

SPC00061 Jacquet, Joyce None Provided 8/8/2003

SPC00061-1

Comment:

I'm requesting again for a noise monitoring. The airplanes fly over house day & night They suppose to fly starting at 5:00 am, but they don't.

At bad weather they take off from West to the house East. They fly so low the house vibrate.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01948-1 regarding noise monitoring. There is no curfew at LAX. However, since the early 1970's, between midnight and 6:30 a.m., and winds permitting, Air Traffic Control converts to an over-ocean operations mode whereby both arrivals and departures fly over the ocean. Although this is a preferred method of operation during the late nighttime window, there is no ban on flight operations to the east of the airport. Even during over-ocean operations, individual pilots can and do request east takeoffs. LAWA has recently initiated a Request For Qualifications to prepare a 14 CFR Part 161 Study for Los Angeles International Airport. LAWA is seeking to establish a partial curfew at LAX that would prohibit the easterly departure of all discretionary aircraft, with certain exemptions, between the hours of 12:00 Midnight to 6:30 a.m. when LAX is in Over-Ocean Operations. During a recent 18-month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. When over-ocean procedures are not practicable for reasons of adverse weather or winds (as defined in Section 4, of LAWA's Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Restrictions), aircraft will continue to depart to the east between midnight and 6:30. For a detailed explanation on sleep disturbance please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use with supporting technical data and analyses in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation, Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement and TR-N-8 regarding noise based vibration.

SPC00061-2

Comment:

They interfere with the television & satellite. I have to wait until one pass before we can see the picture again.

We can hear when they slow the plane. When the windows are open we cannot hear the telephone or television.

Response:

Comment noted. However, FAA and LAWA acknowledge the concern of the commentor and are working to address noise complaints from LAX operations. Please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. See also Topical Responses TR-LU-3 regarding residential sound insulation under the ANMP and TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. It should also be noted that FAA and LAWA staff are not aware of complaints from residents about planes interfering with television and satellite reception, although interference with television antennae reception for residential uses located in proximity to the flight path may occur as a result of aircraft overflights, however, satellite or cable reception would generally not be affected.

SPC00061-3

Comment:

I have a heart condition, asthma and allergies.

3. Comments and Responses

Between the soot & dust, I am having a hard time.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR 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 TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

SPC00062

Gordon, Mike

City of El Segundo

8/20/2003

SPC00062-1

Comment:

Good Evening. I am Mayor Mike Gordon, representing the City of El Segundo.

Given the length and complexity of the Master Plan and environmental documents, our full comments on technical issues will not be ready for some time, therefore the City's comments tonight are preliminary.

The City of El Segundo continues to oppose LAX Master Plan Alternatives A, B, and C for the many reasons the City expressed orally and in writing during the public review and comment period for the initial Draft EIS/EIR in 2002.

While we feel the stated objectives of the new plan supports a regional aviation approach - an issue that Mayor Hahn and I continue to work side by side on - the City of El Segundo has not yet taken an official position on Alternative D, nor have I.

Specifically, the City supports a regional approach alternative that makes proper use of Inland Empire airports.

The City supports an alternative with fewer environmental impacts. We would like to see the adverse impacts of the airport minimized and mitigated to the greatest extent feasible.

The City of El Segundo supports enhanced safety and security at LAX.

And the City supports an alternative that by design will accommodate passenger and cargo levels no greater than the physical capacity of the airport as it exists today, approximately 78 million annual passengers.

Limiting LAX's capacity to its current capacity has always been our number one goal. We believe limiting LAX's capacity will allow other airports in the region to develop and handle a fair share of future regional aviation demand.

This approach will result in fewer environmental impacts, and will improve safety and security at the airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00062-2**Comment:**

However, the City is greatly concerned about the impacts of proposed southside airfield changes that move the southernmost runway 50 feet closer to El Segundo.

LAWA has stated that it believes these changes are necessary to improve runway safety.

However, we are currently studying the impacts of the reconfiguration, and other options for the southern runway complex.

In particular, we urge a full public consideration of end-around taxiways as an alternative that could provide greater safety sooner, at lower cost and with fewer new burdens on local communities.

Safety at LAX must be a priority for all of us.

The City is prepared to support measures necessary to enhance safety, even if those measures increase our burden, but only if we are assured, through an independent expert, that other alternatives are not equally effective.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00038-3 regarding the potential noise impacts of moving the southernmost runway approximately 55 feet south and discussion on runway incursions at LAX and an analysis conducted by NASA Ames Research Center comparing the costs and benefits of a center parallel taxiway and end-around taxiway on the south airfield complex.

SPC00062-3**Comment:**

In conclusion, we are grateful for Mayor Hahn's responsive leadership and his pledge to constrain growth at LAX and foster a regional approach to meeting future aviation demand.

It is our hope that the ultimate outcome of this Master Plan process will be a regional airport approach that ensures that LAX does not exceed its current capacity.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00063**None Provided****County of Los Angeles****8/1/2003**

The content of this comment letter is identical to Attachment I of SAL00004; please refer to Responses to Comments SAL00004-2 through SAL00004-11.

SPC00064**Miscikowski, Cindy****City of Los Angeles****8/23/2003****SPC00064-1****Comment:**

Under the proposed Alternative D of the Los Angeles International Airport Master Plan, the airport will undergo substantial changes which will impact a variety of sectors, including the communities, the airline industry, and the region. The plan is referred to as the "Safety and Security Plan" which reduces substantially the expansion in capacity and site footprint as proposed in Alternatives A, B and C.

3. Comments and Responses

While Alternative D has improved based on requests from the communities and from other constituents, it nonetheless raises some important questions. I have reviewed the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Master Plan and have determined that there are some specific issues that need to be further analyzed and addressed.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00064-2

Comment:

Transportation Issues:

Mitigation measures are unfunded, uncertain, & undervalued: Alternative D shifts the majority of the traffic impacts from the current central terminal area to the area now known as Manchester Square. While there are some traffic mitigations included in the Supplemental EIS/EIR, one of the main features of this proposal requires building an off-ramp from the I-405 freeway at Lennox Blvd. directly into the new Ground Transportation Center (GTC). The vast majority of these mitigations are directly tied to the availability of airport-related funds and to the availability of funding from other agencies, like the Metro Transit Authority and the State of California. There is also a reliance upon "future" expansion of various programs outside of the airport's jurisdiction like the MTA's Rapid Bus service. There seems to be no analysis of the traffic impacts of Alternative D should these mitigations not materialize nor are there any alternatives presented.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02220-6 regarding funding. If a lack of funding affected the airport plan, the plan would have to be amended to reflect alternative mitigation, for which there was funding available. Any major plan revisions would have to have environmental approval, including public input.

SPC00064-3

Comment:

Furthermore, there has been no analysis done of the impacts of the new freeway offramp from the I-405 freeway at Lennox Blvd. on the I-405 freeway, both North and South Bound. Currently, access to the airport via the I-405 is accessible via at least 3 freeway exits, both North and South bound. Alternative D concentrates the freeway access to one point from the I-405 freeway into the GTC. The draft document comparison states that under Alternative D, freeway speeds would be "faster than the No Action/No Project" alternative based on what appears to be an analysis of current traffic patterns. However, given that the proposal in Alternative D creates an entirely different traffic pattern, it is hard to imagine how the comparison is a valid one. Furthermore, there seems to be little hard evidence provided to back up the claims of faster freeway speeds and reduced traffic.

Response:

There was a detailed traffic modeling analysis performed for the I-405 interchange at Lennox Boulevard, including its impacts on northbound and southbound I-405. That analysis is summarized in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.3.2, and in Technical Report S-2b. The conclusion that I-405 would operate with faster speeds in Alternative D than in the No Action/No Project Alternative is based on this analysis. The analysis determined Alternative D conditions with future traffic patterns unique to Alternative D versus the No Action/No Project conditions which would exist without any improvements. Therefore, the comparison is valid. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

SPC00064-4

Comment:

Cargo impacts could be further mitigated: DOT and LAWA have previously analyzed the extension of Avian Blvd. directly into the airport to provide a dedicated cargo road. This option has been fully designed and is likely ready to be implemented. This option would have a positive effect on current airport operations and traffic patterns.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft Master Plan Addendum or the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Modifications to Avion Boulevard are not included as part of LAX Master Plan - Alternative D.

SPC00064-5

Comment:

Public transportation connectivity: The plan calls for the Green Line light rail to be connected to the Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) located at the former Continental City site by way of a moving sidewalk or other device. Furthermore there is an existing EIR for expansion of the Green Line northward past LAX and into Westchester. Green Line project remains in the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA), and the MTA owns the existing heavy rail right-of-way that proceeds northward along Aviation Blvd. into Westchester. Nonetheless, the plan should more explicitly call for the preservation and enhancement of the existing right-of-way for a future expansion of the Green Line. This is most sensitive in the area along Aviation adjacent to Runway 25/7, where it is subject to competing interests: light rail, heavy rail, automated people mover, street widening and FAA flight signaling infrastructure.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHA0005-5, regarding Green Line connectivity along Aviation Boulevard. Alternative D does not preclude the potential for the Green Line to be extended along Aviation in the future.

SPC00064-6

Comment:

Security Issues:

Alternative D is billed as the "Safety and Security" plan for LAX. The premise upon which the security proposals have been designed is to protect the "primary function" of the airport, which, presumably, is the take-off and landing of aircraft. Therefore, the separation of passengers and vehicles from the Central Terminal Area was a primary design component of Alt D to prevent against bomb or other dangerous activity which would stop air traffic at LAX. While the specifics of the technologies required to implement the security provisions have not been detailed in the Supplement, additional information presented in the accompanying SAIC report relies upon a series of assumptions which lead to the ultimate conclusion that Alternative D is safer than the no project alternative and safer than all of the other alternatives previously presented.

As in other areas of the Supplemental EIS/EIR, Alternative D leads to more questions than answers, particularly in the realm of security. First, the premise of protecting the "primary function" of the airport is one that deserves greater consideration. Alternative D, while claiming to diffuse passengers through separate entry points at the Ground Transportation Center (GTC), the Consolidated Rental Car Facility (RAC) and the CTA, actually makes those locations easier targets for terrorists or others wishing to maximize the loss of life in any one incident. This leads to the question of whether enough will be done to protect airport patrons versus airport operations? In addition, one well-placed explosive device on the automated people mover could just as easily debilitate airport operations and create additional risk to area hotels and businesses located on Century Blvd. just below the people mover. There are any

3. Comments and Responses

number of scenarios that could be imagined that seem to be ignored by the security proposals contained within the current document.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX. In addition, please see Appendix I of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum.

SPC00064-7

Comment:

Further, it is worth noting that the current environmental documents do not fully elaborate upon the technology and construction specifics of the proposed security enhancements. LAWA's own security consultants have acknowledged that their analysis is based on technology that does not yet exist. The electronic scanning of automobiles and trucks upon entrance to parking facilities, face recognition technology, and fast baggage screening at the point of entry at the CTA are components of the security plan that are required to make Alternative D work. If any one of these component parts is not yet developed, is too costly once developed to implement or is not commercially available at the time of construction then the plan does not work and security risks are imminently greater.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX. In addition, please see Appendix I of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum.

SPC00064-8

Comment:

SAIC consultants have also stated that while costs for implementation of the security plan are unknown at this time, ultimately the airport would achieve savings through the reduction in security personnel required since technology would replace them. However, the Supplemental EIS/EIR states clearly that there would be "no cost savings for law enforcement personnel" in fact, estimates that security personnel would increase by 162 for airport police and that 12 additional LAPD officers will be required. Is the baseline for this analysis security staffing at LAX pre- or post-9/11? Given that the technologies do not yet exist, how do we even know what will be required to staff and maintain them?

Response:

Police staffing at LAX has already been increased to respond to the heightened level of security since September 11, 2001. The current airport layout and security regime require this extensive, round-the-clock, and wide-spread police presence. As stated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and in the Draft Master Plan Addendum, the physical layout of Alternative D and the proposed approach to securing the facility is one that works to harden the target and improve the facility layout to reduce the heavy dependence on a widely dispersed police presence. Implementation of Alternative D would allow for the most effective deployment of the available force in locations best positioned to respond to security threats. Security technology is never meant to replace a well-trained and equipped police force but rather it makes the force and its mission more effective. The increases in law enforcement personnel indicated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is envisioned based on the increase in passenger activity at the airport in the future over existing levels. The law enforcement personnel projection is a forecast based on the existing situation, however, police staffing requirements may change as a result of a range of unforeseen circumstances.

SPC00064-9**Comment:**

Furthermore, LAWA's original intent was to create a security review after the approval of the EIR. However, the publication of the RAND study was an incentive to accelerate that review and incorporate the SAIC study into the plan release. If the security review was to come after the EIR approval by City Council, that suggests that any terminal structure can be made to be reasonably secure regardless of what was on the land use document. Otherwise, the security review by SAIC would have been incorporated at a very early date. Finally, should this be the case, it begs the fundamental question of why the plan calls for such aggressive construction and development of areas like the GTC to be located at Manchester Square, a mile away from the existing terminals.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-MP-3 regarding the purpose of the GTC at Manchester Square.

SPC00064-10**Comment:**

There is also no discussion of how phasing of construction will affect the overall security elements. Since the CTA, people mover, and baggage transport facility are among the last components of the plan, how will the airport be protected, assuming the premise adopted by Alternative D, in the interim?

Response:

As was described in Figure S3-15 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, 2015 Alternative D Conceptual Summary Schedule, the CTA, APM and Baggage Tunnel GTC to CTA would be constructed in Phase I.

Each existing component of LAX infrastructure would have its existing security maintained or improved if new technology or security techniques become available.

As each component of Alternative D would be constructed, the airport security improvements that were described in Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR would be implemented to protect LAX passengers. For example, once the GTC, ITC, RAC and APM are fully functional, private vehicle access to the CTA would be restricted and traffic redirected to these new facilities to reduce the threat of an explosion in the CTA.

SPC00064-11**Comment:**

These discrepancies and the lack of detail for the actual implementation of the necessary security technologies are of grave concern. Other risk scenarios must be evaluated in this process.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00064-12

Comment:

Concerns over Growth Potential:

The Supplemental EIS/EIR acknowledges that under Alternative D, every single terminal function area will be substantially increased - in many cases doubled. This leaves the only restriction on growth the number of aircraft that can be accommodated by the physical gate structures. Regardless of the number of gates that will be constructed, there still exists the ability to expand gate capacity with portable gates, as are in use today in the western portion of the facility.

Given that ability, what will true capacity be at LAX following the implementation of Alternative D? Furthermore, what, if any, environmental or other review is required to move a portable gate onto the western tarmac? Finally, what constraints, if any, which exist for future elected officials in Los Angeles who may see fit to enact a true capacity expansion at LAX to 98 MAP or higher, even at the expense of a truly regional air transportation system?

Response:

The western remote gates at LAX are not portable. They are fixed in place and accessed via shuttle busses that transport passengers to and from hold room facilities in TBIT to their respective remote gate.

As stated on page 3-45 in Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR the remote gates on the west pad facility would be eliminated and this area would be prohibited from use as a remote passenger boarding location.

The north portion of the existing west pad would be demolished to make room for relocated runway 6R/24L, Taxiways D and E. This includes seven of the nine existing remote gates. However, the two remaining remote gates will also be demolished, as the west pad would be used in the future for aircraft holding, RON positions and maintenance.

As described in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Draft Master Plan Addendum, LAX Master Plan Alternative D would provide facilities that can accommodate a constrained capacity of 78.9 MAP.

All facilities constructed at LAX are subject to environmental review.

If a future elected official were to be interested in further expansion of LAX it would require a change to any previously approved and adopted master plan which would require a new or modified Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Report which would be public. This process would occur in a similar fashion to what has happened with Alternative D. LAWA released a Master Plan in 2001 with a preferred Alternative known as Alternative C. The mayoral election and the events of September 11, 2001 resulted in changes to the Master Plan, which is now known as Alternative D. This process is described in the Executive Summary of the Draft Master Plan Addendum.

SPC00064-13

Comment:

Manchester Square:

Because of the uniqueness and prominence of the proposed GTC at Manchester Square, its discussion deserves special attention. Ground traffic impacts remain a question for the GTC. The community has been assured to a certain point at forums such as the LAX Working Group that traffic impacts would be minimized through the Westchester community because access points to the GTC are limited to the 405/105 freeways, Lennox Blvd. and other points south.

If, however, access to the GTC is largely expected from the 405/105 freeways, then those freeways which already experience overcapacity from non-airport uses will incur additional traffic impact. This suggests that some airport-bound vehicles will approach from north via other routes, like Sepulveda,

Lincoln, Centinela, La Tijera, and La Cienega, much as they do today, even though the explicit design of the GTC is to make this access inconvenient for travelers.

Response:

The traffic modeling showed that some of the non-airport traffic that would normally use the I-405 Freeway would shift to Sepulveda Boulevard and, to a lesser extent, Aviation Boulevard and Lincoln Boulevard after the CTA is closed to future private vehicles and more capacity becomes available on those arterial streets. The capacity of Sepulveda Boulevard and the I-405 would become balanced as the percentage of non-airport traffic increases on Sepulveda Boulevard while the percentage of airport related traffic increases on the I-405 Freeway. As a result, I-405 would not be burdened with both non-airport traffic that it would accommodate if the CTA was open and the new airport traffic generated by the GTC.

SPC00064-14

Comment:

The site footprint of the GTC as outlined in the land use plan raises further questions. If passengers are just moving through the GTC with no concessions or amenities, does it need to be of the large size as suggested on the plan's maps? What uses are called for in a facility the size of the GTC other than security devices? Alternative D is unclear on this. And if efficient passenger throughput can be achieved in a smaller facility, can it occupy either a smaller footprint in Manchester Square, or can it be located elsewhere? All of these issues raise the question of whether the GTC as located at Manchester Square will provide truly adequate security mitigation consistent with the costs associated with this aspect of the project.

Response:

Comment noted. As described in Chapter 2.28, Ground Transportation Center (GTC), of the LAX Draft Master Plan Addendum, the following major functions are anticipated to be included in the GTC: short-term parking, long-term parking, E-Kiosk check-in, curbside interface for busses, private autos, taxis, limos etc., skycap baggage check-in, first level passenger security screening, APM interface, baggage re-claim (optional for checked bags), and compressed natural gas fueling station. There would also be public restroom facilities and potentially limited concession space. The GTC is designed to allow for the efficient flow of arriving and departing passengers with as little congregation as possible to minimize the effects of a potential blast in proximity to the structure. This feature is central to Alternative D's theme of enhanced safety and security. Additionally, the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum describes that a first level security screening process would occur at the GTC with potential features such as sniffing dogs, video surveillance systems and other security devices. However, the GTC would also be designed to accommodate second level security screening at any time. It was determined that efficient passenger throughput and the need to plan for the future implementation of additional levels of security necessitate a facility of the size illustrated in the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum are program level documents. Project level planning for the GTC would identify specific space requirements for each use.

The GTC's primary function would be to provide a passenger pick-up and drop-off location separated from the CTA where large groups of passengers typically congregate. In addition to the functions housed within the GTC structure, the GTC must also provide adequate curb front to efficiently accommodate airport traffic. The required effective curbside length also determined the approximate illustrated size and configuration of the GTC piers.

Detailed information regarding the methodology for designing the curb front at the GTC was described in Technical Report S-2a, Supplemental On-Airport Surface Transportation Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Table S10, Curbside Factored Analysis, Design Day Airport Peak Hour, 2015 Alternative D, highlights factors that determined the required curb length that would be available at the GTC. Additionally, Table S4.3.1-6, Year 2015 Curbside Requirements, on page 4-232 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, described required curb lengths and demand capacity ratios for each alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00064-15

Comment:

OTHER ISSUES:

The draft documentation provided on Alternative D raises some significant additional concerns. One issue that appears to be under-addressed are the potential environmental impacts of the construction of the underground baggage transport facility. Some areas of the plan refer to the baggage facility as a part of the current proposal while others identify it as a potential future development. It seems that regardless of whether it is in or out of the current proposal, it should be evaluated as a part of the Master Plan. Placing a baggage transport system underground will have significant impacts - both during and after construction. How far below grade would this system need to be? What are existing physical limitations - both man made and natural that would affect the feasibility of this system? If the system is never implemented, how and where do the TSA requirements of 100% baggage screening get addressed? Currently there is little to no discussion of the myriad of issues including construction impacts, geological impacts, impacts of the water table, impacts on public utilities, relocation of public and other utility lines, and excavation requirements just to name a few.

Response:

Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR maintains that a tunnel between the GTC and the CTA would be one method of optimizing the movement of oversized passenger baggage between the GTC and CTA. The proposed baggage tunnel is currently anticipated to be developed in conjunction with the APM and sharing the same alignment along the existing 98th Street corridor. Other alignments, including but not limited to the 96th street corridor, may be identified during the preliminary design process as being less restrictive, more cost effective, and less disruptive to the surrounding community. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is a program level document.

The system would be designed to accommodate a forecast amount of passenger baggage expected to be transported in order to avoid man-made and/or physical limitations.

As described in the Draft Master Plan Addendum, 100 percent of TSA baggage screening would occur at the CTA. Therefore the baggage transport system between the GTC and CTA would not influence the location of final TSA baggage screening system.

Construction related impacts of Alternative D are described in Chapter 4.2, Construction Impacts, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00064-16

Comment:

Environmental Justice:

The Supplemental EIS/EIR, while identifying that the majority of affected communities are minority, clearly states that there are no Master Plan commitments related to environmental justice. It merely states that there will be continued input through the ongoing Environmental Justice Program. This is not sufficient given the serious impacts this project will have on the surrounding communities.

Response:

Extensive mitigation measures were provided in the Draft EIS/EIR, as found throughout Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures, and as provided in the Executive Summary, and in Chapter 5, Environmental Action Plan. Many of these measures apply to minority and low-income communities, as well as other potentially effected communities. While a number of these mitigation measures were accounted for and discussed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR, the reason the section did not include a program with mitigation measures and benefits fully reflective of community input, was because the preliminary findings on environmental justice were not known until the document was finalized. It was appropriate, and a clearly stated intent in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (page 4-433), that the Environmental Justice Program would be further

developed and implemented in coordination with affected minority and low-income communities and their representatives in order to ensure that their unique issues and needs would be fully accounted for.

As stated on page 4-337, in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA received a substantial number of recommendations for mitigation measures and other benefits relating to environmental justice concerns from environmental justice workshops, comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR, and subsequent community outreach. All recommendations were thoroughly evaluated against such criteria as whether the recommendation had a nexus or connection with the environmental effects of the proposed LAX Master Plan, or whether it would be feasible for the FAA and/or LAWA to fund and implement. Those recommendations that best met the criteria were instrumental in defining the Environmental Justice Program included in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As further described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2, public input was also received in association with public circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, through additional environmental justice workshops, public hearings, and comments on the EIS/EIR. Furthermore, environmental justice outreach was conducted more recently through meetings with local organizations, environmental groups, and civic, religious, and business leaders in adjacent communities. This additional input was considered and evaluated through a process similar to that undertaken prior to circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The final Environmental Justice Program is presented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of this Final EIS/EIR, with supporting information provided in Appendix F-A, of this Final EIS/EIR.

SPC00064-17

Comment:

Cost:

The \$9 billion cost of Alternative D is no doubt a substantial fiscal impact on several sectors. While it is difficult to compare the LAX Master Plan with those of other U.S. airport remodeling plans and their local realities, the cost differences with those projects are nonetheless striking:

Atlanta:	\$5.4 billion
New York JFK:	\$1.2 billion
Chicago O'Hare:	\$6 billion
San Francisco:	\$2.4 billion

If the LAX Master Plan calls for limited or no capacity expansion plus safety and security improvements, then a cost of \$9 billion is inconsistent with the basic goals of the "Safety and Security Plan". Surely these laudable goals could be accomplished at a lower cost. Could not basic security and safety measures be implemented at LAX for \$2 billion, while reducing gates to limit capacity, increasing airfield safety, improving connectivity to public transportation and making LAX the crown jewel of a truly regional air transportation system?

Response:

Comment noted. It is very difficult to compare master plans among several airports. The goals of the master plan, existing facilities, proposed facilities, and timelines are different for each airport. Very little has been invested at LAX in the past 20 years, whereas billions of dollars have been invested in the same timeframe at Chicago O'Hare, New York Kennedy, and San Francisco. Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00064-18

Comment:

The airline industry will be a substantial source of funding for this project. Assessments to the airlines will come in the form of passenger facility charges (PFCs) and sources. Currently, airlines at LAX enjoy low cost-per-enplanement (the cost of putting one passenger onto an airplane) as compared to other airports, due in part to the fact that LAWA has less debt service that it is currently passing on to the

3. Comments and Responses

carriers. Cost-per-enplanement will nonetheless quadruple or quintuple at LAX as these assessments are incurred.

After the events of September 11, 2001 and due in part to the general economic downturn and subsequent reduction in business and pleasure travel, the airline industry is facing devastating economic impacts. As an industry that inherently has very high operating costs and capital investment requirements, the airlines are highly sensitive to fluctuations in their revenues.

Some airlines are currently in bankruptcy proceedings while others hover perilously close. Furthermore, some of the airlines currently operating at LAX, who represent a significant portion of the U.S. domestic and international travel markets, have expressed concern that they cannot incur these costs over the project's horizon and continue to provide service at LAX as their customers demand. While there has been some communication between the airlines and the planners, the airlines still feel that their concerns over project cost are unheard.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00064-19

Comment:

Other Alternatives Should be Examined:

Of all the project iterations to date, one concept that has never been given enough thought is improving and enhancing the airport within the current physical layout. Creating transportation improvements like adding ATCS systems to more intersections, improving connectivity with public transportation, making security upgrades that will need to be done in the interim anyway, making runway modifications such as the South runway proposal, and terminal changes within the current physical layout can all be accomplished quickly and will have a real impact. These changes, combined with a consolidated transportation access location and a rental car facility could ultimately lead to a safer, more efficient airport that works better in the context of the surrounding community, truly caps growth, and costs significantly less than the soaring costs for Alternative D.

The RAND analysis of security identifies significant infrastructure improvements that can be done now, with existing technology, that will have a direct impact on the safety of airport patrons and airport operations. There are other proposals, such as the previously mentioned extension of Avion Blvd. as a dedicated cargo road and consolidated rental car facility that will significantly improve transportation access to LAX. The rental car facility alone will decrease over 1 million shuttle trips currently occurring because there are multiple rental car locations in and around the airport today.

By ignoring other options and issuing comparisons based on a "do nothing" alternative, we do a disservice to everyone. There is no question that "doing nothing" is not an option. This Master Plan should be one that achieves something real, at a reasonable price and not one that seems to raise more questions than it answers.

I urge your further consideration of these issues as you work to complete a true Master Plan for the future of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. As described in Chapter 3.1, Formulation and Refinement of Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, development of the first iteration of Master Plan concepts began in January 1995 and included the formulation of eight development options, grouped within three overall themes including minimal change. Formulation of the initial build alternatives was described in detail in Section 3.1.3, Development Concepts, of the Draft EIS/EIR.

Alternative D would provide enhancements to the safety and security of the airport in an efficient manner. Limited portions of the existing airfield would be able to be improved for safety and security without significant impact. For example, relocating Runway 7R/25L 55 feet south of its current location would not require the demolition of other existing facilities. However, the relocation of Runway 6R/24L 340 feet south of its current location in order to accommodate the north center parallel taxiway would

3. Comments and Responses

require demolition of Terminals 1, 2, and 3 and their replacement with a lineal concourse building. The amount of area between the existing CTA roadway system and the proposed north airfield runway and taxiway improvements is not sufficient to develop a stand alone fully functioning terminal building. The lineal concourse illustrated in the Alternative D concept contains secure circulation hold rooms and concession but does not provide terminal processing functions north of the existing roadway system. These functions are accommodated in the new redeveloped CTA terminal processors. This is an example of how Alternative D was developed considering comments received on the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, and C. Strong opposition to relocating Runway 6L/24R further north, closer to the Westchester community, was expressed, which resulted in the proposed relocation of Runway 6R/24L as planned in Alternative D, to the south. The two most important components of improving airfield safety at LAX are the relocation of the two runways and the construction of center parallel taxiways eliminating the direct high-speed taxiway links between the arrival and departure runways. Though reconstructing the south airfield would theoretically solve a portion of the problem, the north airfield would remain susceptible to runway incursions. Fixing a portion of the problem is not consistent with the policy and planning objectives outlined in the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum.

Though some security upgrades will be made to the existing CTA including the implementation of 100 percent in-line EDS baggage screening systems, these are not considered to be sufficient in the future as more travelers use LAX. The proximity of the existing vehicle roadway to large numbers of queuing passengers at such functions as ticketing and check-in presents a security threat. Relocating the passenger arrival and departure roadway to the GTC and eliminating private vehicles from the CTA is considered critical in the effort to secure LAX.

As described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Need, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the No Action/No Project Alternative was included in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, as required under NEPA, in order to offer a point of comparison for reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts of the three build alternatives.

Please refer to Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues.

SPC00065 Burke, Yvonne County of Los Angeles 8/23/2003

SPC00065-1

Comment:

On behalf of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, thank you for the opportunity to offer preliminary comments on the SUPPLEMENT TO THE DRAFT EIS/EIR for LAWA's Proposed LAX Master Plan. In reviewing the extensive materials presented in the original EIS/EIR of 2001 and the supplement of 2003, we recognize the enormity and importance of the challenge faced by LAWA, we acknowledge the extensive effort that has been made, and we thank LAWA for responding to public demand in extending the review period into November. HOWEVER, THESE CONSIDERATIONS DO NOT DIMINISH THE VERY REAL CONCERNS OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CONCERNING THE PROPOSED MASTER PLAN and the INADEQUACIES OF THE SUPPLEMENT TO THE DRAFT EIS/EIR. I would like to touch briefly on a couple of the key issues at this time.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00065-2

Comment:

TRAFFIC NOISE AND AIR QUALITY IMPACTS HAVE BEEN SHIFTED EASTWARD

The revised Master Plan as presented in new Alternative D reshuffles airport improvements away from neighboring areas north and south of LAX, and toward communities to the east. As a result, the unincorporated community of Lennox and the City of Inglewood now appear to bear the brunt of added traffic. The community adjacent to Manchester will now face a host of impacts related to the new

3. Comments and Responses

passenger processing facility. Compared with the previously considered Alternative C, this proposal places even a heavier impact burden on communities to the north and east. I have serious concerns about the disproportionate impact of Alternative D on these communities, all of which are in my district. The City of Inglewood and the unincorporated community of Lennox will continue to be the most impacted by the operation of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality and human health 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 14a of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4 and S-9a of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR analyzed impacts on minority and low-income communities to the east of LAX and the I-405 (including Lennox and Inglewood) and provide supporting technical data in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Regarding traffic impacts and as further described in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, although it is correct that a greater number of intersections would be significantly impacted under Alternative D compared to Alternative C, the majority of these intersections are located west of the I-405 and Lennox and Inglewood would not bear the brunt of traffic impacts. In addition, the three intersections that would remain significantly impacted after mitigation are all located to the west of the I-405. Therefore, as concluded in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.5.4.1), Alternative D would not have a disproportionate traffic impact on communities to the east compared to 1996 baseline conditions. In addition, of the 32 intersections identified in Table S4.3-7 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR as being significantly impacted under Alternative D compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative, only 9 of these intersections would be located in Lennox and Inglewood. Therefore, no disproportionate traffic impact would occur to communities to the east compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Furthermore, under Alternative D impacts associated with the ring road and LAX Expressway which were proposed under Alternative C and described in Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR, would not occur, thereby reducing associated impacts on communities to the east.

Regarding air quality impacts, as presented in Section 4.6, Air Quality of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, due to a reduced level of airport activity Alternative D would result in a reduction of overall emissions of NO_x, particulate matter, and toxic air pollutants compared to Alternative C. However, under all of the build alternatives air quality effects would remain adverse after mitigation with related health effects potentially more severe for populations particularly susceptible to asthma and other chronic respiratory illnesses. Although Alternative D would result in significant air quality effects for certain pollutants in areas that include the City of Inglewood and Lennox community compared to 1996 baseline conditions, emissions would generally be reduced compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. See also Topical Response TR-EJ-1 for further discussion of potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-impact and minority communities under the Master Plan alternatives.

Regarding noise impacts, as shown on Table S4.2-19 and S4.2-29 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, fewer dwelling units and population would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL and 94 dBA SEL under Alternative D than under Alternative C. As concluded in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.5.1.1), Alternatives C and D would both result in significant disproportionate levels of noise exposure to communities to the east of LAX. However, as shown on Table S4.2-29 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, due to a shift in the noise contours, the overall area and number of residents within the Lennox community exposed to high noise levels and high single event noise levels under Alternative D would decrease compared to 1996 baseline and the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also under Alternative D, the overall area and number of noise-sensitive uses within Inglewood exposed to high noise levels would increase compared to the 1996 baseline and No Action/No Project Alternative.

It is acknowledged that the City of Inglewood and the unincorporated community of Lennox would continue to be disproportionately impacted by the operation of LAX. As further described in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, an Environmental Justice

Program is proposed to provide mitigation measures or benefits to those minority and low-income communities adversely and disproportionately impacted by LAX. See Topical Response TR-EJ-2 for a description of environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

SPC00065-3

Comment:

Although Alternative D is presented as the alternative that will "constrain" passenger growth to 78.9 million annual passengers based upon the number of available gates, even the eye of a lay person can see that Alternative D provides LAWA with a footprint larger than the prior alternatives. This footprint, along with the new air terminal layout, provides the opportunity of future expansion of LAX with resulting increases in already intolerable air quality, noise, traffic and safety impacts on the communities of Inglewood and Lennox.

Response:

Alternative D does not increase the airport footprint versus the No Action/No Project Alternative. As stated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR the number and type of gates constructed at LAX under Alternative D would constrain the airport to approximately 78.9 MAP.

SPC00065-4

Comment:

The residents of these communities already suffer inordinately from the current operation of LAX. I personally believe it's high time we address whether LAX, an airport surrounded on three sides by urban development, shouldn't be scaled back rather than improved, enhanced and enlarged, unless the present impact from noise is mitigated.

Response:

FAA and LAWA acknowledge the concern of the commentor and are working with jurisdictions affected by high noise levels from LAX operations to address noise complaints. The effect of the operation of LAX on the communities of Inglewood and Lennox under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions are presented throughout Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. However, the general focus of the document, pursuant to CEQA and NEPA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. Although LAX would be improved under the Master Plan, it is important to note that Alternative D, LAWA staff's preferred alternative, is similar to the No Action/No Project Alternative when considering aviation activity levels and noise impacts. Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Chapter 2, Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In an effort to mitigate current noise impacts from LAX operations on adjacent communities, LAWA and other jurisdictions affected by high noise levels (defined under FAR Part 150 and Title 21 as the 65 CNEL) prepare and administer their respective ANMPs. Residential properties within the 65 CNEL are eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP as described in Topical Response TR-LU-3. Priority for sound insulation is given to residential properties within the highest noise level band above the 65 CNEL. As further described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3, page 4-4) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, as of June 2002 it is estimated that of the 33,099 residential units within the current ANMP boundaries, 6,685 previously incompatible dwelling units are now compatible with approximately 3,845 residential units having become compatible since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR in January 2001. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high noise levels. As stated under Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA would accelerate fulfillment of existing commitments to owners wishing to participate within the current ANMP boundaries prior to proceeding with newly eligible properties and would provide additional technical assistance to local jurisdictions to support more rapid and efficient implementation of their respective ANMPs.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00065-5

Comment:

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors has been on record for some time in support of a strong regional airport system which focuses on outlying airports such as Ontario or Palmdale, airports which are not surrounded by development . We expressed this position in our comments on the Draft EIS/EIR in 2001. Although Mayor Hahn has voiced his support for a regional airport system, Alternative D continues to reinforce LAX as the preeminent airport for the Southern California region. Consequently, the concept of strengthening the role of outlying airports in order to avoid adversely impacting the lives of tens of thousands, if riot millions, of people, is seriously undermined.

Response:

LAWA only controls the operations and potential improvements at LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Other jurisdictions are responsible for developing the other regional airports. LAWA is developing plans for all three of its potential commercial service airports. Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports. The master plans will recommend improvements to meet the projected demand. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX and necessary improvements to safety and security.

SPC00065-6

Comment:

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MAY NOT BE WELL SERVED BY THE EIS/EIR EVALUATION

The requirement to consider Environmental Justice has been in place for almost 10 years now, originally signed into law by President Clinton in 1994. And yet, the original Draft EIS/EIR prepared by LAWA in 2001 - 7 years after Executive Order 12898 -- lacked even the most elementary analyses of this topic. Our preliminary review indicates that LAWA has not yet achieved a fair and complete assessment of the critically important issue of Environmental Justice.

In my earlier remarks concerning noise, air quality and traffic, I noted that Alternative D appears to shift the burden of airport improvements away from the wealthier communities on the north and south, and toward the more economically disadvantaged communities east and northeast of LAX. I believe that this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR will not be adequate until it provides an honest assessment of the trade-offs between environmental protection and environmental justice. In designing runway extensions and facilities to the east, this plan appears to protect biological resources - particularly the El Segundo Blue Butterfly - - at the expense of residents - children and families - in the communities of Lennox, Inglewood and Manchester. Can such a trade-off be justified,? I see no assessment that provides the evidence. This EIS/EIR is the right time to take a hard look at the human costs that will be incurred in order to protect a limited habitat area on the coast. We ask that the analysis be performed now, as part of the Environmental Justice assessment, before the opportunity is lost.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00003-5 regarding shifting of burdens to the east and trade-offs between environmental protection and environmental justice. Considerable attention has been paid to the topic of environmental justice. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The analysis provided is extensive, with over 125 pages of narrative, maps, and tabular data. The analysis followed relevant guidance for addressing environment justice and was prepared after a comprehensive review of other analyses prepared for large projects across the country in order to give the issue full and careful consideration. LAWA and the FAA's recognition of the importance of the issue is also demonstrated by their having convened an Environmental Justice Task Force, and by a community outreach program that involved among other efforts, seven workshops in surrounding communities specifically focused on the issue. This program is further described in Topical Response

TR-EJ-2. LAWA and the FAA have made a strong effort and believe that the assessment of environmental justice presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is fair and complete.

SPC00066 Knabe, Don

County of Los Angeles

8/23/2003

SPC00066-1

Comment:

Thank you for the opportunity to speak this morning about the future of Los Angeles International Airport and our regional air transportation needs.

I appreciate Supervisor Burke's comments and support her concerns about environmental justice issues, etc.

I'd like to begin by saying I agree with Mayor Hahn that something must be done to make LAX more secure and more efficient in handling passengers while balancing the concerns of the local community and the need to create additional jobs.

Alternative D indicates that it is designed to accommodate a passenger activity level of 78.9 million annual passengers by reducing the number of existing gates and by foregoing the creation of the new terminal facilities and runway extensions that had previously been considered.

I support the mayor's stated goal of providing for more manageable limits on the passenger volumes at LAX given the well-documented impacts that the airport has had on the surrounding communities and the surrounding infrastructure.

The County of Los Angeles is in the process of reviewing the LAX Master Plan materials to get a better understanding of just how the mayor intends to assure the region that the 78.9 MAP capacity will not be exceeded once Alternative D is implemented.

In May of this year our County Counsel provided us with their opinion that the City and Los Angeles World Airports could legally place deed restrictions on the LAX property restricting the future development of the airport in order to benefit nearby properties owned by other nearby public entities or private parties.

I believe limiting development is a way to keep a passenger cap in place. I have submitted a motion for consideration by the Board of Supervisors to call on the City of Los Angeles to deed restrict the land until 2020 to ensure that LAX does not exceed 78 MAP

I encourage Mayor Hahn and LAWA to follow through on efforts to limit LAX growth to a manageable level to the greatest extent possible through a commitment to place deed restrictions on certain portions of the LAX property until 2020 to prevent those portions from being used to expand facilities to serve passenger volumes beyond the intended 78.9 MAP level.

Specifically, it would be appropriate for LAWA and the City to commit that the portion of LAX generally located on the west side of the airport easterly of Pershing Drive between the north and south pairs of runways and westerly of the proposed Redeveloped Central Terminal Area (Area 1); and the portion generally located on the northeast corner quadrant of the LAX property and currently used for parking lot and rental car purposes depicted as the site of the proposed Consolidated Rental Car Facility (Area 2) would be deed restricted through 2020.

The deed restrictions should provide that those two areas will not be developed with airport passenger terminal, airport runways, or other improvements intended to increase airport passenger capacities beyond Mayor Hahn's stated 78.9 MAP activity target levels.

Such a firm commitment may be crucial in obtaining the support of Mayor Hahn's Alternative D from at least some of the significant interested agencies and groups who will so directly be affected by the development at LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

This comment does not raise any specific environmental issues related to the proposed LAX Master Plan alternatives. LAWA is unable to address the opinion received by Supervisor Knabe because the opinion was not included with the comment.

LAWA has concluded that the proposed deed restrictions, without approval from the Secretary of Transportation, would violate its existing grant assurances. The proposed deed restriction could potentially cause difficulty in bond financing.

Furthermore, deed restrictions, though a possible means of restricting development, may be difficult to draft to accomplish the precise goal of limiting capacity at LAX. For example, they may prevent needed development that enhances efficiency but does not increase capacity. Alternatively, capacity increases may be required to maintain a competitive edge in 2015 for reasons not foreseen today. Deed restrictions would prevent such a change in policy from taking effect.

Deed restrictions are disfavored in California. Therefore, accurate, pointed language is required to maintain their enforceability.

SPC00066-2

Comment:

While I've have spoken this morning about limiting growth, I do want to say that the security aspect of this plan is a major concern of mine. While the County is reviewing the security aspects of this plan and will comment on it in a written report as part of your official record, I still have strong security concerns with the Manchester Square passenger check in facility. I want to make sure that we give the same safety concerns to the passengers as we do the infrastructure of the airport.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00066-3

Comment:

Again, thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today and I hope that we can move forward in a productive way at achieving our common goals for the redevelopment of LAX; Limiting growth and protecting people through viable safety enhancements.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments above.

SPC00067

McDowell, Kelly

City of El Segundo

8/23/2003

SPC00067-1

Comment:

* Given the length and complexity of the Master Plan and its environmental documents, our full comments on technical issues will not be ready for some time. Therefore my City's comments today are preliminary.

* El Segundo continues to oppose Alternatives A, B, and C for the many reasons we expressed orally and in writing during the public review and comment period for the initial Draft EIS/EIR in 2002.

* El Segundo has not endorsed Alternative D -- but we feel its stated objectives are consistent with a regional aviation approach.

* Specifically, the City of El Segundo supports a regional approach alternative that makes proper use of Inland Empire airports.

* We support an alternative with fewer environmental impacts. And we would like to see the adverse impacts of the airport minimized and mitigated to the greatest extent feasible.

* El Segundo supports enhanced safety and security at LAX.

*And my City supports an alternative that by design will accommodate passenger and cargo levels no greater than the physical capacity of the airport as it exists today.

* Limiting LAX to its current capacity has always been our number one goal -- and we believe that limiting LAX's capacity will:

** allow other airports in the region to develop and handle a fair share of future regional aviation demand;

** result in fewer environmental impacts; and

** improve safety and security at the airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00067-2

Comment:

* But my City is greatly concerned about the impacts of proposed southside airfield changes that would move the southernmost runway 50 feet closer to El Segundo.

* LAWA has stated that it believes these changes are necessary to improve runway safety.

* However, we are currently studying the impacts of the proposed reconfiguration, and the options for the southern runway complex.

* In particular, we urge full public consideration of end-around taxiways as an alternative that could provide greater safety at lower cost and with fewer added burdens on nearby communities.

* Safety at LAX must be a priority for all of us.

* El Segundo is prepared to support measures necessary to enhance safety -- even if those measures increase our burden -- but only if we are assured, by an independent expert, that other alternatives would not be equally effective.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00038-3 regarding the potential noise impacts of moving the southernmost runway approximately 55 feet south and discussion on runway incursion at LAX and an analysis conducted by NASA Ames Research Center comparing the costs and benefits of a center parallel taxiway and "end-around" taxiway on the south airfield complex. The NASA study concluded that the end-around taxiway greatly increased taxi time and delays for arriving aircraft and thereby increased the operational costs of this option and did not give any increased safety margin. Air traffic controllers also found the center parallel taxiway which increased their flexibility while controlling arriving aircraft on the south airfield complex. In a separate LAWA study of these two optional taxiway improvements, the end-around taxiway was found to increase noise impacts on El Segundo residential land uses from taxiing aircraft.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00067-3

Comment:

* In conclusion, we are grateful for Mayor Hahn's responsive leadership and his continuing pledge to constrain growth at LAX and foster a regional approach to meet future aviation demand.

* It is our hope that the ultimate outcome of this Master Plan process will be a truly regional airport approach that ensures that LAX does not exceed its current capacity.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00068

Bauer, Sandra

County of Los Angeles

8/23/2003

SPC00068-1

Comment:

In allotted 3 minutes, I will touch briefly on just a few key points:

- Use of Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR
- Baseline Data Assessment
- Security Analysis for Alternative D

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00068-2

Comment:

USE OF A SUPPLEMENT TO THE DRAFT EIS/EIR

CEQA Gdlms state that a SUPPLMNT to and EIR may be prepared IF CHANGES IN A PROJ ARE NOT SIG. Where MAJOR REVISIONS have occurred ... the proper type of document is a SUBSEQNT EIR that presents ALL info ... instead of only the CHANGD info. BOTH types of review are intended for use in conjnctn w/ prevsly certified docs.

In present case, THERE IS NO PREVIOUSLY CERTIFIED or approved document. And FURTHERMORE, the changes to this project are MAJOR - an entirely NEW ALT has been introduced as the preferred project!

Thus EVEN AN ADAPTATION of CEQA -- to encompass a document that HASN'T BEEN CERTIFIED - would indicate the project should have been addressed through preparation of a comprehensive revised Draft EIS/EIR.

In this context, WHY DID LAWA NOT PREPARE A COMPRHENSIV REV. DR EIS/EIR THAT PRESENTED A FULL SET OF INFO for REVIEW w/ THE NEW ALT D?

We have a 2nd SERIOUS CONCERN w/ this process: In 2001, Co. of L.A. devoted considerable time, FUNDS & effort to review & submit comments on extnsive documtn released by LAWA at that time. I am CERTAIN a similar effort was spent by MANY OTHERS HERE TODAY.

There is NO QUESTION that a resp to the earlier comments would have served to ADVANCE PUBLIC DISCOURSE, strengthen the opportunity for ENV. PROJECTN, and facilitated current review & provided insight into an UNDERSTANDING OF THE LEAD AGENCY'S THINKING on a wide range of KEY ISSUES...

3. Comments and Responses

- WHY, THEN, did LAWA not take this opportunity to present ... or EVEN SUMMARIZE .. COMMENTS OFFERED during the 2001 EIS/EIR review?

ADVANCE PUB DISCLOSURE
FACILITATE CURRENT REVIEW
STRENGTHEN ENV. PROT.
PROVIDE INSIGHT INT LD. AG. Thinking

Response:

The essence of the comment is the same as Comment SAL00013-31; please see Response to Comment SAL00013-31.

SPC00068-3

Comment:

INCONSISTENT AND OUTDATED BASELINE DATA

The 2003 Supplmt makes cont'd widespread use of 1996 baseline data -- that was outdated even in 2001. Instead of actually UPDATING the baseline, individual Sectns offer BRIEF discns comparing '96 data w/ data from 2000 (also 3 yrs out of date).

What we DO NOT SEE is an ANAL of the SIG. baseline SHIFT that occurred following 9/11, and how that SHIFT CHANGED the BENCHMARK for understndg proj imp.

GIVEN that condns at LAX have changed dramatically since 2000 (much less '96) ... and ... GIVEN that LAWA developed an ENTIRELY NEW ALT D in resp. to the MAGNITUDE of those very changes, and designated ALT D as their PREFERRED ALT ...

- WHY did LAWA NOT CONSIDER IT WORTHWHILE TO PROVIDE THE PUBLIC - & its own DECISION MAKERS - w/ a BASELINE REFLCTNG CONDNS AT LAX AS OF 2003?

THAT ALSO

Response:

In the summer of 2001, LAWA initiated the development of a new alternative (Alternative D) at the direction of Mayor James Hahn. In the summer of 2002, preparation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR began. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was published in July, 2003. Providing 2003 data in a document published in that same year was not possible, and would subject the EIS/EIR to an indefinite number of updates, which would defeat the public disclosure purposes of NEPA and CEQA. Year 2002 conditions were not included because the analysis began midway through that year, and Year 2001 conditions were substantially skewed by the short-term impacts of the events of September 11, 2001. Instead, Year 2000 conditions were evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In instances where the environmental setting under Year 2000 conditions is materially different from that of 1996 baseline conditions, such differences were described, as were any material differences in the impacts that would result by using the Year 2000 conditions instead of 1996 baseline conditions. Disciplines where impacts are materially different depending upon the baseline year of comparison include noise, air quality, human health risk, employment/socioeconomics, environmental justice, and others. It should be noted, however, that in accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines, conclusions regarding the significance of impacts under CEQA for all the build alternatives are based on the 1996 baseline or, for certain environmental disciplines, the adjusted environmental baseline. Please also see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 for additional discussion of baseline issues.

SPC00068-4

Comment:

SECURITY

3. Comments and Responses

The Suppl EIS/EIR presents Alt D as the "Enhanced Safety & Security Plan." However, our review of Appdx I (Comp of NA/NP Plan w/ Alt D), indicates that LAWA has relied on a theoretical assmt that falls SGNFCNTLY SHORT on detail.

cnsideable adv media attn has already focused on LAWA's proposed use of UNPROVEN SECURITY TEHCNOLOGIES. I'd like to offer JUST 1 EXAMPLE to illustrate why this is a valid concern

Appdx I mentns possible use of 'face-in-the-crowd' technology. On Aug 20, '03 -- just this past week -- the Tampa, FLA Police Dept. announced it has DISCONTINUED use of facial-recognitn surveillance after 2 yrs. This software product failed to make a SINGLE positive indntificatn from a database of more than 24,000 'mugshots.'

our anal also indicates this plan FOCUSES on 'hardening' security for gateway elements of LAX while largely IGNORING perimeter, cargo areas, maintnce & fuel farm fac.. We've found NO DISCN in Apdx I that specifically addresses backside security.

We undrstnd that MANY SECURITY FEATURES are TOO sensitive for public disclosure. However, the lack of sound analysis & ABSENCE OF CLARITY - these flaws suggest that Alt. D is fundamentally flawed - and in the very area of security that it was created to address.

Thank you for opportunity to share these comments on BEHALF of Co of LA.

Response:

Comment noted. This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00069 Correa, Freddy None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00069-1

Comment:

I'm a Mechanical Engineer also a member of Local 250 The Steam Fitter Local.

My point of view is this, I feel it is imperative that LAX be renovated. Due to all the grid lock, congestion, and the unnecessary problems that this airport is affected. also I'll stimulate this stagnant local economy and I'll put LAX on the TOP AIRPORT'S in the world.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00070 Acosta, Jose None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00070-1

Comment:

I have lived in Lennox for 23 years, in the flight path of LAX. Together my wife and I have raised 2 children in Lennox. My sons are 13 and 17 years old I've worked in tourism for 17 years as a Bartender in the Manhattan Beach Marriott.

It is not easy to live in Lennox and raise children here. Our community is poor. We have traffic. Our schools are crowded and noisy from the planes flying overhead. But one thing that makes it worthwhile for me to raise my family here is that I have a good, stable job in the tourism industry.

Modernization will effect us in Lennox. It can hurt us, or it can help us. Modernization could cause more traffic, more noise, more pollution, without giving anything in return. Or, the city can do everything

3. Comments and Responses

possible to make sure that modernization benefits our community and provides good jobs with living wages and health care. If modernization can benefits our community, then we are willing to support it.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addresses traffic, noise, and air quality impacts associated with Alternative D in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.6, Air Quality, respectively. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

SPC00071 Worthington, Emma None Provided

8/23/2003

SPC00071-1

Comment:

Like myself many people who work at the airport live in the surrounding communities. We live in Inglewood, Lennox, Hawthorne, El Segundo and Westchester. We understand the connection between good quality jobs and a quality life. We need more new jobs but we don't minimum wage jobs. What we need is jobs that provide a livable wage and affordable family health coverage. The companies at the airport provide those types of jobs and that is how as a single mom I have been able to raise my family and not be on welfare. We need to insure that this modernization plan provides good employment opportunities for our communities, we encourage the mayor to include in his plan a local hiring program so that others in my communities can also raise their families and our youths can strive to emulate their parents. When we talk about modernization we say we are bringing the airport and Los Angeles into the 21st Century. Well we the workers would like to be able to bring our communities into the 21st Century along with the airport and the rest of Los Angeles. That is why we urge the mayor to ensure that his plan provides good paying jobs with good benefits and a community packet that will ensure we are along for the ride. NOT LEFT BEHIND.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00032-1.

SPC00072 Crawford, Victor None Provided

8/23/2003

SPC00072-1

Comment:

I wanted to give my support to the proposal for Alternative D of the Airport Master Plan.

With Alternative D providing facilities for 78 million annual passengers and 3.1 million tons of cargo a year it supports the idea of Regional Airports. In past plans LAX was expected to have to handle as many as 98 million passengers a year and this was totally unexceptable to residents of the surrounding cities. Mayor Hahn has lived up to the commitment that he made before he was elected, that the modernization plan would limit airport usage.

Alternative D, according to the Environmental Impact Report, will provide the best design, including safety and security concerns, with the lest impact on area residents and I support that ideal.

Thank you for listening to my statement.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00073 Norton, Kevin None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00073-1

Comment:

I came today to let you know that I support the modernization of LAX. Mayor Hahn's design with Alternative D will fulfill the concerns that many area residents have had, especially in regard to the number of passengers that will be able to use the airport.

Mayor Hahn signed a letter that he would not support any airport design that allowed more than 78 million passengers a year to fly into or out of LAX. Alternative D, by design caps the number of passengers and cargo as well. This will push other airport sites to build airport facilities and redirect flights there.

A regional approach to air travel and cargo handling will be required when Alternative D is constructed and other area residents will realize that they should provide airport sites. This as a great plan and it should move forward as soon as possible.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00074 Verduzco-Smith, Maria None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00074-1

Comment:

The Community of Lennox is severely impacted by airport operations but we feel we are mainly neglected. We have schools that jets fly directly over on their approach to the airport and most homes have not been sound proofed to protect against jet noise, as part of the sound mitigation program.

Response:

Environmental conditions on adjacent communities (including the community of Lennox) from airport operations under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions were presented in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and on Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the majority of Lennox is eligible for sound insulation under the current ANMP. Implementation of the ANMP has been slowed in some areas, such as Lennox, due to the existence of substandard or non-code compliant housing stock in heavily noise-impacted areas. These existing code violations require correction prior to the issuance of a building permit by the County of Los Angeles for sound insulation, as further described in Response to Comment SAL00013-109. As stated in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.8), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, mitigation measure MM-LU-1 would provide for the following: accelerate fulfillment of existing commitments to owners wishing to participate within the current ANMP boundaries prior to proceeding with newly eligible properties; reduce or eliminate, to the extent feasible, structural and building code compliance constraints to soundproofing; and additional technical assistance from LAWA to local jurisdictions to support more rapid and efficient implementation of their land use mitigation programs.

See Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels and existing aircraft noise effects on the Lennox School District, and Response to Comment AL00034-38 regarding the potential for impacts on the Lennox School District.

SPC00074-2**Comment:**

Many of our residents can feel the oil and see the soot from the jets.

Response:

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

SPC00074-3**Comment:**

Our children lose hours of education time yearly due to interruptions caused, each time a plane is landing.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment SPHF00040-3; please refer to Response to Comment SPHF00040-3.

SPC00074-4**Comment:**

There are many things to be taken into consideration when a community is located as close to an airport as Lennox: There is the health of the children, the quality of life for the residents and the impact of noise and traffic the airport causes. If the airport is going to modernize, then it is time for our community to modernize also. This plan must have some real community benefits in it so that future health problems can be alleviated, our schools can be safer, our community can be protected and measures are put in place to ensure that the people of Lennox are treated fairly.

Community benefits means that our community is not forgotten in the modernization process. It means that with \$9 billion being spent for airport modernization, there is money actually being spent in our community to make those infra-structural changes needed to accommodate the expected increase of noise and traffic. While there is a push for modernization, we also want to push for increased and visible benefits in our community of Lennox.

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, 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-C1 and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Community benefits were described in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These benefits, a component of the Environmental Justice Program, have been refined and expanded, as presented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of this Final EIS/EIR, based on written comments and input received at environmental justice workshops and public hearings during the circulation period for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and through briefings held in 2003 with civic, business, and religious leaders within affected communities.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00075 Watson, Robert None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00075-1

Comment:

Thank you for the opportunity to speak about the proposed LAX Modernization Plan.

Mayor Hahn has provided an excellent proposal for LAX and with his commitment to cap the airport passengers at 78 million a year, I think that he has satisfied many of the concerns of the residents who live and work near the airport. The idea that other areas, like Palmdale and Orange County will need to take some of the future airline passenger burden is a good one. Mayor Hahn's support for a Regional Approach should be commended as well.

We absolutely need to modernize LAX, not only for the economic and safety concerns that we have, but also so that the area residents will find solutions to their quality of live issues. I think that Alternative D provides many of these solutions, especially with the expanded use of the Green Line Light Rail system that will have a stop a the airport.

Thank you for holding these hearings.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00076 Walter, Marvin None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00076-1

Comment:

In prior hearings such as this and numerous news paper articles regarding Alternative D, many factors as passenger caps, traffic, noise, jobs and security have been raised. Yet the major impetus behind alternative D continues to be security so I'd like to address that particular issue. And frankly, it's not easy to assess the value of Alternative D in that light by reviewing the EIR document.

I offer these direct quotes from various sections of that document.

1. From the comparative analysis section of D vs No Action Page 34

"Vehicular traffic in the Central Terminal area results in crowded terminal areas that create attractive targets for terrorists allows baggage containing potentially significant explosive devices into passenger congregation areas." AND "People approach all facilities with unsecured baggage until they reach the TSA checks."

2. "Security screening stations at the Ground Transportation Center and the Intermodal Transportation Center will protect the Central Terminal area from attack by persons armed with weapons."

By moving arrival & departure passengers rapidly through the entry point, only a small number of people would be clustered as a potential terrorist target.

3. From the Development & Refinement Sectionparagraph 2.2.8

"First level screening at the Ground Transportation Center will be random baggage and passenger checking and use of video surveillance und sniffing dogs."

4. Same Sect 2.2.8

"The architectural design intent for the GTC is to create a partially climate controlled open-air structures to help diffuse potential blast impacts at the curb front by eliminating glass curtain walls."

5. Again, from the comparative analysis section:

"The people mover presents a problem as it is unsecured and subject to attack - but, this can be partially mitigated by use of technology"

6. Again from Development &, Refinement Section Paragraph 2.2.81

"Passengers not using skycap services may carry baggage on the Automated People Mover to the Central Terminal area where screening will be made by the appropriate airline."

So =

1). If unsecured baggage in the Central Terminal is a current problem it doesn't appear this multi-BILLION dollar Alternative D solves that.

2). All passengers spread out through 8 terminals currently & you've seen lines all out down the sidewalk - Here all passengers must do through this one entry point but they will move rapidly so as not to present but a small number as a potential terrorist target?

3). The 6 car people mover really sounds like an exciting entry to the "world class" LAX with baggage carts being rolled in & out among the travelers as well as the meeters and greeters, who are able to ride to the central terminal area.

4). Of course, in a curbside blast, one would want nothing but "partially climate controlled air" between them & the explosion.

A security solution?

NO - A JOKE!

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00077 Gonzalez, Romeo None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00077-1

Comment:

I would like to show my support for the LAX Master Plan and Alternative D. After almost 8 years of planning and dozens of hearings and testimony Mayor Hahn has introduced a plan that takes into account all of the concerns that have been raised.

With the heightened awareness of the possibility for airport disaster, either by accident or by human hand this plan will reduce and consequences. With the remote passenger and baggage handling facility, the flying public should have much more confidence in LAX security. This design, with the early scanning of passengers, carry-ons and baggage, makes the Central Terminal area and airline gates much safer.

I also like the use of people movers and trams in the design. Moving around LAX today is very difficult. The only way to get from airline to airline or different terminals is to walk or wait for a bus. Alternative D's transportation system saves time and confusion.

I hope Alternative D is adopted, and soon.

Thank you for taking my comments.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00078 Anderson, Homer None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00078-1

Comment:

All of us here today use airports at some time or another and if you have been at LAX lately, you know how difficult it can be to get through the check in procedures or even to pick-up someone.

That's why I support the new proposal for the Master Plan. As it is indicated on the boards that are set up outside, there will be new passenger ticketing and baggage handling building built away from the central terminals and gates. With the larger area for passenger drop-off and pick-up and the baggage checking facilities being expanded, passengers should be processed much faster.

Getting the people in and out of the drop-off area faster will also give us a safer and more secure airport. The chances that someone will be injured in any disaster will be greatly reduced with the new design.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00079 Rose, Harry OSAGE Neighbors Association 8/23/2003

SPC00079-1

Comment:

I come before you today on behalf of Osage Neighbors Association, representing approximately 3600 homes in Osage Park and Westport Heights.

Because it would seem that none of our City officials have noticed, we would like to point out that most modern airports operate on a much larger footprint than LAX and are not located in densely populated urban areas. Denver had the vision to build a world-class airport on 53 square miles in a rural area and actually close their old airport. Total cost? Less than half the price of Alternative D. Los Angeles, where is the vision?

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment SPHF00046-1; please see Response to Comment SPHF00046-1.

SPC00079-2

Comment:

While we love a good Public Works boondoggle just as much as anyone else, this one is ill conceived and a violation of Mayor Hahn's election pledge to our community. Airport use of residential property violates his pledge to operate the airport within its current boundaries. The capacity of 78.9 MAP stated in the EIS violates the Mayor's election pledge to us by nearly 1 million passengers a year.

Response:

It is assumed that the commentor's reference to the airport use of residential property pertains to the proposed development of the Ground Transportation Center, under Alternative D, at Manchester Square. As was indicated in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Los Angeles World Airport is, and has been, implementing a voluntary acquisition program for residential properties in Manchester Square separate from the proposed Master Plan. Use of this area for airport-related activity would not be in violation of the Mayor's pledge.

3. Comments and Responses

Alternative D is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level of 78.9 million annual passengers (MAP), which is comparable to the 78.7 MAP projected to occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D is consistent with the Mayor's commitment to no expansion of LAX (i.e., Alternative D provides for the same level of future activity that would be reasonably expected to occur at LAX if the project were not approved.

SPC00079-3

Comment:

Alternative D would dramatically enhance flight field throughput and lay the groundwork for vastly increased ground transportation infrastructure setting the stage for future expansion of LAX operations. We have heard that the FAA is currently studying the feasibility of simultaneous landings on three runways under the new configuration. Do LAWA and FAA plan to visit this practice upon us in the future?

Response:

Alternative D does not increase runway capacity. Neither LAWA nor FAA are currently studying the feasibility of triple simultaneous approaches at LAX in IFR conditions either now or in the future with implementation of the Proposed Alternative D airfield improvements. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00046-3.

SPC00079-4

Comment:

Alternative D would move airport bound traffic two miles to the east subjecting East Westchester, Lennox and Inglewood to increased vehicular air pollution and noise. How does this even begin to comply with the environmental justice provisions of CEQUA?

Response:

The 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 S-D. Please see Response to Comment SAL00010-9 regarding expansion to the east and Response to Comment SAL00004-5 regarding environmental justice issues.

SPC00079-5

Comment:

Alternative D locates a Ground Transportation Center in a tract of land currently zoned R1. The EIS clearly states that no residential property is to be acquired for the project. This leads us to assume that LAWA plans to use property acquired through an ongoing and supposedly Voluntary Noise Mitigation Acquisition program. This method of residential property acquisition for airport use ignores FAA guidelines in Order 5100.37A, Chapter 3, Section 9 implementing the Uniform Act of 1970. We would like a complete explanation as to how LAWA's acquisition and conversion of this property to airport use approaches any semblance of legality.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00046-5.

SPC00080

Joseph, Malcolm

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPC00080-1

Comment:

LAX has been a very large factor in the daily lives of all of us in Los Angeles County. Those who live near the airport have special concerns, even though the airport is an economic boon to us all.

3. Comments and Responses

Obviously, traffic and noise have to be dealt with and I think that the LAX Master Plan with Alternative D does that.

The traffic plan, with improvements being proposed for intersections, extra lanes on La Cienega Boulevard and the improvement to the cargo delivery accesses roads will aid the flow of traffic in the airport's immediate area. But, the greatest change to increased traffic will be the connection of the Green Line Light Rail to the Transportation Center. Finally, a public transportation system will be available from Fly Away Parking facilities or Stations where passengers and be dropped off at over 50 sites throughout Los Angeles County.

Alternative D is my choice and I hope that the FAA and the City will approve the 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.

SPC00081 Kom, Tony None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00081-1

Comment:

LAX MASTER PLAN - SPENDS \$9 BILLION PLUS TO:

* Tear Down Airport Structures Possibly Not Yet Even Paid for

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to Comment SPC00149-1, please refer to Response to Comment SPC00149-1.

SPC00081-2

Comment:

* Concentrate Airport Congestion in Single Vulnerable Location

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX. In addition, the GTC will not concentrate people in one spot but will spread them out more than the existing condition in the CTA.

SPC00081-3

Comment:

* Promote Traffic Gridlock around LAX While Providing No New Rail Transit Access to LAX

Response:

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

SPC00081-4**Comment:**

* Make LAX the Most Inconvenient Airport in the World

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to Comment SPHF00051-4; please refer to Response to Comment SPHF00051-4.

SPC00081-5**Comment:**

Simply moves Airport Congestion & Likely Point of Terrorist Attack to another more congested site without equal replacement parking and still further away from Green Line to Blue Line to Red Line and Urban Destinations. Is it really convenient to go to Park and Ride Lots in Long Beach, Norwalk or Inglewood and ride busses to Manchester Square Airport Security Center?

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00149-5. Please see Response to Comment SPC00149-5.

SPC00081-6**Comment:**

Our past leaders were visionary in buying a large airport site at Palmdale. Tokyo, Seoul, Hong Kong and Washington D.C. all built new larger International Airports far from their cities. Most now use old airports for Domestic Flights Only. Transit Links to other Airports and Cities.

HOW TO SPEND LESS AND GET MORE....a possible Alternative Plan

LOS ANGELES AIRPORTS AND RAIL TRANSIT SCHEME * *

As Illustrated with Detailed Map - Plans & Text shown on Large Display Boards. (Prevented from Showing at Airport Public Hearing. Want to See? Contact Me.)

* New Secure Los Angeles International Airport at Palmdale

With all passenger and baggage screening and check -in features now in LAX Master Plan Using only a small portion of this vast site. Passenger Drop-Off at Tram-Transit Link.

Links Palmdale Metrolink Station (uc) with one-mile Elevated Airport Tram connecting to Security Center for Passenger and Luggage Screening, Flight Check-In and Baggage Check.

Continuing Tram to Huge International Terminal and on to even larger Domestic Terminal for Connecting Flights.

2.5 Mile Elevated Tram Loop from Terminals to Parking, Bus, Taxi and Car Rental Lots; to Security Center; and Metrolink Station.

Vehicle Entry Security Check Points. 500 acres of Open Parking Lots with approximately 50 to 70 thousand Car Capacity. 180 acres for Bus and Taxi Terminals and Car Rental Lots.

Existing Metrolink Travel Time from Union Station to Lancaster is 1 hour and 40 minutes. Would be less from Red Line/Metrolink Station to Palmdale Airport and even less by car on 14 Freeway.

Transit Travel Time to Airport could be greatly reduced by (1) Better Track Alignment (2) Improved Rail Roadbed (3) Grade Separation (4) Double Tracking and (5) Electrification.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

SPC00081-7

Comment:

* Los Angeles Westchester Domestic Airport at LAX

Linked by Terminals Tram to Metro Rail Line. Passenger Drop Off and Security Check Point at Transit-Tram Entry Station Security Check Stations at all Vehicle Entry Points.

Airport Conference Center & Corporate Jet parking at now Tom Bradley International Terminal.

Retain all LAX Terminals, Parking Structures and Runways as they now exist.

LAX Flights Actually Reduced. No Homes or Businesses Taken.

* Easy Rail Transit to ALL Los Angeles Airports.

Including Direct Metro Rail between LAX and Burbank Airports.

Only 15 miles of new Metro Rail lines could link Green Line and LAX to Burbank Airport and Metrolink Rail Line to Palmdale Airport.

Two mile Red Line Valley Metro Rail Extension to Burbank Airport Terminal. Then one mile more to new Antelope Valley Metrolink Station and Rail Transit Service to L.A. Int. Airport at Palmdale. Also increases low income workers access to large nearby affordable housing stock.

Ebony Metro Rail Line from Union Station to Wilshire-Western Stub. Then 12 miles to LAX. Subway down Crenshaw Blvd. and Elevated on MTA owned railroad right-of-way to Century/Aviation Station Link with LAX Airport Terminals Tram. Ending at Green Line Light Rail Aviation Station. Bay Area BART elevated everywhere except in Downtown City Areas.

Long Beach Airport Alternative Terminal Transit Links to Long Beach Blue Line Light Rail.

Now no direct rail access to Ontario Airport. Alternative Plan has new Ontario Airport Stations on Riverside and San Bernardino Metrolink Lines with Transit Links to Airport Terminal.

Response:

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

SPC00082 Davis, Andrea None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00082-1

Comment:

Creating jobs is a good thing, and keeping ALL of our U.S. airports modern and maintained is always a good thing.

But I have to say NO, emphatically, to the mayor's Alternative "d". Mayor Hahn's PR machine keeps repeating that the 9 billion dollar plus LAX "Alternative d" will be safer and more secure. Experts from the Rand Corporation, in a study requested by Congresswoman Jane Harman, disagree. After studying the plan they found that the airport would, in fact, be less safe and less secure than the existing LAX.

In fact, the study concluded, modernization could be accomplished at a much lower cost than alternative d.

Concentrating all the travelers into one check-in just creates an even more attractive target for any terrorist activities. We all will be put at tremendous risk if we allow Mayor Hahn to create one giant bull's-eye at what once was Manchester Square.

Not safer, nor more secure, certainly not more convenient. and unnecessarily expensive.

Alternative "d" is not good community planning, Mr. Mayor, and it's not good governance.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00159-1.

SPC00083 Cope, Danna None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00083-1

Comment:

While Alt. D is a definite improvement over Alts A, B, and C, it does not achieve its stated purpose: to provide safety and security.

Alt. D would cost over \$9 billion, exacerbate the traffic and air pollution problems, expand the boundaries of LAX, and provide very little in mitigation measures.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00054-1.

SPC00083-2

Comment:

By expanding LAX into the Manchester Square area, Alt. D would merely transfer the dangers from the facilities in the Central Terminal Area out to the community, thereby leaving the traveling public and the residents still at risk. Gathering a large number of people into one area would create a terrorist target - and that is what a Ground Transportation Center in Manchester Square would be.

Concrete, metal and plastic would get protection; people would not.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment SPHF00054-2; please refer to Response to Comment SPHF00054-2.

SPC00083-3

Comment:

Extending LAX boundaries into Manchester Square sends the message that LAWA intends to just keep expanding LAX and it can handle all the Southern CA traffic - no regional approach is needed. Other counties and communities should be taking on their share of the air traffic, not told they can rely on LAX.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment SPHF00054-3; please refer to Response to Comment SPHF00054-3.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00083-4

Comment:

There have been very few Category A runway incursions at LAX - certainly not enough to warrant a \$9 billion renovation which includes moving runways. Adequate safety precautions could be instituted with the cooperation of FAA, LAWA, and the air lines.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00054-4 regarding runway incursion at LAX and identified strategies to help solve the problem.

SPC00083-5

Comment:

Air traffic has not rebounded to pre-9-11 levels. This gives us the luxury of taking time to reexamine the assumptions previously made that air travel would return to and increase from those levels. There is no reason to rush to prejudgment. There is time to explore more options on bringing other airports into compliance with a regional approach to air traffic.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment SPHF00054-5; please refer to Response to Comment SPHF00054-5.

SPC00083-6

Comment:

I will be making written comments on specifics of the proposal prior to the November deadline.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00084 Carpio, Sparky None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00084-1

Comment:

Quoting from the supplement to the draft EIR/EIS --

"As of October 31, 2002, progress in acquiring properties under the Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program for Manchester Square and Belford indicates that 62 percent of the property owners (351 properties and 1130 dwelling units) have volunteered to participate in the acquisition program." What about the other 38 percent? What about the people who lived there for over fifty years and DON'T want to move? I guess no one from LAWA or L.A. city really cares, but then why should they?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00058-1.

SPC00084-2

Comment:

Then, as I was randomly leafing through the EIR/EIS, I found an interesting report on the residences which will be most impacted with the plans. Guess which city is impacted most -- Inglewood of course!

3. Comments and Responses

At more than 120 "Newly Exposed Residential and Noise -Sensitive Uses Outside of the 1992 CNEL Noise Contour" for the Alternative D, and over 2,000 listed under "Alternative D 2015 dBA SEL Noise Contours Listing of Newly Exposed Residential Uses Outside of the 1992 65 CNEL Noise Contour", we -- Inglewood -- are the most impacted area in the communities surrounding LAX.

But I guess that really doesn't matter. We -- Inglewood residents -- are just low income NIMBY's who want to stop this "Modernization" -- or is it expansion? -- plan.

Response:

It is unclear where the commentor obtained the referenced information. As stated in Table S4.2-30 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative D 260 dwelling units, 810 residents, and 5 noise-sensitive uses that are located outside of the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour that establishes eligibility for soundproofing under the ANMP, would be newly exposed to high noise levels in the City of Inglewood. As presented in Table S4.2-34 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative D 4,140 dwelling units and 13,170 residents located outside the ANMP contour would be newly exposed to 94 dBA SEL or greater noise levels. As stated under mitigation measures MM-LU-1 and MM-LU-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the ANMP would be revised and expanded to include noise-sensitive uses newly exposed to these respective high noise levels. As stated in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative D the overall number of residential and other noise-sensitive uses exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels would be reduced by 3,380 dwelling units, 6,020 residents, and 5 noise-sensitive uses compared to 1996 baseline conditions. Also under Alternative D compared to 1996 baseline conditions, the number of residential uses exposed to 94 dBA SEL or greater noise levels would be reduced by 2,490 dwelling units and 1,310 residents. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 for a description of environment justice-related mitigation and benefits to address impacts on minority and low-income communities affected by Alternative D.

SPC00084-3

Comment:

Also in the Supplement to the Draft EIR/EIS was that wonderful interchange on Arbor Vitae ST. -- which our beloved L.A. Co. Supervisor pushed for -- under the title:

"Model Update Information -- Regional Roadway Improvements." Our county supervisor had once mentioned that the Arbor Vitae Interchange has nothing to do with Airport Related issues -- at least that is what I remember.

Even worse though, a LAWA staff member had once said it was for our -- now nonexistent -- Kmart! I don't think so!

Response:

The comment is identical to comment SPHF00058-3. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00058-3.

SPC00085

McDowell, Kelly

City of El Segundo

8/11/2003

SPC00085-1

Comment:

Given the length and complexity of the Master Plan and environmental documents, our full comments on technical issues will not be ready for some time, therefore the City's comments tonight are preliminary.

The City continues to oppose Alternatives A, B, and C for the many reasons the City expressed orally and in writing during the public review and comment period for the initial Draft EIS/EIR in 2002.

ES has not endorsed Alt. D, but we feel its stated objectives support a regional aviation approach.

3. Comments and Responses

My City supports an alternative with fewer environmental impacts. We would like to see the adverse impacts of the airport minimized and mitigated to the greatest extent feasible.

ES supports enhanced safety and security at LAX.

And my City supports an alternative that by design will accommodate passenger and cargo levels no greater than the physical capacity of the airport as it exists today.

Limiting LAX's capacity to its current capacity has always been our number one goal and we believe limiting LAX's capacity will allow other airports in the region to develop and handle a fair share of future regional aviation demand,

will result in fewer environmental impacts,

and will improve safety and security at the airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00085-2

Comment:

However, the City is greatly concerned about the impacts of southside airfield changes that would move the southernmost runway 50 feet closer to El Segundo.

LAWA has stated that it believes these changes are necessary to improve runway safety.

However, we are currently studying the impacts of the reconfiguration, and the options for the southern runway complex.

In particular, we urge a full public consideration of end-around taxiways as an alternative that could provide greater safety at lower cost and with fewer new burdens on local communities.

Safety at LAX must be a priority for all of us.

The City is prepared to support measures necessary to enhance safety, even if those measures increase our burden, but only if we are assured, through an independent expert, that other alternatives are not equally effective.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00038-3 regarding the potential noise impacts of moving the southernmost runway approximately 55 feet south and discussion on runway incursion at LAX and an analysis conducted by NASA Ames Research Center comparing the costs and benefits of a center parallel taxiway and end-around taxiway on the south airfield complex.

SPC00085-3

Comment:

In conclusion, we are grateful for Mayor Hahn's responsive leadership and his pledge to constrain growth at LAX and foster a regional approach to meeting future aviation demand.

It is our hope that the ultimate outcome of this Master Plan process will be a regional airport approach that ensures that LAX does not exceed its current capacity.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00086

Reed, Bart

None Provided

8/11/2003

SPC00086-1

Comment:

Subject: Talking points for LAX EIR hearings with respect to rail/airport connections

To All:

The following "talking points" below are the result of many meetings and discussions of rail advocates, the latest of which was last Thursday evening's Friends of the Green Line (FoGL) Meeting in El Segundo.

Key: Since the MTA has no money to pay for a Green Line extension to Westchester, the notion of a such an extension should fall under traffic and/or environmental mitigation, with a final EIR of any Alternative D including a specific design-preferably one that has the written blessing of the FAA.

More talking points:

1) Our goal is for the Green Line to connect to the GTC, wherever it ends up.

Manchester Square is being discussed as a site for the GTC solely because it's on the drawing board as the current site-FoGL is neutral on where the actual location should be..

2) A Green Line Westchester extension would enhance the usefulness of the People Mover by connecting it to local hotels and businesses.

FoGL supports the LAWA People Mover for airport transportation purposes, but not a People Mover that would harm future regional transportation efforts.

3) FoGL recommends a direct connection of the Green Line to the GTC as an alternative to a potentially-superfluous Intermodal Transit Center adjacent to the Aviation/Imperial Green Line station.

A direct Green Line/GTC connection would not interfere with the People Mover designed to connect Parking Lots C and D with the GTC, but would instead separate rail- and car-bound LAX traffic.

4) Federal funding for both a rail connection from the south (along the MTA Harbor Subdivision Line to the GTC), as well as funding for rail connections from the north and Downtown, might be a better argument for LAX-related traffic mitigations than "a Green Line extension to Westchester".

The northern connection would be from the previously-planned Westchester extension, and from Downtown and Inglewood via the MTA Harbor Subdivision Line to the GTC.

5) The Bay Area just established a rail/airport connection, and Orange County has just started looking into its own airport/rail connection via its Centerline-L.A. County should strive for nothing less than its own rail connection(s).

Response:

It is impractical to connect the Green Line directly to the CTA, as discussed in Response to Comment SPHO00004-6. Also, please see Response to Comment SPHL00022-2 regarding the most feasible alignment of the Green Line.

Please see Response to Comment PC02220-6 regarding funding.

3. Comments and Responses

**SPC00087 Collins, Michael Los Angeles Convention and
Visitors Bureau 8/11/2003**

SPC00087-1

Comment:

Notes Re LAX

I'm

Speak in support of the Masterplan that's before you.

Our organization represents an industry:

\$ 10 billion

23 million visitors

240K jobs

LAX is the shelf from which our customers buy LA.

The MasterPlan, Option D has 100's pages of detail.

There is and will be lots of discussion of those details.

But, I am here to ask that the strategic perspective reflected in this plan not get lost the discussion of details.

There are three parts to this strategic perspective:

1. Building a Safe and Secure facility: This is elemental to the future on a both practical and perceptual dimension. Sadly.
2. Designing an airport that maintains LA's status as an international gateway: The international customer is the most sought after in the world. Either we build a user-friendly facility for this customer or they will go elsewhere.
3. Last, this plan recognizes a truth that Southern California's demand for air-travel cannot be built on the backs of the citizens of single city. This plan addresses the truth that there must be a regional solution to regional demand.

Response:

Comment noted.

**SPC00088 Slawson, Richard Los Angeles Building &
Construction Trades Council 8/11/2003**

SPC00088-1

Comment:

Our Council represents over 130,000 Craftsmen and women who live and work throughout Los Angeles. We enthusiastically support Mayor Hahn and his master plan alternative for LAX.

When this plan gets underway, besides moving forward the needed modernization of our airport, nearly 49,000 construction- related jobs will be directly generated during the entire construction phase.

3. Comments and Responses

This is welcome news for our regional economy because putting 49,000 men and women to work, at good wages, is a boost not only to those on the job but throughout Southern California. This many new jobs will have a tremendous ripple effect that will in fact support 100,000 jobs around the region and \$11 billion to total economic activity.

This region desperately needs the economic stimulus from this LAX Master Plan.

Our other concerns are also being met by the Alternative D Plan. As in the case of many other world class airport, including Washington Dulles International Airport, Orlando International Airport and Denver International Airport, their terminals are linked by the use of trams, people movers and trains. Washington Dulles uses what they call movable lounges. Orlando uses trains and Denver uses a combination of moving walkways and an underground train. All of these are similar to the Ground Transportation Center and the Intermodal Transportation Center included in alternative D in the LAX Master Plan. These then connect with the main or Central Terminal Area by the automated people mover. With the heightened security measures that are needed today, this makes absolute sense.

I would also like to commend Mayor Hahn for the commitment that he made to hold LAX to 78 Million Annual Passengers. We all know that LAX must be modernized, but it must also meet the needs and concerns of the residents of Los Angeles and surrounding communities and especially those residents who live near the airport. This plan addresses, traffic, security and noise in its design and regulations. We support the LAX Master Plan and asked that you give it your approval.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00089 Hahn, James City of Los Angeles 8/11/2003

SPC00089-1

Comment:

I am here to voice support for the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan - Alternative D. I believe this alternative that has evolved over the past year breaks new ground in airport design and planning for the 21st century and can serve as a model for airports throughout our nation and the world.

This plan designs the future LAX to accommodate approximately 78 million annual passengers and 3 million annual tons of cargo. Modernizing LAX in this way will help to secure LAX's role as the airport of choice for long haul operations - both passengers and cargo.

78 million annual passengers is consistent with the goals established in the Southern California Association of Governments Regional Transportation Plan. These goals promote growth of underutilized airports in outlying areas and allow us to achieve a more decentralized distribution of future air traffic around the region. It is also fair for the surrounding communities who will also have to bear a burden with increased traffic. Previous proposals that called for up to 98 million annual passengers were unrealistic.

I am pleased that support for my plan is growing. As people learn more about it, they come to understand that my plan is the environmentally superior alternative of all the concepts and plans studied over the past decade. They also realize that my plan incorporates leading-edge technology and design standards to provide travelers and airport workers with unmatched safety and security at the world's largest origination and destination airport.

LAX Master Plan means improved airport safety.

- Alternative D modernizes the airfield to improve safety for aircraft, traveling passengers, and airport workers.

- Center taxiways will provide additional protection against runway incursions.

3. Comments and Responses

- Parallel taxiways and full taxiway spacing improve aircraft movement and reduce taxiing times, improves safety and reduces delays for passengers.

LAX Master Plan means improved airport security.

- Alternative D provides for multiple layers of security protection for the traveling public, airport workers and the surrounding communities.

- Alternative D eliminates the high concentration of people as a potential terrorist target - it disperses the passengers and moves them rapidly among four separate and secure entry portals.

- Alternative D eliminates roadway traffic in the Central Terminal Area and significantly reduces the chance of an oversized vehicle explosive device being delivered to the Central Terminal Area.

- Alternative D permits early observation and assessment of passengers and baggage.

LAX Master Plan supports a regional transportation plan.

- Alternative D addresses community interests and concerns; Alternative D supports only LAX's fair share of the total regional air service market.

- Alternative D allows other regional airports to accommodate a greater share of the air traffic demand.

LAX Master Plan means a modern airport.

- Alternative D offers a redeveloped Central Terminal Area that provides for increased security screening and enhanced passenger conveniences.

- Alternative D will have new passenger terminals that provide for improved ticketing, baggage processing, circulation and concessions

- An Automated People Mover offers convenient access from the new facilities to the Central Terminal Area every two minutes

- The Automated People Mover trains will be modern, designed to easily accommodate rolling luggage and baggage carts.

LAX Master Plan improves ground transportation.

- Alternative D provides key improvements to the ground transportation system in and around LAX.

- Alternative D reduces thousands of private vehicles and commercial shuttle buses from the roadways and significantly reduces the impacts on surface streets and freeways.

- Alternative D designs convenient, easy access to the new facilities and proposes mitigation measures that provide direct access to and from the I- 405 and I-105 Freeways to discourage residential street use.

- Alternative D means a direct connection to the Metro Green Line and encourages the use of mass transit.

- An expanded FlyAway Program encourages the use of high-occupancy vehicles and eliminates thousands of vehicles from the region's roadways.

LAX Master Plan sustains a region's key economic engine.

- LAX Master Plan means jobs; 351,000 jobs in the region by 2015, 295,000 jobs in LA County and nearly 139,000 jobs in the City of Los Angeles.

- LAX Master Plan means LAX will contribute \$64 billion to the regional economy in 2015, \$22 billion annually to the City of Los Angeles.

3. Comments and Responses

- Alternative D means nearly 49,000 construction-related jobs.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that the goal of creating the Enhanced Safety and Security Master Plan is to modernize LAX to protect one of Los Angeles' key economic engines. At the same time, the plan addresses community interests and concerns by designing the facility to serve only LAX's fair share of the total regional air service market.

I thank the staffs of the Federal Aviation Administration and Los Angeles World Airports for your dedication and support of the master plan process. I look forward to the process continuing so that we can begin the long-overdue modernization of LAX as soon as possible.

I am here to support the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan for LAX - also known as Alternative D. I believe this alternative breaks new ground in airport design for the 21st century and can serve as a model for airports throughout the world.

My staff and I have briefed thousands of stakeholders on this plan, including community residents, airlines, labor, and local business leaders. I believe that this plan incorporates many of their suggestions and addresses their concerns with the other alternatives.

Alternative D puts safety and security first. It includes modernization of the airfield, including the addition of center taxiways, to improve safety for aircraft, traveling passengers, and airport workers.

It also provides for multiple layers of security for the passengers, airport workers and the surrounding communities. It disperses travelers and moves them rapidly through four separate and secure entry points. It also allows security screeners to make assessments of passengers and baggage before they get into the Central Terminal Area.

Most importantly, this plan significantly reduces the opportunity for a vehicle with an explosive device to get close to the Central Terminal Area by eliminating traffic through the area. Security experts believe that the Central Terminal Area and its impact on our economy - not passengers - are the key targets for terrorists.

Alternative D also supports my goal of creating a regional air transportation plan. It designs LAX to accommodate approximately 3 million annual tons of cargo and 78 million annual passengers, which is consistent with the goals established in the Southern California Association of Governments Regional Transportation Plan. We are also working to promote use of our other regional airports to meet demand.

Alternative D also means a more modern and convenient LAX for our passengers. The plan includes new passenger terminals with improved ticketing, baggage processing, circulation and concessions. An Automated People Mover designed to easily accommodate rolling luggage and baggage carts will offer convenient access to the Central Terminal Area every two minutes.

Alternative D also provides key improvements to the ground transportation around LAX to reduce congestion and pollution. It will finally provide a direct connection from the Metro Green Line and direct access to and from the 405 and 105 freeways. Approximately 36 new lane-miles and improved curb access will improve passenger access and reduce traffic congestion on surface streets. An expanded FlyAway Program will eliminate thousands of vehicles from the region's roadways.

Finally, Alternative D means jobs and is expected to contribute \$64 billion to the regional economy.

As people learn more about Alternative D, I have found that they support the leading-edge technology and design standards that will provide travelers and airport workers with unparalleled safety and security. They also find that this plan is the environmentally superior alternative compared with the other plans that have been studied over the past decade.

I want to thank all of the community leaders, business leaders, airline representatives, labor leaders, and others who shaped Alternative D. I want to acknowledge Deputy Mayor Troy Edwards and Patricia Torres of my staff. And I want to especially thank the Federal Aviation Administration and Los Angeles World Airports staffs for your dedication and support of the master plan process. I look forward to the process continuing so that we can begin the long-overdue modernization of LAX as soon as possible.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00090

Walter, Mahala

None Provided

8/11/2003

SPC00090-1

Comment:

Today, the Los Angeles World Airports continues to celebrate 75 years of connecting Southern California to the World. Commonly known as LAWA, the Los Angeles World Airports actually consists of FOUR airports... VAN NUYS is the world's BUSIEST general aviation airport. ONTARIO INTERNATIONAL serves the Inland Empire, the fastest growing region in Southern California. The PALMDALE REGIONAL has its' 25 year Master Plan for residents in Antelope & Santa Clarita Valleys, plus portions of San Bernardino/Inyo Counties. And the fourth one, LAX, where travelers throughout the world think of LAX as not only an airport but an entire city, LOS ANGELES. True, LAWA has had a spectacular past BUT now we must now prepare for a SAFE future.

Prior to 9/11, LAX contributed \$60 BILLION per year in economic output, contributed 59,000 JOBS at or near LAX, plus 408,000 JOBS in the southern California region. LAX security is of major importance to not only our nation. Since California has the 5th largest economy in the world, we need better security NOW; Please Mayor Hahn don't waste time on a Master Plan that will be out dated in 15 years, when the war be over. The terrorists will have been hunted down. 15 years is just to long to wait for Alternative D.

With TSA/Home Land Security, the walls came tumbling down in the terminals, moving in a 100 huge million dollar explosive scanners with \$1000,000 maintenance yearly fee. Unfortunately, these monsters had far too many false positive readings with food being a problem.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00090-2

Comment:

* WHO PAYS for Alternate D? We're told a major part will be passed on to airlines via landing fees, etc. NOW that sounds like just what airlines need, especially those who are either in or fighting off bankruptcy!! Besides, the small businesses & hotels around LAX will have a very difficult time for many years and some may not survive. This plan was said to cost 9.1 BILLION, then 9.6. Honestly, How many billions more will it be?

Response:

Comment noted. The proposed master plan improvements would be funded with a combination of FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, and other state/federal grants. The general airport revenue bonds will be repaid from airport revenues, including airline landing fees and other user and tenant fees.

SPC00090-3

Comment:

* Proponents like to couch this whole scenario around "security" as cars and LAX facilities DON'T MIX! Now how do they think people are going to get to this Ground Transportation Center?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Master Plan Addendum, Chapter 2.3, Ground Access and Parking - Alternative D, for a further description of the GTC access plan. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

SPC00090-4

Comment:

If you were a terrorist wanting to inflict major loss of life and damage, would you rather have the passenger load widely distributed around 9 different terminals or where EVERYONE for ALL flights congregated at 1 check in/drop off site?

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00091

Wayne, Alan

United Airlines

8/11/2003

SPC00091-1

Comment:

I AM APPEARING TONIGHT ON BEHALF OF NOT ONLY UNITED, BUT ALSO TEN OTHER FELLOW MEMBERS OF THE STAR ALLIANCE, THE LARGEST AIRLINE CONSORTIUM OPERATING AT LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT. IN ADDITION TO UNITED, WHICH OPERATES A HUB AT LAX, THE STAR MEMBERS INCLUDE AIR CANADA, AIR NEW ZEALAND, ALL NIPPON, ASIANA, LUFTHANSA, MEXICANA, SINGAPORE, THAI, VARIG AND U.S. AIRWAYS.

THOSE ELEVEN CARRIERS, PLUS UNITED'S REGIONAL MARKETING PARTNER SKYWEST, WHOSE 133 DAILY DEPARTURES ARE THE MOST OF ANY CARRIER AT LAX, WISH TONIGHT TO UNDERSCORE OUR COLLECTIVE SUPPORT FOR MAYOR HAHN'S ONGOING EFFORT TO CRAFT A MASTER PLAN FOR LAX THAT WOULD ULTIMATELY IMPROVE AND MODERNIZE THIS CRITICAL, BUT SADLY ANTIQUATED FACILITY.

UNITED AND THE STAR CARRIERS, PLUS SKYWEST, WHO ACCOUNT FOR 30 PERCENT OF THE FLIGHT ACTIVITY HERE, ARE WORKING WITH THE CITY TO ADDRESS THE AIRFIELD SAFETY, AIRPORT SECURITY, GROUND ACCESS, AND PASSENGER TERMINAL ENHANCEMENTS THAT MUST BE ACHIEVED IF THIS AIRPORT, WHICH IS SO IMPORTANT TO THE REGION'S ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS, AND THE THOUSANDS OF JOBS THAT DEPEND ON IT, IS TO REMAIN IN THE FOREFRONT OF COMMERCIAL AVIATION.

TO DO NOTHING, OR TO NOT DO THIS PROJECT REALISTICALLY, IS NOT ACCEPTABLE. THIS PROJECT IS OVERDUE AND MUST GET UNDERWAY. OTHER AIRPORTS - SEATTLE, PORTLAND, SAN FRANCISCO, LAS VEGAS, DENVER, PHOENIX - TO NAME A FEW, HAVE MODERNIZED OR ARE ADVANCING PROGRAMS TO DRAW BUSINESS AWAY FROM LAX.

UNITED AND THE STAR CARRIERS BELIEVE THAT THIS PLAN FOCUSES ON THE ISSUES AND ELEMENTS THAT WILL MOVE LAX FORWARD, AND WE PLAN TO CONTINUE OUR COLLABORATION WITH THE CITY AND THE AIRPORT TO MEET THESE FUTURE REQUIREMENTS. THANK YOU.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00092

Brown, Salvador

None Provided

8/11/2003

SPC00092-1

Comment:

It seems to me that too much is being concentrated in one area. This project, as proposed would increase traffic congestion in that one small area. There is no room for another Freeway, and increased traffic in the immediate area will overwhelm the surface streets with people getting off the freeway looking for alternate ways to by pass the freeway congestion.

What about the mitigation studies done to address the traffic? Well, complex studies have been done for the 405 Fwy expansion, yet, after the expense and long years of construction, it is just as congested as if no work were done to reduce the congestion.

I believe the same results will be likely for the current traffic mitigation plan for Alternative Plan D.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00147-1 regarding traffic mitigation, and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

SPC00092-2

Comment:

To mitigate traffic and improve security for people parking and returning to their cars, I think the parking should be spread out in smaller lots through out the region. From those parking areas have shuttles transport the passengers to the people movers.

As people buy their air line tickets, they can be assigned to the various parking facilities. This would be an effective means by which to spread the traffic through out that area and prevent large concentrations of traffic.

Response:

This suggestion is largely provided via the expanded FlyAway system included as part of Alternative D. Although people would not be forced to use a remote FlyAway lot, as suggested by the commentator, this voluntary method is much more feasible than requiring airlines, travel agencies, etc., to be involved in assigning people a parking location. No precedent exists for such assigned parking in comparable airports, and its implementation in this context could be predicted with some degree of certainty to be perceived as an unreasonable restriction on free movement and to run contrary to the project objective to continue LAX's premier status in the international and national community.

SPC00092-3

Comment:

Many are concerned with a car bomb going off in the terminal area, but a giant parking structure full of thousands of travelers is just as juicy a target for terrorist's car bombs.

By creating smaller, more numerous parking structures, the attractiveness of such a target is reduced, and even if such an attack occurred at one structure the loss of life and injuries would be reduced.

It would also be easier to distribute the loss of one or two lost structures among the remaining parking structures, than if one giant structure were lost.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the

most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00093 Velasco, Valeria Alliance for Regional Solution to Airport Congestion

SPC00093-1

Comment:

ARSAC is a community grass roots organization representing members from Playa del Rey to Whittier, and Van Nuys to Redondo Beach. We played an integral role in the last Mayoral election by getting every Mayoral candidate to sign the "ARSAC Pledge" committing to a regional approach to air commerce for Los Angeles and Southern California.

We acknowledge Mayor Hahn's attempt to abide by the ARSAC pledge he signed to constrain capacity at LAX while establishing a regional approach to support air transport in Southern California.

We thank Mayor Hahn for eliminating Alternative C concepts from Alternative D that were especially troublesome such as: A western terminal; the ring road incorporating Imperial Highway, Pershing Drive, Westchester Parkway and Lincoln and Sepulveda Boulevards for exclusive use as airport ingress and egress; and 98 MAP.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00093-2

Comment:

First, the 45 day public comment period is much too short for public review of some 5,000 pages of the Draft EIR/EIS of the Master Plan. We ask that the FAA confirm extension of the comment period to 120 days. Can we count on you to support extension of the public comment period? We are still in the process of reviewing all 5,000 pages of Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA and FAA extended the public comment period on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to a total of 120 days closing on November 7, 2003. In addition to nine public hearings held in August, three public hearings were held in October, 2003.

SPC00093-3

Comment:

Will FAA and the City of Los Angeles' responses to public comment and inquiry will be canned responses or actually address specific issues addressed by members of the public?

Response:

In accordance with the provisions of NEPA and CEQA, FAA and LAWA have prepared written individual responses to all comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These responses are provided herein as part of this Final EIS/EIR.

SPC00093-4

Comment:

Mayor Hahn touts Alternative D as a "safety and security plan." I had the opportunity to participate on a "Blue Ribbon" panel appointed by Mayor Hahn to review Alternative D (without having been given anything in writing while on that panel). During those months, panel members asked pointed questions

3. Comments and Responses

about safety and security issues. Representatives of LAX and LAX's consultants did not have answers for many basic concerns, many of which had not even been considered when asked by panel members and which remain unanswered by the EIR/EIS. I urge you to consider the following:

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00093-5

Comment:

1. We appreciate the fact that Mayor Hahn limits capacity to "78.9" MAP (the MAP agreed to was actually 78 MAP) by limiting the number of gates at LAX. However, Mayor Hahn fails to live up to the ARSAC pledge he signed on March 26, 2001 which states that "LAX should be constrained to operate safely within the capacity of its existing facilities."

Mayor Hahn has violated the ARSAC pledge by attempting to expand the footprint of the airport to incorporate the area of Manchester Square into Alternative D as the Ground Transportation Center(GTC). LAX is in the process of purchasing lots piece by piece from homeowners in Manchester Square. How is it possible that Alternative D cites Manchester Square for usage in Alternative D when it only owns about 40% of Manchester Square as of this date?

2. Our Community Plan designates Manchester Square as residential; doesn't LAX have to obtain a zone change before they could even use Manchester Square for airport use?

Response:

The proposed GTC in the Manchester Square area under Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, is designed to provide a conventional airport landside environment for air passengers at a separate location from the CTA. The purpose of locating the GTC at Manchester Square is to improve the safety and security of LAX, not increase activity levels beyond the level of activity projected for the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.4 regarding the purpose of the GTC in Manchester Square under Alternative D, and Response to Comment SPHSP00016-2 regarding the level of future airport capacity under Alternative D and Mayor's pledge.

The acquisition of Manchester Square is independent of the residential acquisition necessary for Master Plan implementation. The Manchester Square area is being acquired through the existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program, in support of LAWA's ANMP. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00001-4 regarding the validity of the acquisition of Manchester Square, and Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.6 regarding zoning change.

SPC00093-6

Comment:

3. Remarkably, Alternative D does not provide for screening at the Ground Transportation Center (GTC). Removing parking and check-in from the Central Terminal to the GTC appears to protect buildings, not passengers and other people in the GTC. To prevent terrorists from targeting the GTC, since remote check-in and parking are located in one area, if this is truly a safety and security plan, shouldn't there be baggage screening (as well as screening of all cars entering the GTC) at the GTC before people and their baggage get on the people mover to go to the terminals?

Response:

As stated in Section 2.2.8, Ground Transportation Center (GTC), of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum, a first level passenger security screening would be conducted at the GTC. Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues.

SPC00093-7**Comment:**

4. The studies and information used to prepare this EIR/EIS is old information, some of it dating back to at least 1996. Wouldn't it be a more reliable study if the information compiled relied on current information incorporating data relating to current environmental conditions rather than outdated information?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues. As indicated in the topical response, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR includes a description of the most current environmental conditions that are meaningful and relevant to the analysis of the LAX Master Plan, although 1996 continues to be used as the baseline for the CEQA analysis.

SPC00093-8**Comment:**

5. The plan fails to specifically identify which airports will be used to meet regional demand. Shouldn't the plan address ways of directing air travelers and traffic to regional airports to encourage regional use of other airports?

Response:

The purpose and need of the LAX Master Plan and the associated EIS/EIR is to address improvements at LAX. It is beyond the scope of these documents to develop improvement plans for other airports, particularly airports that are owned and operated by other jurisdictions. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports. The master plans will recommend improvements to meet the projected demand.

SPC00093-9**Comment:**

6. Shouldn't Alt D address noise and health risk mitigation recommendations?

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise and human health and safety impacts associated with Alternative D and recommended mitigation measures to reduce these impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, respectively. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1 and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The above-referenced measures provided the basis for the mitigation measures presented in this Final EIS/EIR.

SPC00093-10**Comment:**

7. Proponents of Alt D, mainly labor unions, support Alt D as it will create jobs. No matter where air commerce is supported, jobs will be created. The creation of jobs is not particular just to the development of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. For clarification, although incremental job growth would occur under Alternative D through 2005, a net decline in airport-related jobs would occur by 2015. As discussed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the decline in total jobs over the planning period results from productivity increases (i.e., producing more economic output per worker) that overwhelm net additional jobs associated with the limited growth in annual passengers and cargo tons in this alternative. Nonetheless, similar to the other build alternatives, Alternative D would provide

3. Comments and Responses

a wide range of long-term employment opportunities within 17 different manufacturing sectors related to air cargo and a variety of airline industry, government, and tourism-related sectors related to air passengers. Furthermore, given that Alternative D is generally consistent with SCAG's forecast for LAX in the Regional Aviation Plan, any reductions in employment resulting from implementation of Alternative D are not of consequence to the extent that development occurs at other regional airports. Substantial regional job growth would nonetheless occur over the course of the planning period, and cumulative employment effects would be beneficial.

SPC00093-11

Comment:

We all want LAX to be safe and secure for our family, friends, tourists flying in and out of LAX as well as safe for our surrounding community. But Alternative D does not achieve safety or security. Therefore, for these and many other reasons, we do not support Alternative D and ask that you send LAWA back to the drawing board to devise a truly safe and secure plan that establishes a regional approach to air transport.

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 and Draft 2004 RTP, which call 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-SEC-1 regarding security-related aspect of the comment.

SPC00094 None Provided None Provided 2/18/2003

SPC00094-1

Comment:

IF LAX REMAINS THE PREPONDERANCE OF AIR COMMERCE CAPACITY IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA THE ECONOMY WILL BE CONSTRAINED AND HURT

Response:

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

SPC00094-2

Comment:

- Aircraft passenger and cargo needs are increasing. Currently all eggs are in one basket - LAX. A natural or terrorist catastrophe can devastate the Southern California economy if LAX has a major incident. We need a regional solution.

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 and Draft 2004 RTP, which call for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

SPC00094-3**Comment:**

- Two of the prime runways at LAX (including the longest which is used for fully loaded cargo flights) have a major highway running beneath. One truck bomb can close both.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00094-4**Comment:**

- LAX is the third busiest airport. Even since 9/11 cargo demand continues to grow and be concentrated at LAX. It has one of the smallest land masses of any large airport. The corresponding sky above it is also limited and can become a severe safety risk.

Response:

Comment noted. The basic size of the airport does not inhibit the FAA's ability to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft using LAX. As stated in Section, 2.1, The Purpose and Objectives of the Proposed Project, of the Draft EIS/EIR, the purpose and objectives of the Master Plan are to provide, in an environmentally sound manner that is compatible with surrounding land uses, sufficient airport capacity for passengers and freight in the Los Angeles region to sustain and advance the economic growth and vitality of the Los Angeles region. Thus, minimizing impacts to the surrounding communities is one of the goals established for Master Plan.

Please see Response to Comment PC01790-3 for a discussion of how the size of an airport relates to activity levels. Please also see Response to Comment PC00656-2 regarding airspace capacity.

SPC00094-5**Comment:**

- LAX is situated in the inner city where the population is highly concentrated. It thereby impacts many more people than airports situated in outlying areas.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00094-6**Comment:**

- Transportation infrastructure around LAX is already over stressed. People travel two or three hours to use LAX. This traffic gridlock wastes large amounts of energy and creates pollution in addition to one of the largest polluters, LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00094-7

Comment:

- It takes about 10 years to expand an airport. If capacity remains concentrated at LAX the next time more capacity is needed there will be no alternatives but to constrain the economy. Slack capacity in outlying airports is currently available but will disappear if action is not taken soon. Further, population (incompatible land uses) will grow around the other airports if not addressed now.

- Los Angeles World Airports, a Department of the City of Los Angeles, owns four airports including outlying ones. It is only now starting to address building their capacity because the City derives taxes from the businesses surrounding LAX.

CONTACT YOUR STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS. WE NEED A COALITION IN CONGRESS TO PROTECT OUR COMMERCE. DEMAND A REGIONAL SOLUTION TO PROTECT THE ECONOMY AND TO ENSURE FUTURE GROWTH IS UNHAMPERED.

Response:

Comment noted. For information regarding the role of the LAX Master Plan in a regional approach to meeting demand, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1. Also, please see Topical Responses TR-RC-1 and TR-RC-5 regarding other airports in the region generally, and the airports at Ontario and Palmdale specifically.

SPC00094-8

Comment:

Alternative E

- World events reduces the urgency for increasing capacities and allows the opportunity for extended time to review this proposal.
- It will be a far less expensive alternative to implement and have less negative impacts on surrounding communities.
- Two areas are designated for passenger security and check in at Century/Airport to Aviation and Lot C - both within or adjacent to the LAX perimeter (more conducive to safely operating under red alert).
- Baggage to be inspected at check in and transported along secure routes without digging a \$1 billion tunnel.
- Supports Green Line access and improves bus access at Century location.

Plan is based on the Westchester-Playa del Rey Community Plan Update that is in the approval process.

- It creates park areas in Manchester Square to help fight pollution.

Creates a convention center and associated green belt and encompasses ideas derived from the Gateway to LA Business Improvement District. Enhances business area, mobility access, and beautifies the area.

Alternative E (2)

- The consolidated rental car area has been moved to the Continental City area right off the freeway so that navigation is simplified and the traffic is not directed through a residential community.
- Additional dedicated roadways to reduce neighborhood traffic to encourage airport entrance via the freeway.
- Many roadway improvements and people mover ideas of Alternative D are retained to benefit from the work done on Alternative D.
- Runway 25L remains unchanged; 25R (inboard) moved north to accommodate new centerline taxiway.
- Northern runway complex and terminals remain intact as is thereby saving substantial, unwarranted expense for restructuring north complex terminals.

3. Comments and Responses

Comparing Alternatives

Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Creates Ring Road disturbing community	Eliminates Ring Road	Eliminates Ring Road
Adds Western Terminal Complex	Adds smaller complex; eliminates some gates	Gates unchanged in CTA; remotes removed
Auto access to Central terminal areas	Manchester Square check in	Redundancy-Check in & security on Century & Lot C
Adds traffic & Congestion	External people mover and baggage handling	Check in Adjacent to LAX; [increase] security control
Lengthens runways adds taxiways; expands north & south	Lengthens runways & adds taxiways; moves south	Lengthens runways & taxiways on exist position South; No N.
Increases Capacity for passengers & adds cargo up to 405 fwy	Potential increase; states passenger limits; some cargo	Maintains current status

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00035-4 regarding the residents' concept, Alternative E.

SPC00094-9

Comment:

Summary of Alternative D Deficiencies

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00094-10

Comment:

- Continues consolidation of air passenger and cargo in one location for all of Southern California.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand.

SPC00094-11

Comment:

- Manchester Square GTC potential single point failure.
- Difficult for safety equipment to access off LAX site areas.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00094-12

Comment:

- Manchester Square GTC in place of the City Council promised park.

Response:

Former Councilwoman Galanter made a promise to make Manchester Square a park, however, there was no action taken by the Los Angeles City Council to make that happen.

SPC00094-13

Comment:

- Increases runway capacity while plan is purported to limit growth.

Response:

Alternative D would not increase runway capacity at LAX. The improvements to the existing airfield at LAX proposed as part of Alternative D would improve airport safety and security. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00021-3 regarding aircraft runway operations of Alternative D.

SPC00094-14

Comment:

- Doesn't resolve safety for passengers or community.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX. In addition, please see Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety (CEQA), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding human health and safety, and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

SPC00094-15

Comment:

- Fails to mitigate traffic and adds more pollution in a concentrated area near residential areas.

Response:

The traffic mitigation plan is provided in Chapter 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00094-16

Comment:

- Doesn't resolve alternate transportation interface issues.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D was designed to provide excellent interface between all modes of private and commercial transportation, including rental cars, buses, taxis, courtesy shuttles, regional buses, and light rail/Green Line service. The APM would provide direct access to all public access points on airport and no mode of transportation would require a transfer.

SPC00094-17**Comment:**

- While the North complex would be modified to accommodate new larger aircraft, only the south runway meets the takeoff length requirements of a loaded A380 per the Airbus website.

Response:

Airbus has now publicly stated that the A380 would need no more than 8,000 feet for arrival operations and 10,000 feet for departure operations at its maximum takeoff weight (MTOW) at LAX. The extended Runway 6L/24R in the north airfield complex would be approximately 10,420 feet and is capable of accommodating A380 departure operations with MTOW.

SPC00094-18**Comment:**

- Realigns and widens spacing of runways prior to finalization of Group VI requirements.

Response:

The runway to center taxiway separation proposed for the north airfield complex in Alternative D is based on the modified Federal Aviation Administration Group VI aircraft design standards. As discussed in Chapter IV Section 3.2, New Large Aircraft Airport Design Requirements (subsection 3.2.6), of the LAX Draft Master Plan (January 2001), a set of modified Group VI aircraft design standards was developed and recommended for airport master planning due to the land constraints of the LAX facility. These modified standards are based on the quantitative risk assessment on centerline tracking deviations and the potential for improved taxiway tracking with the implementation of new technologies.

SPC00094-19**Comment:**

- Unwarranted expenditure of public funds.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00095 Cerdos, Maria None Provided**SPC00095-1****Comment:**

I am a resident of the community of Lennox. Every day I and thousands of other Lennox residents are subject to a tremendous amount of air and noise pollution because of the planes landing at LAX. Right now over 50 million passengers go through LAX every year - this number under the modernization plan is set to expand up to 78 million passengers per year. Undoubtedly the problems being faced by the Lennox community as a result of its proximity to the airport will only get worse.

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality and noise exposure under 1996 and Year 2000 conditions were presented in Section in Section 4.6, Air Quality, Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Air quality and noise impacts associated with Alternative D were analyzed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR analyzed impacts on

3. Comments and Responses

minority and low-income communities to the east of LAX and the I-405 (including the Lennox community) and provide supporting technical data in Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

As presented in Sections 4.4.3.5.2.2 and 4.6.6.3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D would result in significant air quality effects for certain pollutants in areas that include the Lennox community compared to 1996 and Year 2000 conditions. However, emissions would generally be reduced compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. While the mitigation measures presented in Section 4.6, Air Quality, would substantially reduce emissions, most of these effects would remain adverse following implementation of proposed mitigation measures.

As stated in Sections 4.4.3.5.1.2 and 4.2.6 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, portions the Lennox community would be newly exposed to high noise levels and high single event noise levels under Alternative D. However, due to a shift in the noise contours, the overall area and number of residents within Los Angeles County, including the Lennox community, exposed to high noise levels and high single event noise levels would decrease compared to 1996 and Year 2000 conditions.

It is acknowledged that the Lennox community would continue to be impacted by the operation of LAX. As further described in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, an Environmental Justice Program is proposed to provide mitigation measures or benefits to those minority and low-income communities most impacted by LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

Regarding current passenger levels, as stated in Section 3.2.1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, passenger activity level for the Year 2000 was 67.3 million passengers, rather than 50 million as referenced by the commentor. Passenger activity levels under Alternative D, LAWA Staff's preferred Alternative, would be similar to what would occur if the LAX Master Plan were not approved, as reflected under the No Action/No Project Alternative.

SPC00095-2

Comment:

Lennox and Inglewood, unfortunately, have to bear the brunt of the problems associated with LAX, as most planes fly over these two communities when landing. Right now a plane can be heard over Lennox every 45 - 90 seconds - this will increase under the modernization plan. The noise generated by the night time flights will also get worse because after its modernization LAX will be able to handle more planes and bigger planes. Already many of these cargo planes take off heading east during the night. The noise generated during take-off, as you know, is tremendous. Lennox residents, every night, are subject to this noise - many are jostled from their sleep every night because of these planes taking off directly over the community. Despite our efforts to reduce this practice LAWA has made it clear that they cannot compel these cargo planes to take-off westward like other passenger planes. The carriers flying these cargo planes use the excuse that taking off westward would impose a significant extra cost as they would have to circle around to go eastward. This practice cannot be allowed to increase - it must either be stopped or used only in extenuating circumstances.

Response:

The commentor is correct in identifying that communities east of LAX are impacted by LAX arrivals and departures and that future aircraft operations and future operations with heavy aircraft will increase even with the imposition of all feasible mitigation measures. This is as a result of normal growth as identified in the No Project/No Action alternative and secondly through the proposed build alternatives (A-D). The No Action/No Project Alternative for 2015 forecasts 2,119 proposed daily aircraft operations. All proposed build alternatives for 2015 show an increase in aircraft operations with Alternative D showing the smallest increase with 2,119 proposed daily aircraft operations when compared to 1996 Baseline (2,075 operations). However, when compared to Year 2000 Conditions (2,147 daily operations) Alternative C and D show fewer daily operations due to an increase in larger aircraft operations and a reduction of smaller aircraft operations. The No Action/No Project Alternative for 2015 forecasts 706 proposed daily heavy aircraft operations. All proposed build alternatives for 2015 show an increase in heavy aircraft operations with Alternative D showing the smallest increase with 643 proposed daily heavy aircraft operations when compared to 1996 Baseline (352 operations) and Year 2000 Conditions (353 operations).

Regarding night noise, aircraft operators are not avoiding westerly departures during nighttime hours to avoid extra costs but to take advantage of a downward slope on the runway going eastbound. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-5.4 regarding relationship of air cargo flights and night noise impacts. Additionally, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2 regarding relationship between traffic levels and noise levels, Subtopical Response TR-N-6.3 regarding relationship between aircraft size and noise levels, and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations. For a detailed explanation on sleep disturbance, please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use with supporting technical data and analyses in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. LAWA has recently initiated an RFQ to Prepare a FAR Part 161 Study for Los Angeles International Airport. LAWA is seeking to establish a partial curfew at LAX that would prohibit the easterly departure of all aircraft, with certain exemptions, between the hours of 12:00 Midnight to 6:30 a.m. when LAX is in Over-Ocean Operations. The commentor is correct, without FAA approval of the Part 161 Study, LAWA cannot compel aircraft to operate in a westerly direction during nighttime hours. For additional information on the use of a CFR Part 161 Study as a mitigation measure, please see Topical Response TR-N-4.1 regarding additional mitigation actions suggested for flight activity.

SPC00095-3

Comment:

Despite the problems engendered by the airport the community does realize that LAX is a vital component of the region's economy. However, LAWA has not taken minimal measures to ensure that airport related damage to 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; or to discuss what LAWA can do to compensate the Lennox community for bearing a disproportionate share of the burden associated with LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA acknowledges the concern of the commentor and is working to address noise and other complaints from LAX operations. Please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. See also Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding residential sound insulation under the ANMP.

With regard to the statement that there has been no dialogue with the community to discuss ways for LAX to become a better neighbor, or to discuss what LAWA can do to compensate for disproportionate impacts on the community of Lennox, as discussed on pages 4-336 and 4-337, in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA has undertaken an extensive outreach effort as part of its Environmental Justice Program to understand issues in communities surrounding LAX, to help address existing concerns, and to formulate mitigation measures and benefits to address potential disproportionate effects associated with the LAX Master Plan. This input formed the basis for the Environmental Justice Program mitigation measures and benefits presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and this Final EIS/EIR. Of the seven environmental justice workshops held to received public input, two were held in the community of Lennox. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding community outreach efforts and environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

SPC00095-4

Comment:

We have come up with a list of steps that LAWA can take to become a better neighbor and to address the negative externalities associated with LAX.

LIVING

- Meaningful Soundproofing: Lessening of the code stipulations, free inspections; no signing of easements.
- Moratorium on Flights between 11:00pm and 5:30am (part 161 of the EIR)

3. Comments and Responses

- Sound Wall along the 405 Freeway
- Ongoing funding for Healthy Start
- Air conditioners and purifiers for homes and school classrooms
- Special Emergency Response Unit (make community aware of disaster plan)

Response:

Please note, as further described in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, that mitigation measures (see MM-LU-1) are proposed that address soundproofing, including lessening of code stipulations and evaluation of eliminating aviation easement requirements. The current Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) also provides air circulation systems or air conditioning systems for homes located within the ANMP boundaries. Air filtration systems for schools are proposed as a benefit under the Environmental Justice Program presented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7) of this Final EIS/EIR.

Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a mitigation measure for conducting a Part 161 Study (see MM-N-5). This section also indicated that road traffic noise impacts along the I-405 would not be significant under Alternative D, LAWA Staff's preferred alternative, therefore a soundwall along the I-405 is not proposed as mitigation. If Alternatives A, B and C, were to be implemented, the LAX Expressway proposal would require soundwalls along the I-405 as mitigation to address significant noise impacts. All of the build alternatives would however require a soundwall along the I-105, as described in Section 4.1, Noise of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Funding for a mobile health clinic is proposed as a benefit under LAWA's Environmental Justice Program, as described in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7) of this Final EIS/EIR.

Regarding provisions for special emergency response, Sections 4.26.1, Fire Protection and 4.26.2, Law Enforcement, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR indicated that impacts on emergency response would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation is proposed. Furthermore, emergency response plans are in place at LAX and in surrounding jurisdictions to address circumstances in the event of a disaster.

As stated on page 4-337, in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA received a substantial number of recommendations for mitigation measures and other benefits relating to environmental justice concerns from environmental justice workshops, comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR, and subsequent community outreach. All recommendations were thoroughly evaluated with consideration of benefit provided relative to cost, whether the recommendation had a nexus or connection with the environmental effects of the proposed LAX Master Plan, or whether it would be feasible for the FAA and/or LAWA to fund and implement. Those recommendations that best met the criteria were instrumental in defining the Environmental Justice Program included in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As further described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2, public input was also received in association with public circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, through additional environmental justice workshops, public hearings, and comments on the EIS/EIR. Furthermore, environmental justice outreach was conducted more recently through meetings with local organizations, environmental groups, and civic, religious, and business leaders in adjacent communities. This additional input was considered and evaluated through a process similar to that undertaken prior to circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. While all recommendations were considered as possible additional components of the Environmental Justice Program, there was a practical limit to the number of benefits that could be selected to help off-set disproportionately high and adverse environmental effects on minority and low-income communities. Furthermore, while LAWA will investigate and pursue environmental justice benefits as feasible and allowable by law, implementation of any programs or measures is dependent upon LAWA's ability to utilize airport revenue funding, or other state or federal funding sources for such implementation. The final Environmental Justice Program is presented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of this Final EIS/EIR, with supporting information provided in Appendix F-A, of this Final EIS/EIR.

SPC00095-5

Comment:

RECREATION

- Enclose Lennox Pool. Provide for Staff and Life Guard presence throughout the year
- Youth Activity League (YAL) - funding to help with the conversion of the Sheriff's Station
- Skate Park that is covered by insurance

BEAUTIFICATION

- Road and sidewalk improvements. Reconstruct 104th, 111th, Inglewood, and Lennox Blvd.

JOBS

- Training or apprenticeship program with on-site job placement
- Airport employers must show evidence of community outreach
- New hires from the community are tracked for promotion
- Shuttle/Van Pool to and from LAX for new hires
- Land for St. Margaret's Center.

SCHOOL DISTRICT

- Land to build a High School for Lennox Students
- Permanent indoor PE facility.
- Support School District's lobbying efforts for placement of billboards on Schools adjacent to 405 freeway
- Periodic school painting (maybe every 10 years)
- Finance School District Emergency AID kit
- Tours of LAX for kids, a career day at LAX

Response:

While certain of these recommendations, such as tours for kids, career days, training, apprenticeship or internship programs, and road improvements, are already offered by LAWA or are proposed as part of the Environmental Justice Program, the other suggestions were considered for incorporation into the Environmental Justice Program. Please see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice of the Final EIS/EIR with supporting information in Appendix F-A, which includes a matrix (Attachment 1), listing the various benefits and measures suggested by agencies and the public that were evaluated as part of the Environmental Justice Program along with an indication of which benefits or measures were adopted and why certain measures were not adopted. Also note, that adoption of benefits may be influenced by funding constraints, such as legal limitations placed on the use of airport revenue, however, LAWA will investigate, pursue, and implement environmental justice benefits as feasible and allowable by law.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00096

Wills, Yvonne

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPC00096-1

Comment:

I challenge Mayor Hahn's claim that moving the southern runway 50 feet closer to El Segundo homes improves safety or security. Safer for whom? I now experience daily near overflights at my home of 48 years. Living in fear is not living! My quality of life has been destroyed by the fear of "what if", noise and air pollution. The black contaminants falling from above demands undue property maintenance plus the unknown of what we are breathing. I cannot plant anything that could be edible. A new environmental impact report needs to be made.

Response:

Comment noted. The relocation of the runway 50-feet to the south is to accommodate an additional taxiway which will reduce the potential for runway incursions. 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 air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life, and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

SPC00096-2

Comment:

The old lumbering cargo airplane pilots (FEDX is the most blatant) and the larger capacity airplane foreign carriers are the cause of my fear. The airplanes MUST stay north of Imperial Highway. "DRIFT" is NOT an excuse!

And specifically, the 1:30 AM to 4:00 AM cargo flights over our homes are also my concern.

El Segundo residents have an intolerable airplane problem currently--moving the runway 50 feet closer to our homes will exacerbate the NOW occurring safety issue.

PLEASE, DO NOT COMPOUND THIS PROBLEM.

Response:

The commentor's concern with Fed Ex flights and foreign carrier flights is noted. 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 (as defined in Section 1, Operational Procedures and Section 4, Traffic and Flight Procedures of LAWA's Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures and Restrictions), but occasional deviations from the procedure continue to occur. A part of the reason for the impression for early-turns is the alignment of the runways relative to the community. The west ends of the runways nearest El Segundo are closer to the community than the east ends (the runways are aimed more toward the community's west end), while the north runways are both farther away (except in Alternative A) and aimed away from the community. The 747 is the largest US built aircraft and due to its size gives the impression of being much closer to the observer than it is.

Aircraft operate in a complex environment and are regulated by a series of rules and regulations and weather conditions of which LAWA has no control over. The pilot is in command of the aircraft and that aircraft is under the control of the FAA. Failure to comply with LAWA's noise abatement procedures is not a violation of the Federal Aviation Regulations. However, it may result in correspondence from LAWA's Environmental Management Bureau staff advising the aircraft operator of the early turn. As stated in LAWA's Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures and Restrictions; It is not intended that any of the traffic or flight procedures contained herein shall, in any manner, abrogate the authority

and responsibility of the pilot in command to assure the safe operation of the aircraft. For further information regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2. Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement and particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-7.1, regarding enforcement of noise rules (over-ocean, early turns, Stage 2 cockpit procedure), Subtopical Response TR-N-7.2, regarding responsibility for enforcement of noise abatement rules, Subtopical Response TR-N-7.3, regarding compliance with instrument departure procedures, Subtopical Response TR-N-7.4, regarding exceptions to the noise rules and Subtopical Response TR-N-7.5, regarding fines for violations of noise abatement procedures. Additionally, noise abatement measures associated with early turn are addressed in Section 4.1.5, Master Plan Commitments and Section 4.1.8, Mitigation Measures, of Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

For a detailed explanation on sleep disturbance please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use with supporting technical data and analyses in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. There is no curfew at LAX, however, LAWA has recently initiated a Request For Qualifications to Prepare a 14 CFR Part 161 Study for Los Angeles International Airport. LAWA is seeking to establish a partial curfew at LAX that would prohibit the easterly departure of all aircraft, with certain exemptions, between the hours of 12:00 Midnight to 6:30 a.m. when LAX is in Over-Ocean Operations. Over-Ocean procedures have been in place since the 1970's and under appropriate weather conditions arrivals and departures will occur over-ocean on the inboard (6R/24L and 7L/25R) runways between the hours of 12:00 Midnight and 6:30 a.m. For additional information on the use of a Part 161 Study as a mitigation measure, please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation, Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

The commentor is partially correct in identifying that Runway 7R/25L would be relocated 50 feet to the south. This will happen under Alternatives C & D. Whereas, under Alternative A, Runway 7R/25L would be relocated 156 feet south. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1, regarding aviation safety regarding runway incursions and aviation incidents and accidents.

SPC00096-3

Comment:

And one last comment--it is obvious that those of us who are detrimentally impacted, El Segundo, were not given a forum convenient to our area--why? I respectfully request the courtesy of your reply.

Response:

In compliance with State and Federal regulations regarding the facilitation of public involvement in decisions which affect the quality of the human environment, FAA and LAWA conducted three environmental justice workshops and twelve public hearings for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR at locations throughout Greater Los Angeles, in order to provide the most convenient access for all affected and interested parties. The following public hearings for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were conducted on three separate days, at locations within approximately five miles or less from the City of El Segundo:

1. 8/18/03 Hollywood Park Pavilion, Inglewood.
2. 8/20/03 Joslyn Community Center, Manhattan Beach.
3. 8/23/03 Furama Hotel, Los Angeles.

A total of four environmental justice workshops and nine public hearings were also held for the Draft EIS/EIR. The following public hearings for the Draft EIS/EIR were conducted at locations within approximately five miles or less from the City of El Segundo:

1. 6/9/01 Hollywood Park Pavilion, Inglewood.
2. 6/9/01 Joslyn Community Center, Manhattan Beach.
3. 6/9/01 Furama Hotel, Los Angeles.

3. Comments and Responses

For additional information, please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

SPC00097 Scott, Ian None Provided

SPC00097-1

Comment:

I am in Support of Alternative D

LAX is in desperatte Need of Modernization Los Angeles is A World Class City With A Third World Airport.

Considerations To Surrounding Communities Must Be Taken Into Consideration But The Airport Must Keep Pace With The Rest Of The World if The City is To Maintain is Economic and Social Standing Globally.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00098 None Provided None Provided

SPC00098-1

Comment:

Support The Hahn Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00099 Abbott, Dwight None Provided 8/14/2003

SPC00099-1

Comment:

COMMENTS ON LAX MASTER PLAN

Name: Dwight Abbott, 1825 Via Estudillo, Palos Verdes Estates, CA

Background includes: ASEB, Univ degree in Aero Engr, licensed pilot, freq user of LAX & other major airports.

My review finds deficiencies in three important areas: 1) passenger convenience, 2) safety and security, and 3) costs.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00099-2 through SPC00099-6 below.

SPC00099-2

Comment:

Passenger Convenience

This master plan imposes great inconvenience on the passengers that will use it.

The FAA now recognizes passenger convenience as an important airport design factor and defines it in terms of time to move the passenger from the parking lot of the departure airport to the parking lot of the arrival airport - not simply airline gate to airline gate as previously defined. The LAX Master Plan will greatly increase the parking lot to parking lot time required over that of the current LAX configuration.

The proposed Ground Transportation Center (GTC) and Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) are nearly a mile removed from the terminal area. They are connected via a train (people mover) that passengers must ride to the terminal. The passengers must carry any carry-on baggage and packages on the train. The current LAX configuration imposes no such inconvenience.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHSP00036-2 regarding the components of Alternative D.

SPC00099-3

Comment:

Safety & Security

Aircraft collisions during taxi, takeoff and landing can result in more casualties than any terrorist attack. I believe that the proposed reconfigured runways are an improvement, however, I believe that the proposal to move the runway 25L only 50 feet to the south is short sighted. Moving it farther south would provide greater aircraft separation, less wake turbulence interference between runways, and improve safety.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHSP00003-3 regarding the proposed runway and taxiway configuration in the south airfield complex.

SPC00099-4

Comment:

The location of the new Rental Car Facility very near the end of the newly positioned runway 24L is unsafe. An aircraft landing short of the runway or not successfully taking off when the runways are operating in an easterly departure pattern will risk impacting with the proposed Rental Car Facility.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00036-4.

SPC00099-5

Comment:

The master plan puts high importance on security as it should, but it includes several factors that appear to reduce security. Centralizing passenger check-in at the proposed Ground Transportation Center provides a single location that if incapacitated will shut down the entire airport operations. Incapacitation could come from earthquake, fire, electrical outage, and other factors as well as from terrorist activity. The current multi-terminal, decentralized check-in configuration does not have this weakness.

The proposed train (people mover) is another single point failure that can shut down airport operations. A small bomb, bomb scare, mechanical failure, or even protestors on the tracks could bring the entire airport operations to a halt.

An independent RAND Corporation study of the security afforded by the proposed LAX Master Plan found that the proposed changes would not increase security compared to the current LAX configuration.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SAR00006-6 regarding concerns related to the GTC and the APM. Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding the RAND Corporation issue paper.

SPC00099-6

Comment:

Cost

The proposed cost of about \$10 billion is simply too high. My written statement explains this conclusion.

Response:

Comment noted. There has been no major investment in the facilities at LAX for many years. The modernization of LAX will improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft and reduce runway incursions, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking.

SPC00099-7

Comment:

Summary

The proposed LAX Master Plan is unacceptable.

Los Angeles County Supervisor Don Knabe has called the LAX Master Plan unacceptable. Congresswoman Jane Harmon also does not support the plan. Media reports state that the airlines don't favor it. The communities near the airport do not favor it. Certainly the user passengers can not favor it due to the high costs it will impose on them, the lengthened parking lot to parking lot time, the greater inconvenience, and the dubious added security.

A new plan is needed. That plan should have 4 features:

- 1) minimize parking lot to parking lot time for travelers
- 2) improve aircraft safety
- 3) not include centralized facilities that when incapacitated can cause shutdown of the entire airport
- 4) reduce development costs to a level half or less of those proposed.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00036-7.

SPC00100

Clark, Bheala

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPC00100-1

Comment:

Noise/Fairness

Do the right thing. For Thirty years We've had to put up with the noise from the planes and the vibrations. Extend the coverage of the homes in the area 9400 & 9500 We wake up to planes. The same noise thats heard in the house 4 doors from me. I hear it.

Response:

Comment noted. FAA and LAWA acknowledge the concern of the commentor and are working to address noise complaints from LAX operations. The commentor appears to be referring to the 9400 and 9500 block of South Hobart Boulevard in the City of Los Angeles. As shown on Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, this portion of Hobart Boulevard is located outside the boundary of residential properties

3. Comments and Responses

eligible for soundproofing. The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP and monitoring methods used to validate the current 65 CNEL contour are described in Topical Response TR-LU-3. The 65 CNEL is the applicable standard for high noise levels as defined by FAR Part 150 and Title 21 (see Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4) of the Draft EIS/EIR). Priority for sound insulation is given to residential properties within the highest noise level band above the 65 CNEL contour. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts.

See Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. See Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences and Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

SPC00101 Valenti, Frank None Provided 8/21/2003

SPC00101-1

Comment:

I AM FOR THE PROJECT.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00102 Brands, Thomas None Provided 8/21/2003

SPC00102-1

Comment:

The new plan for LAX upgrading, is still faulty for much the same reasons as the old one is:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00102-2

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 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 the security plan, even though this number is a rollback from the 98 MAP that was proposed previously. 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 could be just as devastating.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00102-3

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 various venues around LAX such as Playa Vista 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:

This comment is similar to comment SPHF00030-2. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00030-2.

SPC00102-4

Comment:

3. BUSINESS

How many businesses will get displaced by LAX acquiring additional real estate for the planned security improvement? That's job loss. However, at Palmdale, jobs are just as important as they are around LAX, and the potential for growth is much greater.

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to comment PC00171-6; please see Response to Comment PC00171-6.

SPC00102-5

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:

Comment noted.

SPC00102-6

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:

This comment is essentially the same as Comment PC00171-8; please see Response to Comment PC00171-8. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

SPC00102-7**Comment:**

6. COST

The proposed security plans I hear are estimated at about \$9.5 billion. 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.

Besides, when we hear an estimate as high as 9.5 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?

Response:

Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports in order for these airports to address their part of the projected regional demand.

SPC00102-8**Comment:**

7. CONSTRUCTION

During the construction phase, 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 SPHF00047-5 regarding safety measures during construction. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

SPC00103 Trousdale, Roberta None Provided**8/22/2003****SPC00103-1****Comment:**

I am totally opposed to further expansion to the airport based on security and safety measures as referenced in Mayor Hahn's Alternative D proposal. The Regional Solution needs to be fully explored before any further expansion for security and safety measures are determined.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA only controls the operations and potential improvements at LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Other jurisdictions are responsible for developing the other regional airports. LAWA is developing plans for all three of its potential commercial service airports. Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports. The master plans will recommend improvements to meet the projected demand. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX. For further information regarding the role of the LAX Master Plan in a regional approach to meeting demand, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1. Also, please see Topical Responses TR-RC-1 and TR-RC-5 regarding other airports in the region generally, and the airports at Ontario and Palmdale specifically.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00103-2

Comment:

Right now Alternative D plans are to relocate 6,000 homeowners and renters where the check in terminal is planned. This would be a true dismantling of Westchester, a viable active community.

Response:

As stated in Section 2.8, Relocation - Alternative D (subsection 2.8.1.1) of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum, no residential properties would be acquired under Alternative D. The acquisition of Manchester Square is independent of the residential acquisition necessary for Master Plan implementation. The Manchester Square area is being acquired through the existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program, in support of LAWA's ANMP. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00001-4 regarding the validity of the acquisition of Manchester Square.

SPC00103-3

Comment:

This recommendation is for LAX to create jobs, so people can travel, perhaps, 20 to 100 miles from their homes and further congest the freeway. Why, because there is no place affordable to live.

Our freeways are already jammed specifically at the airport juncture, and there are no current plans to easily change this problem which will only be magnified in the near future. The proposed interchanges would be a present time bottleneck that cannot be considered, as we have overloaded freeways and this construction will only hamper travelers with time delays, accidents and more frustration of driving on the 405 freeway. This would also cause greater noise, traffic and air pollution with further deterioration to an already over-whelmed Westchester/Playa Del Rey/Inglewood community.

Response:

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

SPC00103-4

Comment:

Existing property tax revenues would be lost from removing homes and rental properties as well as commercial properties and existing parking lots, just to increase the size of the project. This planning process has already cost the tax payers multi-millions of dollars, while the airport looks horrible with filthy and dilapidated bathrooms, functionally obsolete and dirty terminals with poor signage. It is a passenger's worst nightmare instead of what is expected from a world class city. What a shame our money has not been spent to make the existing interiors and passage ways more comfortable, safe, clean and inviting.

Response:

The effects of residential and business acquisition/relocation on property and business tax revenues were addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As discussed therein, the long-term economic benefits occurring over the life of the Master Plan (through 2015) would include increases in employment opportunities, annual property taxes, and business tax revenues. More specifically, under Alternative D as with the other build alternatives, new property and business tax revenues generated by LAWA-owned properties through 2015 would outweigh any initial loss of tax revenue immediately following acquisition. In contrast to the other build alternatives, no residential acquisition is proposed for Alternative D.

Relative to suggestions regarding the types of improvements to be implemented at LAX, the Master Plan has been developed in response to increasing local, regional, and international demand for air

transportation, in an effort to sustain and promote economic growth within the Los Angeles region. As was discussed in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, each of the build alternatives would involve passenger terminal improvements and/or new terminal facilities that would be designed to increase efficiency and safety.

SPC00103-5

Comment:

The airport is responsible for the surrounding vacant land by LAX all along the Eastern part of Vista Del Mar and Pershing. It has become an eyesore with trash, graffiti marked toilets in a "park" area with decaying streets left in total abandon. There should be a fine to the airport for its active neglect of a once pristine area that has caused surrounding property values to be reduced because this vacant LAX owned area has been left in decline.

Response:

The comment does not pertain to the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00103-6

Comment:

No mitigation fees have been anticipated in the report for removing natural habitat which again will increase the budget and dismantle an established eco system.

Response:

The cost of mitigation for the LAX Master Plan will vary depending upon which alternative is chosen for implementation by the City of Los Angeles. Mitigation measures differ among Master Plan alternatives, especially in the number of habitat units required for restoration. The amount of restoration, as well as the type of restoration (e.g. valley needlegrass grassland; occupied habitat by the El Segundo blue butterfly), can result in substantial variation in the cost of mitigation. With regard to the latter part of the comment, it is important to note that the biotic communities present within the Air Operations Area are characterized as disturbed bare ground, non-native grassland/ruderal, and ornamental landscaping. These areas are continuously maintained (e.g. disced and mowed) for aircraft safety purposes to prevent or discourage their usage by wildlife species (i.e. avoid establishment of potential attractants that draw birds to the airfield area and result in a bird strike hazard for operating aircraft). These areas are not considered natural or established ecosystems because of the extent of habitat conversion that occurs as a result of routine operations and maintenance undertaken at LAX.

SPC00103-7

Comment:

The temporary security measures that has been in effect could have been improved instead of spending money for additional new plans for the airport. The "barricades" on Pershing and on Westchester Parkway are totally useless, and could be removed easily, by terrorists or those seeking to harm people. There is a North Outfall abandoned access point Project on airport grounds on Vista Del Mar. That is a prime target which should be removed. Instead it is left totally unsecured, instead of being removed. This access point could do untold damage to the underground sewer system and the surrounding area by a terrorist. I do not feel my security has been enhanced. What has been done is merely a band aid, and a poor one at that.

All security measures to date, could have been enhanced, but, Mayor Hahn decided to spend more money on new designs to enlarge the airport venue, instead of keeping the existing footprint and truly working to enhance security, comfort and safety of passengers and neighbors.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the

3. Comments and Responses

most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00103-8

Comment:

My sense is that we can keep the airport with its present footprint, remove cargo and have it relocated at the Palmdale Airport, and let the airport facilities expand south, where existing cargo facilities are located. This would make the necessary improvements in an existing open area, with accessible buildings making it more functional, less expensive and fully utilizing the area.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 for a discussion of issues associated with relocating air cargo service to other airports, including geographic access to demand, splitting airline passenger and air cargo services, and airline economics. LAWA is working with the all-cargo airlines and LAX freight forwarders to encourage the use of Palmdale, Ontario, and the other regional airports for cargo destined for originating near the other airports. LAWA cannot force these companies to use Palmdale. Topical Response TR-RC-5 also includes a discussion on 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.

SPC00103-9

Comment:

Airlines do not want to spend anymore money than is necessary now, with their own future in abeyance, and enlarging the airport at this time is not good for the Los Angeles residents and neighbors. LAX neighbors have long been besieged with building of Playa Vista, Loyola Marymount, airport parking facilities, the 105 offramp, Howard Hughes Center and other building which has caused its own increased traffic, pollution and noise.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00103-10

Comment:

All other counties, particularly Orange County residents should be charged an access fee to use this airport, as this will promote the desire to have their own airport facility in the south counties which need more access. By charging an access fee, they may choose to fully utilize John Wayne, Ontario and Long Beach airports. These LAX access fees should be completely audited and used directly to improve the existing LAX interior space like Vancouver Airport, which is truly a world class facility.

Response:

Comment noted. 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.

SPC00103-11

Comment:

I am opposed to the present proposed Mayor Hahn Alternative D proposal, and do not feel that the basis for this project, security and safety, for its neighbors and passengers has been addressed. It is simply an expansion project under this false label.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. As described in Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Alternative D would enhance LAX safety and security while providing improved passenger facilities that would accommodate a comparable passenger level as the No Action/No Project Alternative. It would also maintain the pre-eminent position of Los Angeles in the economy of the Pacific Rim and other international markets. The facility constraints designed as part of Alternative D are described on Page 3-16 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00104 Karnes, Jeff

New World Travel

8/22/2003

SPC00104-1

Comment:

Unfortunately, I will not be able to attend the public hearing at the Furama Hotel on August 23 to voice my opinion on the LAX Masterplan, but am thankful that I may submit my opinion in writing.

New World Travel is a receptive operator, handling contracting, and group arrangements and representation for international clients traveling to the United States. Our clientele stems from Europe, including Germany, Holland, Italy, France, Switzerland, Austria and the United Kingdom as well as Brazil, Mexico, Tahiti, Australia and New Zealand. We currently bring over 75,000 passengers annually to the United States through LAX.

Los Angeles serves as one of three major gateways into the United States for our passengers, the other 2 being Miami and New York. When our clients package and sell US travel products to their passengers, the gateway city and airport experience is important to them and is the first impression that the passenger has of the city. It must be perceived as safe, well organized and efficient.

The tenets of the LAX Masterplan assure that LAX is and is perceived as safe, well organized and efficient for our arriving passengers and maintains LAX's status and reputation as a modern and relevant airport for the international passenger.

Please consider our opinion

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00105 Mellody, Peggy

None Provided

8/22/2003

SPC00105-1

Comment:

Against proposals.

I am a frequent business travel out of a LAX traveling on a flight a minimum of 2-3 days/wk.

I will no longer use LAX if the proposed separate passenger section is put into place.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00105-2

Comment:

Additionally, the proposed plan will adversely effect the environment & traffic, & property values in the communities surrounding LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided comprehensive analysis of the environmental effects of each Master Plan alternative. Please see the text, tables, and figures throughout Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 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-ES-1 regarding impacts to property values and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

SPC00106 Nimrod, Dr Self-Esteem and World Peace 8/23/2003
Association

SPC00106-1

Comment:

Last year at this time and for the two years I have been living in Marina Del Rey there was no plane noise. None. Nothing. Now it seems as if I am living on an LAX runway! My left ear was hurt by an insane overflight bang on the night of July 16, 2003. To whom do I send my doctor bills? Since June 21, 2003 I have been attacked by noise from LAX but I am told by the FAA that nothing has changed!?

I received a letter from Mr. Swanson, the FAA Operations Unit Supervisor which said that pilots of aircraft must operate their aircraft in accordance to Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 91.119 of the General Operating and Flight Rules in airspace controlled by the FAA. He wrote that these rules state that:

"such aircraft, except for take off and landing, cannot fly over congested areas at an altitude of less than 1,000 feet above the highest obstacle within a 2,000 foot radius of the aircraft except over open water or sparsely populated areas. In those cases, aircraft may not operate closer than 500 feet to a person, vessel, vehicle or structure."

He also wrote that "These regulations address safety of aircraft operation and not noise abatement. Our investigation was unable to substantiate any violation of the Federal Aviation Regulations."

My questions are: (1). is this Marina Del Rey area and the adjacent areas considered "sparsely populated areas? Is the water encompassing Marina Del Rey and Playa Del Rey still considered "open water?" In "sparsely populated areas" and "open water" aircraft can legally operate within 500 feet of a person, vessel, vehicle or structure. The Regulations are probably antiquated and out of date.

Concerning "take off and landings" which are exempt from the above rules, my major problem is with departures as I presently see it.

(2). Has LAX and/or the FAA moved the "landings and take offs" to a runway(s) closer to me or changed the flight patterns of "take offs and landings" so that the aircraft fly lower and/or come closer to me, especially since June 2003? As I comprehend it, there are no boundaries for "take offs and landings." Aircraft can fly within less than 500 feet of a building or person.

The noise has thankfully subsided somewhat. (3). I am wondering was the big change at LAX since June 21, 2003 a security measure to secure air space for Air force 1, for the President's visit which just took place? Are things returning to normal?

Response:

Comment noted. Part 91 of 14 C.F.R. does not explicitly define "Sparsely populated" or "Open water", however Marina del Rey is within the congested area of the greater Los Angeles basin as depicted on Los Angeles Class B airspace chart published by the National Oceanographic service. Since it is located within congested airspace as defined in 14 C.F.R., Part 91.119 of the General Operating Rules apply requiring a minimum of 1,000 feet above the highest obstacle applies. The term "Open water" can generally be assumed to mean large bodies of water such as a lake or ocean, thus the Pacific Ocean west of Marina del Rey might be considered open water, while, the marina itself would not.

The FAA has not modified operational usage of the runways at LAX since June, 2003. Departures from the northern runways (Runway 24L/R) proceed westbound to the shoreline before commencing any turn in compliance with LAWA's noise abatement procedures. During presidential operations the airspace surrounding Air Force 1 is carefully monitored by the FAA, United States Secret Service, and local law enforcement agencies, but the normal arrival and departure procedures remain in use. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding measures/enforcement.

SPC00106-2

Comment:

But now a problem has arisen that has overshadowed the noise problem!

Since the trees where I am living were just pruned back drastically on August 1, 2003, I taste, smell and feel the immense pollution from LAX. Talk about Hell! I don't know whether to close my windows and suffer indoor pollution or keep my windows open! My skin is irritated from the pollution. I gargle constantly! Looking at the AirportMonitor Internet Flight Tracking System is depressing. It shows how the planes converge on the Marina and have really polluted the whole coast line from nearly Hunting Beach to nearly Malibu.

I moved to the Marina for the quiet and fresh air. I now realize that I was in a "fool's paradise" all along living this close to LAX. The pruned trees have really brought the message home now that there is no barrier to abate the cancer causing pollution. I have not slept in my apartment for nearly two weeks! It is costing me a lot of money to have nightly lodgings. I need help to move from my apartment. I need help from the agencies within the city of L.A., the FAA and the LAWA.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address 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-AQ-2 regarding toxic air pollutants, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, and Topical Response TR-HHRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects.

SPC00106-3

Comment:

The FAA does not care about the subsequent noise, because noise abatement is not their concern. Well noise abatement should be their concern and added to the updated Regulations that are sorely needed.

Response:

The concern of the commentor is noted, and LAWA and the FAA are working to address noise complaints from LAX operations. As described in Topical Response TR-LU-3, noise abatement is currently provided under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) and is based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL contour. As shown on Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR the commentor's property (located at 14002 Palawan Way, Marina del Rey) is outside the boundary of residential properties eligible for soundproofing.

FAA regulations do exist to address noise abatement. As described in Section 4.2 (subsection 4.2.3) of the Draft EIS/EIR, land use incompatibility as a result of aircraft noise is defined by Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 150, FAA Order 5050.4A consistent with Appendix 6 of Order 1015.D, and Title 21 of the California Code of Regulations. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address noise impacts, pursuant to FAA and State regulations, in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and

3. Comments and Responses

Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1 and Technical Reports S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Mitigation measures under the LAX Master Plan that would reduce exposure of noise sensitive uses to high noise levels are presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.8.1) and Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.8) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These include making over-ocean procedures mandatory; revising the ANMP to encompass noise-sensitive uses newly exposed to high noise levels, residential uses newly high single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening, and eligible schools newly exposed to high single event noise levels that result in classroom disruption. See also Topical Responses TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation and TR-LU-5 for a summary of land use and noise mitigation and significant noise thresholds presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00106-4

Comment:

Pollution should be a major priority!!!!!! People are dying from it!!!!

(4). Is aircraft exhaust pollution the responsibility of the FAA or is that left to the city of Los Angeles just like the aircraft noise pollution is left to the city?

(5). Is the FAA required to have less loud and filthy engines, like automobiles? When?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address 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.

Aircraft engine pollutant limits are governed by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO).

The FAA, EPA, and ICAO require engines to meet their standards for safety, noise, and emissions. Airlines are continuously updating their fleets with newer, quieter, less polluting engines. However, since aircraft engines have life expectancies of 20 years or more, fleet turnover is slow and older engines are typically "grandfathered" should new more stringent standards be implemented.

Please also see Topical Response TR-AQ-2 regarding toxic air pollutants, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, and Topical Response TR-HHRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects.

SPC00106-5

Comment:

(6). Are there agencies in the city of L. A., the FAA and the LAWA that assist people to move if they are affected by the noise and pollution from LAX? I need that assistance now!

Response:

Comment noted. As described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3) of the Draft EIS/EIR, relocation is one mitigation strategy for incompatible uses located within the ANMP boundary (as defined by the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL contour). However, the method preferred by the City and County of Los Angeles to achieve mitigation within the ANMP boundary is through residential sound insulation. As shown on Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the commentor's property (located at 14002 Palawan Way, Marina del Rey) is outside the boundary of residential properties eligible for soundproofing. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding eligibility under the ANMP and for a list of contacts to obtain additional information or express concerns about the ANMP and relocation for qualifying residents.

Under a separate program from the LAX Master Plan, LAWA is currently moving ahead with a voluntary acquisition and relocation program for the Manchester Square and Belford area. This program was initiated due to a high level of interest from residents and property owners who requested that LAWA

3. Comments and Responses

New Mayor proposal will solve the above & we believe and hope it will allow smoother more efficient and quicker International guest arrivals & departures.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00109 Staffelbach, Myron United Association 8/23/2003

SPC00109-1

Comment:

I have attended several of the LAX community meetings - none had the Pledge of Allegiance. Should not any public meeting of this type include the pledge of allegiance & the American flag? Please correct this oversight at any other of your public meetings

Response:

Comment noted. There is no federal law or regulation that requires the stating of the Pledge of Allegiance at a federal public hearing. Reciting the Pledge of Allegiance at other types of public meetings such as City Council meetings is a local custom and not a requirement.

SPC00110 Otten, Elece None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00110-1

Comment:

Support Alternative D

- LAX is a global airport designed/enhanced approximately 25 years ago.

- We need to improve LAX as the other regional airports, ie: Burbank, John Wayne, Ontario, Long Beach, are not global airports and cannot support a global system.

This will:

- create high paying jobs.

- improve & streamline traffic, creating efficiency.

- We must continue to improve LAX!

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00111 Williams, Douglas Ironworkers Local 433 8/23/2003

SPC00111-1

Comment:

I would like to comment on my Support for Plan D. It is time we made the airport safer for the passengers and employees. The new runway configuration will accomodate the large planes which is drastically needed. The security system will address the modern world situation making it more secure.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00112 Ingham, Russell Ironworkers Local 433 8/23/2003

SPC00112-1

Comment:

I would like to say that the Lax Modernization Plan D is a very good plan and should be implemented as soon as possible We need to get LAX updated for better security, safety and the plethora of jobs it will open up. We must get on board and get this modernization going. It will greatly help the economy of L.A. & surrounding area; we need the jobs and of course the revenue

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00113 Yang, Joy None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00113-1

Comment:

I have concerns about Plan D. It seems it would be very inefficient for residents of the LAX area who drop off people or want to wait with people who are departing from LAX. Right now it takes me 5 minutes (driving time) to drop off someone at the curb from my home - With Plan D, it would take 5 -10 minutes to get to the parking area, and an additional 8 minutes to get to the terminal on the people mover. If it's inefficient for one who lives only 5 min. away, it will likely be more time-consuming for others, who are coming from further away.

Plan C seems to be a more reasonable & efficient plan - maintaining people movers w/in the airport.

I'm concerned that Plan D as drafted to primarily satisfy special interests (union, contractors) instead of the public interest of Los Angelinos, particularly airport area residents.

Response:

Comment noted. Each plan has unique advantages and disadvantages. Although Alternative D would require an additional people mover ride that many people using Alternative C would not have, the Alternative D parking system would be consolidated in the eastern portion of the airport, resulting in easier access from the I-405 and I-105 freeways. Both alternatives offer airport access improvements compared to today or to the No Action/No Project Alternative.

SPC00114 Smith, Edson None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00114-1

Comment:

General Comments:

I've been fortunate to be able to travel to many of the world's great cities: London, Paris, Rome, Tokyo, & Amsterdam. The one thing these cities have in common is that they've located their international airports far outside the urban area. Travel is fast and efficient, and there are plenty of airport related jobs.

In light of this, it's just plain nutty that Los Angeles wants to refurbish its urdan airport rather than migrate operations to Antelope Valley onto land it already owns. Expansion of LAX is contrary to both trends and logic, and I am not in favor of it.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding the role of Palmdale in a regional solution.

SPC00115 Huth, Grace None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00115-1

Comment:

Your efforts for a new LAX Extension are not welcome by the Surrounding communities. Please, once and for all try to find a Regional Solution -

And Mr. Hahn should remember all the promises he made and signed to be elected.

Response:

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

SPC00116 Young, Jeanne None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00116-1

Comment:

I am against the Plan for changing LAX. I am definitely against building another structure 1 mile away from the airport. I am for building & expanding Ontario, Orange County, and Lancaster.

If they build another structure near LAX I will fly out of Long Beach.

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.

SPC00117 Forture, Dora None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00117-1

Comment:

Aircraft Noise Exposure

I live at 94th & Hobart Blvd. I am five houses off of 96th st. The plan for the program Aircraft noise exposure stops at 96th & Hobart Blvd. there is no 95th on Hobart Blvd. I am asking for expansion of the plan to include 94th & Hobart. I have lived here for thirty-six years. We get the same noise and the same planes fly over our house as on 96th st. Every years it gets worse. You can't hear your T.V. or talk

3. Comments and Responses

the current 65 CNEL contour are described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4. The 65 CNEL is the applicable standard for high noise levels as defined by FAR Part 150 and Title 21 (see Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4) of the Draft EIS/EIR). Priority for sound insulation is given to residential properties within the highest noise level band above the 65 CNEL contour. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts.

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address aviation incidents and accidents in Section 4.24.3, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Report 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As concluded in Section 4.24.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, no impacts to aviation incidents and accidents would occur under the Master Plan alternatives.

See Subtopical Responses TR-LU-3.4 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and TR-LU-3.14 for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. See Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding the difference between single event and CNEL noise levels and TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

SPC00119 Damle, Sudhir None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00119-1

Comment:

I am in support of the reconfiguration of LAX for reasons of safety. I also support the Mayor's plan for regionalization of airports. In line with that I encourage the Mayor to surcharge 20% on ticket to all Orange County residents who use LAX. This would force them to open up their airports for expansion & help the Mayor contain the capacity of LAX to 78.9 million.

Response:

Comment noted. 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.

SPC00120 Parisi, Cheryl AFSCME Council 36 8/23/2003

SPC00120-1

Comment:

AFSCME Council 36 urges strong support for Plan D -

It's integrated approach to transit, enhancing the use of the Green Line & planned expansion of the Flyaway System will improve air quality & reduce individual auto trip, into the LAX surrounding communities -

The Job Creation included in the plan will be the best form of assistance & improvement for the quality of life in the surrounding communities of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00121 Downing, Patricia None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00121-1

Comment:

MY SUPPORT IS FOR ALTERNATIVE C PARTICULARLY BECAUSE OF LOCATING CAR RENTAL, ETC. LOCATIONS TO THE WEST SIDE. THERE IS SO MUCH SPACE THERE, WHY NOT USE IT INSTEAD OF TAKING RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY ON EAST SIDE? MANCHESTER SQ IS TOO CENTRALIZED!

Response:

Comment noted. Like all alternatives, concept development of Alternative D was an iterative process under which five initial concepts were developed and subsequently six new alternatives emerged. Please see Appendix H of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum, which contains development sketches and original concepts demonstrating the evolution of the Alternative D concept and discusses why the Manchester Square area was chosen for the proposed GTC.

SPC00121-2

Comment:

I ALSO CONTINUE TO THINK WE NEED TO USE/IMPROVE PALMDALE MORE AND PROMOTE IT FOR SF VALLEY FLYERS.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding the role of Palmdale in a regional solution.

SPC00122 Barahona, Virginia None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00122-1

Comment:

Please we need union in employments, companies that respect the employees, and that offer reasonable salaries, as well as health and dental services. They are too expensive for us employees that earn little. It's one way to help welfare, in order for them to save money for more important things. Thank you for offering our children employment opportunities here in Los Angeles.

Response:

Comment noted. Employment and socio-economic issues were addressed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As for the types of new jobs and associated wages that will be generated with Master Plan implementation, each of the alternatives would be directly associated with a wide range of long-term employment opportunities within 17 different manufacturing sectors related to air cargo (none of which are minimum wage) and a variety of airline industry, government, and tourism-related sectors related to air passengers (only some of which may involve minimum wage jobs).

SPC00123 Casey, John None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00123-1

Comment:

I am opposed to expansion of LAX. I believe congestion, noise and other impacts outweigh the economic benefits.

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 economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2 and S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D provides a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

SPC00123-2

Comment:

Travelers can be served through the development of other facilities such as Ontario. This latter action will also provide a more diverse economic base for the greater LA/So Cal area.

Response:

Comment noted. A master plan update is currently underway for Ontario. The master plan will recommend improvements to meet the projected demand of 17.6 MAP in 2015. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding other airports in the region generally and Ontario specifically.

SPC00124 Zaman, Karim None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00124-1

Comment:

As a local minority, small business owner and Board member of the Greater Los African American Chamber of Commerce I give full support to LAX Master Plan as proposed by Mayor Jim Hahn. Additionally, with the increased population growth of LA whether or not LAX is expanded Southern California needs to increase its trade & commerce a major step in this direction is the modernization & growth of LAX

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00125 Carley, Mary None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00125-1

Comment:

As a frequent traveler both nationally and internationally I support the efforts of the LAX Masterplan to effect modernization and security of Los Angeles Intl. Airport.

The economic benefits of a modern and efficient LAX will have a long term effect on the city's fiscal health. Without it LAX will no longer be the largest international gateway in the Western US which will result in lost jobs and revenue.

Yes to the LAX Masterplan

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00126 **Amigo-Arcware,
Nestor** **None Provided** **8/23/2003**

SPC00126-1

Comment:

I BELIEVE THAT THIS IS A GOOD PLAN. A VERY GOOD PLAN. NOW IS THE TIME TO MAKE THESE CHANGES. LAX NEEDS THIS UPGRADE. NOT ONLY WILL IT EASE TRANSPORTATION BUT IT WILL ALSO CREATE JOBS AND THIS IS THE BOTTOM LINE.

WITH THIS INCENTIVE, OTHER COMPANIES WILL SEE IMPROVEMENTS AND THEREFORE THEY WILL NEED TO ALIGN THEMSELVES WITH THESE CHANGES AND THIS SPELLS JOB.

LAWA AND THE L.A. CITY MAY JUST BE THE LEADER IN BRINGING RECOVERY TO L.A.'S ECONOMY IF NOT THE WHOLE OF CALIFORNIA. PLEASE - DO THIS.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00127 **Jimenez, Trini** **Lennox School District** **8/23/2003**

SPC00127-1

Comment:

My name is Trini Jimenez. I am the School Board President in the Lennox School District. Lennox is a small, mostly Latino community, located west of LAX and sandwiched between the 405 Fwy and the 105 Fwy. The Lennox School District serves over 7,000 children in this very densely populated area. We have a paramount interest in the LAX Master Plan because of the direct impact on our community.

We have carefully analyzed the impacts of the new option in the Master Plan and found that mitigations are crucial in our community because of the extreme proximity of the airport. The Lennox School District has conveyed our community's impacts and specific concerns in September 2001. The Lennox School District looks forward to working with Mayor Hahn, the Los Angeles City Council, The LAWA Board of Airport Commissioners, and the Los Angeles World Airport Staff.

We are confident that with appropriate mitigation we can support the Mayor in his effort to improve safety and security at Los Angeles International Airport.

Response:

Comment noted. Comments submitted by the Lennox School District in September 2001 are provided in comment letter AL00034; please see responses to comment letter AL00034. Also, please see Response to Comment AR00003-63 regarding proposed mitigation measures.

SPC00128 **Brown, Piedmont** **Ironworkers Local 433** **8/23/2003**

SPC00128-1

Comment:

Ironworkers Local 433 support Alternative D 100% and the future of L.A.X.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00129

Phillips, Greg

None Provided

8/24/2003

SPC00129-1

Comment:

1 Concentrating passengers together for checkin will make them more vulnerable to terrorist bombings.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00129-2

Comment:

2 The rail facility at the airport needs to be fully functional, to be able to sell tickets for all metro rail trains. A foreign traveler, upon arriving at LAX should be able to understand how to get from LAX to Union Station. There should be MTA people stationed at the airport to explain and answer how to access commuter rail.

Response:

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

SPC00129-3

Comment:

3 We need to expand the commuter capacity of LAX to support LA's growing population . . . we cannot just rely on regional airports.

Response:

Alternative D is designed to accommodate domestic, international and commuter passenger air operations in addition to cargo, GA and others types of air traffic. Alternative D would not relegate all commuter operations to other regional airports. In fact, Alternative D would maintain the role of LAX as the primary hub for commuter air service in the region. The most likely type of service to be reduced at LAX relative to the other alternatives is domestic narrow body air carrier service which can easily be accommodated at the many other airports in the Los Angeles region.

SPC00129-4

Comment:

4 I live in manchester square. I don't appreciate being kicked out of my home. I want at least \$10,000 as compensation. Also, I work near the airport. I need to be able to live near the airport after I am relocated! Since the airport area is very expensive, compensation for me should take that into account.

I believe the current relocation plan for residents of Manchester Square is inadequate and forces unconstitutional restrictions on where a resident can live as a requirement of accepting the money offer.

Response:

In compliance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, the relocation payment for the residents of Manchester Square has provided compensation at fair market value, taking into account moving expenses, mortgage interest rate differentials or rent differentials, down payment assistance, and assorted incidental costs. Please see

3. Comments and Responses

Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.2 regarding relocation compensation. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.1.2 regarding legality of the relocation plan for residents of Manchester Square.

SPC00130 Murphy, Ronald None Provided 8/25/2003

SPC00130-1

Comment:

I am not in favor of the LAX Expansion Project.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00130-2

Comment:

The vibration from the air traffic has caused numerous amount of cracks in both bathroom and bedroom located in the southern part of my property. Not only has it caused these cracks it has caused the bathroom door to rattle when some flights are flying lower than others.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor's residence is located outside the ANMP. Based on the research conducted by the FAA and FICAN there is no indication that the noise levels on neighborhoods around LAX would result in physical damage to residential structures. Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

SPC00130-3

Comment:

If this project is approved, I am convinced that there will be an increase not only in noise, but also an increase in health risk from fuel dumping as well. Also, these things will cause a huge decrease in property value as well.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding fuel dumping, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to property values.

SPC00130-4

Comment:

It seems to me that minorities are always the victims of unwanted projects in their communities.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00131 Schneider, Denny LAX Community Noise Roundtable

SPC00131-1

Comment:

Thank you for this opportunity to speak about the LAX Master Plan and EIS/EIR.

I come before you as Vice President of ARSAC, Alliance for a Regional Solution to Airport Congestion, an active participant in many of the Westchester-Playa del Rey and Southern California area community organizations.

EACH OF THE BUILD ALTERNATIVES ARE AN EXPANSION AND DO NOT MEET THE MAYORS CAMPAIGN PLEDGE.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level of 78.9 million annual passengers (MAP), which is comparable to the 78.7 MAP projected to occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. As such, Alternative D is not considered to represent an expansion of LAX. The other build alternatives (Alternatives A, B, and C) are designed to serve a future activity level substantially more than the No Action/No Project Alternative and, therefore, represent an expansion of LAX. Alternative D is consistent with the Mayor's commitment to no expansion of LAX.

SPC00131-2

Comment:

I oppose Alternative D on several levels, but let me say IT IS NOT AS ONEROUS AS ALTERNATIVES A, B, OR C.

It is too expensive - whatever the real costs turn out to be.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00131-3

Comment:

It perpetuates the continued concentration of air commerce in one place by focusing on increasing LAX NOW and other airports as afterthoughts. We CAN expand LAX again now, but there is a consequence. When the next round of expansions are needed at the other airports their surrounding communities will have built up and become highly concentrated populations just like we already have around LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. However, Alternative D does not increase the passenger or cargo capacity of LAX. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports. The master plans will recommend improvements to meet the projected demand. For further information regarding the role of the LAX Master Plan in a regional approach to meeting demand, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1. Also, please see Topical Responses TR-RC-1 and TR-RC-5 regarding other airports in the region generally, and the airports at Ontario and Palmdale specifically.

SPC00131-4

Comment:

This Plan adds even more environmental impacts on areas already having more than their fair share.

Response:

Comment noted. Environmental Justice was addressed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00131-5

Comment:

The plan is to take all of Manchester Square as a check in facility whereas the LA City Council promised us almost three years ago that it could be used as a much needed park - if the local residents chose to be purchased by LAWA as sound mitigation. Unfortunately the remaining residents will in all likelihood be forced out by the LAWA demolition of those homes purchased so their leaving will not be voluntary.

Response:

Former Councilwoman Galanter made a promise to make Manchester Square a park, however, there was no action taken by the Los Angeles City Council to make that happen. The Manchester Square area is being acquired through the existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program, in support of LAWA's ANMP. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00001-4 regarding the validity of the acquisition of Manchester Square and relocation of homes in Manchester Square. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.3 regarding the future of the residents who do not wish to move.

SPC00131-6

Comment:

Focusing on the EIS/EIR Documentation. The data is old, incomplete, and contradictory.

Response:

In the summer of 2001, LAWA initiated the development of a new alternative (Alternative D) at the direction of Mayor James Hahn. In the summer of 2002, preparation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR began. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was published in July 2003. It is not possible to include an analysis of Year 2003 conditions in a document that was published before the year was completed. Moreover, given that the environmental analysis was initiated in mid-2002, it was not possible to fully describe Year 2002 conditions.

Appendix S-B, Existing Baseline Comparison Issues - 1996 to 2000, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR includes a discussion of the nature of and purpose for providing updated information pertaining to the environmental setting in the Supplement. As was indicated in Section 1.2, Baseline Update, of Appendix S-B, Year 2001 data would not be representative of the affected environment for comparative purposes in an EIS/EIR. As indicated in that section, in the long-term, air traffic at LAX is projected to fully recover from the effects of September 11, 2001. Instead, Year 2000 conditions were evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In instances where the environmental setting under Year 2000 conditions is materially different from that of 1996 baseline conditions, such differences are described, as are any material differences in the impacts that would result by using the Year 2000 conditions instead of 1996 baseline conditions. Disciplines where impacts are materially difference depending upon the baseline year of comparison include noise, air quality, human health risk, employment/socioeconomics, environmental justice, and others. It should be noted, however, that, in accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines, conclusions regarding the significance of impacts for all build alternatives are based on the 1996 baseline or, for certain environmental disciplines, the adjusted environmental baseline.

SPC00131-7

Comment:

Even recognizing that this is a program level environmental document instead of a project, every facet is covered by several options so we really can't do an evaluation of what will be the real impacts.

3. Comments and Responses

Examples are the people mover. We don't know where it will stop and even the details of what it will look like. Baggage handling includes building a billion dollar tunnel as well as making everyone carry their own from Manchester Square. Runway "improvements" also state differences such as the northern most runway 24R will be looking to be widened 50' at some time...north, south or some combination? The other northern runway movement calls for various differences in movement too.

Response:

Comment noted.

LAX Master Plan - Alternative D includes a landside APM and an airside APM. The landside APM would feature two routes. The first would connect the ITC with the CTA with one stop between at the RAC. The second landside APM route would connect the GTC with the CTA. There would be six total stops on the landside APM system including one at the ITC, two at the GTC, one at the RAC facility, one between Terminals 1 and 4 in the CTA and one between Terminals 2 and 3 in the CTA. No passenger would need to make more than two stops prior to reaching his or her destination. The airside APM would have three stops including one at the CTA between Terminals 2 and 3, one at TBIT and one at the proposed West Satellite Concourse. Figure 2.4-5 in the Draft Master Plan Addendum illustrates both the interior and exterior of the proposed APM.

Skycap type baggage check facilities would be available at the GTC for those passengers that would prefer not to carry their luggage aboard the APM linking the GTC to the CTA.

LAX Master Plan - Alternative D does not include plans to widen Runway 6L/24R. However, runway and taxiway separation standards are always measured from centerline. Therefore, widening a runway 50 feet would result in the addition of 25 feet of pavement to each side.

As described in the Draft Master Plan Addendum - Chapter 2.1, Runway 6R/24L would be relocated as part of LAX Master Plan - Alternative D. The Runway would be moved 340 feet south of its existing location, widened from 150 feet to 200 feet and lengthened 1,280 feet east and 135 feet west. The proposed runway would be 11,700 feet long and 200 feet wide.

SPC00131-8

Comment:

I have to also ask what safeguards we'd have that the next phase after this is done won't impact the community even more with another round of expansion?

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D serves to prepare LAX to meet the needs of the community through 2015. The Master Plan process is ongoing and will evolve over time. Changes to LAX beyond 2015 would be decided in the future and would be subject to additional environmental review.

SPC00131-9

Comment:

In terms of fast tracking of this process, I have doubts that the State has formally supported this activities and many surrounding cities and Counties have definitively opposed this action.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00131-10

Comment:

Further, what happened to all of the answers to questions from two years ago? Nothing has been released to us to see why ANYTHING is planned. What makes us believe that the new questions will be adequately addressed?

Response:

It is assumed that the commentor's reference to "all the answers to questions from two years ago" pertains to responses to comments submitted on the Draft EIS/EIR. The Final EIS/EIR for the LAX Master Plan includes all of the comments submitted during the 295 day public review period for the Draft EIS/EIR and written responses to each of those comments, and, similarly, all the comments submitted during the 120-day public review period for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and written responses to those comments.

SPC00131-11

Comment:

I note that a community prepared alternative, we called it E, was not accepted for comments prior to these hearings and that we are supposed to submit it simply as another comment.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00035-4 regarding the residents' concept, Alternative E.

SPC00131-12

Comment:

Why should we trust this process to protect us from anything? The determination can be made that any impact MITIGATED OR NOT, CAN BE ACCEPTED and the projects moved forward. Most every mitigation is being done by an agency other than LAWA since it is not on airport properties. How can we be assured that the other agencies will follow through? It hasn't happened in the past.

Response:

Comment noted. NEPA and CEQA require the presentation of mitigation measures for identified significant impacts irrespective of whether the lead agency has control of implementation of those measures. For mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for which control and responsibility of the mitigation measures lie outside of LAWA's and FAA's jurisdiction, the lead agency shall participate in a fair-share manner to implement the measures, or otherwise encourage or promote the responsible agency to implement the measures, as appropriate. In addition, only those mitigation measures that are feasible were included in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Pursuant to Section 21081.6(a) of CEQA, the public (lead) agency shall adopt a monitoring or reporting program for mitigation measures when making the necessary findings in conjunction with project approval. The mitigation monitoring and reporting program will specify the timing of, and monitoring responsibility for, implementation of adopted mitigation measures. The mitigation monitoring and reporting program is a means to ensure compliance with mitigation measures during project implementation. Pursuant to Section 1505.2(c) of NEPA, the Record of Decision (ROD) must include a monitoring and enforcement program for each mitigation measure. Neither NEPA nor CEQA require or encourage the inclusion of the mitigation monitoring or reporting program as part of a Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00132 Ehret, John None Provided

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter SPC00022; please refer to the Responses to Comment letter SPC00022.

SPC00133 Schneider, Denny None Provided

SPC00133-1

Comment:

Background Summary for LAX Expansion

3. Comments and Responses

LAX is operated by Los Angeles World Airports, LAWA, an independent department within the City of Los Angeles. Prior to Sept 11 LAX was the world's third busiest passenger (67.8 million annual passengers, MAP) and third busiest cargo facility (almost 2 million annual tons, MAT). LAX has slipped to being the fifth busiest passenger facility having lost about 15-20 percent of its passenger base. It continues to be number 3 in cargo with slightly over 2 MAT and increasing. LAX handles approximately seventy five percent of all commercial air traffic in all of Southern California and is the only International airport of consequence south of San Francisco. LAX land mass is one of the smallest major airports at 3500 acres compared to a typical of about 10,000 acres. LAX is located in the densely populated Westside and is surrounded by a substantial amount of "non-compatible land uses" - people's residences.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00133-2

Comment:

LAX is noted as a top terrorist target. The economic impact on Southern California would be devastating if there were either a man-made or natural disaster at LAX.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00133-3

Comment:

Attempts to truly diversify air traffic have stalled. Establishment of an airport at the former El Torro military base in Orange County has been defeated by south Orange County interests. The Southern California Regional Airport Authority has apparently died due to lack of support by Los Angeles City and some other participants.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00133-4

Comment:

The last major expansion of LAX authorized by a Master Plan (and full environmental impact review) was 1978-1982 which increased LAX to 40 MAP. This was promised to be the last. Past expansions have removed one third of the local residences. Subsequent incremental project expansions (no environmental impact study was required because each individual project was only a small percentage increase) raised the stated potential capacity to 78 MAP with ground traffic access to LAX as the prime constraint. BOAC President Ted Stein estimated that without this constraint LAX capacity is 83 MAP.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding past and present activity levels at LAX. Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Chapter 3 of the Draft Master Plan Addendum provide the basis for how Alternative D was designed and determined to serve a future (2015) airport activity level of 78.9 MAP.

SPC00133-5**Comment:**

The FAA no longer establishes airline routes or schedules. This responsibility ended with the 1980's deregulation of the airline industry. Airlines establish their own frequency to any airport. The FAA states that they will work to safely facilitate all desired flights based on the ability of an airport to safely handle aircraft take offs, landings, and gate availability - even if it maximizes air traffic all 24 hours of the day.

Response:

Comment noted. The Airline Deregulation Act was passed by Congress in 1978.

SPC00133-6**Comment:**

Mayor Hahn was elected in 2001 after signing a pledge by the Alliance for A Regional Solution to Airport Congestion, ARSAC, that he would not increase LAX capacity. Subsequent to September 11 Mayor Hahn had a new Master Plan alternative, "the Safety and Security Alternative D," added to the Riordan Master Plan. Reissue of the Riordan Master Plan with this new alternative is anticipated this summer. More than \$125 million has been spent preparing this plan. The \$9-11 billion Alternative D estimates capacity at 78 MAP. This pronouncement is NOT universally accepted. Alt. D safety and security benefits are questioned by local "activists" and most recently by a RAND Corporation study.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00133-7**Comment:**

Southern California Association of Governments, SCAG, a four county coordinating body, projects an increased air capacity need for Southern California. Their "allocation" of air capacity usage to various airports (not an enforceable number) calls for a percentage reduction of overall So Cal flights at LAX from three-fourths down to two-thirds by 2020. The Riordan expansion LAX Master Plan released (and defeated) about two years ago called for increases in LAX capacity to between 94 MAP to 100 MAP plus. SCAG estimated building equivalent capacity in areas other than LAX would cost \$2 billion less.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00133-8**Comment:**

More than twenty years ago it was anticipated that Southern California would need more airport capacity. The LAWA Board of Airport Commissioners owns and operates Palmdale Airport and Ontario Airports. There is currently no commercial air service from Palmdale and about 6.7 Million Annual Passengers leave/return to Ontario Airport. Although LAWA has slack capacity at both Ontario and Palmdale, LAX remains the preferred site. During portions of the day LAX operates at near maximum capacity.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Responses TR-RC-1 and TR-RC-5 regarding other airports as a regional solution.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00133-9

Comment:

The initial Riordan plan was 12,000 pages long and environmental impacts were justified using 1996 data. The Hahn alternative has been added to the Riordan Master Plan and will be reissued. This approach allows continued use of the 1996 data rather than more current data.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues. As indicated in the topical response, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR includes a description of the most current environmental conditions that are meaningful and relevant to the analysis of the LAX Master Plan, although 1996 continues to be used as the baseline for the CEQA analysis.

SPC00133-10

Comment:

Although thousands of comments were submitted and major flaws found within the Riordan plans and support data, there have been no responses to the public comments. LAWA instead proceeded with development of Alternative D "with the comments in mind." They removed some of the significantly objectionable elements from the Riordan alternatives. Alternative D would have far less severe local impacts than Alternatives A, B, or C. None-the-less significant undesirable local and Southern California impacts remain.

Response:

Comment noted. The Final EIS/EIR for the LAX Master Plan includes all of the comments submitted during the 295 day public review period for the Draft EIS/EIR and written responses to each of those comments and, similarly, all the comments submitted during the 120-day public review period for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and written responses to those comments.

SPC00133-11

Comment:

Alternative D Master Plan development has been largely uni-directional. Little criticism has been tolerated and schedules appear to get all approvals before the next Mayoral election. Eleven months have past, for instance, since the most impacted homeowners area was promised a meeting. The initial Alternative D press announcement was by invitation only. The Plan has enjoyed much general exposure by LAWA, but few details exposed. Virtually all meetings are of the "this is what it is" nature.

Response:

In July 2002, a press release outlining Alternative D was made by the Mayor of Los Angeles. This press release made no announcement of any meetings; it simply introduced the alternative to the public. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, published in July of 2003, provides details on the design of Alternative D, as well as an analysis of potential environmental impacts of that alternative. Pursuant to Section 509(b)(6) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended [49 CFR Section 47106(c)(1)(A)], and the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended, the FAA and the City of Los Angeles (LAWA) provided sufficient public notice of availability of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also in compliance with State and Federal regulations regarding the facilitation of public involvement decisions which affect the quality of the human environment, FAA and LAWA conducted twelve public hearings and three Environmental Justice Workshops at locations dispersed throughout Greater Los Angeles, in order to provide the most convenient access for all affected and interested parties. For example, public meetings regarding the LAX Master Plan alternatives, including Alternative D, were held on 8/18/03 at Hollywood Park Pavilion, Inglewood, and 8/23/03 at Furama Hotel, Westchester, two communities that would be most affected by project alternatives. In addition, a blue ribbon committee of citizens of Westchester was formed to provide a specific venue for dialogue between LAWA and Westchester citizens regarding the LAX Master Plan. LAWA provided briefings on project alternatives

3. Comments and Responses

to this committee, answered questions, and received the committee's comments on Master Plan alternatives throughout 2003.

Finally, please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

SPC00133-12

Comment:

Only the Mayor's Blue Ribbon Committee on Manchester Square allowed some give-and-take, but was convened with major assumptions such as expansion into Manchester Square residential area fixed as a condition. Attendance was by invitation only in a secure location with no handouts or recording allowed. The public and press were not given admittance. Manchester Square procurement by LAWA is under GAO investigation for irregularities. If the area were to be procured, it was promised to remaining local residents as a park by the City Council in March 2001.

Response:

The comment on the Mayor's Blue Ribbon Committee is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Former Councilwoman Galanter made a promise to make Manchester Square a park, however, there was no action taken by the Los Angeles City Council to make that happen.

SPC00133-13

Comment:

Local residents were told from the start that the general aspects of the plan are "not negotiable." Numerous requests to address plan objections were consistently met with the phrase, "we thought about it and decided against it." Alternative D continues to lack support from the Airlines, local community, or surrounding governmental entities. Only LA City Council and Mayoral approval is required to proceed.

Response:

Comment noted. In addition to approval by the Los Angeles City Council, the FAA must approve the environmental impact statement and the Airport Layout Plan that is derived from the Master Plan.

SPC00133-14

Comment:

Local community leaders independently developed their own Alternative E without support from LAWA consultants already being paid \$1 million per month. Alternative E addresses Alt. D shortcomings. The Mayor and LAWA remain unwilling to address this plan despite a Neighborhood Council request.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00035-4 regarding the residents' concept, Alternative E.

SPC00133-15

Comment:

The Riordan review period was more than a six months long. This time we will be required to inspect the initial 12,000 page documentation for changes in addition to what we have been told will be 4,000-8,000 additional pages covering Alternative D - all within 45 days! Numerous requests from all levels of government and interest groups to extend the comment period have been rebuffed.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA and FAA extended the public comment period on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to a total of 120 days closing on November 7, 2003. In addition to nine public hearings held in August, three public hearings were held in October, 2003.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00133-16

Comment:

The enclosed CD contains numerous annotated named documents including a Powerpoint presentation on the history of LAX development, Alternative D, and Alternative E.

There are many nuances to this dollar give-away.

Response:

Comment noted. The CD referenced in the comment was not submitted as part of this comment letter. However, a CD with comments on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Addendum to the Draft LAX Master Plan was submitted by Mr. Schneider at the Public Hearing held on October 25, 2003 at the EPIC Center/Olympic Swim Stadium. The comments presented in this CD are identified as comment letter SPC00309. Responses to these comments are provided in the Response to Comment letter SPC00309.

SPC00134 Ho, Ping

UCLA Collaborative Centers for Integrative Medicine 8/15/2003

SPC00134-1

Comment:

Mayor Hahn's LAX Master Plan Proposal simply trades one security hazard for another. If safety is the primary motivation for this proposal, then it falls seriously short of its promises.

A recent Rand Corp. study has indicated that congregating all commercial passengers in one location increases the risk and harm to a greater number of people by a terrorist attack.

The proposal creates a major loophole. The added inconvenience of additional time required to be screened and transported to the airline terminals encourages business and wealthy travelers to engage private business jets, charters, and fractional share aircraft for transportation. These general aviation options are not regulated as strictly as commercial aircraft nor are the aircraft or their passengers screened for security purposes at LAX or any general aviation airport in the area.

I urge Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) to thoughtfully consider the risks of this proposal and to address the lack of security at the general aviation passenger access to LAX at the Imperial entrance. In addition, encourage the FAA to increase security standards nationwide for access to all general aviation areas and other airports with general aviation traffic.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPFA00001-1.

SPC00135 Hamilton, Patricia None Provided

SPC00135-1

Comment:

These are my thoughts as presented yesterday 8/23/03 at the public hearing in Westchester's Furama Hotel on the modernization plan for Los Angeles International Airport.

See Attached writing

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00135-2

Comment:

Lax's Current Plan for Expansion

Technology for the future cannot be predicted at this time so the cost involved to build the new Airport Plan cannot be estimated today - which is only a rough estimate -

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00135-3

Comment:

Our lives here in the United States changed on 9/11 Security and Time is of the Essence The Rand Corporation and the Airlines have given some helpful information for modernization security at the airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00135-4

Comment:

Nine years and million of dollars have already been spent on un-practical plans without taking into consideration -- The Big Picture -- A Regional Solution --

To enlarge LAX on the small and confined acreage including off-site check in facility in this metropolitan area should not be an option.

For serious safety, security, efficiency and convenience the City of Los Angeles should follow the lead of the major Cities in the United States, Europe and Asia by using larger acreages outside of metropolitan areas. Los Angeles already owns larger acreages in Palmdale and Ontario. These Airfields should be developed and enlarged with connecting Metro-Link-Rail Transportation Systems to accommodate the new Jumbo Jets that will hold 500 passengers that are already in the planning stages.

More people's lives could be spared in the event of this type of catastrophe that has already occurred on 9/11 in New York City.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment SPHF00063-3; please refer to Response to Comment SPHF00063-3.

SPC00136

Culjat, Martin

None Provided

8/22/2003

SPC00136-1

Comment:

With the ITC in place, two of the greatest assets in the area are being overlooked: The Union - Station - LAX train tracks, and the Green Line.

- Plans should be made to accommodate a Metrolink -type train station adjacent to either the ITC or GTC. Such a train line is inevitable as LA County's rail system continues to grow and quick transfers between LAX and Union Station are increasingly desired.

3. Comments and Responses

- Plans should also be made to accommodate a Green Line extension north through LAX to Westchester, connecting westsiders to the rail system.

Response:

Comment noted. The Green Line Aviation station serves the purpose suggested by the commentor for Union Station access, albeit more circuitous than a direct line through Westchester. Alternative D would not preclude such a line in the future.

SPC00137 Larson, Cathy None Provided 8/21/2003

SPC00137-1

Comment:

It is essential that Los Angeles World Airports review its current Master Plan Proposal.

Although, Mayor Hahn's LAX Master Plan Alternative was intended to focus on "safety and security" issues, it has become apparent that there are very serious flaws in this proposal.

A recent Rand Corp. study, has indicated that congregating all commercial passengers in one location increases the risk and harm to a greater number of people by a terrorist attack.

The added inconvenience of additional time required to be screened and transported to the airline terminals encourages business and wealthy travelers to engage private business jets, charters, and fractional share aircraft for transportation. These general aviation options are not regulated as strictly as commercial aircraft nor are the aircraft or their passengers screened for security purposes at LAX or any general aviation airport in the area.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPFA00001-1.

SPC00137-2

Comment:

This Plan would also drastically alter traffic patterns. As a resident of Santa Monica, I am well aware that the majority of travelers who live in the North Western area including Santa Monica, Pacific Palisades, Marina del Rey, Venice, Playa del Rey, Topanga, and Malibu access LAX via Lincoln Blvd and other surface streets. I would imagine a similar situation exists from communities accessing LAX from the South Western area.

Will all this traffic be routed through residential areas of Westchester? That probably doesn't sound very appealing to that community. Or perhaps be forced to use the 405 Freeway which already doubles as the largest parking lot in the world?

Response:

Alternative D traffic from the north would be directed on I-405, although traffic could use arterial streets such as La Cienega and Sepulveda Boulevards. Traffic will not be routed through residential areas.

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

SPC00137-3**Comment:**

I urge Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) to thoughtfully consider the risks of this proposal and to address the lack of security at the general aviation passenger access to LAX at the Imperial entrance. In addition, encourage the FAA to increase security standards nationwide for access to all general aviation areas and other airports with general aviation traffic.

Response:

Comment noted. The FAA is working with airport operators across the country in conjunction with the Transportation Security Administration to enhance the security of LAX and the other airports in the United States.

SPC00137-4**Comment:**

Also, any future change in LAX design that alters auto access must include traffic mitigation measures that don't exacerbate an already significant problem.

Response:

Comment noted. The analysis was conducted to ensure that mitigation measures do not exacerbate existing problems.

SPC00138**McCaw Jr, Fred****None Provided****8/20/2003****SPC00138-1****Comment:**

Attached you will find my letter to Antelope Valley Press regarding my opinion and concern in the master plan proposal to expand LAX to meet aviation growth demand.

As a citizen of Antelope Valley, I would like to express my opinion and hoping that your good office would provide the City of Los Angeles the best plan and recommendation to include Palmdale Regional Airport. The success and failure of Mayor Hahn's master plan is in your good hands including the future of Antelope Valley.

I will pray to our Greatest Architect of the Universe to keep you steadfast in your decisions.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding the role of Palmdale in a regional solution.

SPC00138-2**Comment:**

Palmdale Regional Airport

Mayor James Hahn mega bucks proposal of 9 Billion Dollars to renovate LAX would be another blow to Los Angeles taxpayers. However, for the sake of security and environmental impact to the City of Los Angeles, the Palmdale Regional Airport should be considered as an alternative solution to solve over congestion in LAX. Let us built an infrastructure, such as speed rail transportation from LAX to Palmdale Regional Airport. We can move the Cargo Airlines from LAX to relieve some of the 3.1 million tons of cargo and some of the 8 million passengers each year to Palmdale Regional Airport. Proper planning can control traffic congestion and smog pollution.

3. Comments and Responses

It's about time that a Mayor of Los Angeles and members of the City Council includes Palmdale Regional Airport to meet the growth of aviation demand in Los Angeles. Thanks to Mayor Mike Gordon of El Segundo for supporting the utilization of Palmdale Regional Airport. I also wish to thank our County Supervisor Mr. Mike Antanovich for his long time support of using Palmdale Regional Airport.

May I suggest to Mr. David B. Kessler of AICP, US Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration and Jim Richie, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles World Airports, LAX Master Plan Office to use their professional and unbiased non-political decisions to include Palmdale Regional Airport in the master plan expansion of LAX.

If the master plan to include Palmdale Regional Airport fails, it would be time for the citizens of Antelope Valley to purchase Palmdale Regional Airport from Los Angeles. If this also failed, we should legally claim this land, since LAX has no use for it. Then and only then, we would be free from the politicians of Los Angeles City and would be able to determine the destiny of our airport.

Response:

Comment noted. No county or taxpayer monies will be used for on-airport improvements at LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding planned high-speed rail in the region. Cargo cannot be moved arbitrarily. LAWA is working with the all-cargo airlines and LAX freight forwarders to encourage the use of Palmdale, Ontario, and the other regional airports for cargo destined for or originating near the other airports. LAWA cannot force these companies to use Palmdale. Much of LAX's existing competitive advantage is due to the foresight of the City thirty to forty years ago building sufficient facility capacity to handle long-term growth in aviation demand. As the first jet facility in the region, it was already well established by the time the region had grown enough to support a multiple airport system. Many businesses in the region that depend on air transportation chose to locate near LAX and made substantial investments in facilities and improvements. Airlines and other service providers have supported LAX by making major commitments to this facility. The unamortized investments in facilities at LAX and the cost of relocation will make wholesale movements of cargo flights unlikely in the near-term. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding LAWA's efforts to encourage operations at Palmdale, planned improvements at the airport and nearby roadways by LAWA and Caltrans, and the master plan update that is currently underway.

SPC00139 Border, Claudia None Provided 8/7/2003

SPC00139-1

Comment:

Additional Comments: Do we need to have another attack to be more proactive for our citizens?

I'm also worried about the safety of Santa Monica Airport, they could start entering there and cause trouble.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00139-2

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to form letter SPFA; please refer to the response to form letter SPFA.

SPC00140 Harewood, Adrian None Provided 8/21/2003

SPC00140-1

Comment:

Although, Mayor Hahn's recent proposed LAX Master Plan Alternative was intended to focus on "safety and security" issues, it has become apparent that there are very serious flaws in this proposal.

A recent Rand Corp. study has indicated that congregating all commercial passengers in one location increases the risk and harm to a greater number of people by a terrorist attack.

The added inconvenience of additional time required to be screened and transported to the airline terminals encourages business and wealthy travelers to engage private business jets, charters, and fractional share aircraft for transportation. This will detrimentally effect the increase of the already overwhelming air traffic related noise and air pollution from jet fuel exhaust at smaller airports adjacent to family oriented residential communities (such as Santa Monica Airport).

In addition, these general aviation options are not regulated as strictly as commercial aircraft nor are the aircraft or their passengers screened for security purposes at LAX or any general aviation Airport in the area. Based on media reports and our personal experience with Santa Monica airport, the increasingly larger commercial jets are pushing the limits of utilizing the smaller and unregulated airports, which leaves a dangerous and gaping hole in our nations aviation security apparatus.

We urge Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) to thoughtfully consider the risks of this proposal and to address the lack of security at the general aviation passenger access to LAX at the Imperial entrance. In addition, encourage the FAA to increase security standards nationwide for access to all general aviation areas and other airports with general aviation traffic.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security-related aspects of the comment.

General aviation security is maintained through the limited access of the general aviation facilities. Fixed based operators, aircraft owners/operators and pilots work together to ensure safety of their passengers. In the case of LAX, the general aviation facilities are physically separated from the commercial passenger terminal areas to provide ease of operation by both and to limit security risks. FAA and TSA are responsible for security standards related to general aviation and both agencies have been addressing this issue in recent regulations that apply to the entire industry.

SPC00141 Lindstrom, Dean None Provided 9/8/2003

SPC00141-1

Comment:

1. One of the first things we should have learned from the terrorist attack of 9/11/01 is that enlarging LAX will make it a more desirable target, Spreading the flights and passengers to other areas would make an attack less likely.

2. Establishing a check-in facility in Manchester Square, makes that a good target for terrorists; adding the 2 mile trams also adds inviting and easy targets.

3. Comments and Responses

3. This does tend to make the buildings less vulnerable at the expense of increased vulnerability for the people.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00141-2

Comment:

4. The traffic congestion on the 405 and 105 freeways and in the check-in area will be significantly increased, causing many problems.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding traffic impacts of Alternative D.

SPC00141-3

Comment:

5. The destruction of facilities and construction of new ones is a terrible waste of money with no significant improvement in operations.

Response:

LAX Master Plan - Alternative D will enhance safety and security at The Airport. Please see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR for a discussion on Purpose and Need. Increased LAX airport safety is considered to be an improvement. Airfield safety would be improved through the addition of center parallel taxiways between the runways reducing the likelihood of runway incursions. This is one example of a direct benefit to airfield safety provided by the LAX Master Plan. Demolishing the existing parking garages in the CTA and replacing them with new, larger terminals will benefit passenger convenience by improving the passenger processing efficiency. Alternative D would separate commercial and private vehicle landside components from the passenger terminal facilities and gates in CTA eliminating the threat of blast in close proximity to large congregations of queuing passengers at functions such as ticketing and baggage claim. Overall increases in safety, security, efficiency and convenience are all improvements to LAX operations.

SPC00141-4

Comment:

6. Expansion to the east will have a major impact on the citizens east of the airport.

Response:

The 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 S-D. Please see Response to Comment SAL00004-9 regarding expansion to the east.

SPC00141-5

Comment:

7. A very important factor making this such a terrible waste of time and money is the fact that population growth in Southern California is north toward Palmdale and east to Riverside and San Bernardino. Long before the LAX expansion is complete, airport expansion in those areas will be necessary. Where does that money come from?

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional

3. Comments and Responses

demand. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports. The master plans will recommend improvements to address the projected demand. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX. The proposed LAX 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. The funding for the proposed LAX projects will not reduce the monies available for other regional airport expansions.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding the role of Palmdale in a regional solution.

SPC00141-6

Comment:

8. One of the biggest things lacking in this plan is Common Sense.

9. No other major airport is located in the middle of the city. Cities around the world have expanded and built new airports, but not in the middle of the city. Check Hong Kong, Milan, Italy, and Munich, Germany for examples.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00141-7

Comment:

10. It is clear that this is a plan where special interests will make a lot of money, rather than a plan to improve airport transportation and its impact on the surrounding community.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00142 Prestegui, Yaneth Lennox Academy School 9/13/2003

SPC00142-1

Comment:

I represent the Lennox Academy School

When airplanes pass, car alarms sound there is too much sound everywhere and the noise is so loud. So fix this place and just make a useful time for airplanes to pass.

Response:

Comment noted. Lennox Math, Science & Technology High School Academy (located at 4125 West 105th Street) is a new school as of August 13, 2003 and is the former Whelan Elementary School as identified in the Draft and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The impacts on the Lennox Math, Science & Technology High School Academy as Whelan Elementary School (Grid Cell ID code PBS 123) were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Under the terms of the "Settlement Agreement," the City of Los Angeles awarded approximately \$2.5 million to the Lennox School District to use for sound insulation of affected schools within the 65 CNEL and the Lennox School District agreed to allow an aviation easement deeming their schools compatible with the airport under Title 21 provisions. Schools significantly impacted by aircraft noise impacts that result in classroom disruption will receive sound insulation to reduce interior noise levels to the applicable threshold noise level, unless the school is subject to an existing aviation easement. Please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00142-2

Comment:

Also at night when airplanes pass they don't let us sleep. Make a useful time for airplanes to pass.

Response:

Comment noted. There is no curfew at LAX. However, since the early 1970's, between midnight and 6:30 a.m., and winds permitting, Air Traffic Control converts to an over-ocean operations mode whereby both arrivals and departures fly over the ocean. Although this is a preferred method of operation during the late nighttime window, there is no ban on flight operations to the east of the airport. Even during over-ocean operations, individual pilots can and do request east takeoffs. LAWA has recently initiated a Request For Qualifications to prepare a 14 CFR Part 161 Study for Los Angeles International Airport. LAWA is seeking to establish a partial curfew at LAX that would prohibit the easterly departure of all discretionary aircraft, with certain exemptions, between the hours of 12:00 Midnight to 6:30 a.m. when LAX is in Over-Ocean Operations. During a recent 18-month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. When over-ocean procedures are not practicable for reasons of adverse weather or winds (as defined in Section 4, of LAWA's Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Restrictions), aircraft will continue to depart to the east between midnight and 6:30.

For a detailed explanation on sleep disturbance please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use with supporting technical data and analyses in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation, Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and TR-N-8 regarding noise based vibration. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement and particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-7.1, regarding enforcement of noise rules (over-ocean, early turns, Stage 2 cockpit procedure), Subtopical Response TR-N-7.2, regarding responsibility for enforcement of noise abatement rules, Subtopical Response TR-N-7.3, regarding compliance with instrument departure procedures, Subtopical Response TR-N-7.4, regarding exceptions to the noise rules and Subtopical Response TR-N-7.5, regarding fines for violations of noise abatement procedures.

SPC00143 Williams, Ryan None Provided 9/13/2003

SPC00143-1

Comment:

I live in Culver City and work in Lennox. Rand shows that we should restrict growth to lessen LAX as a target.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security-related aspect of the comment.

SPC00143-2

Comment:

How dare the business community continue to exploit people of color in Lennox. We all know that this "investment" in security leaves the door wide open for continued growth at LAX. Why are we investing 9 billion in LAX when we need to be redistributing the sound, environmental and medical burden to the greater community. Anyone who supports spending money at LAX is slitting the throats of the immigrant community that is the backbone of this community.

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-EJ-3 regarding environmental justice and regional context.

SPC00144

Hartman, Randall

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPC00144-1

Comment:

I am a Quality Assurance Inspector of aircraft maintenance for American Airlines. I have worked at LAX in this capacity for the last 20 yrs as both an aircraft inspector and mechanic. I intimately see everyday the problems LAX has gone through over the years, and the current problems it faces in trying to maintain safety and security, and in dealing with increasing air traffic.

I have studied Mayor Hahn's plan for LAX thoroughly and quite honestly find it laughable. Nothing about it makes any common sense in trying to solve the current, and future problems facing LAX. The only logic for this plan, is to "make work" (since I think it is a waste of labor and resources) for the construction firm(s) that will be doing this job. I wouldn't doubt that these contractors gave Hahn a heap of money in his campaign for mayor.

First and foremost lets talk about security. Hahn' plan claims this will improve security at LAX. His plan calls for having everyone check in at one central location and then "people-move" them to their gates. THIS PLAN IS A TERRORIST DREAM! Yea, lets gather the massive crowds of people that go through LAX and put them all in one area. Even a moron should be able to see that this isn't a very bright idea. A suicide bomber then could mix in with this crowd before they check in, and wipe out a hell of a lot of people.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00288-2 which discusses dispersion of people at the GTC.

SPC00144-2

Comment:

Hahn's plan would severely hamper the efficiency and order of LAX for an estimated 11 yrs, and that's if they do it on schedule which rarely happens. This is 11 yrs of inconvenience to the passengers, airlines, and vendors. The airline industry is already severely hurting financially and this will impact operations here at LAX for 11 yrs. On top of that the cost of this massive project that will do nothing to improve anything. It will be financed by higher air fares, and this will hamper the airlines, and also any business that relies on air travel, like tourism, business travel, airport vendors, etc.. What is Hahn and all those that support this thinking!?

Response:

The construction of various components of the Draft LAX Master Plan would be phased in a manner that would minimize passenger, vendor and airline inconvenience. Please see Figure S3-15 in Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a description of a conceptual summary schedule of construction of components of the proposed master plan.

SPC00144-3

Comment:

Stop this insanity! You don't need to mess up LAX. You need to develop a regional approach to handle air traffic around Los Angeles. Most of the people that work for the airlines, and those that fly that live in the LA area, don't live near LAX! They live elsewhere and would be better served by airports like Ontario, San Bernardino, Orange County, Burbank, and Palmdale. That is where you should expand, and you can make improvements to LAX if needed, but don't do anything stupid and major, like move

3. Comments and Responses

runways, or terminals, and make a centrally located check-in area. Most of my co-workers here at American Airlines feel the same way. We don't need your so called "improvements".

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA only controls the operations and potential improvements at LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Other jurisdictions are responsible for developing the other regional airports. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports. The master plans will recommend improvements to meet the projected demand. LAWA estimates that these four facilities will handle approximately 97 MAP in 2015. Regional demand in excess of this amount will have to be met by the other airports in the region or some of the excess demand will be diverted to airports outside of the region and the balance of the demand will go unserved. LAWA has planned Alternative D to be in compliance with SCAG's 2001 and Draft 2004 RTP allocations to LAX. It is up to the other regional airport operators to meet a larger percentage of the regional demand. For further information regarding the role of the LAX Master Plan in a regional approach to meeting demand, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1. Also, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

SPC00145 Goldklatt, Joseph None Provided

SPC00145-1

Comment:

RT WING LOW B Attn: (K) LAX MASTER PLAN Public path Rt WING

Learning Center, Room 10-A 6661 Imperial Highway,
(B) Los Angeles, CA 90045 ES (13) Lb. (12) Lib (11) Lib
(3) Airports (E) (2) clerks Ontario 1 Airport Palmdale 1 Airport Mt. San Antonio 1 Learning Resource
(B6) Libraries (1) college r 36 1 clerk 1 clerk 1 airport van nuys 1 council Govt
(E) Sum 41 + 1 college *UCLA Henry J. Brunner sm LAX

d at www.laxmasterplan.org

* (y)or (all) of the volumes that comprise the Draft LAX master plan Addendum and/or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, please contact: Inc phone: (323) 727-6868 nue FAX: (323) 727-6878 90040 Email: LAX@printcoonline.com

50.00 Mastercard only), money order, cashier's check or personal check any order

paid by personal check will be delayed until the check clears. ALL rGES.

(H) and are bound with 2- hole punch rings

(J) Sting of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Draft LAX Master plan entirety.

copy only 81/2x11,11x17 81/2x11 11x17

(1) volume totaling 1,165 pages. It does not include supporting appendices and \$330.00 \$281.00 \$240.00

Draft EIS/EIR (paper copy only) 1 volume totaling 183 pages. Each Appendix provides

reference data which DRAFT EIS/EIR. The cost of each individual Appendix varies according to it \$190.00 \$120.00 \$105.00

to the draft EIS/EIR (paper only) of five (5) volumes totaling 2,626 pages. Each report represents ulate the conclusions in the Supplement to the Draft EIR/EIS. The cost of summaries according to its total page count 755.00 642.00 1596.00

3. Comments and Responses

paper copy only - addendum consists of two (2) volumes totaling 749 pages this series of documents responds to various Federal Aviation Administration requirements & mitigation. \$340.00 \$289.00 \$246.00

D in color. If you purchase a document in black and white only the color pages may be difficult to interpret Evelyn Y Quintanilla at (310) 646-7693 may be difficult to interpret.

LEFT WING Lf. WING 13 Libraries, John Wayne airport (1) and Federal (1) Aviation LF WING Administration office of the Airport driven 1500 Aviation Blvd Hawthorne, CA 90261

SUM = (15)

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR can also be vi

purchase of documents: to request a copy "D"

printco Grap

2943 Supply

Los Angeles,

payments may be made by: cash, credit card (visa a items are subject to california sales tax and freight Note: this paper copy documents do not include a cov

Compact discs Four (4) Compact (CDs) C

Addendum described below in th

My Addendum (E.) (MA) (history company (exchange for CD'S 5 CD's total) 5 special for project

Supplement to DRAFT EIS/EIR CD

this document consists of technical reports

Appendices to the Supplement to the Appendices consists supports the supports the

Supplement total pages count

Technical Reports to the supplen. The technical report can technical analysis used to individual Technical re po

Draft LAX plan addendi The Draft LAX Master pla background and other rela for planning end technical

* portions of these documents were designed to be L

Si necesito asistencia en espanol. Favor comunicat

Response:

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

SPC00145-2

Comment:

Date	Location	
Monday, Oct. 20, 2003	Doubletree Hotel	Von John
5:00pm - 9:00pm	880 Montebello Blvd.	Prof. GoldKlatt

3. Comments and Responses

	Rosemead, CA 91170	Between 6:00-7:00 pm
Wednesday, Oct. 22, 2003	Granada Hills Charter H.S	Von
5:00pm - 9:00pm	10535 Zulzah Ave	Prof. Stratchie
	Granada Hills, CA 91344	Between 8:00 - 9:00
Saturday-Oct 25, 2003	EPIC Center	Von Prof Ernst Frito S.
9:00am - 1:00pm	39806 Menlo Avenue	or Shchegor
	Los Angeles, CA 90037	Between 8:00-12:00am/pm

Response:

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

SPC00146 Stoller, Herman None Provided 7/7/2003

SPC00146-1

Comment:

I VOTED FOR YOU BUT I'M SORRY I DID THE ACTION.

YOUR PLAN TO SPEND \$9.6 BILLION ON AIRPORT MODERNIZING IS WASTFUL.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00146-2

Comment:

WHAT THE CITIZENS NEED IS A TRAIN TO LAX AS E.G. ATLANTA, BART (S.F.), N.YC IS BUILDING ONE.

Response:

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

SPC00146-3

Comment:

PLEASE FOCUS ON MOVING TWO PARALLEL RUNWAYS ON THE SO SIDE OF THE AIRFIELD FARTHER APART. I WAS ON A PLANE WHEREBY WE HAD A NEAR MISS.

Response:

The commentor correctly stated the need for re-configuration of the runways in the south airfield complex. All of the Master Plan build alternatives including Alternative D propose a center taxiway between the closely spaced parallel runways and the purpose of the center taxiway is to enhance safe aircraft operations and reduce the potential for runway incursions. Please see Response to Comment SPHSP00003-3 regarding runway and taxiway configuration in the south airfield complex and Response to Comment SPHO00004-9 regarding the need of a center taxiway between the parallel runways to enhance safe aircraft operations and reduce the potential for runway incursions.

SPC00146-4**Comment:**

WE NEED ADDITIONAL EFFICIENTCY IN THE USE OF OUR POLICE MANPOWER E.G. (1) DO WE NEED TWO OFFICERS PER CAR DAY & NIGH SHIFTS? (2) DO WE NEED 2 AND 3 POLICE CAR AT TRAFFIC ACCIDENT LOCATION? (3) WHY MOST TO CITY PAY TIME AND HALF TO POLICE OFFICERS THAT APPEARS IN TRAFFIC COURT?

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, however the commentor's concerns and questions regarding existing police services are noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed police services in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement (CEQA), with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 16b. of the Draft EIS/EIR. The focus of the law enforcement analysis provided in these documents is on the potential for the proposed LAX Master Plan to impact the environment.

SPC00146-5**Comment:**

WHEN WILL THE CRA, M.T.A. AND OTHER DEPARTMENT STOP THEIR WASTEFUL SPENDING AND BECOME MORE COST EFFECTIVE.

YOUR THE LEADER OF THE BAND. HOW ABOUT SOME COMMON BUSINESS SENSE IN LEADERSHIP?

P.S. A REPLY WOULD BE APPRECIATED

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Responses to individual comments included in this comment letter are provided above.

SPC00147 Rosenberger, Paul None Provided 7/13/2003

SPC00147-1**Comment:**

Although admirable in many respects, your airport plan does not address the traffic congestion that is already paralyzing the 405 virtually around the clock, much of it attributable to the airport traffic. As the airport capacity expands, this problem will become catastrophic.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D does not expand the capacity of the airport beyond the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also, the percentage of traffic on the I-405 Freeway that is related to the airport is actually relatively small. Nonetheless, Section 6 of Technical Report S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR discusses project impacts on the freeway system and regional arterial streets and proposes a mitigation plan. Although the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR must account for existing traffic congestion in their analyses, only significant impacts to traffic directly caused by the project can be mitigated by the project.

SPC00147-2**Comment:**

The current plan calls for passengers to be processed at a central baggage screening facility, after which they board buses to be transported to their departure terminals.

3. Comments and Responses

A much better alternative is to have multiple regional facilities (down town LA, the valley, Orange county, etc.) and bus passengers from there to the terminals. As long as passengers have to board a bus, they might as well board it where it is convenient to their home location. This may be more expensive in the short run, but would pay huge dividends in passenger convenience, traffic reduction, and avoidance of extremely expensive freeway expansion.

Please give consideration to this important issue as you refine your air port modernization plan.

Response:

The concept suggested by the commentor is included in Alternative D. As was indicated on page 4-252 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D includes an expanded FlyAway service which will provide the same services that are suggested, at locations throughout the region. Please see Response to Comment SAL00004-27, regarding potential locations for a future FlyAway service.

SPC00148 Allen, Lucille None Provided

SPC00148-1

Comment:

We are writing to ask you to increase the minimum public comment period for the LAX Master Plan, Alternative D, from 45 days to 180 days because 45 days is simply too little time for public review and comment. Fairness to all interested parties requires adequate time to receive, review and comment on such an important document that will affect everyone in the city of Los Angeles and well beyond.

We therefore urge you to increase the public review period to 180 days.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA and FAA extended the public comment period on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to a total of 120 days closing on November 7, 2003. In addition to nine public hearings held in August, three public hearings were held in October, 2003.

SPC00149 Kom, Tony None Provided 8/18/2003

SPC00149-1

Comment:

LAX MASTER PLAN - SPENDS 9 BILLION PLUS TO:

- Tear Down Airport Structures Possibly Not Yet Even Paid For

Response:

Alternative D would improve the level of safety and security in the most efficient manner possible. The demolition of some structures to be replaced by new, more modern, safer and more secure facilities is considered to be a cost effective method of improving the safety and security of LAX passengers. The existing infrastructure at LAX would be retained and reused to the greatest extent possible without sacrificing airport safety and security.

SPC00149-2

Comment:

- Concentrate Airport Congestion

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00149-3**Comment:**

- Promote Traffic Gridlock

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00149-4**Comment:**

- Make LAX the Most Inconvenient Airport in the World

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to Comment SPHF00051-4; please refer to Response to Comment SPHF00051-4.

SPC00149-5**Comment:**

Simply moves Airport Congestion & Likely Point of Terrorist Attack to another more congested site without equal replacement parking and still further away from Green Line to Blue Line to Red Line and Urban Destinations. Is it really convenient to go to Park and Ride Lots in Long Beach, Norwalk & Inglewood and ride busses to Manchester Square Airport Security Center?

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D would disperse the traffic that is now concentrated at the CTA to three locations: the new GTC, ITC, and RAC facilities. Therefore, none of the three future passenger areas would have to accommodate as much activity as would the CTA, if Alternative D is not constructed. Also, people using any future FlyAway stations, including in Long Beach, Norwalk, and Inglewood, would have direct access to the CTA, bypassing the GTC. Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues.

SPC00149-6**Comment:**

Our past leaders were visionary in buying a large airport site at Palmdale. Tokyo, Seoul, Hong Kong and Washington D.C. all built new larger International Airports far from their cities. Most now use old airports for Domestic Flights Only. Transit Links to other Airports and Cities.

HOW TO SPEND LESS AND GET MORE....a possible Alternative Plan

LOS ANGELES AIRPORTS AND RAIL TRANSIT SCHEME * *

As Illustrated with Detailed Map - Plans & Text shown on Large Display Boards. (Prevented from Showing at Airport Public Hearing)

* New Secure Los Angeles International Airport at Palmdale

With all passenger and baggage screening and check -in features now in LAX Master Plan Using only a small portion of this vast site.

Links Palmdale Metrolink Station (uc) with one-mile Elevated Airport Tram connecting to Security Center for Passenger and Luggage Screening, Flight Check-In and Baggage Check.

3. Comments and Responses

Continuing Tram to Huge International Terminal and on to even larger Domestic Terminal for Connecting Flights.

2.5 Mile Elevated Tram Loop from Terminals to Parking, Bus, Taxi and Car Rental Lots; to Security Center; and Metrolink Station.

500 acres of Open Parking Lots with approximately 50 to 70 thousand Car Capacity. 180 acres for Bus and Taxi Terminals and Car Rental Lots.

Existing Metrolink Travel Time from Union Station to Lancaster is 1 hour and 40 minutes. Would be less from Red Line/Metrolink Station to Palmdale Airport and even less by car on 14 Freeway.

Transit Travel Time to Airport could be greatly reduced by (1) Better Track Alignment improved Rail Roadbed (3) Grade Separation (4) Double Tracking and (5) Electrification.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment SPC00081-6; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00081-6.

SPC00149-7

Comment:

* Los Angeles Westchester Domestic Airport at LAX

Linked by Terminals Tram to Metro Rail Line. Possible Security Check Point at Tram Station.

Airport Conference Center & Corporate Jet parking at now Tom Bradley International Terminal.

Retain all LAX Terminals, Parking Structures and Runways as they now exist.

LAX Flights Actually Reduced. No Homes or Businesses Taken.

* Easy Rail Transit to ALL Los Angeles Airports.

Including Direct Metro Rail between LAX and Burbank Airports.

Only 15 miles of new Metro Rail lines could link Green Line and LAX to Burbank Airport and Metrolink Rail Line to Palmdale Airport.

Two mile Red Line Valley Metro Rail Extension to Burbank Airport Terminal. Then one mile more to new Antelope Valley Metrolink Station and Rail Transit Service to L.A. Int. Airport at Palmdale. Also increases low income workers access to large nearby affordable housing stock.

Ebony Metro Rail Line from Union Station to Wilshire-Western Stub. Then 12 miles to LAX. Subway down Crenshaw Blvd. and Elevated on MTA owned railroad right-of-way to Century/Aviation Station Link with LAX Airport Terminals Tram. Ending at Green Line Light Rail Aviation Station. Bay Area BART elevated everywhere except in Downtown City Areas.

Long Beach Airport Alternative Terminal Transit Links to Long Beach Blue Line Light Rail.

Now no direct rail access to Ontario Airport. Alternative Plan has new Ontario Airport Stations on Riverside and San Bernardino Metrolink Lines with Transit Links to Airport Terminal.

Response:

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

SPC00150 Durazo, Maria None Provided 9/10/2003

SPC00150-1

Comment:

Suggestion: Please next time, NO CHILDREN

I am a resident of Westchester, who attended the airport meeting on August 23. I couldn't hear the speakers because two children chattered throughout the meeting.

The children would not stop talking, even though the union representatives told their children to be quiet. This did no good, in fact, the two small girls were asked to be quiet about a dozen times, but never stopped talking for a second, until finally at the break they were taken out. It was unbelievably rude not to keep them quiet or take them out of the room during the meeting.

In addition, three other children in this group played a game for quite awhile which was distracting, also disruptive to trying to hear the speakers. No attempt was made to stop the game or ask these children to go outside.

We all want to hear every speaker at the meeting. I'm sure the union wants its message to be heard--it was a shame their own noisy children prevented us from hearing their message too.

Next meeting, please, no children.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00151 Bharadwa, Mina None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00151-1

Comment:

My name is Mina Bharadwa. I am a local realtor I live & work in Westchester.

I support Alternative E as devised by local residents.

Manchester Square should be convention centre or park.

The check in facility should be relocated to airport land at corner of Aviation and Century

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00035-4 regarding the residents' concept, Alternative E.

SPC00151-2

Comment:

The Regional solution needs to be investigated. People who do not live in LA County should pay surcharge especially Orange County residents where they do not want El Toro to be a regional airport.

Response:

Comment noted. 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.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00152 MacJenneth, Patti Los Angeles Convention and Visitors Bureau 8/23/2002

SPC00152-1

Comment:

Regretfully, I was unable to stay for the balance of the public hearing meeting at the Furama Hotel. I would appreciate it if you could include my comments (attached).

Response:

Please see Response to Comment below.

SPC00152-2

Comment:

On behalf of the Los Angeles Convention & Visitors Bureau, I'm here to speak in support of the LAX Masterplan.

Our organization represents LA's tourism industry, the second largest industry in L.A. providing over 240,000 jobs. Last year, tourism injected \$11.8 billion in direct visitor spending.

LA's growth as a top travel destination is largely due to LAX which provides easy access & competitive airfares from all major cities around the world.

In today's environment, competition for the visitor is fierce. Travelers today have more choices than ever before in history. They can choose airports such as Phoenix, SFO and Las Vegas that have updated facilities.

We are here to underscore the core elements of this plan.

1. To provide a safe and secure facility - which ultimately benefits all travelers and the surrounding community.
2. To modernize the airport in order for LAX to maintain its standing as a premier international gateway.
3. To recognize that a regionalized system is the long-term solution to Southern California's increasing air travel demand.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00153 Leighton, Andrew None Provided 8/28/2003

SPC00153-1

Comment:

Please register my opposition to Master Plan LAX. The proposed changes will do little to increase airline safety. They will in fact, set up an increase in passenger capacity - an issue opposed by all the neighboring communities for reasons of increased traffic as well as noise and air pollution. We here in the South Bay continue to ask why other regional airports are not asked to increase their capacity. Finally, the price tag (\$9 billion plus?) is much too high. During these fiscally trying times, couldn't that money be better spent on something else?

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has several features designed to improve LAX safety and security. For example, the addition of center parallel taxiways on both the north and south airfields would reduce the potential for runway incursions. Improvements to airport security are also included in the Alternative D design such as the prohibition of private vehicle traffic in the CTA where large groups of passengers typically queue at functions such as ticketing and baggage claim.

As described in Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, facilities associated with Alternative D are designed to constrain passenger activity level to 78.9 MAP, which is equivalent to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D would also encourage other regional airports to increase their capacity or take on a larger share of the regional demand for air travel.

SPC00154 Butler, Viggo Los Angeles County Economic 8/28/2003
Development Corporation

SPC00154-1

Comment:

Thank you for participating so actively in the LAEDC Critical Infrastructure Council's efforts to develop a position on the LAX Master Plan. As you know, the Council is most concerned about the region's need to meet its growing demand for airport capacity and the functionality and ease of use of its airports for travelers and cargo. Based upon the presentation by Ted Stein, President of the LAWA Airport Commission, we would appreciate your response to the following questions:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00154-2

Comment:

1) What flexibility exists in Alternative D to enable LAX to grow beyond 78 MAP if other regional airports prove unable to satisfy future demand for growth?

Response:

For LAX to safely and efficiently accommodate greater than 78.9 MAP after implementation of Alternative D, other plans for LAX would need to be examined.

SPC00154-3

Comment:

2) Why does Alternative D contemplate the Ground Transportation Center, Automated People Mover and new Central Terminal Area as Phase I changes rather than projects to be considered in later phases depending on the development of security technologies and TSA procedures?

Response:

Comment noted. The threat of a vehicle containing an explosive device at the terminal curbside is considered to be the greatest existing threat to LAX security. Constructing the GTC in the early phases would eliminate this threat as quickly as possible. No existing technology would eliminate this threat. In addition, construction of the GTC, APM, and CTA in the early phases would allow construction of other components such as the West Satellite Concourse. The GTC, APM and CTA would be designed and constructed to best utilize the most advanced security technology available. These facilities, as with all Alternative D facilities, are designed to remain as dynamic as possible so that they may accommodate improved security technology as it becomes available.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00154-4

Comment:

3) Why does Alternative D postpone the enhancement of Bradley Terminal upgrades to later phases considering the age and growing obsolescence of the facility for international passengers?

Response:

The phasing plan for Alternative D proposes constructing a new central terminal facility in the areas currently occupied by the parking structures in Phase one as described in Figure S3-15 in Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. This facility provides additional/replacement Federal Inspection Services that would process the increased passenger loads of an expanded Tom Bradley International Terminal (TBIT). The current curb front configuration at TBIT is inadequate to accommodate significant expansion, therefore the timing and phasing of the TBIT Modifications are planned after the completion of the GTC.

SPC00154-5

Comment:

- 4) Why wouldn't Lot C be a better location for a Ground Transportation Center considering the following:
- A location closer to LAX reduces the "security envelope" to be protected?
 - Reduction in distance and cost for the Automated People Mover System and any associated baggage transport system?
 - Improved access to the GTC from already existing roadways and more distance from the 405 and 105 freeways to avoid "stack-up" of vehicles?
 - The ability to better stage the construction and development of the GTC.
 - The option of using Manchester Square as the consolidated rental car facility.

Response:

Lot C is not an ideal location for the GTC due to its proximity to the approach paths to runways 24L and 24R. Low flying aircraft on approach to these runways would limit not only the height of structures in this area but also the height of construction equipment. Additionally, runway protection zones are generally considered areas to avoid in constructing facilities where large numbers of people would be passing through.

Please see Responses to Comments SPC00035-4 and SPC00035-6.

The security envelope would not be reduced because the RAC and ITC would still need to be secured.

The APM connects the RAC to the CTA as well as the GTC to the CTA. Switching the location of the RAC and GTC would not reduce the distance the APM would travel.

Manchester Square provides a viable option for direct freeway access to the GTC facility. Potential access options are delineated as potential mitigation measures. Internal airport roadways can be developed east of Aviation Boulevard and west of La Cienega Boulevard to absorb approaching vehicle traffic. The Sepulveda Tunnel is at or near capacity and adding additional capacity would be very difficult. Finally, Sepulveda Boulevard remains as a major north/south arterial for local traffic and greatly reduces the roadway capacity for passenger traffic.

Construction activity and staging would be better at Manchester Square. Potential crane activity would be very limited on the approach paths to the north runway complex.

The consolidated rental car facility could work at Manchester Square however given its size and configuration of Customer Facility Building it is better suited to the Lot C area where it is located

between 96th and 98th Street adjacent to Airport Blvd. It has a lower level of automobile traffic than that generated by the GTC and ITC facilities.

SPC00154-6

Comment:

5) What are the estimated annual operating cost increases for LAX under Alternative D?

Response:

A cost analysis of this type has not been developed and is not required for the Master Plan or the EIS/EIR.

SPC00154-7

Comment:

6) In order to finance Alternative D, what will be the increase in landing fees for LAX?

Response:

A cost analysis of this type is not required for the Master Plan or the EIS/EIR. The proposed master plan improvements would be funded with a combination of FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, and other state/federal grants.

SPC00154-8

Comment:

7) If there will be three trains for the APM, how many tracks will be used?

Response:

There would be one track for each direction. Therefore, there would be one westbound track along 98th Street, one eastbound track along Century Boulevard, and two tracks along Aviation Boulevard, one in each direction.

SPC00154-9

Comment:

8) Will passengers be able to check in baggage at the GTC so they don't have to carry it on the APM?

Response:

As described in the Draft Master Plan Addendum, Skycap baggage check-in is anticipated to be a function at the GTC allowing passengers to travel to the CTA via the APM without checked baggage.

SPC00154-10

Comment:

9) Will passengers be able to check in for flights at the GTC?

Response:

As described in the Draft Master Plan Addendum, E-Kiosk check-in is anticipated to be a function at the GTC allowing passengers to check in for flights and obtain boarding passes prior to boarding the APM for the CTA.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00154-11

Comment:

10) What assumptions limit Flyaway Service to 5 MAP at LAX?

Response:

The Alternative D analysis did not limit service to 5 MAP. FlyAway bus trips were determined by increasing existing FlyAway bus activity according to the expected increase in O&D passenger activity through 2015. A further increase in activity was assumed due to the unique design of Alternative D, which encourages FlyAway use by providing the only direct access to the CTA of any private or commercial vehicles.

SPC00154-12

Comment:

We plan to finalize our position on the LAX Master Plan in the next few weeks and would appreciate your response.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments above.

SPC00155 Everett, Eric None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00155-1

Comment:

I am a stakeholder in the LAX plan for expansion. I need the LAX Master Plan Notification of Availability (NOA) mailed to me. I seem to have misplaced the one we received a few weeks ago. Thank you for your help.

Response:

Comment noted. A second copy of the Notice of Availability was mailed upon receipt of the author's letter.

SPC00156 Mego, Gordon None Provided 8/23/2003

SPC00156-1

Comment:

See "Attachments"

1) Copy of speech on LAX Airport, date Apr. 14, 2003, that I gave to the Board of Commissioners of LAWA on May 6, 2003.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments SPC00156-5 through SPC00156-17 below.

SPC00156-2

Comment:

2) Maps of LAX Airport on 8 1/2" X 14" sheet which shows the current layout and the Hahn proposal that depicts the potential fallout of an explosion in the 'Manchester Square Area'.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00156-3**Comment:**

3) L.A. Times Newspaper Article dated August 10, 2003 and entitled "Price of LAX Project Could Jump"

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00156-4**Comment:**

4) L.A. Times Newspaper article dated August 20, 2003 and entitled "Hahn's LAX Plan Draws County Fire"

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00156-5**Comment:**

Hello! My name is Gordon Michael Mego, my address is 4535 141st Street and my phone # is (310) 675-8674. I am a native and resident of Hawthorne and the South Bay region since Oct. 8, 1952. And I am a former aerospace engineer who has worked on the F-18 and the B-2 aircraft at Northrop Corp., the B-1 bomber at Rockwell Intl., and the C-17 transport at McDonnell Douglas from the mid 1970's to the late 1980's.

I grew up in an era when propeller-driven airplanes were a common sight and sound. I flew aboard an airliner for the first time in the late 1950's with TWA on a Lockheed Constellation plane that had a triple-tail design and small air cond vents by the windows. It was an interesting experience on flights to and from New York where the sister of my mother had lived in Brooklyn since the 1930's.

My father worked for American Airlines during the 1950's as a Senior and then Lead Mechanic who always maintained the aircraft in nearly perfect flying condition.

On some occasions, I had the opportunity to see the behind-the-scenes activities at the airport, including visits to the old control tower building with its Spanish-style-architecture.

Over the course of decades from the 1960's onward, I had the pleasure of flying aboard various aircraft with different airlines. Of particular enjoyment was my trip to Washington D.C. where I stayed for eight days in July of 1983 including the Washington Hotel near the White House, visited many places around the historic capital, and rode on their fantastic Metro Rail system.

As the Los Angeles region, and especially the South Bay area, increased in residential population and with various businesses, LAX Airport expanded the size and scope of its operations accordingly to meet the demands of the growing region of So. Calif.

By the year 2000, LAX Airport had reached a level of 67 million passengers who traveled to various destinations in the United States and around the world. While the annual capacity for passengers at the facility is currently 78 million, there are proposals to increase the capacity to as much as 120 million.

3. Comments and Responses

After the Sept. 11, 2001 tragedies in New York, Washington, D.C., Pennsylvania, and elsewhere, the number of people who flew aboard commercial airliners was reduced by 10 to 25% depending on the airline company. At LAX Airport, the annual level is down by 10% - 15% or approximately 52 million to 55 million passengers from the 2001 rate of 61 million.

Even at the current levels of airline flights, the residents of the South Bay area in Los Angeles County, and especially in the City of Hawthorne, are experiencing and enduring significant amounts of air pollution, loud noise, road traffic, population density, etc. which affect the quality of life for all the people of the region.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor is correct in noting that air travel declined at most US airports since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. LAX is showing a gradual recovery with a full recovery expected. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the impact of September 11, 2001 in Appendix S-B. 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 and socio-economic issues, including population growth, are addressed 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, 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-LU-1 regarding quality of life.

SPC00156-6

Comment:

Of particular annoyance is the roaring sounds of engines from low-flying commercial aircraft which occasionally traverse the skies of the South Bay area in an effort to shorten their travel from LAX Airport. Pilots must be required to follow certain protocols with respect to flight paths, altitudes, etc. over Hawthorne and other surrounding cities. Violations of these procedures should result in financial penalties and/or restricted access to LAX Airport.

Response:

Comment noted. Aircraft operate in a complex environment and are regulated by a series of rules and regulations and weather conditions of which LAWA has no control over. The pilot is in command of the aircraft. And that aircraft is under the control of the FAA. As stated in LAWA's Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures and Restrictions; It is not intended that any of the traffic or flight procedures contained herein shall, in any manner, abrogate the authority and responsibility of the pilot in command to assure the safe operation of the aircraft. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding South Bay overflights. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement and particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-7.1, regarding enforcement of noise rules (over-ocean, early turns, Stage 2 cockpit procedure), Subtopical Response TR-N-7.2, regarding responsibility for enforcement of noise abatement rules, Subtopical Response TR-N-7.3, regarding compliance with instrument departure procedures, Subtopical Response TR-N-7.4, regarding exceptions to the noise rules and Subtopical Response TR-N-7.5, regarding fines for violations of noise abatement procedures. Additionally, noise abatement measures associated with early turn are addressed in Section 4.1.5, Master Plan Commitments and Section 4.1.8, Mitigation Measures, of Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00156-7

Comment:

There have been various proposals to expand LAX Airport which would increase the annual level of passengers not only from the record high of 67 million to a maximum of 78 million, but even to as much as 120 million. The proposals will essentially require moderate to major reconstruction of the airport of the airport facility and significant destruction of residential neighborhoods in the area.

Response:

For clarification, the facilities proposed as part of the LAX Master Plan could accommodate up to 97.9 MAP under Alternatives A and B, 89.6 MAP under Alternative C, or 78.9 MAP under Alternative D. The passenger activity recorded for the Year 2000 was 67.3 MAP.

FAA and LAWA respectively disagree with the commentor's comment. Separate from the Master Plan, the Manchester Square area is being acquired at the request of the residents, as was made public by them during the 1997 Public Scoping Meetings for the EIS/EIR. Other residential areas that are affected by the proposed project will have appropriate mitigation to reduce the impact of the proposed project.

SPC00156-8

Comment:

The Manchester Square area of Los Angeles, which is located between Century Blvd and Arbor Vital, and between La Cienega and Aviation Blvds., is residential neighborhood that was mainly comprised of single-family homes, which date back to the 1940's, and even included an elementary school which served the surrounding community.

Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) is currently in the process of acquiring property and demolishing buildings in the Manchester Square area in order to build a passenger, check-in facility. If LAWA achieves their goal of owning every property in the area, Manchester Square will cease to exist as a residential neighborhood in the Los Angeles region where there is shortage of housing.

Since LAWA has not approved of any expansion plan for LAX Airport, it should cease further acquisition of property in the Manchester Square area, resale purchased property to residential homeowners, insulate homes that are currently available or eventually build, and reopen the public elementary and/or middle schools for students.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00001-4 regarding the acquisition of the Manchester Square area to build a passenger check-in facility, and Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.5 regarding housing needs.

SPC00156-9

Comment:

According to a proposal by Mayor James Hahn of Los Angeles, there would be a major transformation of LAX Airport. It would involve tearing down some terminal buildings, and parking structures, building a remote passenger check-in facility in the Manchester Square area of L.A. closing off the two-level inner roadway to the general public, building a "People Mover" system to connect the remote facility with the main part of the airport, moving and adding taxiways and runways, and other changes. The price tag for this enormous project is approximately \$10 billion that will surely increase during the years ahead.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00156-10

Comment:

As with previous efforts to expand or renovate LAX Airport, the new proposal is not an acceptable solution for the South Bay region of Los Angeles County.

The implementation of any such changes would lead to increased levels of possible terrorism and other criminal activity, of invasive security measures, of business slowdowns and failures, of unemployed people, of various taxes, fees, etc., of vehicle traffic on streets and highways, of loud noise from more aircraft, of air, land, and water pollution, and of population in the region.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed safety impacts in Section 4.24.3, Safety; economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise and Section 4.2 Land Use; air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality; water quality impacts in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality; and population growth inducement in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement) . Supporting technical data and analyses is provided in Appendices D and G, Technical Report 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR; and Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-3, S-4, S-6, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

SPC00156-11

Comment:

The establishment of a remote check-in facility for airport passengers would greatly expand the overall size of LAX that will stretch east to the 405 Fwy and substantially increase the residential and business areas that could be affected by a major terrorist act, especially from a nuclear weapon or conventional missile.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00156-12

Comment:

Without even considering the latest proposals for change at LAX the current security environments creates the feeling of an armed encampment. The intrusive and invasive measures treat people in an undignified manner and abusive ways as if they were criminals.

There is something quite wrong when elderly folks, soccer moms, various celebrities, government officials, and other innocent people are forced to endure long delays, physical searches, shoe scans, identity verification, personal background checks, luggage inspections (some without the consent and presence of the owner), surveillance cameras, traffic and parking difficulties, and other situations.

Until LAWA implements an approach to security that is based upon reasonable suspicion and common sense, there will be an increasing number of people who will not travel aboard commercial airliners or spend money at businesses within the airport and around the region.

As if the effects of Sept. 11, 2001 were not bad enough for the U.S. economy, the current activity at and proposed changes for LAX will cause more financial problems to the airline industry, retail stores, hotels, restaurants and other businesses who will reduce operations or file bankruptcy which means higher unemployment, lower tax revenue, etc.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00156-13

Comment:

In order to facilitate the smooth flow of people into and out of LAX Airport, it is absolutely necessary that the double-decker roadway and the parking structures within the facility must remain open for use by

the general public who want to drop off or pick up passengers and luggage at the terminal gates, sidewalks, or parking areas.

Response:

Assuming that the commentor is referring to keeping the CTA curbs open to private vehicles, Alternative D was designed to specifically remove from the CTA, to the extent feasible, all vehicles that cannot be secured. Alternatively, the GTC is designed to provide non-stop access for private vehicles, facilitating the smooth flow of people into and out of the airport.

SPC00156-14

Comment:

Further, the Green Line of the Metro Rail system must be extended into LAX Airport where the passenger trains would travel around the inner perimeter of the facility and stop in front of each airline terminal. This will provide an alternative mode of transportation from other parts of California which will reduce highway traffic, improve air quality, provide convenience, and save money for people in the long term.

Response:

Comment noted. It is impractical to connect the Green Line directly to the CTA, as discussed in Response to Comment SPHO00004-6. Please see Response to Comment SPHL00022-2 regarding the most feasible alignment of the Green Line and Response to Comment SPHL00026-1 regarding the Green Line/People Mover interface.

SPC00156-15

Comment:

Efforts must be pursued to create a regional system that will handle the significant number of airline passengers in Southern California, particularly in Los Angeles and Orange Counties. LAX Airport must not be forced to accommodate the increased loads from other areas.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA only controls the operations and potential improvements at LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Other jurisdictions are responsible for developing the other regional airports. LAWA is developing plans for all three of its potential commercial service airports. Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports. The master plans will recommend improvements to meet the projected demand. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX. For further information regarding the role of the LAX Master Plan in a regional approach to meeting demand, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

SPC00156-16

Comment:

Therefore, LAX Airport must not be expanded beyond its current capacity of 78 million passengers and preferably should be limited to 67 million passengers, which is a peak annual level in year 2000.

The current layout of LAX Airport must be limited to only necessary improvements of the facility within its current land boundaries for the convenience of the passengers and the efficiency of airport operations.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

As described in Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D is designed to constrain LAX passenger activity to 78.9 MAP. 78.9 MAP is the forecast constrained passenger activity level identified in the No Action/No Project Alternative in 2015. Please see Response to Comment SPC00308-7.

Alternative D improvements LAX safety and security while maintaining the greatest feasible convenience and efficiency for LAX passengers.

Alternative D would require the acquisition of approximately 77 acres of property, the least amount of land acquisition of all the proposed build alternatives.

SPC00156-17

Comment:

In conclusion, I am hopeful that my comments about LAX Airport will resonate with the board members of Los Angeles World Airports. LAWA has the difficult task of upgrading the existing airport and handling the various criminal elements while trying to promote the commercial aspects of aviation travel. But it is incumbent upon the board members of LAWA to pursue courses of action that will improve the quality of life and the economic vitality of the region for the vast majority of the people without spending enormous sums of money on unnecessary projects and sacrificing our personal freedoms as stated in the U.S. Constitution and in the Bill of Rights.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00157 Mego, Gordon None Provided 8/25/2003

SPC00157-1

Comment:

As a person who was born in October of 1952, I have had the opportunity to see the airport of Los Angeles evolve into LAX Airport. It has changed and grown over the decades to become one of the top five major airports in the nation.

I have flown on many aircraft to various destinations over the decades that include my first flight aboard TWA's Lockheed Constellation in the late 1950's.

When my father worked for American airlines in the 1950's as a senior and lead mechanic, I was allowed to see behind-the-scenes operations at the airport.

My interest in airplanes eventually lead me to become an aerospace engineer who has worked for various defense-related businesses, including Rockwell, Intl. in the Weapons Systems Div. for the B-1 Bomber during the 1980's.

LAX Airport certainly needs changes in order to modernize the facility. It is necessary to improve 1) convenience, that is make it more user friendly, for passengers, visitors, etc., 2) efficiency of operations that reduce time involved from arrival to departure for passengers, visitors, and others, 3) level of safety and security for people in and around the area, 4) amount of permanent jobs from businesses in the airport, nearby areas, and L.A. region, and 5) the quality of life for people from air and noise pollution, heavy traffic, etc.

Unfortunately, the earlier plans by L.A. Mayor Richard Riordan would not and the current proposal by Mayor James Hahn will not achieve any of the objectives, but will actually make everything, to one degree or another, worse than before at LAX Airport while costing at least \$10 billion.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00157-2

Comment:

While the downturn in the U.S. economy has affected the number of passengers who take flights to and from LAX Airport, the level of security is another factor that has impacted the yearly amount of people traveling, which is now about 52 million.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00157-3

Comment:

The implementation of the Ground Transportation Center is what is now a residential neighborhood of Manchester Square, of the Baggage Screening Center in place of the parking structures in the Central Terminal area and the people mover rail system that will connect the two sections will certainly slow down the overall operations of the airport, will definitely increase the amount of time and the level of inconvenience for people at the airport, and will surely expand the areas where more lives will be affected by any terrorist attack.

In fact, if an explosive device(s) were to be detonated in the Ground Transportation Center literally thousands of people could be killed or injured not only there, but also in the surrounding residential areas that are located north and east of it, in the nearby commercial areas which include large hotels, and along the 405 freeway which is a heavily traveled route that may be shut down.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00157-4

Comment:

Curiously, the Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) has been purchasing homes from property owners in the Manchester Square neighborhood during the past six years with the goal of owning all the property in the area. The question is how can they legally expend public funds to buy these or any other properties for some unauthorized future project? They have never received approval from residents and businesses in the area nor from the various governing bodies at the local and national levels.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00001-4 regarding legality of the acquisition of Manchester Square. Please also see Topical Response TR-MP-3 regarding the use of Manchester Square in Alternative D.

SPC00157-5

Comment:

Also, Mayor Hahn is trying to seek approval of his LAX Airport proposal based upon an outdated Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that was commissioned by Mayor Riordan for earlier renovation proposals. He has chosen not to initiate a new Environmental Impact Study (EIS) as required by law for his proposed changes for LAX Airport.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Alternative D has undergone rigorous environmental analysis and extensive public review, comparable to that provided for the other Master Plan alternatives, within the context of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. This approach to, and form of, environmental documentation for Alternative D is in full compliance with the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.

SPC00157-6

Comment:

On May 15, 2003, the Rand Institute of Santa Monica, which is a highly regarded private research group, issued its report on Mayor Hahn's proposal for LAX Airport. It was critical of nearly every aspect of the proposed renovation for \$10 billion.

In their analysis, they concluded that the Hahn proposal would not achieve its stated goals and would negatively impact the region at an enormous cost to taxpayers, businesses, etc. and that the safety and security of the people at LAX Airport could be easily improved with simple, common-sense upgrades at a small fraction of the \$10 billion.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00157-7

Comment:

On Aug. 19, 2003, A.C. Lazzaretto & Assoc. issued their report that was commissioned by the L.A. County Board of Supervisors on the Hahn proposal for LAX Airport. It was critical about issues of security, environment, growth, etc. that affect the quality of life for people.

Response:

Responses to the comments submitted by A.C. Lazzaretto & Associates are provided in Responses to Comments SAL00004-2 through SAL00004-11.

SPC00157-8

Comment:

The viability of the airline industry in the United States is questionable considering the filings for bankruptcy by various air carriers which have lost billions of dollars in recent years. Where does Hahn suppose that they find the money to renovate LAX Airport? What does Hahn think will happen to them while they are subjected to constant disruption of their operations during the 11-year construction period? Obviously, there will be airlines that will simply go out of business! The economic fallout for the L.A. region, the state of California, and the rest of the nation would be significant.

Response:

The events of September 11, 2001 and the economic slowdown are analyzed in Appendix S-B, Existing Baseline Comparison Issues - 1996 to 2000, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The conclusions reached in the analysis confirm the need to plan for and build an expanding regional network of airports to support the future growth of the Los Angeles basin. The role of an alternative at LAX in meeting this need is presented in Section 1.3, Meeting the Demand for Transportation in the Region, of the Draft EIS/EIR. The analysis confirms that Alternative D, while responding to safety and security concerns, would allow LAX to continue as the gateway airport onto the Los Angeles community, particularly serving international travelers, but its proportional share of total regional traffic would diminish through

the forecast horizon of 2015. Alternative D has been created to respond to the needed improvements without expanding LAX.

As discussed in Section 2.8, Funding, of the Draft EIS/EIR, the proposed Master Plan improvements will be funded with a combination of FAA Airport Improvement Program Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, airline fees, and other state/federal grants. No Los Angeles General Fund dollars will be used to pay for any of the proposed improvements. As stated on page 4-539, in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts (subsection 4.20.3), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, "Primary considerations in planning for the construction activities were the safe and uninterrupted operation of the airport, including runway operations and passenger access to terminals, the GTC, and parking areas." Also, the construction for Alternative D is assumed to start in the 3rd quarter of 2004, with completion by the end of 2014, which represents a duration of approximately 10 years.

SPC00157-9

Comment:

LAX Airport should not be expected to handle an increasing number of passengers from other parts of Los Angeles and surrounding counties. There must a regional approach that utilizes the large airports to the maximum extent possible with approval of residents, businesses, and others in the affected communities.

Response:

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

SPC00157-10

Comment:

As part of the solution to traffic congestion in Los Angeles County, LAX could serve as a model for a futuristic airport with diversity in transportation which allows people the option of using private vehicles, shuttle buses, railroad trains, etc. to reach any of the airline terminals.

Of particular importance, it will be necessary to extend the Green Line of the Metro Rail into the central terminal area of LAX Airport along the inner, double-deck roadway. At some point in time, there could be a connection of a rail line that will travel north to West L.A., Santa Monica, etc.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPHO00004-6 regarding issues with extending the Green Line into the existing CTA.

SPC00157-11

Comment:

During the past few years, the U.S. economy has been in a downturn with significant losses in employment among the various sectors of business. Therefore it is understandable that labor unions are seeking work for their members who can't afford to be unemployed.

But I would ask the leaders of the various unions in California to withhold or to withdraw their support for the Hahn proposal for LAX Airport. In doing so, they can help create a more realistic and viable plan that a majority of the people will approve.

Under any new proposal for LAX Airport, it is imperative that we retain the airline terminals at their present locations, the parking structures in the central terminal areas, and the double-deck roadway for private vehicles, that we limit any changes to the facility to necessary improvements for the convenience and the safety of the passengers, visitors, and others as well as the efficiency of operations at the airport, and that we prevent the expansion of LAX into any unused or new areas.

3. Comments and Responses

In conclusion, I am hopeful that my comments about LAX Airport will resonate with those individuals who are considering any proposed changes to the facility. It is incumbent upon the governing bodies to pursue courses of action that will improve the quality of life and the economic vitality of the region for the vast majority of people without spending enormous sums of money on unnecessary projects.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00158 Klein, Michael None Provided 8/19/2003

SPC00158-1

Comment:

We write in opposition to Mayor Hahn's proposed LAX Master Plan Alternative.

Although his proposal was intended to focus on "safety and security" issues, it has become apparent that there are very serious flaws in this proposal.

First and foremost, the recent Rand Corporation study indicated that congregating all commercial passengers in one location increases the risk and will probably result in harm to a greater number of people in the event of a terrorist attack.

Also, the added inconvenience of additional time for screening and transportation to the airline terminals encourages business and wealthy travelers to engage private business jets, charters, and fractional share aircraft for transportation. These general aviation options are not regulated as strictly as commercial aircraft nor are the aircraft or their passengers screened for security purposes at LAX or any general aviation airport in the area.

In general, we oppose this proposal and urge that it not proceed.

In addition, please encourage the FAA to increase security standards nationwide for access to all general aviation areas and other airports with general aviation traffic.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPFA00001-1.

SPC00159 Davis, Andrea None Provided

SPC00159-1

Comment:

Creating jobs is a good thing, and keeping ALL of our U.S. airports modern and maintained is certainly a good thing.

But I have to say NO, emphatically, to the mayor's Alternative "d". Mayor Hahn's PR machine keeps repeating that the 9 billion dollar plus LAX "Alternative d" will be safer and more secure. Experts from the Rand Corporation, in a study requested by Congresswoman Jane Harman, disagree. After studying the plan they found that the airport would, in fact, be less safe and less secure than the existing LAX.

In fact, the study concluded, modernization could be accomplished at a much lower cost than alternative d.

Concentrating all the travelers into one remote check-in just creates an even more attractive target for any terrorist activities. We the residents that surround LAX, we the travelers, we ALL will be put at tremendous risk if we allow Mayor Hahn to create one giant bull's-eye at what once was Manchester Square.

Not safer, nor more secure, certainly not more convenient. and unnecessarily expensive.

Alternative "d" is not good community planning, Mr. Mayor, and it's not good governance.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00160 Walter, Mahala None Provided 8/18/2003

SPC00160-1

Comment:

As your former airport commissioner, you told me, "We need a \$3 FLYAWAY to LAX just like what the Valley has!"

You also asked, "Why doesn't the GREEN LINE go to LAX?"

NOW the FLYAWAY IS REALLY GOING TO HAPPEN!...But, how about the Green Line?

Instead of Alternative D, extend the GREEN LINE north 2.5 miles up Aviation, turning left on 98th St., then it goes right to LAX at Sepulveda.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment SPHP00012-1. Please see Response to Comment SPHP00012-1.

SPC00160-2

Comment:

Combine this change with a north runway extension over Pershing Drive, not only is their more land space available for LAX passenger dispersion, but the 2 mile perimeter for shoulder firing missiles is also extended out over the ocean for shared protection by the Coast Guard.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHO00004-8 regarding extending the inboard north Runway 6R/24L over Pershing Drive.

SPC00160-3

Comment:

Construction on the runways should start NOW, not 2014.

Contrary to Alternative D, the plane & traffic noise levels and the congestion will be considerably less for the 105, 405, Sepulveda and Inglewood communities. There would be no need for a people mover; no disruption of Century Blvd. Manchester Squares would become a beautiful park for not only the tourists to enjoy, but also the community.

Seeing that there is to be a Green Line station planned on Aviation, between 98th & Century, one could visualize the Retail/Recreation Center at this stop where tourists could enjoy a 6 hour layover. LAX could become the most tourist- friendly airport in the world, benefiting all Angelenos.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHP00012-3.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00160-4

Comment:

The GREEN LINE has the Right-of-Way to go north on Sepulveda Blvd., hooking up with Slauson for a GREEN LINE LAX EXPRESS to downtown Los Angeles Union Station. However, the community won't like the Green Line going through downtown Westchester & I certainly don't want it to go down MY street! THEN when I focus in on 20 years later, I realize I'll be almost 90. With just a short walk, I could go ANYWHERE. And best of all, our grandchildren will enjoy the positive environmental impact on our city.

Response:

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

SPC00161

Manns, Rachael

None Provided

9/28/2003

SPC00161-1

Comment:

I am a resident occupying space which could possibly vacated I'm concerned about relocation payments. I have noticed that homes on my street have been destroyed, and eminent domain is prevailing. I do not want to be one of the last residents in my neighborhood to move. At what time/date can I move with relocation fees.

Response:

The above-referenced property, 5426 W. 99th Place, would not be acquired under any of the build alternatives proposed under the LAX Master Plan. Residential properties proposed for acquisition under the Master Plan were identified in Table A-3, Parcel Detail of Acquisition Areas Alternative A, Table B-3, Summary Statistics of Acquisition Areas Alternative B, and Table C-3, Summary Statistics of Acquisition Areas Alternative C, in Appendix P to Chapter V of the Master Plan, Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan. No residential acquisition is proposed for Alternative D.

The above-referenced property is located in the Manchester Square neighborhood, within which property acquisitions are currently occurring as part of LAWA's separately approved Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP). As was discussed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, properties within the Manchester Square and Belford areas are heavily impacted by noise, traffic, and incompatible adjacent land uses. Residents in those areas approached the airport and requested that their properties be acquired rather than soundproofed. However, should the ANMP land acquisition for the Belford and Manchester Square areas not be completed by the time the Master Plan is approved, the City of Los Angeles will use the most appropriate and practical measures available (e.g., voluntary acquisition, leasing, and/or public condemnation) to ensure that the designated areas are vacated consistent with the Construction Sequencing Plan. These measures would be available for all build alternatives to pursue any needed acquisition that cannot be obtained through negotiations.

For more specific information regarding the voluntary residential acquisition program in support of LAWA's ANMP, please contact LAWA's Residential Acquisition Bureau at 8616 La Tijera Boulevard, Suite 107, Los Angeles, CA 90045, or (310) 417-6100.

SPC00162

Koch, Brian

None Provided

10/1/2003

SPC00162-1

Comment:

As a homeowner in the Westchester community, I would like to register my strong concerns with Alternative D. While modernization and security are important, this plan doesn't improve either enough

3. Comments and Responses

to justify a \$9B price tag, 12 years of construction-related impacts to our community, and loss of proposed open space.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00162-2 through SPC00162-6 below. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

SPC00162-2

Comment:

Specifically, Alternative D will:

- Require 12 years of construction, causing significant noise, traffic, and air quality impacts.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed construction-related noise, traffic, and air quality impacts associated with Alternative D in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, Section 4.6, Air Quality, and Section 4.20, Construction Impacts. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-3 regarding construction traffic.

SPC00162-3

Comment:

- Increase congestion on Sepulveda Blvd.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding traffic congestion on surface streets.

SPC00162-4

Comment:

- The Ground Transportation Center (GTC) will remove a promised park at the site and become a vulnerable target, very near existing residential neighborhoods.

Response:

Former Councilwoman Galanter made a promise to make Manchester Square a park, however, there was no action taken by the Los Angeles City Council to make that happen. The proposed GTC under Alternative D would be designed to improve safety and security of LAX by eliminating the threat of blast in close proximity to large congregations of queuing passengers at the existing CTA. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.4 regarding the role of the GTC and Appendix H of the Draft Master Plan Addendum regarding why the Manchester Square area was chosen for the GTC. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 and Appendix I of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum regarding security.

SPC00162-5

Comment:

- Drain \$9B from the airlines and passengers to construct unneeded facilities.

Response:

Alternative D will improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking. The design of the improvements incorporated in Alternative D

3. Comments and Responses

was given much thought and review. There has been no major investment in the facilities at LAX for many years.

SPC00162-6

Comment:

There are viable proposals that are cheaper and less disruptive. The Mayor's Blue Ribbon Committee on Manchester Square has proposed a scaled down "Alternative E" plan and the L.A. Airline Airport Affairs Committee has proposed their own \$3B plan. Both these plans envision the Manchester Square area as a the previously-promised and much-needed community park, limit demolition of perfectly usable airport parking structures and garages, while improving security checkpoints and freeway access via the Green Line and freeway links. The large scale GTC is not required in either of these plans.

The NEPA/CEQA process has been valuable to identify these better alternatives. Now it is the City of Los Angeles' obligation to find a better plan than Alternative D.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00035-4 regarding the residents' concept, Alternative E, and Response to Comment SPC00298-27 regarding the L.A. Airline Airport Affairs Committee plan.

SPC00162-7

The remainder of this comment letter is identical to comments SPC00162-1 through SPC00162-6 above; please see Responses to Comments SPC00162-1 through SPC00162-6.

SPC00163 Humber, Daniel None Provided 8/14/2003

The content of this comment letter consists of an online article related to LAX in general (i.e., not specifically related to the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR) that was identified and described in comment letter SPHSP00012; please see the Response to Comment SPHSP00012-1.

SPC00164 Schneider, Denny Alliance for Regional Solution to 8/14/2003
Airport Congestion

The content of this comment letter consists of documents not specifically related to the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. However, Topical Response TR-MP-3 addresses these documents, including how property acquisition within Manchester Square was initiated and will continue to occur, separate from the LAX Master Plan.

SPC00165 Coonley, Grant Gateway to L.A., Inc. 10/13/2003

SPC00165-1

Comment:

The Gateway to LA Property-Based Business Improvement District (PBID) continues to appreciate the extensive dialogue we have had with you as well as other LAWA and City officials on Alternative D.

3. Comments and Responses

We understand that the Alternative D Draft EIR is a "program-level" document, therefore all the details that Gateway would like to see in such a document are simply not part of the record, but will be provided as project-level reviews take place.

With the detail that Gateway to LA has obtained, we believe that Alternative D does a better job responding to the needs of the Century Corridor than the other Master Plan alternatives that have been prepared. This belief, based on the current level of information available, leads us to an endorsement in concept of Alternative D.

Gateway to LA looks forward to working with you, LAWA and City officials as project-level details are developed for Alternative D and we appreciate LAWA's offer to create a Gateway to LA Working Group to facilitate dialogue on specific aspects of Alternative D. As you are aware, Gateway continues to plan for the revitalization of the area through a day-use conference center and shopping destination. We believe this effort complements Alternative D and we look forward to pursuing this vision of unifying the entire area from a transportation standpoint to visitor serving uses through the Gateway to LA Working Group.

As we look toward the development of project-level details. Gateway submits the following set of questions for your review and comment as you finalize the Environmental Impact Report for Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00165-2 through SPC00165-26 below.

SPC00165-2

Comment:

98th Street/Automated People Mover/Consolidated Rental Car Facility

1) How will pedestrians, vehicles and the people mover inter-relate along 98th Street?

Response:

98th Street will continue in its current configuration. The Automated People Mover (APM) will be elevated above 98th Street. Pedestrians will continue to be accommodated on sidewalks, similar to the existing sidewalk system.

SPC00165-3

Comment:

2) What land will need to be acquired for the APM system?

3) What businesses and or facilities would be lost in the process?

Response:

Properties planned for acquisition under Alternative D were identified in Figure S3-14, 2015 Alternative D Proposed Property Acquisition Areas, in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR as well as in Figure 2.7-1, Alternative D Proposed Property Acquisition Areas, in Chapter 2.7 of the Master Plan Addendum. In Figure 2.7-1 the individual properties proposed for acquisition were indicated by numbers corresponding to the properties listed in Table 2.7-2, Alternative D - Parcel Detail of Acquisition Areas, in Chapter 2.7 of the Master Plan Addendum. That table identified the address, primary business name, land use, and floor area of affected businesses. As was shown in both Figure S3-14 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure 2.7-1 of the Master Plan Addendum, properties along 98th Street between Sepulveda Boulevard and Airport Boulevard and properties near the northeast and southeast corners of Century Boulevard and Aviation Boulevard would be acquired to accommodate the APM, RAC, and on-site public access roadways. Table 2.7-2 in the Master Plan Addendum also indicated whether affected properties are targeted for relocation on airport property, at LAX Northside, or within available space within the local market. Assistance provided by LAWA under

3. Comments and Responses

Master Plan Commitment RBR-1, Residential and Business Relocation Program (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), would provide a competitive advantage to affected businesses in securing relocation sites.

SPC00165-4

Comment:

4) What is the exact route of the APM?

Response:

The proposed route of the APM is shown in the Master Plan Addendum, Chapter 2.3, Ground Access and Parking - Alternative D.

SPC00165-5

Comment:

5) Even though the APM is an elevated structure after Sepulveda Boulevard, will it eliminate a traffic lane on 98th Street or have other traffic impacts?

Response:

The structural design of the APM standards has not been determined at this stage of the analysis. That will be determined during the design phase of the project. However, it is not the intent to remove any existing lanes along 98th Street in the final system.

SPC00165-6

Comment:

6) Has a potential location for the future spur line extension of the AMP (page 2-72 of the Master Plan Addendum) been determined? If not, why? (Please elaborate)

Response:

A potential location or alignment for such a spur has not been determined. It is not needed for Alternative D to function properly, and would not directly support the Purpose and Need of the project. However, such a line could be incorporated into the proposed APM system at a future time, if necessary.

SPC00165-7

Comment:

7) Has a specific traffic study for 98th St. been conducted to determine how the APM will interface with vehicle traffic? If not, why? (Please elaborate)

Response:

A detailed traffic study is not required for a Environmental Impacts Statement/Report. A detailed study will be conducted during the design phase of the project, however.

SPC00165-8

Comment:

8) How will vehicles enter/exit the RAC?

Response:

Please see Master Plan Addendum, Chapter 2.3, Ground Access and Parking - Alternative D, for a description of the consolidated rental car access plan.

SPC00165-9**Comment:**

9) How will public access be facilitated to the RAC for both pick-up and drop off of passengers headed to LAX?

Response:

The RAC will be connected via the Automated People Mover (APM) directly to the CTA passenger terminals. There is no need for a public transit connection to the RAC, since the RAC demand is almost entirely generated by the airport. There is little, if any, demand for area residents to rent cars at LAX. Passengers will ordinarily be picked up and dropped off at the GTC, not the RAC.

SPC00165-10**Comment:**

10) How will public access be facilitated to the Ground Transportation Center (GTC) from Century?

Response:

There will be a loop ramp east of Aviation Boulevard connecting eastbound Century Boulevard traffic to the GTC. Westbound traffic on Century Boulevard would need to turn left onto southbound La Cienega Boulevard and enter the on-airport roadway system opposite Lennox Boulevard to access the GTC. Please see Master Plan Addendum, Chapter 2.3, Ground Access and Parking - Alternative D, for a further description of the GTC access plan.

SPC00165-11**Comment:**

11) Will there be a Gray Bus entrance from Century into the GTC? If so, where would it be located and how would access be regulated?

Response:

Public and charter buses would not access the GTC. These large buses would pick up and drop off passengers at the Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC), located at the northeast corner of Aviation Boulevard and Imperial Highway.

SPC00165-12**Comment:**

12) The DEIR discusses closing 98th St. during construction. Is there a way to minimize impacts to 98th St. and only closing parts of the street thereby allowing traffic to pass during construction? What ideas are being proposed?

Response:

A detailed construction phasing plan would be prepared during a later phase of analysis. However, a general principle of construction would be to maintain at least partial access to routes such as 98th Street unless absolutely necessary. If full closure is necessary, an adequate alternative route would be provided.

SPC00165-13**Comment:**

New LAWA Parking Structures

3. Comments and Responses

13) Have parking rates and fees for users of the new parking structures been developed? In not, why? (Please elaborate)

Response:

The analysis of parking in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR assumes that future parking rates are the same as the existing (i.e. 1996) rates. Future parking rates for Alternative D have not been developed. That level of detail is not necessary for an EIS/EIR. A detailed parking rate study will be conducted prior to opening those future parking facilities to determine the most appropriate rates at that time, given the parking demand conditions which will exist at time.

SPC00165-14

Comment:

14) The DEIR states there would be 12,890 private parking stalls. Where will these stalls be located?

15) Is 12,890 an estimate of existing stalls or does it include future stalls to be added?

Response:

The 12,890 stalls include all existing off-airport parking lots and garages that would not be acquired for Alternative D. These are privately owned facilities that currently provide public parking with shuttle service to LAX. The 12,890 stalls includes only existing stalls; it does not include future stalls to be added.

SPC00165-15

Comment:

16) What percentage of the parking stalls in the GTC will be designated "short term parking" vs. "long term parking?" Is this consistent with what was stated in the original Master Plan EIR/EIS? What will the daily rates be for each of these particular types of parking?

Response:

The number of short-term vs. long-term parking stalls is shown in the Master Plan Addendum, Chapter 2.3, Ground Access and Parking - Alternative D. Of the 7,515 GTC stalls provided, 4,253 (57 percent) would be priced for short-term parking, while the remaining 3,262 (43 percent) would be priced for long-term parking. The split of long-term vs. short-term stalls is consistent with the total number of long-term vs. short-term stalls in the Draft EIS/EIR.

Please see Response to Comment SPC00165-13 regarding parking rates.

SPC00165-16

Comment:

17) What percentage of the parking stalls in the ITC will be designated "short term parking" vs. "long term parking?" Is this consistent with what was stated in the original Master Plan EIR/EIS? What will the daily rates be for each of these particular types of parking?

Response:

For the analysis, it was assumed that all parking at the ITC would be short-term parking. Because the ITC is a proposed facility only under Alternative D, a consistency comparison between the parking at the ITC and the original Master Plan EIS/EIR cannot be made. Future parking rates for the ITC in Alternative D have not been developed. That level of detail is not necessary for an EIS/EIR. A detailed parking rate study will be conducted prior to the opening of the ITC to determine the most appropriate rates at that time, given the parking demand conditions which will exist at the time.

SPC00165-17**Comment:**

Transportation Issues

18) If Gateway was to undertake a universal shuttle system, could the shuttle be allowed access directly to the CTA? If not, why? (Please elaborate)

Response:

Shuttles would not be allowed to access the CTA directly. Allowing shuttles in the CTA would violate one of the cornerstone principles of Alternative D, which is high CTA security. Even if a screening system could be developed for shuttles, the same could be argued for other forms of commercial transportation. Allowing any other commercial transportation within the CTA other than FlyAway buses could ultimately compromise security.

SPC00165-18**Comment:**

19) What is the exact route of the proposed cargo roadway network?

Response:

Please see Master Plan Addendum, Chapter 2.3, Ground Access and Parking - Alternative D, for a description of the cargo access plan.

SPC00165-19**Comment:**

20) Why doesn't the DEIR study traffic impacts at 102nd and 104th streets as part of the cargo roadway network?

Response:

Although these streets were included in the traffic model for Alternative D, the results were not explicitly noted in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The volume of traffic on 102nd Street and 104th Street is low and these are not streets typically analyzed for a traffic impact and mitigation study. As proposed in Alternative D, 104th Street would be closed east of Aviation Boulevard, and traffic rerouted to 102nd Street via a new north/south connection. This closure is necessary because there would be insufficient vertical clearance between the proposed north/south roadways and the existing 104th Street. A new traffic signal would be proposed at the intersection of 102nd Street and Aviation Boulevard.

SPC00165-20**Comment:**

21) How many construction truck trips will occur along Century Boulevard during a.m./p.m. peak construction?

Response:

The project includes a policy that no construction trips would be generated during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. This is intended to minimize traffic impacts during these important hours.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00165-21

Comment:

22) Have alternative routes that would create less of an impact to the businesses along Century Boulevard been studied? What are those routes?

Response:

The analysis did not restrict traffic on any of the surrounding streets for airport traffic. To restrict access to airport traffic would also restrict non-airport traffic, which is undesirable. However, the primary landside facilities in Alternative D--the GTC, the ITC, and the consolidated RAC--are located to minimize the impact on Century Boulevard west of Aviation Boulevard. The primary access routes for these facilities would be I-405, I-105, La Cienega Boulevard, Aviation Boulevard, Arbor Vitae Street, and Century Boulevard east of Aviation Boulevard. Century Boulevard west of Aviation Boulevard would be a secondary route used primarily by non-airport vehicles and patrons of the businesses along that section of road.

SPC00165-22

Comment:

23) How will overall average daily trips from all vehicles change on Century Boulevard?

Response:

The accepted metric used for traffic engineering analyses and required for the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, is peak hour, not Average Daily Traffic (ADT). Therefore, an analysis of ADT was not conducted. Table S4.3.2-4 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR shows that Century Boulevard west of La Brea would have Levels of Service (LOS) A or B, depending on direction and hour selected, with or without the project in 2015.

SPC00165-23

Comment:

24) How will other project area street segments change from existing conditions under Alternative D and under the no project alternative?

Response:

The No Action/No Project Alternative would not have any changes to the area street segments. A number of streets would change under Alternative D. These were provided in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.3.2.

SPC00165-24

Comment:

Miscellaneous

25) Alternative D looks to require the acquisition of approximately 77 acres of land. Which specific parcels have been identified in all or in part for potential acquisition? Have specific guidelines been established for land acquisition/condemnation?

Response:

Properties planned for acquisition under Alternative D were identified in Figure S3-14, 2015 Alternative D Proposed Property Acquisition Areas, in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, as well as in Figure 2.7-1, Alternative D Proposed Property Acquisition Areas, and Table 2.7-2, Alternative D - Parcel Detail of Acquisition Areas, in Chapter 2.7 of the Master Plan Addendum. In Figure 2.7-1 the individual properties proposed for acquisition were identified by numbers which corresponded to the properties listed in Table 2.7-2 of the Master Plan Addendum. That table identified

the address, primary business name, land use, and floor area of affected businesses. Table 2.7-2 also indicated whether the affected properties are targeted for relocation on airport property, at LAX Northside, or within available space within the local market.

LAWA has proposed Master Plan Commitment RBR-1, Residential and Business Relocation Program (Alternatives A, B, C, and D) in compliance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, and its implementing regulations (collectively referred to as the Uniform Act); applicable state and local regulations; and FAA Advisory Circular 150/5100-17, Land Acquisition and Relocation Assistance for Airport Improvement Program Assisted Projects. The text of this Master Plan commitment, including many of the provisions the Proposed Relocation Plan would address, was provided in its entirety in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Proposed Relocation Plan would build upon the existing program currently in place as part of the Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program for the Belford and Manchester Square areas. A Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan, provided in Appendix P to Chapter V of the Master Plan and Chapters 2.7 and 2.8 of the Master Plan Addendum, has been drafted and provides as many businesses as possible the opportunity to relocate onto the airport or into the airport-owned developments. The Proposed Relocation Plan would provide all affected businesses with an array of relocation assistance that would meet and may exceed requirements under state and federal law, and may include special assistance for displaced businesses in finding relocation sites within nearby areas of the City of Los Angeles. The Proposed Relocation Plan would also establish procedures for the acquisition of affected properties. LAWA will attempt to acquire all properties without resorting to condemnation; however, the City of Los Angeles will reserve this action within its authority to implement, as necessary. In addition, Mitigation Measure MM-RBR-1, Phasing for Business Relocations (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), proposes to reschedule acquisition phasing and/or development phasing in order to maximize opportunities for airport/airport-dependent businesses and other businesses being acquired to relocate in proximity to their current sites.

SPC00165-25

Comment:

26) Will LAWA make special arrangements to replace gas stations that are displaced by Alternative D? If not, why? (Please elaborate)

Response:

Properties planned for acquisition under Alternative D were listed in Table 2.7-2, Alternative D - Parcel Detail of Acquisition Areas, in Chapter 2.7 of the Master Plan Addendum. As indicated therein, the three gas stations to be acquired under Alternative D are targeted for relocation within the local market. As was discussed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, a limited number of affected businesses, including the gas stations, are expected to be relocated within available space in the surrounding areas. Such uses could also potentially relocate to future development at LAX Northside upon buildout of that site. In any event, the Proposed Relocation Plan to be implemented by LAWA (refer to Appendix P to Chapter V of the Master Plan and Chapters 2.7 and 2.8 of the Master Plan Addendum) would provide all affected businesses with an array of relocation assistance that would meet and may exceed requirements under state and federal law, and may include special assistance for displaced businesses in finding relocation sites within nearby areas of the City of Los Angeles. Please see Response to Comment PC02222-37 for further discussion of gas station properties to be acquired.

SPC00165-26

Comment:

27) What are LAWA's specific plans for beautification of the Century Corridor and 98th Street during construction and at build out of Alternative D?

Response:

As was stated on page 4-569 in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, temporary impacts from construction activities would be reduced through screening measures along key roadways and other areas of visual sensitivity. With implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-DA-1, Construction Fencing (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), construction-related aesthetic and view

3. Comments and Responses

impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. As was discussed in Section 4.21, Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative D the proposed APM would line segments of both Century Boulevard and 98th Street. The APM guideway would be designed to promote the Century Corridor's existing Southern Californian landscape theme, with extensive landscaping provided in accordance with the LAX Street Frontage and Landscape Plan. A more detailed description of the APM and associated facilities was provided on page 4-575 in Section 4.21, Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, Alternative D would include an approximately 50-foot wide continuous landscaped parkway on the south side of Century Boulevard from just east of Aviation Boulevard to the CTA. Design of new facilities along Century Boulevard would adhere to the LAX Air Cargo Facilities Design Guidelines, and accordingly, the edge treatment along Century Boulevard would also include a one-foot high by three-foot wide turf berm, with trees planted along either side of the berm. Trees would be placed a minimum of 30 feet apart at a minimum ratio of one tree per 1,000 square feet of landscaped area. Edge and landscape treatments throughout the area would also be provided in compliance with the Street Frontage and Landscape Development Plan. Please see Response to Comment PC02222-31 for further discussion.

SPC00165-27

Comment:

We appreciate your attention and input on these issues as part of the EIR process and we look forward to continuing to work with you as Alternative D takes shape.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00165-2 through SPC00165-26 above.

SPC00166 Mego, Gordon None Provided 8/13/2003

SPC00166-1

Comment:

I am providing you a copy of my speech that I gave to the Board of Commissioners of the Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) on May 6, 2003 regarding LAX Airport. As you may be aware, Mayor James Hahn of Los Angeles recently presented his plan for significant changes to LAX Airport. The major renovation will do little or nothing, and possibly even worsen, for the convenience and safety of the traveling public, and for the efficiency and profitability of the airlines and the airport. Many individuals; citizen groups, homeowner organizations, businesses and corporations, private researchers (e.g. Rand Institute), and government officials at various levels are adamantly opposed to Mayor Hahn's plan for LAX airport. We hope that you will exert your influence to prevent a disaster of a plan from getting off the ground!

Response:

Comment noted. The copy of the speech referenced at the beginning of this comment is the same as the attachment to Comment Letter SPC00156; please refer to Responses to Comments SPC00156-5 through SPC00156-17 for responses to the specific comments raised in the subject speech.

SPC00166-2

Comment:

The attachment to this comment letter is identical to the attachment to comment letter SPC00156; please refer to the Responses to Comments SPC00156-5 through SPC00156-17.

Response:

SPC00167 Hartman, Randall None Provided 8/20/2003

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter SPC00144; please refer to the Responses to Comment letter SPC00144.

SPC00168 Nimrod, Nimrod Self-Esteem and World Peace Association 8/3/2003

SPC00168-1

Comment:

I attended the Environmental Justice meeting held on August 2, 2003 at Inglewood High. Included are comments and insights I gathered at that meeting concerning the Draft EIS/EIR and an on going problem I am having with LAX noise since June 21, 2003.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00168-2

Comment:

Another subject I will address at those Public Hearings on the LAX Master Plan that I will be attending, other than my present problem with the arbitrary plane noise from LAX is, will Inglewood High be soundproofed and any other school that is in the path of those loud planes which are actually Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs)?

The planes were almost landing on the school grounds and the noise was astonishing! What I found interesting is that I could see and hear those low flying planes as could everyone at that workshop. The noise at my home is comparable but I cannot see the planes. Amazing. I wonder how the children can properly study with that constant noise? Environmental Justice must take into consideration the teaching environment of the children and the soundproofing of schools, especially Inglewood High.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00106-1, SPC00106-3 and Topical Responses TR-LU-3, TR-N-4, and TR-LU-5 for responses to previous comments by the commentor about plane noise from LAX. Since the commentor's address is Marina del Rey noise levels and views of planes would be different than those experienced at Inglewood High School.

Noise effects on the teaching environment of schools were analyzed in Section 4.1, Noise and 4.2, Land Use of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. See Response to Comment AL00035-36 for a summary of single event and cumulative noise impacts identified for school within the Inglewood Unified School District. See also Response to Comment AL00035-23 regarding land use compatibility effects of schools within the Inglewood Unified School District that have been addressed through aviation easements and noise mitigation payments under the terms of the Amended Judgment and Final Order or "Settlement Agreement" involving the City of Los Angeles and Inglewood Unified School District.

SPC00168-3

Comment:

The plane noise has gotten lower at my home this morning due to my complaints at that workshop yesterday. They got the word in that LAX Tower and now know that I am truly serious. But the noise will

3. Comments and Responses

rise again as usual when the urge hits them. I want them to abide by the law. I want the noise stopped, not only lowered at their whim!

Also, what is the make-up of those in the Air Traffic Control Tower? Do they empathize and live in the low-income communities impacted by the LAX plane noise? Are there any women and other minorities in that Tower?

Or are they all middle class white men who are not being properly supervised and who can increase the volume and rate of noise anytime and direct the planes anywhere they choose thereby posing a great security risk? Airport Security is concentrating on the passengers and not the workers in the Towers. This is a big mistake!

These questions I will ask at the meetings and they must be answered before any Plan is ratified. Because I truly believe there is a god-complex disease and racist attitude in the LAX Tower. And they are terrorizing many neighborhoods.

You probably disagree with me, but these are the facts. Keep an open mind. People lives are at stake.

Response:

Comment noted. The Federal Aviation Administration, which employs the controllers at LAX ATCT is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

SPC00168-4

Comment:

Enclosure: 7/28/03 Newsweek article: "The 9-11 Report: Slamming the FBI."

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00168-5

Comment:

Enclosure: 7/20/03 Letter to Ms. Lydia H. Kennard, Executive Director of LAWA

Response:

The attached letter does not contain comments on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR; however, the commentor's letter to Ms. Lydia Kennard regarding existing aircraft noise associated with LAX is noted. The existing aircraft noise and land use compatibility characteristics and the future (2015) aircraft noise and land use compatibility characteristics associated with each of the Master Plan alternatives were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakenings in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

SPC00169 Waters, Maxine U.S. House of Representatives 10/20/2003

SPC00169-1

Comment:

Alternative D is a \$9 billion project that would demolish homes and disturb communities without improving the safety and security of LAX. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is an inaccurate and misleading document that fails to reflect the true impact of this project.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00169-2 through SPC00169-6 below.

SPC00169-2

Comment:

The centerpiece of Alternative D is the Ground Transportation Center (GTC), a large remote passenger check-in facility that would be constructed at Manchester Square, several blocks away from the airport terminals. An Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) would be constructed at Aviation Blvd. and Imperial Highway, which would provide a connection to the Green Line. According to the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the GTC and the ITC would be the primary access points for all passenger drop-off and pick-up and vehicle parking. An Automated People Mover (APM) would be constructed to transport people to the airport terminals, and a baggage tunnel would be constructed to transport baggage. A Consolidated Rental Car (RAC) facility would be constructed in Westchester.

Local families could no longer drive to the Central Terminal Area (CTA) in order to drop off passengers. Instead, all passengers and employees would access the CTA from the GTC, the ITC and the RAC via the APM, carrying their carry-on baggage with them. This would be extremely inconvenient for most passengers, and it would present special hardships for the elderly, the handicapped and families traveling with small children.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPHGH00003-2 regarding the elderly and handicapped.

SPC00169-3

Comment:

Airport Security Issues

Supporters of the proposed project to construct a remote passenger check-in facility claim that the facility is necessary to improve the safety and security of LAX and prevent terrorist attacks at LAX. Theoretically, diverting all vehicular traffic to remote parking structures and the remote passenger check-in facility would protect the Central Terminal Area from car bombs.

The RAND Corporation conducted a security study of the proposed remote passenger check-in facility, which was released on May 14, 2003. The study concluded that the proposed project would not significantly improve the security of LAX. The study also concluded that concentrating passengers in the proposed remote passenger check-in facility could make the check-in facility the likely target of a terrorist attack. Finally, the study concluded that concentrating several airport functions in the remote passenger check-in facility could exacerbate the effects of an attack on airport operations.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00228-3.

SPC00169-4

Comment:

On July 25, 2003, I introduced H.R. 2985, a bill to condition construction of a remote passenger check-in facility at LAX upon a finding that such a facility will promote the safety and security of the public. H.R. 2985 would require the Secretary of Homeland Security to review the proposed facility prior to its construction to determine whether it will protect the safety and security of air passengers and the general public more effectively than the existing facilities at LAX. If the Secretary of Homeland Security does not determine that the facility will improve public safety and security, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) would not be allowed to approve its construction. On Sept 2, the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County passed a motion to support my legislation.

3. Comments and Responses

Ironically, Alternative D does not even significantly improve security at the Central Terminal Area. According to the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D calls for the installation of new baggage screening facilities in the Central Terminal Area -- not the remote passenger check-in facility. If Alternative D were designed to protect the Central Terminal Area from terrorist attacks, one would think that the baggage would be fully screened before it is transported through the baggage tunnel to this area. Nine billion dollars is an extremely high price to pay for a project that provides a single building protection from car bombs but not from suitcase bombs.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00169-5

Comment:

Housing Issues

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR makes the astounding claim that Alternative D would not displace any residents. Instead, the Supplement predicts that 2,500 houses and apartments will be acquired and the residents relocated under LAWA's existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program, through which LAWA may acquire property and relocate residents on a voluntary basis in order to mitigate the impact of airport noise. The Supplement then concludes that Alternative D would not require the acquisition of any additional dwelling units or the relocation of any additional residents. This claim is especially ironic, given the fact that several Manchester Square residents and apartment owners have already said that they will not leave their homes voluntarily.

In reality, Alternative D would displace thousands of Manchester Square residents. In order to construct the remote passenger check-in facility, the City of Los Angeles would have to acquire and demolish 38 houses, 179 apartment buildings and a 52-year-old elementary school, in addition to the 263 structures it has already acquired. It would also have to relocate about 6,200 people, some of whom have federally subsidized housing vouchers. I strongly oppose the forced relocation of any of these residents.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comments SPHR00005-4 and SPHGH00003-4; please refer to Responses to Comments SPHR00005-4 and SPHGH00003-4.

SPC00169-6

Comment:

Cost of the Alternative D

Alternative D would cost \$9 billion, an exorbitant amount of money, at a time when budget deficits are growing and the economy is weak. Airlines would be required to increase their passenger fees in order to fund the proposal, which would amount to a tax increase for air passengers. American taxpayers have already provided loan guarantees to the airline industry to keep the airlines in business following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. They should not have to pay increased passenger fees for unnecessary airport construction projects as well.

Air passengers and other taxpayers are willing to provide reasonable expenditures to pay for measures that provide real increases in security, such as the installation of baggage screening facilities. However, the remote passenger check-in facility, the automated people mover and the baggage tunnel included in Alternative D are not reasonable expenditures and do not provide real increases in security.

The American people are sick and tired of deficits and bloated government spending. The State of California is now running a \$38 billion deficit, and the federal government has a \$525 billion deficit. Furthermore, Congress is in the process of providing the President an additional \$87 billion for

continuing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Alternative D is an outrageously expensive boondoggle, which the American people cannot afford.

Response:

Comment noted. The proposed master plan improvements would be funded with a combination of FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, and other state/federal grants. No general tax dollars will be used to pay for any of the proposed on-airport improvements.

Alternative D is intended to improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking. The design of the improvements incorporated in Alternative D was given much thought and review.

Please also see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues.

SPC00169-7

Comment:

Conclusion

Alternative D is simply a continuation of former Mayor Richard Riordan's plan to expand the airport in the name of safety and security. I urge the City Council of the City of Los Angeles to reject this ill-advised and expensive scheme that will displace thousands of Manchester Square residents without improving the safety and security of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level of 78.9 million annual passengers (MAP), which is comparable to the 78.7 MAP projected to occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. As such, Alternative D is not considered to represent an expansion of LAX. The other build alternatives (Alternatives A, B, and C) are designed to serve a future activity level substantially more than the No Action/No Project Alternative, and therefore represent an expansion of LAX. Alternative D is consistent with the Mayor's commitment to no expansion of LAX.

It is important to note that the voluntary property acquisition program that has been, and is currently, underway at Manchester Square was initiated separate from the LAX Master Plan and will continue onto completion regardless of whether any of the Master Plan alternative are selected. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-3 regarding the use of Manchester Square in Alternative D. As noted therein, the property acquisition program at Manchester Square was initiated at the request of the majority of property owners at Manchester Square.

SPC00170 Harrington, Mary None Provided 10/16/2003

SPC00170-1

Comment:

I am requesting to be considered to soundproof my home at the above address. Can you please re-evaluate the decimal sound of the flight path of the LAX Airport above my property and area. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Response:

Comment noted. FAA and LAWA acknowledge the concerns of the commentator and are working to address noise complaints from LAX operations. As shown on Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR the commentator's property (located at 1638 West 83rd Street and northeast of the intersection of Western Avenue and Manchester Boulevard in South Los Angeles) is approximately three blocks or 1500 feet to the northeast of the eastern boundary that defines residential properties eligible for soundproofing (which ends at approximately Western Avenue and 85th Street).

3. Comments and Responses

The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP and monitoring methods used to evaluate the current 65 CNEL contour are described in Topical Response TR-LU-3. The 65 CNEL is the applicable standard for high noise levels as defined by FAR Part 150 and Title 21 (see Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4) of the Draft EIS/EIR). Priority for sound insulation is given to residential properties within the highest noise level band above the 65 CNEL contour. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts.

See Topical Response TR-LU-3, regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. See Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding the difference between single event and CNEL noise levels.

SPC00171 Mego, Gordon None Provided 9/8/2003

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter SPC00157; please refer to the Responses to Comment letter SPC00157. This comment letter also includes an attached exhibit that was also attached to comment letter SPC00156; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00156-2 which addresses the exhibit.

SPC00172 Lipp, Susan None Provided 9/2/2003

SPC00172-1

Comment:

Who is the mayor trying to fool with this plan of safety and security? Many questions remain unanswered as to whether this will add safety for the public. How about the RAND study?

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00172-2

Comment:

As a resident of the Valley, my concern is traffic. The nightmare of getting to LAX from Studio City will not be any more improved after spending the \$9 billion. The 405 is still a parking lot.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00172-3

Comment:

Air traffic is still down since Sept. 11 and yet the mayor feels this is what Los Angeles needs right now. I am completely opposed to such an outrageously expensive "facelift" for LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00173

Garnholz, Liz

None Provided

8/21/2003

SPC00173-1

Comment:

Subject: Supplement to the DEIS/EIR LAX Master Plan - "Governor's Certificate" and PUC 21661.6 and how they relate to Alternative D, cargo, and nighttime operations

The "Governor's Certificate" arose from the federal Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982. In California the governor delegated this certification responsibility to the California Air Resources Board, CARB. The CARB developed an Air Quality Certificate process to regulate air emission - Section 509(b) (7) (a).

QUESTION 1. What is LAX's interpretation of the invoking of the "Governor's Certificate" on Mayor Hahn's Alternative D plan?

Response:

As noted in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the Airport and Airway Improvement Act (AAIA) of 1982, as amended, is an applicable federal law. The AAIA required, pursuant to Section 47106(c)(B), that, as a necessary condition of approval by the Secretary of the Department of Transportation of an application for an airport development project involving the location of an airport or runway or a major runway extension, the governor of the state in which the project will be located must certify in writing that there is reasonable assurance that the project will be located, designed, constructed, and operated in compliance with applicable air and water quality standards. It should be noted that on December 12, 2003, President Bush signed into law the FAA reauthorization bill (Flight 100 - Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act.) This Act eliminates the requirement for the "Governor's Certificate."

SPC00173-2

Comment:

Public Utility Code, PUC 21661.6 states that a California city cannot buy land for a project until the project has been officially approved. The City of Los Angeles owns LAX. LAX has acquired homes in Manchester Square, the Belford apartment area, plans to acquire approximately 57 homes in the Wiley Post area, and the Southern California Association of Governments has approved/allocated money to widen the I405 Freeway/Arbor Vitae Interchange at the expense of removing minority housing, businesses, part of a park, part of a school, and one church. All this acquiring and planning to acquire is being done without an approved LAX project. In fact, as far back as 1998 LAX expansion maps have shown cargo planes in the Manchester Square/Belford areas, again with no approved LAX expansion plan.

QUESTION 2. What legal "leg" does LAX have to violate Public Utility Code, PUC 21661.6 by acquiring properties for the LAX expansion project when that project has not been officially approved by the Los Angeles City Council or the Mayor of Los Angeles?

Response:

As stated in the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, homes in the Manchester Square area are being acquired through the existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program currently underway within the Manchester Square and Airport/Belford areas near the airport, in support of LAWA's ANMP. The acquisition of Manchester Square is independent of the residential acquisition necessary for Master Plan implementation. The comment on SCAG's Arbor Vitae Interchange is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The FHWA withdrew its support for the 405 Freeway/Arbor Vitae Interchange. Further, the Arbor Vitae Interchange is not part of the LAX Master Plan. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.1.2 and Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.2 regarding legality of the acquisition of Manchester Square.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00173-3

Comment:

Cargo A previous LAX expansion EIS/EIR stated that cargo was an exception to EIS/EIR regulation, rules, etc., in other words cargo was going to operate under variance rulings.

QUESTION 3. Does Alternative D treat cargo and passenger operations exactly the same or is cargo being treated under different rules/variances? If cargo has different rules what are they and what are their effects in the air, on the ground, and environment wise?

Response:

It is unclear as to why and how the commentor feels that the Draft EIS/EIR indicates that cargo is an exception to EIS/EIR regulations. Environmental impacts from cargo traffic are not exempt from NEPA or CEQA analysis. The LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR evaluate the entirety of each of the five alternatives (No Action/No Project and Alternatives A through D), including the aspects related to cargo, in full accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Alternative D is designed to accommodate 3.1 million annual tons of cargo in 2015, as was stated in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The environmental analysis that was presented in Chapter 4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR accounted for such cargo activity.

SPC00173-4

Comment:

Nighttime operations LAX can expand to beyond 100 MAP as it exists today - August 21, 2003. This can be done by merely extending and expanding nighttime operations.

QUESTION 4. What are the nighttime hours, operation limits, and other regulations for passenger and cargo operations in this EIS/EIR Supplement? What guarantees are there that limit percentage-wise or operation-wise increases in nighttime operations - a cap guarantee on ALL types of operations and hours of operations?

Response:

Comment noted. Table S3-1, Summary of Activity by Alternative - 2015 as shown in Chapter 3, Alternatives (Including Proposed Action) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR shows that neither the Unconstrained Forecast, No Action/No Project nor any of the forecasted build Alternatives (A-D) exceed a total of 97.9 MAP. Since there is no curfew at LAX, and if there is a demand, flights can continue to be scheduled and will operate during the nighttime hours of 10:00 p.m. to 6:59:59 a.m.

The design day forecasts for the LAX Master Plan (Appendix F and Appendix H) or LAX Master Plan Addendum (Appendix F) do not show a significant increase in nighttime operations. The 1996 Baseline shows that 12.95 percent of the total operations are nighttime operations. Whereas, 2000 conditions shows that 14.5 percent of the total operations are nighttime operations. By 2015, No Action/No Project shows that 17.9 percent of total operations are nighttime operations with all build alternatives ranging between 13 percent and 14.3 percent. Capacity of a public works project is not based on a 24-hour basis. Capacity is related to when people expect the service to be available. In order to reach 100 MAP, passengers would have to very radically change their travel habits to push the airport into a 100 MAP situation. As shown in the forecasts, LAX passengers are not going to radically change their demand to nighttime operations beyond what we have been forecast.

There is no proposed aircraft operational limit or cargo limit in the No Action/No Project Alternative nor in any of the proposed build Alternatives (A-D). If there is a demand for nighttime flights in to or out of LAX then there may be an increase in nighttime flight activity. There are no guarantees that limit nighttime operations whether on a percentage basis, operations basis or through a cap in the No Action/No Project Alternative nor in any of the proposed build Alternatives (A-D). Any of these potential restrictions would be required to withstand a 14 CFR Part 161 Study.

3. Comments and Responses

Another issue facing the future of Los Angeles is the expansion of the MTA system and the proposed California High Speed Rail project. While Alternative D does include a direct connection with the Metro Green line at Aviation via a pedestrian walkway (an option which will only help both MTA and cut down on Airport traffic), I haven't found details about what will be done with the existing northbound MTA-owned ROW along Aviation.

In the past, various parties have insisted that a Green Line extension northward or any rail into the airport may affect various controlling beacons and equipment. Having taken the EI into O'Hare, obviously it is doable. Please encourage all parties included to think for the future of the city and the airport to preserve this right of way and to build into the construction budget the necessary trench west of Aviation Blvd along the MTA Harbor Subdivision ROW. This would allow the Green Line to proceed north from the current Aviation/Imperial Green Line station without interfering with LAX radar beacons and/or other electromagnetic operations associated with LAX.

On the same note, please encourage those involved to allow space for a future additional train station at the ITC or the GTC should the Green Line expand or should High Speed Rail come from Union Station to LAX via the former Slauson railroad tracks.

Thank you very much for your time, your efforts, and your open mind:

Response:

Comment noted. The MTA ROW will be preserved in Alternative D for a potential Green Line extension in the future. Please see Response to Comment SPHL00022-2 regarding the complexities of incorporating a Green Line extension into the GTC. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan and high-speed rail.

SPC00176 Washington, James Local 347 10/25/2003

SPC00176-1

Comment:

[No comment.]

Response:

No comments were included in this letter.

SPC00177 Flores, Adan None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00177-1

Comment:

Support plan D

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00178 Hernandez, Roberto Laborers Local 300 10/25/2003

SPC00178-1

Comment:

I SUPPORT PLAN (D)

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00179 Pavlovich, F None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00179-1

Comment:

I SAPORT PLAN B.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00180 Arreola, Angel None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00180-1

Comment:

I support Plan D and Mayor Hann.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00181 Aguilar, Dan Laborers Local 300 10/25/2003

SPC00181-1

Comment:

I SUPORT PLAN D

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00182 Robinson, Brenda None Provided

SPC00182-1

Comment:

I am here today to give testimony on the damage being done to our homes as a result of the increased airline travel over our community. I have lived in this community for over 31 years.

This issue is not new to us. We have tried over the last ten years to engage in a constructive dialogue with the LAX Airport Representatives and time and time, they have ignored our concerns and request to assistance in repairing our home impacted by the air services.

Many of our home have cracks in the foundations, our doors and windows frame are out of alignment with the structure of the homes and our roofs have been damaged as a result of the low flying and the fumes traveling down.

The noise has been so loud when the airplanes are traveling over our homes, that we have to play an up and down game with the sound on our televisions or phone conversation in order to hear.

When Representatives have meet with us (only on a few occasions), and stated that the noise indicator do not show that we are in the direct noise flight path, we have shown them the actual map created by the LAX is out dated. The increase use of the airport and the need to expand, should be clear indicators that a new set of noise box indicator should be placed in new locations to determine the of impact the

3. Comments and Responses

airplanes. We have tried to convey this to the Representative, yet no one is willing to give us a definitive answer or allow us to identify some of the location if this were to take place.

We are requesting, no demanding that action take place to address our concerns and to establish a relationship with us in helping to resolving this issue and repairing our home in the same manner you have done with Westchester, Inglewood and a small portion of southwest LA close to the Inglewood city line.

Keep in mind that LAX is own by the City and we as residents of the City pay taxes and patronize the facility and should be entitle the level of customer service you pay to visitor using the airport.

Response:

Comment noted. As shown on Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the commentor's property is located outside the boundary of residential properties eligible for soundproofing under the ANMP. The ANMP boundary is based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour. The 65 CNEL is the applicable standard for high noise levels as defined by FAR Part 150 and Title 21 (see Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4) of the Draft EIS/EIR). Priority for sound insulation is given to residential properties within the highest noise level band above the 65 CNEL contour. As described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4, the boundary of the 65 CNEL contour is validated through the continuous monitoring of 25 sites in the area surrounding LAX and quarterly noise reports are submitted by LAWA to Caltrans and the County of Los Angeles. Even though the ANMP was developed based on 1992 conditions, noise levels have decreased over time primarily due to the phasing out of noisier (stage 2) aircraft. This decrease is depicted on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts.

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the ANMP, in particular Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 regarding how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP, including expanding and upgrading the current monitoring system. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. See Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding the difference between single event and CNEL noise levels; TR-N-8 regarding the effects of noise-based vibration; and TR-AQ-1 regarding deposits, soot, and fuel dumping.

SPC00183 Feinstein, Dianne United States Senate 10/20/2003

SPC00183-1

Comment:

I am forwarding the attached constituent inquiry regarding the expansion of Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) for your review. I believe that my constituent would benefit from your response to the specific issues raised in the enclosed letter.

I would appreciate it if you would return your response to me as quickly as possible so that I can share the information with Mr. Mego.

Response:

The referenced comments are provided in comment letter SPC00184, which is identical to comment letter SPC00157; please see responses to comment letter SPC00157. The referenced comment letter also includes an attached exhibit that was also attached to comment letter SPC00156; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00156-2, which addresses the exhibit.

SPC00184 Mego, Gordon None Provided 8/25/2003

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter SPC00157; please refer to the Response to Comment Letter SPC00157. This comment letter also includes an attached exhibit that

3. Comments and Responses

was also attached to comment letter SPC00156; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00156-2 which addresses the exhibit.

SPC00185 Alvarado, Armando None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00185-1

Comment:

I support plan "D"

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00186 Garcia, Gregorio None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00186-1

Comment:

I support Plan "D".

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00187 Xhro, Heminio None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00187-1

Comment:

I support plan D

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00188 Espedel, Luis None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00188-1

Comment:

I SUPPORT PLAN "D"

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00189 Ramos, Agustin Laborers Local 300 10/25/2003

SPC00189-1

Comment:

I SUPPORT PLAN D

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00190 Contreras, Fernando None Provided

SPC00190-1

Comment:

I SUPPORT PLAN (D)

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00191 Alarcon, Benito None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00191-1

Comment:

I support the mayor of the city of Los Angeles.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00192 Jimenez, Henry None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00192-1

Comment:

I SUPPORT JAMES HANE PLAN FOR LAX

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00193 Monzon, Francisco Laborers Local 300 10/25/2003

SPC00193-1

Comment:

I SUPPORT PLAN (D)

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00194 Longoria, Mario None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00194-1

Comment:

I SUPPORT PLA D

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00195 Jimenes, Jesus None Provided 10/28/2003

SPC00195-1

Comment:
I SUPPORT PLAN D

Response:
Comment noted.

SPC00196 Flores, Fernando Laborers Local 300 10/25/2003

SPC00196-1

Comment:
I SUPPORT PLAN (D)

Response:
Comment noted.

SPC00197 Carrillo, Juan None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00197-1

Comment:
I SUPPORT PLAN (D)

Response:
Comment noted.

SPC00198 Castillo, Carlos None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00198-1

Comment:
I SUPPORT PLAN (D)

Response:
Comment noted.

SPC00199 De la Cruz, Delfino None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00199-1

Comment:
I SUPPORT PLAN "D"

Response:
Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00200 Gaddis, Jessie None Provided

SPC00200-1

Comment:

[No comment.]

Response:

No comments were included in this letter.

SPC00201 Adelman, Charles None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00201-1

Comment:

1) LAX is the main trans-Pacific Hub for the United States. every flight into or out of LAX carries both local origin/Destination passengers and connecting passengers. It is not practical to devide these passengers to different airports. There fore to be realistic, we must either increase the capacity of LAX to meet demand, build direct high speed rail connections between airports, or replace LAX with a new larger airport in the Inland empire

Response:

Although Alternative D does not expand the capacity of LAX, LAWA does recognize the importance of increasing capacity in the region. LAWA encourages the jurisdictions that control other airports in the region to expand their airports to the extent possible. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA, which control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports, are currently preparing Master Plan updates for both Ontario and Palmdale, to play their part in addressing the anticipated regional demand. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX.

SPC00201-2

Comment:

2) Moving the main parking area out of the Central Terminal area is essential for both security and traffic management reasons; However, concentrating all parking in a new "surface transportation area" simply moves security problems & traffic conjection to a different location; solving the conjection and car bomb security issues requires creating an effective network of transit connections into LAX. The intermodal Transportation center must be located in the central terminal area so that passengers can walk to the terminals from their trains with out having to change trains. LAX needs to have a direct highspeed rail link to Union Station down-town and John Wyne Airport in Orange County. It needs to have grade seperated transit links from the San Fernando Valley/Westside, from down town/San Gabriel Valley and from Burbank airport. LAX must work with MTA & SCAG to develop the following Rail Lines:

- 1) LAX - Union Station - Ontaro Airport High Speed Rail
- 2) LAX - Anaheim - John Wayne Airport H.S.R.
- 3) LAX - Union Station - El Monte Subway
- 4) Aviation Sta - LAX - Westwood - Sherman Oaks - San Fernando
Green Line extention
- 5) Redondo - Southbay Gallarea - Del Amo Square - Long Beach
Green Line extention
- 6) Burban Airport - Hollywood - Beverly Center - LAX Subway

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Under Alternative D, passengers may choose between three on-airport parking locations, namely the Intermodal Transportation Center, the Ground Transportation Center, and a surface parking lot west of La Cienega Boulevard and north of 111th Street.

Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security at the proposed Ground Transportation Center.

LAWA staff has had several discussions with MTA staff with respect to their plans for transit improvements in the vicinity of LAX and will continue to work with them in this regard. SCAG is in the process of developing an update to their Regional Transportation Plan, which will include their concept for high-speed rail in the region. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding further discussion of rail and transit connections to LAX airport.

SPC00202 Hilfenhaus, Jim None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00202-1

Comment:

I Support plan D

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00203 None Provided None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00203-1

Comment:

I support Plan D.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00204 Sifuntes, Jorge None Provided

SPC00204-1

Comment:

[No comment.]

Response:

No comments were included in this letter.

SPC00205 Lopez, Efrain None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00205-1

Comment:

I support Plan D.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00206 Nevarez, Guadalupe Laborers Local 300 10/25/2003

SPC00206-1

Comment:

I support Plan D.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00207 Arrizon, Francisco None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00207-1

Comment:

Support Plan D

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00208 Herrera, Eddie None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00208-1

Comment:

I SopoRT PIAN D

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00209 Sanchez, Jacobo None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00209-1

Comment:

I SUPPORT PLAN D

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00210 Gomez, Juan None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00210-1

Comment:

I SUPPORT PLan D

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00211 Govea, James None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00211-1

Comment:
I SUPPORT PLAN D

Response:
Comment noted.

SPC00212 Zavala, Arturo None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00212-1

Comment:
I Support Plan "D"

Response:
Comment noted.

SPC00213 DePalm, Frederick None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00213-1

Comment:
I SUPPONT PLAN "D"

Response:
Comment noted.

SPC00214 Felix, Arturo None Provided

SPC00214-1

Comment:
I SUPPORT PLAN "D"

Response:
Comment noted.

SPC00215 Brown, Dennis None Provided 10/9/2003

SPC00215-1

Comment:
When Alternative D is continually referred to as the mayor's "Safety and Security" plan, it disturbs me a great deal. Although the plans are difficult to decipher, upon closer examination, it becomes very clear that the only thing that will be safe and secure is the airport itself.

It was my initial understanding that the Safety and Security plan was designed to protect the traveling public. This plan appears to do just the opposite. By having passengers concentrated in an area far

3. Comments and Responses

removed from the physical structure of LAX, it is the same as painting a giant bullseye on the Ground Transportation Center and inviting terrorists to have a go at it. The propose 'people mover' has the same potential - an underground tunnel with thousands of passengers concentrated (trapped) in one area.

If the argument is for security, there seem to be many details / questions that have gone unanswered in this plan. Security technology that has not yet been developed, costs of implementation unknown - it would be irresponsible of the city, and the FAA to proceed with Alt. D without these answers.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00216 Feller, Bob

**Executive Management
Consulting International**

10/28/2003

SPC00216-1

Comment:

I. MOVE ALL THE IMPERIAL TERM. FREIGHT +, TO THE 4 OUTLYING LAWA AIRPORTS THAT WANT IT.

II. DOUBLE + LAX PASSERGER CAPACITY BY BUILDING A 2nd LAX @ IMPERIAL.

Response:

Cargo cannot be moved simply to suit the needs of the airport. The airlines select airports to best serve their customers and minimize costs. LAWA is working with the all-cargo airlines and LAX freight forwarders to provide incentives to use Ontario for cargo destined for or originating near the airport. LAWA cannot force these companies to use Ontario.

The passenger capacity of LAX under Alternative D is 78.9 MAP. That is approximately the capacity of the existing facility.

SPC00216-2

Comment:

III. FOR SECURITY HAVE "BOOTHs" TO INSPECT PEOPLE & LUGGAGE, WITH A ELECTRONIC CLOSED DOOR INTO TERMINAL, A 4(+) ARMED POLICE THERE AT ALL TIMES. ONLY OPEN DOOR TO TERMINAL AFTER PEOPLE & LUGGAGE CLEARED FOR NBC'S & CONTRABAND.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00216-3

Comment:

IV. ANY OTHER HELP, WRITE ME!

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00217

McDowell, Kelly

City of El Segundo

10/25/2003

SPC00217-1

Comment:

Good morning. I am Councilman Kelly McDowell, representing the City of El Segundo.

Given the length and complexity of the Master Plan and environmental documents, our complete comments, including those on technical issues, will be finalized soon and my City's comments today are preliminary.

The City of El Segundo continues to oppose Alternatives A, B, and C for the many reasons the City expressed orally and in writing during the public review and comment period for the initial Draft EIS/EIR in 2002.

The City of El Segundo has not endorsed Alternative D. However, we feel its stated objective of constraining LAX to its current capacity is appropriate and supports a regional aviation approach.

To be clear, the City of El Segundo can only support an alternative that by design will accommodate passenger and cargo levels no greater than the physical capacity of the airport as it exists today.

The City has retained a nationally respected expert to assess the capacity of Alternative D.

To the extent that our expert consultant's findings are that the passenger capacity of Alternative D, as currently designed, exceeds 78 MAP, we would hope that LAWA would cooperate with El Segundo in incorporating any revisions in the Plan necessary to ensure the capacity is not increased beyond 78 MAP.

Limiting LAX's capacity to its current capacity has always been our number one goal.

We believe that limiting capacity at LAX will allow other airports in the region to develop and handle their fair share of future regional aviation demand.

Response:

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

SPC00217-2

Comment:

However, my City is greatly concerned about the impacts of southside airfield changes that would move the southernmost runway 50 feet closer to El Segundo.

LAWA has stated that it believes these changes are necessary to improve runway safety.

However, we are currently studying the impacts of the proposed reconfiguration and the options for the southern runway complex.

In particular, we urge full public consideration of end-around taxiways as an alternative that could provide greater safety at lower cost and with fewer new burdens on local communities.

Safety at LAX must be a priority for all of us.

El Segundo is prepared to support measures necessary to enhance safety, even if those measures increase our burden, but only if we are assured, through an independent expert, that alternatives with fewer impacts are not equally effective.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00038-3 regarding the potential noise impacts of moving the southernmost runway approximately 55 feet south and discussion on runway incursions at LAX and an analysis conducted by NASA Ames Research Center comparing the costs and benefits of a center parallel taxiway and end-around taxiway on the south airfield complex.

SPC00217-3

Comment:

In conclusion, we are grateful for Mayor Hahn's responsive leadership and his pledge to constrain growth at LAX and foster a regional approach to meeting future aviation demand.

It is our hope that the ultimate outcome of this Master Plan process will be a regional airport approach that ensures that LAX does not exceed its current capacity.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00218 Worthington, Emma None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00218-1

Comment:

My name is Emma Worthington and I live in Inglewood. I also work at the airport and have worked there for almost 30 years. Like myself many people who work at the airport live in the surrounding communities. We live in Inglewood, Lennox, Hawthore, El Segundo and Westchester. We understand the connection between good quality jobs and a quality life. We need new jobs but we don't minimum wage jobs. What we need is jobs that provide a livable wage and affordable family health coverage. The companies at the airport provide those types of jobs and that is how I have been able to raise my family and not be on welfare. In order to insure that this modernization plan provides good employment opportunities for our communities, we encourage the mayor to include in his plan a local hiring program so that others in my communities can also raise their families and our youth can strive to immitate their parents. When we talk about modernization we say we are bringing the airport and Los Angeles into the 21st Century. Well we the workers would like to be able to bring our communities into the 21st Century along with the airport and the rest of Los Angeles. That is why we urge the mayor to ensure that his plan provides good paying jobs with good benefits and a community packet that will ensure we are along for the ride. NOT LEFT BEHIND.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00219 Roberts, Sondra None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00219-1

Comment:

I've resided in Inglewood for 30 years. When I moved here the airport was innocuous. Inbound planes flew in a pattern which seemed to follow Century Blvd. Out bound planes did not affect us.

The air traffic was minimal. The street traffic was bearable. The air was breathable. My sleep was not disturbed at night.

Now residents anywhere in the city have either seen or heard an airplane over their houses.

And this has resulted in.....

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00219-2

Comment:

Traffic Congestion
main arteries
neighborhoods (speeding)
street damage

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00219-3

Comment:

Noise Pollution 24 hours per day
aircraft
street
freeway

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00219-4

Comment:

neurosensory disorders

Response:

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

SPC00219-5

Comment:

Air Pollution
Aircraft emissions
Traffic emissions
Particulate matter (that we have to breath day in and day out).

Most of our adults suffer from some respiratory disorder, but alarmingly the problem is wide spread among our children whose young lungs should be uncontaminated.

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to Comment SPHE00022-5. Please see Response to Comment SPHE00022-5.

SPC00219-6

Comment:

Neurological / Psychiatric Disorders
Sleep deprivation
Anxiety-depression

3. Comments and Responses

Learning disorders airplanes are on the descent directly over many of our schools

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise. In addition, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings and school disruption associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1.

SPC00219-7

Comment:

Safety Issues
Low flying aircraft
More airport related facilities moving closer and into our communities - bringing with them possible terror attacks
Too many aircraft flying in close proximity at a time

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Responses TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues.

SPC00219-8

Comment:

Property Damage
caused by air pollutants and sound waves

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition and Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

SPC00219-9

Comment:

LAX has been methodically increasing the airport's capacity without the required environmental impact reports.

Response:

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

SPC00219-10

Comment:

The current report is sorely lacking in validity. It does not address solutions to any of our quality of life issues, traffic, noise and air pollution, mental and physical health, property damage and safety. It's based on old, erroneous, unsubstantiated, and irrelevant data.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were completed in accordance with NEPA and CEQA requirements, as well as with FAA Orders 5050.4 and 1050.1D, which specify the various environmental impact categories to be evaluated. The Draft EIS/EIR and the

3. Comments and Responses

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. Also, please see Topical Responses TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and TR-GEN-1 regarding environmental baseline issues.

SPC00219-11

Comment:

LAX is not an asset Inglewood. It is the worst possible neighbor any community could have. It profits from our misfortune. But what better place to exploit than a low income minority community?

Response:

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

SPC00219-12

Comment:

If I had any lung capacity left I'd like to go out of my house be able to fill them with clean air.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00220 Solomon, Willie None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00220-1

Comment:

- Why are planes permitted to take-off and land between the hours of 11:00 PM and 6:00 AM?

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as Response to Comment SPHE00024-1; please refer to Response to Comment SPHE00024-1.

SPC00220-2

Comment:

- Referring to jet noise levels - why haven't new criteria been established to account for flight patterns over areas such as Vermont Knolls?

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as Response to Comment SPHE00024-2; please refer to Response to Comment SPHE00024-2.

SPC00220-3

Comment:

- Why can't jet engines noise be muffled 10 miles before landing?

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as Response to Comment SPHE00024-3; please refer to Response to Comment SPHE00024-3.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00220-4

Comment:

- How can the residue from jet fuel be reduced over our community?

Response:

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

SPC00220-5

Comment:

- Why not extend the airport and runways out into the ocean?, Japan has done this successfully?

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to Comment SPHE00024-5. Please see Response to Comment SPHE00024-5.

SPC00220-6

Comment:

- What methodology has been devised to mass transit passengers to terminals if no curbside drop off is permitted?

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPHE00024-6. Please see Response to Comment SPHE00024-6.

SPC00220-7

Comment:

- Local residents were told from the start that the general aspects of the plans were not negotiable, then why are you holding public hearings?

Response:

The goal of the Master Plan process is to produce a plan for modernizing Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) that is appropriate for the City of Los Angeles and the Five-county region. In 2001, the Draft LAX Master Plan and the Draft EIS/EIR were published by LAWA to seek input from the public and to start the agency review and comment process. These documents were produced to describe and analyze four alternatives: the No Action/No Project Alternative, Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D. Alternative D was developed in response to the feedback and public comments received on the other four alternatives. Draft documents were prepared to describe Alternative D: the Master Plan Addendum, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the Airport Layout Plans (ALP) Package. The public was allowed to formally review and comment on these draft documents. Government entities and the public will have a chance to review and provide comments through oral testimony, written comments, and public hearings. The City of Los Angeles and the FAA will decide which of the Master Plan alternatives best meets the needs of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles region only after input from the public and governmental entities has been received and considered.

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

SPC00220-8**Comment:**

- Since the existing airport was designed to accommodate 40 million passengers, last year 56.2 millions used the facilities and the expansion will accommodate 78.9 million, what are your plans to not further impact our quality of life or has it been factored into your plans?

Response:

Comment noted. The 78.9 million passengers that would be accommodated under Alternative D would be similar to what would occur if the LAX Master Plan were not approved, as reflected under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D is designed to serve aviation activity at LAX consistent with the SCAG's 2001 Regional Transportation Plan and as a result, would encourage the growth of aviation activity at airports other than LAX. Chapter 5, Environmental Action Plan, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR presented Project Design Features, Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures intended to avoid or reduce the potential environmental impacts of the LAX Master Plan. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. Regarding passenger levels, as stated in Section 3.2.1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the passenger activity level for the Year 2000 was 67.3 million passengers, rather than the 56.2 million referenced by the commentor.

SPC00220-9**Comment:**

ECONOMY:

- Of the 49,000 jobs that the airport expansion is projected to create, how many jobs for the residents in those communities that have and will be impacted be made available?

- The Mayor has addressed unions with the expansion plans, are there plans to reach out to none union workers, giving them an opportunity for employment?

- How will the public be notified of available employment?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02204-14 for clarification on the net change in jobs associated with airport operations under Alternative D and regarding the types of new jobs to be created. Also see Response to Comment PC01045-2 regarding the distribution of projected job growth; and Response to Comment SPHE00024-9 regarding the anticipated job applicant pool for construction jobs and typical job notification methods.

SPC00221**Netherly, Tarlise****None Provided****10/25/2003****SPC00221-1****Comment:**

It took me a total of 12 days, 3 hours a day, to read and understand the proposed plan and the drastic changes being proposed. I originally began reading the plan to get insight on a piece of property in your proposal that I would like to develop; however, in doing my research I found something quite alarming.

With myself being handicapped I am thoroughly aware of my surroundings; therefore, I noticed that the proposal has not stated specific handicapped or disabled safety precautions being developed. The "alternative master d plan" states is "it's accessible" but what does that mean?

For instance in the proposed "People Mover", there are no intended railings for the blind to hold onto, there are no seating schematics, and there are no wheelchair safety locks. Anyone who knows anything

3. Comments and Responses

about wheelchairs knows the wheel locks on the wheelchair are not always sturdy. There is also no mention of our exceptional four-legged friends (dogs) who assist some of us in getting around; they too are a part of us. Posting the well-recognized handicap placard is meaningless if there is no actual assistance to back it up.

Your suggestion of "Alternative Master Plan D" utilizes a great deal of paper, and yet leaves out a part of a social class that is alive, well and extremely vital in the community, it is imperative that precautions for the handicapped and disabled are included on paper and not just phased in while construction takes place; this would be improper procedure.

All too often, society ignores the fact that someone who looks, talks, and walks differently may indeed have feelings just like the next "normal" person. This is precisely why I am asking the counsel to go back and review the schematics for "Alternative Master Plan D", before making a commitment to spending millions of dollars in order to reconstruct and redevelop LAX and its surrounding areas. Should you decide to research the information I have given you regarding the handicapped and disabled, you will find there are a substantial amount of people both young and elderly who enjoy and/or are required to travel. Your "people mover" must accommodate us as well.

Response:

The this comment is similar to comment SPHE00029-1. Please see Response to Comment SPHE00029-1.

SPC00221-2

Comment:

The second reason for my coming before you is, as I have previously stated, there is a piece of property in your plan that I would very much like to develop.

The current address of the property is 9011 S. Airport Blvd, Los Angeles, Ca. Its location is on the north/south corner of Arbor Vita and Airport Blvd; [directly adjacent the Post Office]. Please see map 2.3-1 and 2.3-2 in Alternative Master Plan D Volume I The property has been vacant for approximately five years; previously, it was occupied by the Hertz Corporation, as a car rental station.

I would like to take this land and establish a nightclub. Allow me to emphasize that this will not be a strip club but an establishment where all diversities can go and enjoy themselves. The club will promote class, excitement, and relaxation, as there will be "Spoken Word" and Jazz on Wednesday's and Sunday's. There will also be Hip Hop and disco Thursday through Saturday, with hopes of diverting attention away from the adult entertainment in the area. In doing so, we will introduce a higher quality of entertainment in correlation with the image you are trying to establish with the reconstruction of the LAX area. Thus, generating additional positive revenue for the various surrounding communities around the Los Angeles International Airport.

My proposal of the nightclub will generate positive revenue for the area. As you may already know there is currently a law on the table regarding lap dancing which if passed would mean that exotic dancers would have to remain six feet way from the customer; no doubt that this will cripple the adult entertainment industry. Should this law come to pass, it will affect the three adult clubs in the airport area. From a strategic standpoint, I would like for my nightclub to take a positive spin from the negative outcome. Bring a positive outlook to the situation while still maintaining and generating more revenue for the area.

According to your "Alternative Master Plan D-section A2.2- Passenger Operations 1996 vs. 2000". LAX in 1996 had 57,975 visitors to the Los Angeles area vs. in 2000 there was 67,303, a difference of 9,328 (1.7%) in approximately 4 years. With precise advertising, considering future demographics of the area, I believe that there will be an approximate growth increase of 2% to 5% in 5 years to support the financial burden needed for the redevelopment of the area.

Response:

The area that encompasses the old Hertz rental car facility is going to be incorporated within the new Consolidated Rental Car Facility and is not available for commercial development.

SPC00221-3**Comment:**

I know that I am solely one person, however I am one person taking a stand for not only myself but for others in my community. The handicapped and disabled persons issue came up only after doing the research required for the nightclub. I now leave you with two major issues to contemplate. First, how to incorporate safety precautions for the handicapped and disabled into your plan, and second, allowing me to lease a plot of land that has been vacant for quite some time. My objective is to turn it into a positive influence for the community and the LAX area as well.

I have taken the liberty of visiting the land, as well as have taken (show pictures) as you can see, the surrounding area is a place where an influx of revenue can have a positive influence on the area. Since the current night spots are the sports bars in hotels. with the nightclub in this central area there will be a diversion of revenue from the distant surrounding areas to the main area in which you are trying to redevelop.

The areas that will be influenced by the nightclub's location; 1) more employment, 2) parking structures, 3) eateries, 4) the hotels in the area, 5) airport travelers, and 6) the surrounding business and residential communities.

Now I am not going to tell you that everything is going to be completely positive, because this is not Utopia. The downside to all this is going to be a security issue for both the Airport and the nightclub, however that can be minimized, with the right Security firm that coincides with the Security implemented in the surrounding parking structures and the Airport, that downside can become null and void.

I urge you, the counsel, to please consider this alternative in the redevelopment and reconstruct LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPC00221-1 above regarding access for disabled persons.

SPC00222 Porras, Carlos None Provided 10/25/2003

SPC00222-1**Comment:**

In L.A. County African American, Latinos and Asians are three times more likely to have a hazardous waste Treatment, Storage or Disposal facility within one mile of their homes than white population Schools with more than 50% people of color population are three times more likely to a facility reporting to the Federal Toxic Release Inventory within a mile of the school. Children attending schools with the highest risk to respiratory health problems (from poor air quality) score significantly lower achievement

People of color have historically been burdened with the negative impacts of development that benefits the broader society while forced to live in poverty People of color are now declaring this environmental racism unjust. We demand environmental justice Any project at LAX will have impact on the surrounding communities of color and we demand justice for these communities. Any Project that benefits the economy has to benefit the people impacted

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHE00031-1.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00223 Carpio, Sparky

None Provided

10/25/2003

SPC00223-1

Comment:

Skimming through the supplement to the draft EIS/EIR, and listening to different LAWA staff people (and elected officials) I have come to believe that they seem to be more concerned and careful of the infrastructure and economics of the buildings and money-making resources, than of the health, welfare and sanity of the surrounding communities. All I see in this plan is greed on all levels of government. Why don't people who are not elected officials get the compensation and quality of life they deserve?

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 14a and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-4 regarding human health mitigation strategies and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on the quality of life. 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.

SPC00223-2

Comment:

In 2001 SCAG had an item in its RTP about the Arbor Vitae interchange. Time and again elected officials had said that it had nothing to do with the airport or its expansion, and LAWA staff even went so far as to say that the interchange was for the Forum (which is now a church), Hollywood Park (which needed financial help from the city of Inglewood) and a Kmart that is no longer existent. So if the interchange is not for the airport why is it in the EIS/EIR?

Response:

This comment is similar to comment SPHE00032-2. Please see Response to Comment SPHE00032-2.

SPC00223-3

Comment:

There is a MOU between LAWA and Inglewood that is mentioned in the EIS/EIR, that its aviation easement requirements are currently suspended - the requirements to the aviation easements that the residents had/have to sign takes away their right to sue the airport.

In the past Inglewood's mayor had wrongly stated at a City Council meeting that the Easements had been eliminated while in fact they were merely suspended.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00223-4

Comment:

With Manchester Square as the GTC how will it improve security and safety? I guess if you want to keep the CTA safe Manchester Square helps, but how is putting all the people closer to the residents of Westchester going to keep the passengers and residents safe? If someone really wanted to do something to improve safety and security they would do the best thing and regionalize.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

SPC00224 Logan, Styles

None Provided

10/25/2003

SPC00224-1

Comment:

QUALITY OF LIFE COMMENTS:

- Pollution - both noise and aerosols components will increase dramatically, because airline traffic will expand to the level required by the planned MAP goal.

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-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels at LAX.

SPC00224-2

Comment:

- Included in the plan, should be a proposal to provide funds to complete the existing soundproofing contracts and identify the remaining homes that are affected, based on 55 DNL noise levels and above.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment SPHE00034-2. Please see Response to Comment SPHE00034-2.

SPC00224-3

Comment:

- The infrastructure- Century Blvd. from the 110 freeway to La Cienega and other heavily traveled streets to and from the airport should be resurfaced regularly with funding support from LAWA to eliminate pot holes and other irregularities.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment SPHE00034-3. Please see Response to Comment SPHE00034-3.

SPC00224-4

Comment:

- Homeowners residing in the flight path of Los Angeles International Airport are significantly impacted by airplane noise, making it difficult to plan and enjoy activities in the backyard or leave doors and windows opened for ventilation. The constant drone of airplanes taking off or landing does not permit normal phone conversation without interruptions or the enjoyment of a television program without exceeding the 60 decibels dBA level, which have been determined to be a normal level for conversation.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the ANMP and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. See Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft 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. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, in particular, Subtopical Response TR-N-2.2 regarding reducing the noise standard to 60 CNEL

SPC00224-5

Comment:

- Environmental issues, health issues and soundproofing for residents living in the flight path and around LAX must be mitigated prior to approval of any plans to expand.

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment SPHE00034-5; please refer to Response to Comment SPHE00034-5.

SPC00224-6

Comment:

ENVIRONMENTAL

- The environmental impact, particularly air pollution and noise will be substantial increased during the physical construction as well as when the expansion is complete.

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; and construction-related impacts in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts. 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. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

SPC00224-7

Comment:

HEALTH ISSUES:

- Studies dating back to 1977 reports that continued exposure to loud noise is a health hazard to individuals living near or around flight corridors.

- Airplane noises are linked to:
Stress
Hypertension
Sleep deprivation and interruptions
work-related performance
learning and academic performance

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise. In addition, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings and school disruption associated with the No Action/No Project

3. Comments and Responses

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.

SPC00224-8

Comment:

The residents of the 8th District would like to go on record opposing any expansion until the environmental, health and economic issues are mitigated to assure that our quality of life will not be further compromised.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments above.

SPC00225 Kim, Susan None Provided 10/20/2003

SPC00225-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS SUSAN Kim AND I REPRESENT KOREAN WELFARE ORGANIZATION I have come here today to support of Alternative D of the LAX MASTER plan.

I believe that Mayor Hanh's proposal is a balanced plan because it allows for some growth while taking into consideration the impacts to the surrounding communities plus this project will create some what 50,000 construction related jobs for the people of Los Angeles

The plan will improve operations and create a greater level of customer service by improving the passenger experience for travelers

I myself believe it is time to modernize LAX and I believe Alternative D is steps in the right direction

Alternative D isn't for Mayor Hahn. It's for the City of Los Angeles.

Thank you

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00226 Burcher, Julie S.E.I.U., Local 347 10/25/2003

SPC00226-1

Comment:

On behalf of the Service employees International Union - AFL-CIO (SEIU) Local 347, I would like to express our strong support for Alternative D of the LAX Master Plan.

SEIU Local 347 represents over 700 employees that work at LAX and thousands that live in the surrounding communities. The employees we represent are directly impacted by what happens at LAX. We feel that your efforts to modernize LAX are a step in the right direction. Alternative D is a balanced approach to maintaining LAX as an economic engine for our regional economy while considering the environmental and traffic impacts to the surrounding communities.

Your Safety and Security Alternative addresses many security concerns at LAX and allows the flexibility to accommodate evolving federal security requirements and technology. SEIU Local 347 has a great interest in providing a safe and secure work environment for its members at the airport and in the surrounding areas.

3. Comments and Responses

SEIU Local 347 feels strongly that the modernization of the airport is long overdue and necessary. The improvements that alternative D proposes will provide for improved operations and increased efficiencies that will benefit passengers and concessions at LAX. Maintaining LAX as an international gateway to the country will maintain hundreds of thousands of jobs directly related to LAX. We recognize the importance of preserving LAX as a premiere airport in the world.

We appreciate your leadership and continuous efforts to modernize LAX. We look forward to working closely with you throughout the master plan process.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00227 Alpern, Ken Friends of the Green Line 10/20/2003

SPC00227-1

Comment:

SPECIFIC GOALS FOR LAX RECONFIGURATION PLANS - GREEN LINE CONNECTIONS

Friends of the Green Line has concluded as its realistic goals to ask the City of Los Angeles and LA World Airports to NOT PREVENT LAX RAIL ACCESS FROM THE NORTH AND/OR TO PREVENT THE GREEN LINE FROM PROCEEDING NORTH BEYOND LAX:

Where Friends of the Green Line now stands with respect to the Green Line and LAWA Traffic Mitigation as part of its final EIR is that non-automobile-related traffic measures should include:

1) A written promise for LAWA to fund the necessary trench west of Aviation Blvd. along the MTA Harbor Subdivision ROW to allow the Green Line to proceed north from the current Aviation/Imperial Green Line station without interfering with LAX radar beacons and/or other electromagnetic operations associated with LAX

2) A written promise for LAWA to fund and construct its final Ground Transportation Center (whether it is at Manchester Square or anywhere else) in a manner that allows for a future Green Line station.

LAX-bound passengers from the north should not overshoot LAX to reach the future Intermodal Transit Center at Aviation/Imperial in order to connect with the Central Terminal Area via the LAX People Mover

3) A written promise for LAWA to fund and staff any future preliminary engineering for a Green Line that connects to Westchester and the Westside in a manner that does not preclude the Green Line from reaching these destinations, and in a manner that complements, not competes with, the future LAX People Mover

Response:

It is impractical to connect the Green Line directly to the CTA, as discussed in Response to Comment SPHO00004-6. Also, please see Response to Comment SPHL00022-2 regarding the most feasible alignment of the Green Line.

Any decision to extend the Green Line would be made by the LAC-MTA. Alternative D does not preclude the MTA from extending the Green Line northerly if they choose to do so. The MTA right-of-way along the west side of Aviation Boulevard will be preserved for this potential future transit project. However, the MTA has no current plans for extending the Green Line, and LAWA and the FAA have no authority to force them to do so. Since the MTA is not pursuing an extension of the Green Line at this time, it is premature for LAWA to agree to fund the construction of a trench along Aviation Boulevard or the preparation of preliminary engineering plans. Furthermore, federal law would likely restrict LAWA from using airport revenues in this regard.

LAWA has had several discussions with MTA staff regarding their plans for transit in the LAX vicinity. MTA staff will be invited to participate in the advanced planning of the Ground Transportation Center.

SPC00228 Waters, Maxine U.S. House of Representatives 10/22/2003

SPC00228-1

Comment:

Alternative D is a \$9 billion project that would demolish homes and disturb communities without improving the safety and security of LAX. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is an inaccurate and misleading document that fails to reflect the true impact of this project.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00228-2 through SPC00228-7 below.

SPC00228-2

Comment:

The centerpiece of Alternative D is the Ground Transportation Center (GTC), a large remote passenger check-in facility that would be constructed at Manchester Square, several blocks away from the airport terminals. An Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) would be constructed at Aviation Blvd. and Imperial Highway, which would provide a connection to the Green Line. According to the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the GTC and the ITC would be the primary access points for all passenger drop-off and pick-up and vehicle parking. A Consolidated Rental Car (RAC) facility would be constructed in Westchester.

Inconvenience for Passengers

Local families could no longer drive to the Central Terminal Area in order to drop off passengers. Instead, an Automated People Mover would be constructed to transport people to the airport terminals, and a baggage tunnel would be constructed to transport baggage. All airport employees and passengers would access the Central Terminal Area from the GTC, the ITC and the RAC via the Automated People Mover, carrying their carry-on baggage with them. This would be extremely inconvenient for most passengers, and it would present special hardships for the elderly, the handicapped and families traveling with small children.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPHGH00003-2 regarding the elderly and handicapped.

SPC00228-3

Comment:

Airport Security

Supporters of the proposed project to construct a remote passenger check-in facility claim that the facility is necessary to improve the safety and security of LAX and prevent terrorist attacks at LAX. Theoretically, diverting all vehicular traffic to remote parking structures and the remote passenger check-in facility would protect the Central Terminal Area from car bombs.

The RAND Corporation conducted a security study of the proposed remote passenger check-in facility, which was released on May 14, 2003. The study concluded that the proposed project would not significantly improve the security of LAX. The study also concluded that concentrating passengers in the proposed remote passenger check-in facility could increase the likelihood that the check-in facility would be the target of a terrorist attack. Finally, the study concluded that concentrating several airport functions in the remote passenger check-in facility could exacerbate the effects of an attack on airport operations.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00228-4

Comment:

On July 25, 2003, I introduced H.R. 2985, a bill to condition construction of a remote passenger check-in facility at LAX upon a finding that such a facility will promote the safety and security of the public. H.R. 2985 would require the Secretary of Homeland Security to review the proposed facility prior to its construction to determine whether it will protect the safety and security of air passengers and the general public more effectively than the existing facilities at LAX. If the Secretary of Homeland Security does not determine that the facility will improve public safety and security, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) would not be allowed to approve its construction. On September 2, the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County passed a motion to support my legislation.

Ironically, Alternative D does not even significantly improve security at the Central Terminal Area. According to the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D calls for the installation of new baggage screening facilities in the Central Terminal Area - not the remote passenger check-in facility. If Alternative D were designed to protect the Central Terminal Area from terrorist attacks, one would think that the baggage would be fully screened before it is transported through the baggage tunnel to this area. Nine billion dollars is an extremely high price to pay for a security project that provides protection from car bombs but not from suitcase bombs.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment SPC00169-4; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00169-4.

SPC00228-5

Comment:

Displacement of Residents

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR makes the astounding claim that Alternative D would not displace any residents. Instead, the Supplement predicts that 2,500 houses and apartments will be acquired and the residents relocated under LAWA's existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program, through which LAWA may acquire property and relocate residents on a voluntary basis in order to mitigate the impact of airport noise. The Supplement then concludes that Alternative D would not require the acquisition of any additional dwelling units or the relocation of any additional residents. This claim is especially ironic, given the fact that several Manchester Square residents have already said that they' will not leave their homes voluntarily.

In reality, Alternative D would displace thousands of Manchester Square residents. In order to construct the remote passenger check-in facility, the City of Los Angeles would have to acquire and demolish 38 houses, 179 apartment buildings and a 52-year-old elementary school, in addition to the 263 structures it has already acquired. It would also have to relocate about 6,200 people, some of whom have federally subsidized housing vouchers. I strongly oppose the forced relocation of any of these residents.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00169-5.

SPC00228-6

Comment:

The Cost of Alternative D

3. Comments and Responses

Alternative D would cost \$9 billion, an exorbitant amount of money, at a time when budget deficits are growing and the economy is weak. Airlines would be required to increase their passenger fees in order to fund the proposal, which would amount to a tax increase for air passengers. American taxpayers have already provided loan guarantees to the airline industry to keep the airlines in business following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. They should not have to pay higher passenger fees for unnecessary airport construction projects as well.

Air passengers and other taxpayers are willing to support reasonable expenditures to pay for measures that provide real enhancements in security, such as the installation of baggage screening facilities. However, the remote passenger check-in facility, the Automated People Mover and the baggage tunnel included in Alternative D are not reasonable expenditures and do not provide real enhancements in security.

The American people are sick and tired of deficits and bloated government spending. The State of California is now running a \$38 billion deficit, and the federal government has a \$374 billion deficit in 2003. Furthermore, Congress is in the process of providing the President an additional \$87 billion for continuing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The American people cannot afford to spend \$9 billion on an outrageously expensive boondoggle at LAX.

Response:

This content of this comment is identical to comment SPC00169-6; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00169-6.

SPC00228-7

Comment:

Conclusion

Alternative D is simply a continuation of former Mayor Richard Riordan's plan to expand the airport in the name of safety and security. I urge the City Council of the City of Los Angeles to reject this ill-advised and expensive scheme that will displace thousands of Manchester Square residents without improving the safety and security of LAX.

Response:

The content of this comment is the same as that of Comment SPC00169-7; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00169-7.

SPC00229 Waters, Maxine U.S. House of Representatives 10/25/2003

SPC00229-1

Comment:

Alternative D is a \$9 billion project that would demolish homes and disturb communities without improving the safety and security of LAX. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is an inaccurate and misleading document that fails to reflect the true impact of this project.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00229-2 through SPC00229-10 below.

SPC00229-2

Comment:

The centerpiece of Alternative D is the Ground Transportation Center (GTC), a large remote passenger check-in facility that would be constructed at Manchester Square, several blocks away from the airport terminals. An Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) would be constructed at Aviation Blvd. and Imperial Highway, which would provide a connection to the Green Line. According to the Supplement to

3. Comments and Responses

the Draft EIS/EIR, the GTC and the ITC would be the primary access points for all passenger drop-off and pick-up and vehicle parking. A Consolidated Rental Car (RAC) facility would be constructed in Westchester.

Inconvenience for Passengers

Local families could no longer drive to the Central Terminal Area in order to drop off passengers. Instead, an Automated People Mover would be constructed to transport people to the airport terminals, and a baggage tunnel would be constructed to transport baggage. All airport employees and passengers would access the Central Terminal Area from the GTC, the ITC and the RAC via the Automated People Mover, carrying their carry-on baggage with them. This would be extremely inconvenient for most passengers, and it would present special hardships for the elderly, the handicapped and families traveling with small children.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPHGH00003-2 regarding the elderly and handicapped.

SPC00229-3

Comment:

Airport Security

Supporters of the proposed project to construct a remote passenger check-in facility claim that the facility is necessary to improve the safety and security of LAX and prevent terrorist attacks at LAX. Theoretically, diverting all vehicular traffic to remote parking structures and the remote passenger check-in facility would protect the Central Terminal Area from car bombs.

The RAND Corporation conducted a security study of the proposed remote passenger check-in facility, which was released on May 14, 2003. The study concluded that the proposed project would not significantly improve the security of LAX. The study also concluded that concentrating passengers in the proposed remote passenger check-in facility could increase the likelihood that the check-in facility would be the target of a terrorist attack. Finally, the study concluded that concentrating several airport functions in the remote passenger check-in facility could exacerbate the effects of an attack on airport operations.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment SPC00228-3; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00228-3.

SPC00229-4

Comment:

On July 25, 2003, I introduced H.R. 2985, a bill to condition construction of a remote passenger check-in facility at LAX upon a finding that such a facility will promote the safety and security of the public. H.R. 2985 would require the Secretary of Homeland Security to review the proposed facility prior to its construction to determine whether it will protect the safety and security of air passengers and the general public more effectively than the existing facilities at LAX. If the Secretary of Homeland Security does not determine that the facility will improve public safety and security, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) would not be allowed to approve its construction. On September 2, the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County passed a motion to support my legislation.

Ironically, Alternative D does not even significantly improve security at the Central Terminal Area. According to the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D calls for the installation of new baggage screening facilities in the Central Terminal Area - not the remote passenger check-in facility. If Alternative D were designed to protect the Central Terminal Area from terrorist attacks one would think that the baggage would be fully screened before it is transported through the baggage tunnel to this area. Nine billion dollars is an extremely high price to pay for a security project that provides protection from car bombs but not from suitcase bombs.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment SPC00169-4; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00169-4.

SPC00229-5

Comment:

Displacement of Residents

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR makes the astounding claim that Alternative D would not displace any residents. Instead, the Supplement predicts that 2,500 houses and apartments will be acquired and the residents relocated under LAWA's existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program, through which LAWA may acquire property and relocate residents on a voluntary basis in order to mitigate the impact of airport noise. The Supplement then concludes that Alternative D would not require the acquisition of any additional dwelling units or the relocation of any additional residents. This claim is especially ironic, given the fact that several Manchester Square residents have already said that they will not leave their homes voluntarily.

In reality, Alternative D would displace thousands of Manchester Square residents. In order to construct the remote passenger check-in facility, the City of Los Angeles would have to acquire and demolish 38 houses, 179 apartment buildings and a 52-year-old elementary school, in addition to the 263 structures it has already acquired. It would also have to relocate about 6,200 people, some of whom have federally subsidized housing vouchers. I strongly oppose the forced relocation of any of these residents.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00169-5.

SPC00229-6

Comment:

Noise and Traffic Congestion

For several years, I have been working to limit the environmental impact of Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) on the surrounding community. My constituents living next door to LAX, in Westchester, Inglewood, Hawthorne, Gardena and South Central Los Angeles, must contend with excessive noise, pollution and traffic congestion caused by the airport. These residents suffer many sleepless nights due to deafening jet noise. They must wipe the soot from aircraft emissions from their cars and driveways everyday. Residents have reported increased cases of asthma, respiratory ailments and hearing problems.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00229-7

Comment:

I do not accept the claim in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR that Alternative D would reduce by 1,300 the number of residents exposed to noise levels of over 65 CNEL by the year 2015. Most airport noise is the result of airplane landings and departures, and Alternative D does not propose any reduction in landings and departures. In fact, Alternative D would increase the airport's capacity from 78 million air passengers per year to 78.9 million air passengers per year. Consequently, Alternative D could allow the number of landings and departures and the corresponding jet noise to increase. Of course, Alternative D could reduce the number of residents exposed to high levels of airport noise as a result of the forced relocation of residents from Manchester Square. However, forcing residents to leave their homes is no way to respond to their complaints about noise.

Response:

Comment noted. The commenter appears to be referencing Table S4.1-24 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, which indicates a reduction of 1,350 residents exposed to 65 CNEL and greater noise levels compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. As stated on page 4-64, in Section 4.1, Noise of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, there is very little difference between aircraft noise exposure under Alternative D and the No Action/No Project Alternative. While there would be an increase in the off-airport area exposed to high noise levels under Alternative D compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative, the differences in the pattern of the noise contour due to runway changes results in fewer residents exposed to high noise levels.

Regarding passenger activity levels, Alternative D is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level of 78.9 million annual passengers (MAP), which is comparable to the 78.7 MAP projected to occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. As such, Alternative D is not considered to represent an expansion of LAX. The other build alternatives (Alternatives A, B, and C) are designed to serve a future activity level substantially more than that of the No Action/No Project Alternative and therefore represent an expansion of LAX. See also Topical Responses TR-GEN-3 regarding projected activity levels and TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG RTP.

Regarding Manchester Square relocation program, as further described in Topical Response TR-MP-3, this is a voluntary program that is currently being implemented by LAWA and is independent of the LAX Master Plan. The reduction in residents who would be exposed to high noise levels due to this existing acquisition program are accounted for under the No Action/No Project Alternative and the build alternatives. Regarding the statement about forced relocation of residents from Manchester Square and that it is no way to respond to noise complaints, note that this is a voluntary relocation program that was implemented by LAWA due to requests of property owners and a high level of interest within the community to be relocated rather than receive soundproofing.

SPC00229-8

Comment:

The claim in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR that Alternative D would reduce traffic congestion is also not credible. Alternative D would concentrate airport traffic on the east side of the airport near the proposed remote passenger check-in facility, causing a shift in airport traffic to the I-405 freeway near the Arbor Vitae/Manchester Avenue exits. This could cause a tremendous increase in traffic congestion on I-405, which is already heavily congested. It could also increase traffic congestion in the surrounding communities as airport passengers and other drivers seek alternative routes to get to, from and around the airport. Concentrating airport traffic at a single facility will not reduce congestion.

Response:

The traffic model shows that after the Central Terminal Area is closed to private vehicles, there is more capacity on Sepulveda Boulevard and, to a lesser extent, Aviation Boulevard. As airport traffic shifts easterly, some of the non-airport traffic on the I-405 Freeway shifts to those arterial streets. That is, the capacity of Sepulveda Boulevard and the I-405 Freeway would balance itself, regardless of whether the traffic is related to the airport.

Also, the streets adjacent to the Ground Transportation Center are proposed to be widened for traffic movement on the city street network. These streets include Arbor Vitae Street, La Cienega Boulevard, Aviation Boulevard and Century Boulevard. In addition, many intersectional improvements are planned to facilitate traffic flow.

Airport traffic is not being concentrated at a single facility. The Ground Transportation Center is expected to accommodate about 60 percent of the inbound trips to the airport, with the Intermodal Transportation Center, Rental Car Facility, and existing Central Terminal Area accommodating the remainder of the inbound airport trips.

SPC00229-9

Comment:

The Cost-of Alternative D

Alternative D would cost \$9 billion, an exorbitant amount of money, at a time when budget deficits are growing and the economy is weak. Airlines would be required to increase their passenger fees in order to fund the proposal, which would amount to a tax increase for air passengers. American taxpayers have already provided loan guarantees to the airline industry to keep the airlines in business following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. They should not have to pay higher passenger fees for unnecessary airport construction projects as well.

Air passengers and other taxpayers are willing to support reasonable expenditures to pay for measures that provide real enhancements in security, such as the installation of baggage screening facilities. However, the remote passenger check-in facility, the Automated People Mover and the baggage tunnel included in Alternative D are not reasonable expenditures and do not provide real enhancements in security.

The American people are sick and tired of deficits and bloated government spending. The State of California is now running a \$38 billion deficit, and the federal government has a \$374 billion deficit in 2003. Furthermore, Congress is in the process of providing the President an additional \$87 billion for continuing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The American people cannot afford to spend \$9 billion on an outrageously expensive boondoggle at LAX

Response:

This content of this comment is identical to comment SPC00169-6; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00169-6.

SPC00229-10

Comment:

Conclusion

Alternative D is simply a continuation of former Mayor Richard Riordan's plan to expand the airport in the name of safety and security. I urge the City Council of the City of Los Angeles to reject this ill-advised and expensive scheme that will displace thousands of Manchester Square residents without improving the safety and security of LAX.

Response:

The content of this comment is the same as that of Comment SPC00169-7; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00169-7.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00230

Glennon, Ruth

None Provided

10/25/2003

SPC00230-1

Comment:

The past two weeks have been among the worst in our lives. The cause? The constant and unrelenting noise from LAX that has gone on late into the night and started up early in the morning. We live one mile north of the airport, have insulation and double paned windows. The week-end of the 10th was a week-end from hell and we averaged four and a half hours of sleep on Friday, Saturday and Sunday. Mayor Hahn, you wouldn't want to live like this and neither should the people in Westchester/Playa del Rey. We deserve something better

Response:

Comment noted. Please see TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-N-3, regarding aircraft flight procedures, Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

SPC00230-2

Comment:

The plan D you're proposing will only make things worse. This "modernization" which would also allow for 12+ million more passengers, sounds like an expansion to us. You can pour 9 billion or 90 billion into LAX and, in the long run, it will still be a second class, tiny airport which is over-crowded and obsolete for today's needs. LAX should have been used as a secondary air port two decades ago, but no one has had the foresight to realize it or take the necessary steps.

Every other major city in this country and Europe has recognized the need to build a new airport outside the inner city and has done so. Los Angeles is the only one lagging behind in all forms of transportation, but especially air. We have lived in Los Angeles for over 50 years and heard Palmdale, Palmdale, Palmdale from day one. Yet no one has had the boldness and vision to build a state-of-the art International airport there where there is plenty of acreage for future expansion. There would be room for nice hotels and restaurants also. Of course, there has to be ground transportation to accompany an airport, but there are many choices there as well. There are thousands of people in the Valley and inland areas that would be delighted not to have to come to LAX. It will take someone with vision to do this and that person could be you.

Where would our city be if the movers and shakers of the past had listened to the "naysayers"? We'd still be a small town. The recent and wonderful additions to our down-town, especially the spectacular Concert Hall, will undoubtedly attract thousands of visitors if Frank Gehry's museum in Bilbao, Spain is any indication. The Staples center and new Cathedral are also major attractions.

Where will these people land? Will it be in some dinky, obsolete air-port or a modern terminal where they can be quickly and comfortably transported to down-town (think Union Station).

This is your chance, Mayor Hahn, to step into a new age, a new millennium, and plan for the future. All too often, your predecessors have looked to the past and applied the "band-aid" approach to solve the problems of Los Angeles. This could be your chance to make our city BETTER, not just bigger. It would then become the great city it was intended to be.

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

3. Comments and Responses

idle. Dallas/Ft. Worth is only 10 miles from downtown. 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 transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The 12 million additional passengers would be able to be accommodated at LAX with or without Alternative D under the No Action/No Project Alternative; therefore, Alternative D proposes to accommodate them at an acceptable level of service while enhancing safety and security at the airport.

SPC00231 Collins, Jimmie None Provided 10/27/2003

SPC00231-1

Comment:

My home is situated along the aircraft landing approach to LAX. Therefore, I am requesting that my home and those in my surrounding neighborhood be retrofitted with sound-proof windows and air-conditioning as part of the airport noise abatement program.

As a member of the Manhattan Place Block Club Organization, I am also requesting an immediate response to these concerns on behalf of those I represent.

Response:

Comment noted. FAA and LAWA are working to address noise complaints from LAX operations. As shown on Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR the commentor's property and generally those above the 10400 Manhattan Place block are located outside the boundary of residential properties eligible for soundproofing. The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP and monitoring methods used to validate the current 65 CNEL contour are described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4. The 65 CNEL is the applicable standard for high noise levels as defined by FAR Part 150 and Title 21 (see Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4) of the Draft EIS/EIR). Priority for sound insulation is given to residential properties within the highest noise level band above the 65 CNEL contour. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts.

See Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the ANMP, in particular Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 regarding how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. See Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding the difference between single event and CNEL noise levels.

SPC00232 Morrison, Nancee None Provided 10/31/2003

SPC00232-1

Comment:

Why is Los Angeles the only major city that is serviced by one airport? LAX can only be improved/modernized to a certain extent. Rather than putting a bandaide fix on this problem, wouldn't it be better to be looking at a regional solution that would distribute passengers throughout Southern California?

Trying to expand LAX is like trying to put a spare peg in a round hole. The area around the airport will NOT support the growth proposed, yet the city is willing to pull out all the stops to make this work. Why not put that energy into development of Palmdale and Ontario where the projected growth is? These areas would welcome the business it would bring to their communities. It doesn't look like the desire or will is there to find a truly workable solution to the problem.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The jurisdictions that operate the John Wayne, Long Beach, and Burbank airports, as well as LAWA's Ontario International, will be surprised to learn that they do not serve the population of the Los Angeles basin. Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. LAWA is currently preparing Master Plan updates for both Ontario and Palmdale, in order for them to play their part in addressing the anticipated regional demand. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX. Please see Topical Responses TR-RC-1 and TR-RC-5 for more detail on the relationship between LAWA's planning for its three commercial service airports and the plans of other airport jurisdictions in the region.

SPC00233 Toedter, Seth None Provided 10/17/2003

SPC00233-1

Comment:

Nothing about the plan that has been presented to the public sounds like it is very secure. It sounds like the airport, the airplanes and buildings are more important than the passengers are.

It sounds like the city (the mayor) just wants to get anything done and get this airport issue behind him. This alternative D plan doesn't seem like it will actually do anything to make traveling in and out of Los Angeles more safe. I don't like the idea of having to go all the way to the other side of the airport from where I live to catch a flight.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00234 Wiltz, Pamela None Provided 10/12/2003

SPC00234-1

Comment:

As a resident of a neighborhood near LAX, I'm quite concerned about the transportation issues involved in Alternative D of the Master Plan.

In all of the meetings I've attended, I still haven't heard specifics addressing traffic mitigation. There do not seem to be hard and fast answers about how the mitigation measures offered to our community will be funded.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addresses the traffic mitigation plan in Table S4.3.2-11 and S4.3.2.12 of Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation.

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding project funding.

SPC00234-2

Comment:

Traffic on the 405 freeway around LAX is always congested, but there are several offramps to choose from. Frequent travelers know that they have several alternate routes. From what I've observed, Alternative D would funnel all airport traffic through one offramp. The plan claims that this would

3. Comments and Responses

increase freeway speeds and reduce traffic. Although I'm not an engineer, I can't imagine that taking traffic from 3 exits and squeezing it into ONE exit will do anything to relieve airport traffic from the 405.

Response:

Alternative D proposes a new interchange on the I-405 Freeway at Lennox Boulevard. This interchange would allow both northbound and southbound traffic on the I-405 to exit the freeway and enter the airport roadways leading directly to the GTC and ITC. Unlike the existing freeway exits, there would be no traffic signals on the proposed off-ramps to interfere with the flow of traffic heading to the airport. Since the proposed off-ramps have the advantage of leading directly to the proposed airport facilities, most of the airport traffic on the I-405 Freeway is expected to use the new interchange. Other off-ramps on the I-405 Freeway, such as those at Century Boulevard and Imperial Highway, will remain open.

The traffic model reveals that some non-airport related traffic shifts from using the I-405 Freeway to parallel arterial streets such as Aviation Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard, freeing up capacity for airport-related traffic to remain on the freeway.

SPC00234-3

Comment:

I would like to know what type of traffic studies have indicated that Alternative D will do anything to alleviate the already congested traffic situation.

Response:

Chapter 4.3.2, "Off Airport Surface Transportation," in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR summarizes the results of the traffic study as well as the mitigations proposed under Alternative D. In general, Alternative D proposes the construction of an on-airport roadway system to the GTC and ITC, direct connections from the I-105 and I-405 Freeways to these roadways, street widening on La Cienega Boulevard, Century Boulevard, Aviation Boulevard, Arbor Vitae Street, and 111th Street, and physical improvements to over off-airport 30 intersections. Under the No Action/No Project Alternative, off-airport traffic will also increase, but few, if any, of these improvements would be constructed to help with the increased traffic congestion.

SPC00235 Thoeming, Norm None Provided 10/20/2003

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter SPC00175; please refer to the responses to comment letter SPC00175.

SPC00236 McTaggart, John LAX Community Noise Roundtable 10/28/2003

SPC00236-1

Comment:

The LAX Community Noise Roundtable Draft EIR / EIS Comments

The LAX Community Noise Roundtable was created in September 2000. It is composed of elected officials or their designees from Rancho Palos Verdes, Palos Verdes Estates, Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, Manhattan Beach, El Segundo, Culver City, Monterey Park, Los Angeles (Districts 11 and 8), Inglewood, Hawthorne, Los Angeles County, the FAA, the ATA, Los Angeles International Airport Area Advisory Committee and representatives from area groups.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00236-2

Comment:

1. The dates used do not satisfy the baseline for comparison to be as of the time that the Supplemental to the Draft EIS/EIR was submitted. The baselines were outdated at the time they completed the Supplemental to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Response:

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

SPC00236-3

Comment:

2. 4.1.6.1.5 states, "the increase of the size of aircraft would result in louder individual noise events and consequently greater total noise energy levels and slightly increased contour size". This is against our stated policy of shifting noise from one community to another.

Response:

The complete citation in Section 4.1.6.1.5, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR that describes noise effects under Alternative D stated:

"The small increase in the number of average daily operations would cause almost no change in the noise exposure pattern by itself, but the increase of the size of the aircraft would result in louder individual noise events, and consequently greater total noise energy levels and slightly increased contour size. The change of utilization and the different fleet mixes do not appear to be extensive enough to have substantial effects on the size or shape of the noise contour pattern shown in Figure S4.2-17, Alternative D vs. No Action/No Project Alternative Areas Newly Exposed . . ."

Therefore under Alternative D, the shift in the noise contour would be similar to what would occur without approval of the project as represented under the No Action/No Project Alternative. See also Subtopical Response TR-N-6.3 regarding the relationship between aircraft size and noise levels.

Regarding shifting noise from one community to another, while it is true that the Alternative D would result in minor shifts in the noise contours with some areas being newly exposed to high noise levels, noise impacts would affect the same communities that have historically been exposed to high noise levels from LAX operations. LAWA Staff's preferred Alternative D has been designed to limit airfield improvements and aviation activity levels. Therefore, Alternative D would result in the least amount of noise-sensitive uses that would be newly exposed to high noise levels and would result in a decrease in the overall area exposed to high noise levels compared to 1996 baseline, Year 2000, and the No Action/No Project Alternative.

SPC00236-4

Comment:

3. 4.1.6.1.5.3 - Page 4-65. This is against our stated policy of shifting noise from one community to another. S4.1-27 indicates a 2000 increase in population newly exposed to 65 CNEL or greater; an increase of 150 dwellings added within the 65CNEL; and 4 schools, 2 churches and 3 hospitals are newly added. Where are the precise mitigation measures for these increases?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00236-3 regarding shifts in the noise contours that would occur under Alternative D compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. While there would be some areas newly exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels, as indicated on Table S4.1-27 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the shift in the noise contours associated with Alternative D would result in the removal of 3,350 persons, 810 dwelling units, and 10 noise-sensitive uses from the areas exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative.

Regarding mitigation for noise-sensitive uses newly exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels under Alternative D compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative, these areas are shown on Figure S4.2-17 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As further described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14, those noise-sensitive parcels that are not subject to an existing aviation easement and that are not located within the ANMP boundaries, would be eligible for sound insulation or relocation under a revised ANMP as described in mitigation measure MM-LU-1. Further mitigation is provided under mitigation measures MM-LU-3 and MM-LU-4 in the form of study of aircraft noise levels that result in classroom disruption and sound insulation for schools determined by the study or interim noise measurements to be significantly impacted. See Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP.

SPC00236-5

Comment:

4. The LAX Noise Roundtable does not support any flight track alteration or airfield alteration that shifts noise from one community to another. The FAA has also stated that to be their policy.

The moving and/or extending of runways 24L, 24R, and 25L results in the shifting of the noise contours and/or the shifting of noise from one community to another. Moving a runway changing the take off and landing of an aircraft flight path causes a significant shifting of noise. Why does the document indicate that there is not a significant change? What metric is used to determine 'significant'?

Response:

While it is true that Alternative D would result in shifts in the noise contours and some areas being newly exposed to high noise levels, noise impacts would affect the same communities that have historically been exposed to high noise levels from LAX operations. As further described in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.6.1.5) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the shift in the noise contour under Alternative D would be similar to what would occur without approval of the project, as represented under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please also see Response to Comment SPC00236-3 regarding shift in the noise contour that would occur under Alternative D. As analyzed 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, although the shift of the noise contour under Alternative D would result in some noise-sensitive uses being newly exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels, other noise-sensitive uses would be removed from areas exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels.

While noise contours would be shifted under Alternative D, runway modifications would be limited to those necessary to reduce the risk of runway incursions, which is also consistent with FAA policy and safety goals. Regarding FAA policy, an approval of any of the Master Plan alternatives would involve policy decisions that would be made in light of the environmental analysis presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Sections 4.1.6 and 4.2.6 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR did identify significant aircraft noise impacts that would occur under Alternative D. Thresholds, or metrics, used to determine significant aircraft noise impacts were stated in Sections 4.1.4.1 and 4.2.4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 for a summary of thresholds, impacts, and mitigation measures that were presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00236-6

Comment:

5. The development of the A-380 and other potential jumbo jets noise characteristics have not been analyzed or incorporated. Will this increase or decrease the single event noise and the CNEL Contours? The actual noise characteristics of these advanced aircraft should be used in your study. Why does the document not mention these characteristics? How do the larger jumbo's perform with tail winds below 2, 4,6, 8, and 10 knots?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

There is no data yet available relative to the anticipated noise characteristics of the New Large Aircraft (NLA), other than the requirement that to operate in the United States, it must meet the requirement of Federal Aviation Regulation, Part 36, which sets noise level limits for all commercial aircraft. All aircraft weighing more than 850,000 pounds, including the NLA and the 747-400 are subject to the same noise level requirements. For noise modeling purposes, the NLA is considered to be equivalent to the 747-400. Consequently, its effect in turns will be equivalent to that of the substitution aircraft. The airport is being developed using Airplane Design Group V standards while being able to accommodate the Airplane Design Group VI aircraft such as the Airbus A380. Please see FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13, Airport Design for FAA Airport Design Standards. Please see Figures V-J.51 through V-J.53 in the Draft LAX Master Plan, Chapter V, Appendix J, for taxiways able to accommodate Group VI standards. For additional information on the A380 please see Response to Comment AL00040-153 regarding A380 data. Following the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA developed a new alternative that is designed to accommodate passenger and cargo activity at LAX that would approximate those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, has fewer environmental impacts, and improves airport safety and security. Alternative D, the LAWA staff preferred alternative, would also have the ability to accommodate the Group VI aircraft. For the taxiways able to accommodate Group VI standards in Alternative D, please see Figure E-11 of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum Appendix E. Future aircraft operating conditions were addressed 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. Tailwind impacts on jumbo aircraft operations is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00236-7

Comment:

6. The World Health Organization (WHO) has upgraded noise pollution from a nuisance to a serious hazard. According to the WHO, "prolonged or excessive noise exposure has been linked to high blood pressure, heart disease, concentration problems and, of course, hearing loss. People who live in neighborhoods near highways and airports experience noise risks". Why were the affects of noise from health studies not presented in the document?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52, which indicates that various health studies that address the effects of noise are discussed and referenced in Technical Report 14b. In addition, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings and school disruption associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1.

SPC00236-8

Comment:

7. The threshold of significance for SEL single event noise used was 94 dba for exterior noise and 81 dba for interior noise for awakenings and is inadequate. The 94dBA and 81dBA is too high a threshold. We feel the SEL single event dba should more closely be associated with 'annoyance' and not just 'awakenings'. Why didn't the EIS/EIR deal with annoyance? Why were the reputable WHO statistics not evaluated in the guidelines?

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA has conducted its own evaluation of the anticipated effects of its proposed development actions on the single event noise levels in the environs of LAX to meet requirements set forth for CEQA evaluations by the California Court of Appeal. The California Court of Appeal did not mandate specific standards for the determination of the significance of those impacts, leaving the determination of precisely what types of impacts and the establishment of thresholds of significance to the project sponsor, based on the sponsor's own assessment of what is locally meaningful. Based on the anticipated expansion of cargo facilities and the forecast growth in nighttime operations under the various development alternatives, as well as public comments received during the review of the Draft EIS/EIR, the potential for the public to be awakened at night was selected for single event evaluation

and not annoyance as the commentor suggests. The term "annoyance" is related to land use compatibility and is addressed by the use of CNEL throughout the study findings, while the term "awakenings" is specifically related to the issue addressed by the single event awakenings threshold adopted by LAWA in response to court directives to Oakland. Please see Section 6.1.1, Threshold of Significance and Section 6.2.1, Threshold of Significance of Section S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a detailed explanation as to how the thresholds were determined. While the World Health Organization does provide noise related guidelines, FICAN and FICON guidelines were used since they are accepted by FAA. The 35 decibel interior Leq(h) standard from ANSI is similar to what WHO identified in its classroom disruption guidelines.

SPC00236-9

Comment:

8. Why in the NA/NP alternative is there an increase in nighttime noise?

Response:

The commentor is not clear where in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR the No Action/No Project Alternative he is referencing shows an increase in nighttime noise. Please see Section 6.1.2.2, Projected Future Conditions, of Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed nighttime noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00236-10

Comment:

9. We recommend that SEL single event noise be used to expand the areas for noise insulation. No one complains about a CNEL infraction. They call about single event noise. The Supplemental to the Draft EIS/EIR does not use as a mitigation measure a program to incorporate the single event criteria as a useful tool to a soundproofing program. Seeing as this is something that should have been included years ago it is only appropriate that LAX use this new legal tool to expand the area of dwellings in the soundproofing program. Why wasn't this issue addressed in the Supplemental to the Draft EIS/EIR? How many times a day are single event noise thresholds exceeded?

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR comprehensively addressed noise impacts associated with single event noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As described in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.2.1) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in response to the legal requirement to evaluate the effects of single event aircraft noise levels for CEQA purposes, a threshold of significance was developed based on nighttime awakening impacts. The 94 dBA SEL represents the noise level that would awaken 10 percent of the area population at least once in 10 days. As stated in Section 4.2.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, MM-LU-2 would expand the boundaries of the ANMP to include residential uses newly exposed to high single event nighttime noise levels that are outside the ANMP boundaries based on the Master Plan alternative that is ultimately approved. Actual adjustments to the ANMP contour would be based on periodic reevaluation of the 94 dBA SEL noise contour by LAWA that would result from actual operating conditions under the Master Plan alternative that is ultimately approved.

Regarding the number of times a day that single event noise thresholds are exceeded, these are not presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR since the 94 dBA SEL is based on an average frequency that would occur once in 10 days on average. Since the 94 dBA SEL that would occur under the build Alternative are modeled based on future conditions, the actual 94 dBA SEL would be reevaluated and adjusted by LAWA based on annual average conditions. This approach would be similar to evaluation of the 65 CNEL contour under the current ANMP and would therefore exclude any short-term 94 dBA noise levels that may have occurred as a result of abnormal operating conditions. Although the 94 dBA SEL is the single event noise threshold evaluated for nighttime events in the

3. Comments and Responses

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Tables S16, S17, S18, and S19 of Technical Report S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included an analysis of time in minutes above (TA) 65 dBA, 75 dBA, 85 dBA, and 95 dBA that would occur under the Master Plan Alternatives at a variety of locations based on average annual conditions. The CNEL considers every single event noise level to which a location in the airport environs is exposed and converts the result to a metric of convenience. See also Topical Response TR-N-2 for a discussion of single event and CNEL differences.

SPC00236-11

Comment:

10. The outcome of a WHO expert task force meeting in London in March 1999, includes guideline values for community noise:

Environment	Critical Health Effect	Sound Level dB (A)	Time hours
Outdoor Living Areas	Annoyance	50 - 55	16
Indoor Dwellings	Speech intelligibility	35	16
Bedrooms	Sleep disturbance	30	8
School Classrooms	Disturbance of communication	35	During class

Response:

Comment noted. While the World Health Organization does provide noise related guidelines, FICAN and FICON guidelines were used since they are accepted by FAA. The 35 decibel interior Leq(h) standard from ANSI is similar to what WHO identified in its classroom disruption guidelines. The WHO guidelines indicated in the chart were developed as goals to be sought, rather than as standards that should be achieved by any governmental body. Please see Section 4.1.2.1.1 Awakenings and 4.1.2.1.2 Classroom Disruption of Section 4.1 Noise, and Section 6. Single Event Noise Analysis of Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a better description of single event methodology.

SPC00236-12

Comment:

11. Percentages are very misleading when used in noise disturbance statistics. The actual numbers including percentages are needed for analysis. Facts, figures, noise levels, estimated values, decibels, and comparisons should have been provided. Why were the actual metrics not presented?

Response:

Comment noted. The intent of the sleep disturbance analysis was to state that 10 percent of the population being awakened no more than once every 10 days is statistically equivalent to not more than 1 percent of the population being awakened on an average night. Actual numbers associated with single event noise events are addressed in detail in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use and supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Although the Berkeley Jets ruling directed that the significance of single event noise effects be addressed in an EIR, there was no established basis for defining or assessing the significance of single event aircraft noise, and the Court of Appeal did not set forth any standards of significance in the evaluation of such events. Furthermore, although the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook generally discusses the relevance of single event noise to land use planning in the airport environs, it does not suggest thresholds of significance for application to these evaluations. As such, LAWA, as the lead CEQA agency for the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR, has developed thresholds of significance regarding single event noise effects, based on a comprehensive review of existing studies and research literature pertaining to the issue. It should be noted that the thresholds of significance developed by LAWA are intended solely for use in the CEQA evaluation of the LAX Master Plan, as addressed in this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. There is no federal threshold for single event levels. The intent of the sleep disturbance analysis was to state that 10 percent of the population being awakened no more than

once every 10 days is statistically equivalent to not more than 1 percent of the population being awakened on an average night. Actual numbers associated with single event noise events are addressed in detail in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use and supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Please see Section 4.1.2.1 Aircraft Noise Methodology of Section 4.1, Noise and Section 6.1.1, Threshold of Significance of Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for information regarding the threshold selection. Additionally, The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00236-13

Comment:

12. Will simultaneous landings of aircraft, on 24L, 24R, 25L, 25R runways, take place during the construction of the aforementioned runways? If so, what impact will that have on the CNEL and singles event noise?

13. What impact will simultaneous landings and/or takeoffs have on noise contours and single event noise?

14. Will simultaneous landings take place when all runways are completed?

15. What will be the noise impact of air traffic rerouting during runway reconstruction?

Response:

Simultaneous approaches to all four runways 24L, 24R, 25L and 24R will not occur during construction or after construction. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed CNEL and single-event noise impacts and related contours in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. During runway reconstruction, aircraft operations will shift to other runways and there is no anticipated change the air traffic routing. Please see Section 3.5 Temporary Aircraft Noise Patterns During Construction of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 3.1.5 Alternative D, Aircraft Noise Pattern During Reconstruction of Runway 7R/25L in Appendix S-C1, of the Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00236-14

Comment:

16. Easterly direction take offs are very disturbing to airport neighbors for awakenings and annoyance. It is apparent to the Roundtable that the awakenings of easterly takeoffs at night is far more disturbing than one out of ten instances that your report indicates. How were your figures determined?

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor misinterprets the nighttime single-event analysis. The Nighttime Awakenings Analysis is limited to the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. However, it is not limited to easterly departures only since LAX is only in over-ocean operations midnight to 6:30 a.m. Please see Section 6. Nighttime Awakenings Analysis of Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a more detailed description on selected thresholds and SEL noise contours. Please see Response to Comment SAL00015-127 regarding selection of the 94 dBA SEL for nighttime awakenings. Additionally, please see Section 6.1.2.2, Projected Future Conditions, of Appendix S-C1, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a description of projected nighttime easterly operations and Subtopical Response TR-N-5.2, regarding east flow operations at night.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00236-15

Comment:

17. Low frequency noise measurements are neglected in the Supplemental to the Draft EIS/EIR. Low frequency noise is a serious disturbance. Why aren't there any measurements and mitigation measures for low frequency noise included in this Supplemental to the Draft EIS/EIR? Please provide any information you have pertaining to this problem.

Response:

The noise analysis was done in complete compliance with appropriate FAA and scientific principles including FAA Order 1050.10 and Order 5050.4A. There are no state or federal requirements for low frequency measurements and mitigation, nor are there any standards in use to define the significance of low frequency noise in evaluations of land use compatibility. Consequently, low frequency noise was not addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The potential for berms and other barriers was addressed in the assessment of potential alternative mitigation actions. The analyses did not suggest that they would significantly abate noise on any residences except those in the immediate vicinity of their location. Please see Topical Response TR-N-4, regarding noise mitigation and in particular Subtopic Response TR-N-4.2, regarding berms, barriers, urban forest, walls proposed to interrupt ground noise and Subtopic Response TR-N-4.3, regarding additional mitigation measures.

SPC00236-16

Comment:

18. We recommend the suspension of all aviation easement requirements on all noise insulation programs. Why weren't the state requirements for avigational easements included in the noise insulation programs? Why hasn't LAWA included air conditioning units in all past and future noise insulation programs even though not funded by the Federal government?

Response:

The current status of LAWA's deliberations regarding possible suspension of all aviation easement requirements was presented in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, page 12 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Suspension of aviation easement requirements in exchange for funding of residential sound insulation is currently under study by LAWA as a condition of the 2001 Noise Variance for the jurisdictions of the City of Los Angeles, El Segundo, and Los Angeles County. As also described on pages 10 and 11 of the Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, under the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the City of Los Angeles and City of Inglewood, LAWA has suspended the requirement for an aviation easement for Inglewood residents receiving residential sound insulation under the ANMP as long as there is continued cooperation between the City of Los Angeles and Inglewood in studying, designing, and implementing mitigation measures that are mutually beneficial to Inglewood and LAWA. Lifting this requirement for other jurisdictions, or as a policy change, will be influenced by the result of the effort in Inglewood. As stated in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.8), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with approval of the LAX Master Plan, under mitigation measure MM-LU-1, suspension of the requirement for granting of aviation easements with sound insulation mitigation is being proposed for reevaluation by LAWA.

It is unclear from the commentor what State requirements for avigational easements are not included in the noise insulation programs, since LAWA requests that affected property owners execute aviation easements in exchange for soundproofing.

Residential units located to the east of the I-405 and within the ANMP boundaries receive air conditioning as part of sound insulation since the FAA considers areas east of the I-405 to be in a higher climate zone compared to areas west of the I-405. Extending this program west of the I-405 would not be necessary since this area is considered to be a coastal climate zone with an air temperature that is on average 10 degrees cooler than east of the I-405. Therefore an air ventilation system, rather than air conditioning, is considered adequate to maintain comfortable indoor temperatures.

SPC00236-17

Comment:

19. Why is there no noise information about the Beach communities and Palos Verdes Peninsula, even though they have had noise annoyance problems for some time? Why have they been omitted? Explain the failure to look at noise impacts at CNEL levels below 65 that might include Palos Verdes Peninsula and the beach communities? (For example 50, 55, 60 CNEL)

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts associated with Alternative D in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As more fully analyzed therein, potential impacts associated with Alternative D would not extend to the Palos Verdes Peninsula and the beach communities. See Response to Comment PC00611-2 regarding potential impacts on Palos Verdes Peninsula and the beach communities, see Topical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding South Bay overflights, Response to Comment PC00552-2 regarding nighttime easterly departures circling the South Bay area, Response to Comment PC01377-9 regarding noise impacts on the City of El Segundo, Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels, and Topical Response TR-N-2.3 regarding CNEL noise levels below 65.

SPC00236-18

Comment:

20. Single event noise levels should expand to include a 20 mile radius. How can you determine an annoyance factor area if you don't expand your area of investigation? Why were areas negatively impacted by single event noise not included in the EIR/EIS? (See comment 10)

Response:

The analysis of noise effects was not limited to a geographically defined area. Noise effects were studied outward from LAX based on calculation of the points beyond which effects were no longer significant. Please see Section 6. Single Event Noise Analysis of Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Technical Noise Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for how the thresholds of significance were determined for nighttime awakenings and classroom disruption. Public annoyance with aircraft noise has been shown in several studies to be most closely aligned with the average cumulative noise level rather than with infrequent single events. Numerous studies have demonstrated that annoyance with aircraft noise is most closely correlated with the cumulative noise level (DNL or CNEL), and also that the only useful land use compatibility guidelines for planning in an airport environment are based on cumulative metrics. Therefore, the FAA has developed its land use guidance and compatibility criteria around the cumulative metrics. It has determined that 65 CNEL is the level at which significant impacts are present. Use of the CNEL does not contend that individuals are not bothered or annoyed by single noise events, but rather that a more scientifically acceptable correlation for land use planning purposes is present with the cumulative metric. Nighttime single event noise impacts and mitigation for LAX Master Plan alternatives are presented in Sections 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting information in Appendix SC and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-2 Single Event Noise and CNEL Differences. Please see Response to Comment SAL00115-110 regarding annoyance and single event noise levels.

SPC00236-19

Comment:

21. What feet mix in 2015 was used to arrive at the conclusions in the document? How many are turbo-props?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The 2015 fleet mix for Alternative D was presented in Table F-3, Hourly Design Day Total Operations by Aircraft Type, in Appendix F of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum. The total number of turbo-props operations would be 479 operations out of 2,279 total operations at the 2015 design day level.

SPC00236-20

Comment:

22. The EIR/EIS states the Alternative D capacity of 78.9 MAP is a theoretical number, which may be exceeded. The use of 78.9 MAP as a limiting factor in the future growth of LAX is not enforceable. Why weren't noise impacts above 78.9 MAP investigated and documented? What is your plan? Will the relocation of the "curb front" allow more passengers to use the airport and thus more operations and thus more noise? Why were there no new theoretical MAP numbers applied to Alternative D when it increases the capacity of LAX beyond 78.9 MAP?

If the theoretical capacity as stated in the EIR/EIS can exceed 78.9 MAP if demand increases where is the regional plan which would reduce the demand on LAX? If there is no regional plan then where are the numbers showing impacts above 78.9 MAP?

Response:

The constrained passenger activity level of 78.9 MAP forecast for 2015 with Alternative D was determined based on the design of Alternative D and the projected airline response to the limited gate facilities. The environmental analyses in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, including noise and air quality, have addressed the potential impacts under the most practical and most likely activity level for each alternative including Alternative D. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding regional context.

SPC00236-21

Comment:

23. Why hasn't the City of Los Angeles continued to support the Southern California Regional Airport Authority if they believe in a regional approach in airport capacities and a cap of 78.9 MAP at LAX?

Response:

The Southern California Regional Airport Authority (SCRAA) is a joint powers agreement among the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino, and the City of Los Angeles. The Authority was formed to develop and implement a regional approach of providing airport capacity. After being dormant for many years, the SCRAA was reactivated in March 2001 to deal principally with two issues: the proposed expansion of LAX, and the proposed conversion of El Toro to a civilian airport. The decline in air travel demand due to the economic recession, the events of September 11th, the war in Iraq, and SARS and frequent lack of a quorum have largely driven the Authority back to inactivity. Riverside County voted in July 2002 to withdraw from SCRAA.

SPC00236-22

Comment:

24. As demand increases when will the capacity of normal operations start to impact over ocean operations? At what point does demand cause LAX to remain in normal operations past the 12 a.m. to 6:30 a.m. window?

Response:

FAA Airport Capacity Benchmark Report 2001 publishes two types of rates for operational capacity: Optimum Rate and Reduced Rate. Optimum Rate is defined as the maximum number of aircraft that can routinely be handled hourly using visual approaches during periods of unlimited ceiling and visibility.

At LAX the optimum rate is 150 operations. The Reduced Rate is defined as the maximum number of aircraft that can routinely be handled during reduced visibility conditions when radar is required to provide separation between aircraft. At LAX the Reduced Rate is 128 operations. None of the Hourly Forecast Design Day Tables (V-H.31, V-H.32, V-H.33) in the LAX Draft Master Plan or the LAX Draft Master Plan Addendum (Table F-9) forecasts exceeds an hourly demand of 72 hourly operations. Based on discussions with LAX FAA controllers during nighttime over-ocean conditions arrival capacity approaches for LAX are 64 operations. None of the Hourly Forecast Design Day Tables (V-H.31, V-H.32, V-H.33) in the LAX Draft Master Plan or the LAX Draft Master Plan Addendum (Table F-9) forecasts exceeds an hourly arrival demand of 30 hourly operations. Additionally, current noise rules already allow ATC discretion in unusual situations to deviate from LAWA's noise abatement procedures. Please see Section 1a of LAWA's Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures and Restrictions, provided in Attachment 1 of this Final EIS/EIR.

SPC00236-23

Comment:

25. The EIR/EIS relies on mitigation measures based on the successful Part 161 approval by the FAA. Is this a guaranteed approval process? Why was it assumed that this would happen? Why are there no studies that show the impact without the Part 161?

Response:

As stated on page 147, Section 6.1.3, Mitigation of Awakening in Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Mitigation of the areas newly exposed to significant levels of nighttime single events will be sought through two techniques. The first will be the preparation of a 14 CFR Part 161 application to the FAA to limit the number of operations east of the airport during the night hours. 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 to and approaches from the east when over-ocean procedures are in effect. Additionally, LAWA has recently initiated a Request For Qualifications to prepare a 14 CFR Part 161 Study for Los Angeles International Airport. LAWA is seeking to establish a partial curfew at LAX that would prohibit the easterly departure of all discretionary aircraft, with certain exemptions, between the hours of 12:00 Midnight to 6:30 a.m. when LAX is in Over-Ocean Operations. During a recent 18-month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. When over-ocean procedures are not practicable for reasons of adverse weather or winds (as defined in Section 4, of LAWA's Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Restrictions), aircraft will continue to depart to the east between midnight and 6:30 a.m. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5, regarding nighttime aircraft operations and TR-N-7, regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. The second will be that any area remaining within the newly exposed area of significant exposure subsequent to the implementation of operational restrictions, or should operational restrictions not be approved, would become eligible for sound insulation through expansion of the boundaries of the ANMP. Noise impacts are addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00236-24

Comment:

26. The EIS/EIR states 6.2.3: "Prior to the determination of sound treatment eligibility, however, a new study of the relationship between specific aircraft noise levels and childhood learning abilities will be undertaken by LAWA as part of the continuing environmental monitoring process obligated under CEQA. This study will seek a predictive statistical relationship between the level of aircraft noise present at a school and the ability of children to learn, as expressed by standardized test results. When that study is complete and acceptable results are achieved, the potential for additions to the sound insulation program for schools will be revisited as part of LAWA's continuing environmental management responsibilities."

How do you plan to test the impact of noise on the ability of children to learn in affected schools like the Lennox Elementary School District when the only learning environment has been one with aircraft

3. Comments and Responses

noise? What would be their learning abilities without noise when they haven't had the opportunity to learn without noise.

Response:

It is not clear from the comment where this reference was obtained since there is no section or page 6.2.3 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and this statement does not appear verbatim in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The commentor appears to be referencing page 4-210 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Mitigation Measure MM-LU-3, Conduct Study of the Relationship Between Aircraft Noise Levels and the Ability of Children to Learn, which states:

"Current studies of aircraft noise and the ability of children to learn have not resulted in the development of statistically reliable predictive model of the relative changes in aircraft noise levels on learning. Therefore, a comprehensive study shall be initiated by LAWA to determine what, if any, measurable relationship may be present between learning and the disruptions caused by aircraft noise at various levels. An element of the evaluation shall be the setting of an acceptable replacement threshold of significance for classroom disruption by both specific and sustained aircraft noise events."

As stated in MM-LU-3 and presented in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the study to determine noise levels that affect the ability of children to learn would be based on noise levels that result in disruption of speech in a classroom setting, rather than a comparison of test results over time within the Lennox School District. The methodology used to determine the relationship between levels of noise and children's ability to learn will be one of the first elements to be developed by educational and psychoacoustical specialists retained to conduct the study. Specific criteria for determining the relationship between levels of noise and the children's ability to learn will be determined by the experts developing the study.

Please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding existing aircraft noise effects on the Lennox School District and Response to Comment AL00034-38 regarding the potential for noise impacts on the Lennox School District under the Master Plan alternatives. As presented in Response to Comment AL00034-38, implementation of LAWA Staff's new preferred Alternative D would not result in a significant noise impact to the Lennox School District.

SPC00236-25

Comment:

27. Speech interference was the level of significance used in the analysis. Why was this not used to measure impacts that would result in the need to identify mitigation actions?

Response:

Three different single event school disruption thresholds of significance were identified in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These are identified in Section 4.1.4, Thresholds of Significance, of Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 6.2, School Single Event Analysis, of Appendix S-C1, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These threshold levels did identify impacts that are addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, mitigation measures to address speech interference in the classroom are addressed in Section 4.2.8 Mitigation Measures, of Section 4.2 Land Use and Section 6.2.3, Mitigation of Single Event Effects on Schools, of Appendix S-C1, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00236-26

Comment:

28. The word 'significant' is used throughout the SUPPLEMENT TO THE DRAFT EIS/EIR MASTER PLAN for LAX. We have come to the conclusion. After making several inquiries about the definition of the word 'significant' to high level Deputy Executive Directors of LAWA and others, there is no one definition capable of applying to all instances of its use. The Executive Summary of Volume One of this Supplemental Draft to the EIS/EIR does not address the definition of "significant " Therefore it is necessary to ask the same question about similar but different statements included in the Supplemental Draft to the EIS/EIR. Please refer to the Executive Summary, Volume One of the Supplemental Draft to

the EIS/EIR for titles and page numbers of the Executive Summary Tables. Please do not use words that are synonymous with 'significant' to explain. Define, and interpret the word 'significant'. Some of the words to avoid in explaining the definition are: important, meaningful, weighty, notable, profound. Pivotal, serious, momentous. Substantial, and other synonyms of this type. Facts, figures, noise levels. Estimated values, decibels, and comparisons should have been provided what metric values were used to determine these levels of significance?

Executive Summary pages 51-76 4.1 Noise

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
7. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.2 Land Use

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
10. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
11. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.24.2 Health Effects of Noise

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section

4.27 Schools

3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01835-10 regarding an explanation of thresholds of significance and where thresholds of significance were identified in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00236-27

Comment:

29. How can noise impacts that are 'unavoidable' be acceptable?

Response:

As reflected in the requirements of Sections 21002 and 21081 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), significant impacts must be avoided or reduced to the extent feasible through mitigation measures or alternatives. Impacts that cannot be mitigated to a level that is less than significant are considered to be "unavoidable". Prior to the lead agency approving any project that has unavoidable significant impacts, certain findings to that effect must be made and a statement of overriding considerations must be adopted. Through that process, as specified by CEQA, an unavoidable significant impact can be considered to be acceptable.

SPC00236-28

Comment:

30. Will the elimination of "avigation" easements for all impacted areas help reduce the number of legally impacted dwellings and people? How many households refused the sound insulation offers because of avigation easements requirements?

Response:

As stated in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.8) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the intent of reevaluating the requirement for granting of avigation easements with sound insulation, under Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1, consistent with the recommendations of the LAX Community Noise

3. Comments and Responses

Roundtable and Caltrans as stated in the 2001 Noise Variance, is to accelerate the rate of land use mitigation to eliminate noise impact areas in a timely and efficient manner.

LAWA's policy of requiring avigation easements in exchange for funding of sound insulation has precluded the participation of El Segundo in Title 21 programs offered by LAWA under the current ANMP. While this has limited funding sources for sound insulation in El Segundo, they do operate their own program. However, it is not known how much the absence of funding has limited their progress in providing sound insulation.

As a component of a Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Los Angeles and City of Inglewood, LAWA has suspended the requirement for an avigation easement for Inglewood residents receiving sound insulation under the ANMP as long as there is continued cooperation between the cities of Los Angeles and Inglewood in studying, designing, and implementing mitigation measures that are mutually beneficial to Inglewood and LAWA. The intent of this provision is to increase the number of residences that receive sound insulation in the City of Inglewood. The number of households that have refused sound insulation offers because of avigation easements requirements is not known, since LAWA and other jurisdictions within the ANMP do not track the reasons for refusal of sound insulation. However, since inception of the ANMP approximately 50 homeowners in the City of Los Angeles have declined to participate. In general, reasons for refusal are due to recent renovations or unique features of a home (e.g., large window in Playa del Rey) that a homeowner does not want altered to provide soundproofing. In Los Angeles County areas it is known that homeowners have refused sound insulation due to the need to correct building code violations.

SPC00236-29

Comment:

31. The California Airport Land Use Handbook concludes that no definitive, widely recognized, single event noise level guidelines currently exist relative to land use compatibility planning. This Supplemental to the Draft EIS/EIR would have been an ideal tool to establish single event noise level guidelines. Why didn't the document include the necessary research to accomplish that goal?

Response:

As stated on page 139, of Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the single-event information is not intended for use at other airports, without careful consideration of the similarities and dissimilarities of the other airports with LAX. Because the specific factors contributing to the noise impacts vary among airports, the appropriate single event measures and their thresholds of significance for LAX may not necessarily be the same as those for an airport developed on a new site, or for a small airport located in a rural or suburban setting, or even for another large urban airport with a different set of operating characteristics. Therefore this would not make an ideal tool for single-event noise level guidelines.

SPC00236-30

Comment:

32. The Automated People Mover (APM) operation will impose undesirable noise on all 10 existing hotels in the Century Boulevard/98th Street area. The noise level: is rated by the EIS/EIR as a severe impact on 2 hotels and a significant impact on 4 others. High activity levels include 1755 day- trips (about 2 per minute) and 615 night-trips (about 1 per minute). What are the mitigation measures for noise of the APM?

Response:

The mitigation measures for APM noise are discussed on page 4-79, in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00236-31**Comment:**

33. Some requests for easterly takeoffs during over ocean operation are based the slant of runway 25R/7L from west to east. Why was the leveling of the runways on the south side of LAX not included in the EIS/EIR?

Response:

The commentor is correct. Some aircraft operators do request an easterly departure during over-ocean operations as a result of the easterly slope in the south runway complex. What is suggested is infeasible and not practical due to its environmental impacts and costs. It would be a massive project to build the runway up high enough to level out the runways. Not only one runway needs to be elevated, but also the adjacent parallel runway, their associated taxiways and aprons, and gates and terminals. The enormous large amount of fill needed would not be generated at LAX and need to be transported from somewhere else. The number of truck trips in and out of LAX just for moving the fill would be a much added burden to the surrounding community. A preliminary cost estimate was performed for moving the fill and re-constructing the two runways, the associated taxiways and aprons, and gates and terminals and it concluded that elevating the south airfield is too expensive to be feasible. LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction (MM-N-5. Conduct Part 161 Study to Make Over-Ocean Procedures Mandatory) 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.

SPC00236-32**Comment:**

34. Do the characteristics and performance of the A380's and other jumbos interfere with its ability to comply with over ocean operations?

Response:

The performance characteristics of an A380 will not prohibit the aircraft from complying with over-ocean operations. Please see Response to Comment AL00040-153 regarding A380 data.

SPC00237**Karp, Jack****None Provided****11/3/2003****SPC00237-1****Comment:**

1. I have reason to believe and allege that the public hearing venues are purposely chosen to maximize the inconvenience and dissuade people who live in the South Bay Area (Torrance, Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, El Segundo, Lawndale, Hawthorne, Rancho Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills Estates, Palos Verdes Estates, & Rolling Mills) from attending. This is a blatant example of purposely inconveniencing people to limit adverse comments.

Response:

Pursuant to Section 509 (b) (6) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended [49 U.S.C. Section 47106(c) (1) (A)], the FAA and the City of Los Angeles (LAWA) provided sufficient public notice of availability of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also in compliance with State and Federal regulations regarding the facilitation of public involvement in decisions which affect the quality of the human environment, FAA and LAWA conducted twelve public hearings and three Environmental Justice Workshops at locations dispersed throughout Greater Los Angeles, in order to provide the most convenient access for all affected and interested parties.

There were three hearings conducted in, or adjacent to, South Bay communities:

August 18, 2003 at Hollywood Park Pavilion

3. Comments and Responses

August 20, 2003 at the Manhattan Beach Joslyn Center

August 23, 2003 at The Furama Hotel

Notification of those hearings, as well as the nine other hearings, was published in the following South Bay-area circulations:

The Daily Breeze

The Argonaut

The El Segundo Herald

In accordance with City practices regarding notification for public hearings and/or meetings, LAWA's notification included, but was not limited to, affected residents, businesses and/or organizations within a 500ft radius of LAX property boundaries. Approximately 20,000 Notices of Availability regarding this extended public comment period, which included a schedule of the last three hearings, were also mailed to LAX adjacent state, local and federal municipalities, and agencies, including adjacent neighborhood councils. Additionally, notice of the three additional public hearings was published in the following periodicals more than a month before the hearing dates:

The Los Angeles Times

Antelope Valley Press

The Daily Breeze

Los Angeles Sentinel

Los Angeles Business Journal

Daily News

Los Angeles Inland Valley Daily Bulletin (Ontario)

The Wave

Argonaut (Westchester/South Bay)

El Segundo Herald

Riverside Press Enterprise

San Gabriel Valley Tribune

Finally, please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

SPC00237-2

Comment:

2. I saw no discussion about aircraft noise after departure heading south to southeast that affects the South Bay Area. Aircraft noise is a prime complaint of our residents. Planes fly too low and turn too soon. This issue is avoidable by demanding departures extend 5 miles west from the shore line and reach an altitude of 10,000 feet, whichever occurs first, before changing course and heading southerly and easterly over the Los Angeles basin.

Response:

Comment noted. All future alternatives identified in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR show aircraft crossing the coastline before initiating turns. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX.

SPC00238

Breese, Kristine

None Provided

10/8/2003

SPC00238-1

Comment:

When I read \$9 billion as the projected cost of Alternative D, I can't quite grasp the number. With friends who work in the airline industry fearful of job losses and the public traveling less since 9-11, how can this expenditure be justified?

My main concern after reading parts of the Rand Study printed in the paper is that this Alt. D will not actually guarantee safety or security. As a community member, I'm not sure we can't find ways of implementing security measures NOW for a fraction of the cost proposed by Alt. D. The \$9 billion price tag is really a red flag to those of us who already think that this plan is a boondoggle!

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00239

Stanley, Eric

None Provided

10/28/2003

SPC00239-1

Comment:

Alternative D of the LAX Master Plan still does not address the major concerns of the airport's neighbors.

How long will it take to get answers to what health impacts we are being subjected to by living in close proximity to the airport?

So far, the studies still do not answer question parents have about pollution, toxic emissions, learning issues, sleep disturbance and noise associated with increased operations at LAX. These questions will not go away. Until air quality can be measured and deemed safe for the surrounding communities, Alternative D should not be given the green light to move forward.

Response:

A detailed discussion of the human health risk assessment was provided in the Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report 14a of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9a of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The human health risk assessment includes an evaluation of potential adverse health effects associated with air pollutants released by airport activities for the selected alternatives.

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and noise 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 and S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 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 and school disruption in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-2 regarding toxic air pollutants, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00240 **Stone, Russell** **None Provided** **10/11/2003**

SPC00240-1

Comment:

Since those who conducted the RAND study have nothing to gain in the ongoing airport expansion debate, I think the city should take heed to the points it makes rather than dismissing it. The cost of the project for Los Angeles airport has raised many questions about how (and if) it can be financed. I was under the impression that you could build a couple of airports for what it would cost to improve or modernize this existing one.

I agree that something needs to be done to improve the current traffic congestion in and around the airport - especially for those of us who live nearby. But the RAND study does point out that there are many things that could be done in the way of improvements that would have an impact such as the Avion Boulevard cargo road and putting all the rental car companies on one location to take the burden off streets surrounding the airport. It seems like these would be more cost-effective solutions to current challenges.

I guess what I'm trying to say is that I'm not convinced of the safety and security argument that we are hearing as the reason for Alternative D. It just sounds like the new name for the Riordan Master Plan that we heard about years ago. It seemed like a bad idea then and this one seems to be no better.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00241 **Straube, Bob** **None Provided** **10/25/2003**

SPC00241-1

Comment:

I THINK EXPANDING THE CAPACITY OF LAX IS THE WRONG DIRECTION FOR OUR FUTURE. OTHER SURROUNDING AREAS REJECT AIRPORTS WHICH COULD LESSEN THE NEEDS FOR A LARGER, NOISIER LAX.

MINIMIZING LAX GROWTH SHOULD HAVE THE EFFECT OF FORCING PLACES SUCH AS ANTELOPE VALLEY AND ORANGE COUNTY TO FIND WAYS TO SERVE THEIR POPULATIONS AIR TRAVEL NEEDS WITHOUT USING LAX.

Response:

Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to accommodate a larger percentage of the regional demand.

SPC00241-2

Comment:

OUR AREA IS BEING STAMPEDED BY MEGA-LAX PROPONENTS WHO GIVE NO THOUGHT TO THE DETERIORATING QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE AREAS IMPACTED BY LAX TRAFFIC, NOISE AND GROWTH.

EXPANDING LAX AD INFINITUM IS NOT A WISE SOLUTION TO THE AREA'S TRANSIT PROBLEMS.

3. Comments and Responses

PLEASE STOP ENDLESS LAX GROWTH BEFORE ALL OF SOUTH BAY IS ONE ENDLESS 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 growth in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement). Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

SPC00242 Murphy, Gary None Provided 11/1/2003

SPC00242-1

Comment:

After reviewing the presentation of the latest LAX Master Plan and supporting documents, I find that the plan has no benefits other than the runway changes and urge those making the decision to reject it.

1. The LAX proposal does not address the congestion and environmental problems that will result from concentrating our air transportation at one location. It does not recognize that future air travel growth will be due to growth in population in San Bernardino County, Northern Los Angeles County and Ventura County. The proposed plan does indicate that Ontario airport will have to carry part of the increase in future airport traffic, but provides no funding or plans to accomplish this. It shows no utilization of Palmdale at all. It makes no sense to put \$9 billion into one location, when this funding could be used to create alternative airports that could be a great convenience to the additional population in the area. With the added congestion and off-site check-in, a person flying out of LAX from Riverside or Palmdale would have to leave home 4 or 5 hours before their flight

2. Experts are also correct in calling the proposal a step backward in safety. It provides no safety benefits, only moving the target to another location. It also seems very unwise to become dependent on one major airport. Expanding to regional airports will insure that air transportation is available in case of some major disaster or threat at one airport.

With the large government deficits we now have we cannot afford to waste \$9 billion on construction that accomplishes nothing. Regional airports will be needed and this funding could be used for them and improved transportation to them.

Response:

The LAX Master Plan and associated EIS/EIR deal only with the proposed development of LAX. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Master Plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale. As a responsible public agency, LAWA will only develop Palmdale when demand can be demonstrated. Other jurisdictions are responsible for planning and developing the other regional airports. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 for more detail about planning for LAX and the other airports in the region, and Topical Responses TR-RC-1 and TR-RC-5 regarding LAWA's planning for Ontario and Palmdale.

Alternative D is believed to provide the best solution for improving safety and security for passengers, aircraft, and airport infrastructure. Alternative D was formulated and refined in 2002 to provide an additional option for the LAX Master Plan and is designed to protect airport users and critical airport infrastructure in response to the increased risk of terrorism aimed at aviation and commercial assets. The plan is designed with the flexibility to incorporate evolving federal airport security requirements and allows for the dispersal of people and security processes away from critical points on the airport complex. This allows for consistent levels of screening, an increased ability for law enforcement and security personnel to respond to threats, and the protection of people and critical facilities essential to the continued operation of the airport.

3. Comments and Responses

The proposed Master Plan improvements would be funded with a combination of FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, airline fees, and other state/federal grants. No taxpayer dollars or local government funds will be used to pay for any of the proposed on-airport improvements.

SPC00243 Harrington, Marry None Provided 10/24/2003

SPC00243-1

Comment:

I am writing to you to request to be considered and added to your master plan of soundproofing my home at the above address. My property and the area that I live in is also in the flight path of the airplanes that fly to LAX Airport daily. Can you please re-evaluate the decibal sound of the flight path above my property and in the area. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00170-1 regarding including the commentor's property in the ANMP. See Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the ANMP, in particular Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4 regarding how eligibility of soundproofing is determined and for a description monitoring methods used to validate the current 65 CNEL contour, and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would revise the ANMP, including expanding and upgrading the current monitoring system. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high noise levels and Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences.

SPC00244 Burns, Barbara None Provided 11/3/2003

SPC00244-1

Comment:

The following comments are submitted be included in the public record of the LAX Draft Master Plan and Draft EIS/EIR.

In 1988, LAX publicly announced that at 65 MAP the airspace would reach its maximum capacity. Alternative A, B, C and D, as well as the No Action Alternative exceed this capacity by up to 50%. All alternatives in the LAX master plan would cram more air traffic into already overcrowded space. This is not rational. This is not safe.

Response:

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

SPC00244-2

Comment:

In the vicinity of LAX, there are ten other commercial airports ready to be used. Homeland Security compels us to consider a regional approach to handle passenger and cargo aircraft.

All the existing variations and alternatives in the current LAX Master Plan should be rejected.

A regional planning committee composed of representatives from all areas of Southern California, including residents and activists in the various communities, should be immediately formed to develop a five-county air transportation master plan to cope with the realities of the 21st century.

Response:

The LAX Master Plan and associated EIS/EIR deal only with the proposed development of LAX. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Other jurisdictions are responsible for planning and developing the other regional airports.

The Southern California Regional Airport Authority (SCRAA) is a joint powers agreement among the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino, and the City of Los Angeles. The Authority was formed to develop and implement a regional approach of providing airport capacity. After being dormant for many years, the SCRAA was reactivated in March 2001 to deal principally with two issues: the proposed expansion of LAX, and the proposed conversion of El Toro to a civilian airport. The decline in air travel demand due to the economic recession, the events of September 11th, the war in Iraq, and SARS and frequent lack of a quorum have largely driven the Authority back to inactivity. Riverside County voted in July 2002 to withdraw from SCRAA.

Officials from Los Angeles joined political leaders from the Inland Empire to form a new coalition in October 2003 to plan as a region for the growth of air traffic in Southern California.

SCAG already has a regional aviation planning committee consisting of elected local officials from all over Southern California that formulates a regional plan, advised by industry representatives, experts, and citizens from affected communities. SCAG's latest official aviation plan is in the 2001 RTP. SCAG is currently finalizing the 2004 RTP. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the aviation plan in the 2001 RTP and the draft 2004 RTP.

SPC00245 Burns, Bruce None Provided 11/3/2003

SPC00245-1**Comment:**

The following comments are submitted to be included in the public record of the LAX Draft Master Plan and Draft EIS/EIR.

The most essential ingredient for "Enhanced Safety and Security" has been omitted from the Alternative D Supplement to the LAX Master Plan and that is dispersion of both passenger and cargo aircraft among many airports in Southern California. Lacking this vital feature, Alternative D is unacceptable and should be rejected.

For the same reason, Alternatives A, B and C should also be rejected.

Response:

LAWA only controls the operations and potential improvements at LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Other jurisdictions are responsible for developing the other regional airports. LAWA is currently preparing Master Plan updates for both Ontario and Palmdale, in order for them to play their part in addressing the anticipated regional demand. LAWA has planned Alternative D to be in compliance with SCAG's 2001 and Draft 2004 RTP allocations to LAX. It is up to the other regional airport operators to meet a larger percentage of the regional demand. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 for more detail about planning for LAX and the other airports in the region, and Topical Responses TR-RC-1 and TR-RC-5 regarding LAWA's planning for Ontario and Palmdale.

SPC00245-2**Comment:**

Other immediate problems that are not addressed in any of the alternatives, but which should be considered are:

1. Runway incursions. Pilots rank LAX as one of the most dangerous airports in the nation.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

SPC00245-3

Comment:

2. Overflights above El Segundo. These are unnecessary and hazardous, but frequent.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX.

SPC00245-4

Comment:

3. Noise and traffic in the communities impacted by LAX. These safety, health and environmental concerns must be addressed under the present level of MAP and MAT before any changes in the structure or operations of the airport should be considered.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, 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 were provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment PC00029-1 regarding how the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR account for existing and future aircraft activity.

SPC00246

Carpio, Sparky

None Provided

11/2/2003

SPC00246-1

Comment:

I remember that after the last Public Hearing for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for the Los Angeles International Airport Master Plan you had asked if I had a question. At the time I did not, although afterwards I thought of one that I hope you will be able to answer.

For what length of time will the Draft, and Supplement to the Draft, EIS/EIR for the LAX Master Plan be available for public reference at the Inglewood main library?

I greatly appreciate your time, and would respectfully inquire why the Draft EIS/EIR for the first four LAX master plan alternatives was removed from the Inglewood main library in 2002.

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.

SPC00247

Walter, R. Mahala

10/23/2003

SPC00247-1

Comment:

Unfortunately, the SYSTEM IS NOT WORKING!!! Therefore, I must insist on NO ACTION on ALTERNATIVE A, B, C, D, and E.

3. Comments and Responses

The wishes of the airline carriers necessitate priority consideration. As I've worked through the public hearings, it is obvious that we must start over, accommodating the demands security & modernization in historical times. The following recommendations are submitted:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00247-2

Comment:

1). Moving two parallel runways on the south side farther apart so that they conform to FAA Standards.

Response:

The runway and taxiway system on the south airfield complex was designed to accommodate Group V aircraft and is in compliance with FAA design standards for Group V aircraft.

SPC00247-3

Comment:

2). Move new runway 50 feet closer to El Segundo and farther westward; thus using available land reducing noise/pollution for the entire city, plus obtain the much needed housing.

Response:

There are no new runways proposed in Alternative D. From the following content we inferred that the new runway the commentor mentioned here may refer to Runway 7R/25L. Runway 7R/25L would be moved approximately 55 feet south in Alternative D but would not be shifted westward. The suggested shifting will create runway threshold stagger between the two parallel runways in the south airfield complex and put Runway 7R/25L threshold west of Runway 7L/25R. This suggested configuration would decrease the existing runway capacity especially during the primary west flow since the departure operations on Runway 7L/25R would have to wait for the arrival operations on Runway 7R/25L cross its own runway threshold which is further west.

SPC00247-4

Comment:

3). Must remodel Bradley to welcome the air bus to truly remain a competitive International airport.

Response:

The Tom Bradley International Terminal TBIT is currently being studied outside of the Master Plan to investigate potential modifications for accommodating the Airbus A380 prior to its initiating its service at LAX in 2006. The LAX Master Plan does provide multiple areas within the redeveloped terminal facilities to accommodate the Airbus A380 aircraft.

SPC00247-5

Comment:

4). Make every effort to divert cargo traffic to Ontario & Palmdale.

Response:

Cargo cannot be moved simply to suit the needs of the airport. The airlines select airports to best serve their customers and minimize costs. LAWA is working with the all-cargo airlines and LAX freight forwarders to provide incentives to use Ontario and Palmdale for cargo destined for or originating near the airport. LAWA's master plan updates for Ontario and Palmdale will likely provide for increased cargo capacity at both airports. LAWA cannot force these companies to use Ontario or Palmdale.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00247-6

Comment:

It appears to me that there is NO city planning that brings the communities all TOGETHER to best serve southern California. Therefore, I propose that LYDIA KENNARD, the person who is most knowledgeable about LAWA, to head a lockdown conference with one representative from the following government agencies and communities that live with the traffic, pollution, noise, and financial benefits of LAX. No doubt impossible, but worth a try.

Gov't agencies: Gov. Schwarzenegger, Congresswoman Waters/Harman, TSA Loy, Transportation Sec'y Mineta, Supervisors Burke/Knabe, Mayor Hahn, Gordon (El Segundo), Ovitt (Ontario), City Councilpersons Miscikowski/Parks, FFA, Green Line, MTA, L A Co. Planning Officer,

Communities: Central LA., Culver City, El Segundo, Inglewood, LAX, Lennox, Marina del Rey, Manhattan Beach, Osage, Playa del Rey, Playa Vista, Westchester

Other: Alliance for Regional Solution to Airport Congestion, Gateway to LA, LA Airlines Airport Committee, LA Co. Economic Development Corp., LAX Community Noise Roundtable, Rand Corporation, Regional Solution to Airport Congestion

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00247-7

Comment:

Many THANKS for the opportunity to speak out at the public hearings. Also submitting my fast-track opinion which City Council really didn't want to hear, cutting the three minutes to one. Good Luck with successful LAX planning,

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00248 Walter, R. Mahala None Provided 11/4/2003

SPC00248-1

Comment:

As a former airport commissioner, I am asking you, CITY COUNCIL, to vote YES on this MOTION. If the consultants had done their job properly in the first place, there wouldn't be so many questions about Alternative D. Why don't the CONSULTANTS stand up and answer the questions about their design? Why send LAWA people out to face the public?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00248-2

Comment:

Let's start with....the underground luggage tunnel. Its' construction is due to start in 2005, but the safety features recommended by the FAA for run-way & taxiway safety are not scheduled for completion until 2015. The under-ground luggage tunnel, is there going to be one...or NOT! Where's it going to run?

Last year I warned a couple Congressional Representatives & NATE HOLDEN that our own crazies could put timers on bombs in their luggage and sent them through to the CTA and not even have to commit suicide! Now YOU union PEOPLE, do you really want your union brothers & sisters to work

3. Comments and Responses

there?.....And by the way, what makes you think you'll be getting the job. Time & time again, I objected to subcontractors coming in from out of state to do the work!

You know, proponents like to couch this whole scenario around security as "Cars & LAX FACILITIES don't mix!" Now tell me, how do they think people are going to get to this Ground Transportation Center?.....And what if you were a TERRORIST wanting to inflict major damage & loss of life, where would you rather have the PASSENGER LOAD WIDELY DISTRIBUTED AROUND 8 DIFFERENT TERMINALS or where EVERYONE for ALL FLIGHTS CONGREGATE AT one CHECK in/DROP off site? You see now why proponents have had to scrap security and recently invent "modernization."

Response:

Comment noted. This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00248-3

Comment:

Sounds like a Disneyland attraction to use the Automated People Mover to funnel an increased number of people, travelers plus meeters & greeters, into the 200 additional businesses proposed by the mayor, shifting money from existing businesses for the benefit of increasing airport revenues. What happens now to the small businesses & hotels around LAX, who will have a very difficult time for many years? SOME MAY NOT SURVIVE. And what about the AIRLINES, especially those who are either in or fighting off bankruptcy!!!

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00248-4

Comment:

By the way, Ted Stein, were these consultants paid by the word or by the page? It certainly wasn't for the quality of work. Why spend millions more for a plan that will not FLY?

Vote YES to stop fast-track planning of Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00249

Peterson, Linda

None Provided

11/5/2003

SPC00249-1

Comment:

Although I commend Mr. Hahn for making improvements in his proposed Alternative D over the prior plans for the airport, I do not believe there has been sufficient consideration of other alternatives for handling safety and security at LAX and in the region. Your EIR/EIS should have more thoroughly analyzed Alternative D, considered options other than just Alternative D,

Response:

Comment noted. The development of Alternative D was an iterative process which included the consideration of many concepts. Please see Appendix H, Concept Development, of the LAX Master Plan Addendum for a discussion of the different concepts considered during the development of Alternative D and Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00249-2

Comment:

and considered data more recent than 1996.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00022-12 and Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues.

SPC00249-3

Comment:

The most significant thing you could do to impact LAX security would be to disperse air traffic throughout the region. Instead, Alternative D would give terrorists a spruced-up, more compact and more inviting target. A terrorist bombing of LAX would be devastating to the region's economy, but it would be far less devastating if there were other airports that could handle the traffic that would have to be diverted from LAX.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00249-4

Comment:

The Palmdale airport should be expanded and developed, and airlines and cargo companies given encouragement to use it. To respond to the naysayers who contend that it is too far away to develop, I suggest looking at the experience of Dulles airport. When it was initially built, there was very little development anywhere around it, and much skepticism about how much it would be used. Now it is the center of a thriving commercial district, mostly businesses attracted to that area because the airport is there. The same thing would happen if you were to expand the Palmdale facility.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00057-16 regarding the success of Dulles. Washington Dulles is approximately 25 miles from the central business district (CBD), and required restrictions on Washington National to be successful. Palmdale is more than 50 miles from downtown.

SPC00249-5

Comment:

The proposed 12-year construction project at LAX is of concern to me as a neighbor of the airport. I have seen what has happened to the Waterview landscaping project, where a lovely concept has become a neighborhood blight because the airport failed to do adequate research or planning with the Coastal Commission. How can you ensure that Alternative D, if adopted, would not run into similar, but much more substantial, problems and delays?

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D does not propose any improvements within the Coastal Zone, except for the relocation/replacement of existing navigational aids within the dunes west of Pershing Drive. No other approvals from the CCC are required for Alternative D. The existing navigational aids are owned by the federal government and are required pursuant to federal safety requirements. LAWA and the FAA will take all appropriate steps to ensure that all necessary approvals, including any required from the California Coastal Commission (CCC), are obtained in order to allow the relocation/replacement of

3. Comments and Responses

the navigation aids to occur in a timely manner. It should be noted that the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided for a comprehensive habitat restoration program for impacts associated with relocation/replacement of the existing navigation aids, and implementation of the program would be initiated well in advance of the impacts occurring to avoid any temporal loss of habitat value within the coastal zone.

SPC00249-6

Comment:

As a procedural matter, I would like to know if the City Attorney has given an opinion regarding whether it would be a conflict of interest for LAWA Commissioner Miguel Contreras to vote on the various proposals coming before the Commission, given that he spoke out in favor of Alternative D as a representative of a labor union at the public meeting held at the Furama Hotel on August 23. To what extent was he involved in organizing union members to attend the various public meetings?

Response:

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

SPC00249-7

Comment:

As a neighbor of LAX, I am not totally opposed to anything happening at the airport. I agree that it needs modernization and improvements in vehicular access. I am opposed to anything that would allow the airport to expand beyond its current borders, which would be in violation of Mayor Hahn's campaign promises. Alternative D would appear to be designed to allow future expansion.

Please ensure that whatever is done at LAX is fair to the surrounding communities, and that other areas of Southern California shoulder their fair share of the burdens of an airport.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level of 78.9 million annual passengers (MAP), which is comparable to the 78.7 MAP projected to occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. As such, Alternative D is not considered to represent an expansion of LAX. The other build alternatives (Alternatives A, B, and C) are designed to serve a future activity level substantially more than that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and therefore represent an expansion of LAX.

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

SPC00250

Peura, Edwin

Peura Enterprises

11/4/2003

SPC00250-1

Comment:

In accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, Section 509(b)(5) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended, I reviewed the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) Draft Master Plan Addendum and the Supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR).

Based upon my review, I respectfully offer the following observations and enclosed comments for your consideration. My review focused on Ground Transportation into and out of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00250-2

Comment:

As a member of the business community, I understand how important international trade is to this region's and my community's economy and future economic growth. LAX and other regional airports provide a vital international trade link for the region.

A strong regional economy requires a regional air transportation system capable of continued accommodation of demands for such services. In this regard, projected shortfalls of 10 to 30 million annual passengers (MAP) are disconcerting. The discussion in the Planning Objectives Section of the Addendum raises considerable doubt regarding the region's ability to meet future demands for air transportation. The proposed Alternative D does little to satisfy these future needs.

To really take control of the situation and make truly regional decisions in this matter, decision-making regarding how and when airports are served cannot remain the sole purview of the airlines. I am not suggesting regulating airlines and reestablishing the Civil Aeronautics Board abolished by the federal Airline Deregulation Act. However, under the current unregulated environment, local or regional caps on numbers of flights and passengers are meaningless. Additionally, suggested allocations of air traffic growth are meaningless unless and until sponsors of other regional airports expand to handle their share.

Response:

LAWA only controls the operations and potential improvements at LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Other jurisdictions are responsible for developing the other regional airports. LAWA is currently preparing Master Plan updates for both Ontario and Palmdale, in order for them to play their part in addressing the anticipated regional demand. LAWA has planned Alternative D to be in compliance with SCAG's 2001 and Draft 2004 RTP allocations to LAX. It is up to the other regional airport operators to meet a larger percentage of the regional demand.

SPC00250-3

Comment:

One of the more serious issues with the EIS/EIR is the cost of traffic mitigation measures and funding sources have not been identified. Also, ground transportation projects of other jurisdictions are used to mitigate impacts without regard to their validity. Because identified mitigation measures are primarily north of the airport, problems created south of the airport remain unresolved.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding project funding.

Only future funded transportation system improvements were added to the model networks. These projects are all considered valid projects. The projects mentioned in the traffic mitigation plan which are within other jurisdictions, namely the Marina Expressway extension and the MTA's Metro Rapid Bus Program, are both considered realistic projects that are expected to be implemented.

The traffic mitigation plan proposes improvements south of the airport, including Aviation Boulevard and El Segundo Boulevard, Aviation Boulevard and Rosecrans Avenue, El Segundo Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard, Highland/Vista del Mar and Rosecrans Avenue, Rosecrans Avenue and Sepulveda Boulevard, El Segundo Boulevard and La Cienega Boulevard, and various locations along Imperial Highway.

SPC00250-4

Comment:

My observation of past events regarding LAX improvements strongly suggests justifiable concern about proposed caps on the number of flights, inadequacy of identified mitigation measures, and lack of funding for mitigation measures.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00250-2 and SPC00250-3 above and SPC00250-5 and SPC00250-6 below.

SPC00250-5

Comment:

When the airport was expanded in the early 1980s, the EIS/EIR provided for expansion to 40 MAP. That level proved to be meaningless. Moreover, the mitigation measures identified at that time were inadequate (and similarly not funded) at the 40 MAP level, let alone at today's level of operation. No measures have been implemented to mitigate increases over the 1980 EIS/EIR- approved level. Consequently, ground transportation mitigation measures for the Master Plan Addendum must therefore use 40 MAP as the baseline.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00537-7.

SPC00250-6

Comment:

In addition, conditions of approval must contain specific funding sources, schedules, legally binding commitments to implement signed by the responsible agencies, and remedies in the case of non-performance. Without such funding sources, implementation commitments, and remedies, any mitigation measures are illusory.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AR00003-63. There are no requirements under CEQA or NEPA that funding sources for mitigation measures be specified. A specific funding plan has not yet been prepared for the Master Plan; however, it is anticipated that a joint funding effort would be pursued, involving Federal and State grants and other efforts. Much of the project would likely be funded with airport-generated revenues, such as concession fees, landing fees, revenue bonds, leases, and passenger facility charges (PFCs). It is not anticipated that any local tax revenue would be used for this project. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the airport's funding abilities outside of the airport. Finally, please note that CEQA requires a mitigation monitoring or reporting program be adopted for this project to ensure the implementation of all required mitigation measures.

SPC00250-7

Comment:

LAX Master Plan Addendum And Supplement to Draft EIS/EIR Comments

General

1. Considerable uncertainty regarding Los Angeles World Airports' (LAWA's) intention to complete proposed mitigation measures is raised by the following comment:

3. Comments and Responses

"Mitigation measures are applicable only to the extent that the use of airport revenues to fund such measures is permissible under federal law and policies." (Technical Report 2a, page 41 and elsewhere as indicated by specific comments below.)

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-6.

SPC00250-8

Comment:

2. As with the 2001 Draft Master Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report Draft EIS/EIR, the study area for Off- Airport Ground Access is primarily north of LAX. Little attention is paid to streets and freeways south of the airport. More significantly, mitigation measures appear to be limited to LADOT jurisdictions with little regard to traffic problems created in surrounding areas outside of the City of Los Angeles.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-3.

SPC00250-9

Comment:

3. It is not clear how moving passenger access east outside of the Central Terminal Area improves security. Requiring passengers with luggage and visitors to use a 1.5-mile long Automated People Mover before entering security makes no sense. What is being protected? Obviously not passengers because they could be subject to numerous threats while in transit. Granted the Central Terminal Area will no longer be as insecure with removal of parking structures. That threat has been moved to the new Ground Transportation Center and the new Intermodal Transportation Center.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00250-10

Comment:

EIS/EIR Supplement, Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures

1. Page 4-2 to 4-3, Mitigation Measures Bullet, - The comment - "It should be noted that mitigation measures, as well as Master Plan commitments, are applicable to the extent that the use of airport revenue to fund such measures and commitments is permissible under federal law and policies." creates considerable uncertainty regarding the validity of any proposed mitigation measures.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-6.

SPC00250-11

Comment:

2. Page 4-3, The Environmental Baseline, - Using the 1998 Revision to CEQA Guidelines - "as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published...." as a basis for establishing an environmental baseline ignores all environmental impacts since LAX was expanded in the 1980s and 1990s from 40 MAP to the

current baseline. Unmitigated impacts have resulted in uncontrolled traffic growth with significant impact on neighborhoods north, south, and east of LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues and TR-GEN-3 regarding growth at LAX beyond 40 MAP.

SPC00250-12

Comment:

3. Pages 4-3 and 4-4. The Environmental Baseline, Third Paragraph - The discussion in this paragraph regarding "incremental" and "cumulative" impacts raises the issue of incremental changes to LAX since the last Draft EIS/EIR of 1978 from 40 MAP to the current baseline. Our view is these incremental changes and their impacts especially with regard to traffic should be addressed by this Supplement to allow mitigation to 40 MAP. This would necessitate an Environmental Baseline of 1984 vice 1996/97.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00537-7.

SPC00250-13

Comment:

4. Page 4-6, Formulation of Master Plan Commitments and Mitigation Measures. Third Paragraph - What is the timetable for "formulation" of the referenced Mitigation Monitoring Plan? How will mitigation measures be enforced?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AR00003-63 regarding the mitigation monitoring and reporting program.

SPC00250-14

Comment:

EIS/EIR Supplement, Chapter 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation

1. Page 4-243, 4.3.2.2 General Approach and Methodology, Second Bullet, Third Sentence and Figure S4.3.2-1, Off-Airport Surface Transportation Study Areas - What is the rationale for limiting the area of study south of LAX to north of Rosecrans while including a more extensive area north and east of LAX? As indicated in our June 12, 2001 comments, the study area is biased toward those areas within the jurisdiction of LADOT to the exclusion of other neighboring jurisdictions.

Response:

The ten additional intersections added to the traffic study in Alternative D were included because Alternative D is the only alternative that proposes the addition of two passenger facilities on the east end of the airport. The ten additional intersections are located relatively close to these facilities. One of these ten additional intersections, 104th Street and La Cienega Boulevard, lies partially within the jurisdiction of LADOT. The eastern half of that intersection is within County of Los Angeles jurisdiction. The other 9 intersections are within Los Angeles County, the City of Inglewood, or the City of Hawthorne.

In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 and, in particular, Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.2 regarding a discussion of the study area and facilities analyzed.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00250-15

Comment:

2. Page 4-247. Sixth Paragraph Last Sentence - What is the rationale for limiting coordination to LADOT?

Response:

The line referenced did not intend to imply that the coordination was limited only to LADOT. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 and, in particular, Subtopic Response TR-ST-2.8 for a list of other cities and agencies that were consulted regarding integration of local plans into the baseline scenarios.

SPC00250-16

Comment:

3. Pages 4-248 to 4-250, 4.3.2.5 Master Plan Commitments - Will off-airport traffic control actions, necessitated by these commitments, be coordinated with jurisdictions other than LADOT?

Response:

LAWA will coordinate with the appropriate transportation jurisdiction on off-airport traffic control actions necessitated by the Master Plan commitments.

SPC00250-17

Comment:

4. Pages 4-254 to 4-261, Figure S4.3.2-4, Year 2015 Alternative D Levels of Service (Adjusted Environmental Baseline Comparison) - What are the Levels of Service and Impacts for the following intersections:

- Sepulveda and Marine,
- Sepulveda and Manhattan Beach,
- Aviation and Marine,
- Aviation and Manhattan Beach,
- Nash and El Segundo,
- Douglas and El Segundo,
- La Cienega and El Segundo (east of the 405),
- La Cienega and Rosecrans,
- Inglewood and El Segundo,
- Inglewood and Rosecrans,
- Inglewood and Marine,
- Inglewood and Manhattan Beach,
- Hawthorne and El Segundo,
- Hawthorne and Rosecrans,
- Hawthorne and Marine, and
- Hawthorne and Manhattan Beach/Artesia?

Response:

The summary of the levels of service and impacts for all analyzed intersections are in Chapter 4.3.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Further details for the analyzed intersections can be found in Technical Report S-2b and Attachment I of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-2 and, in particular, Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.2 regarding why all potentially impacted intersections were not included in the traffic study.

SPC00250-18

Comment:

5. Pages 4-254 to 4-261, Figure S4.3.2-4, Year 2015 Alternative D Levels of Service (Adjusted Environmental Baseline Comparison) - What are the Levels of Service and Impacts for the following links:

- Sepulveda south of Rosecrans,
- Sepulveda Tunnel,
- Aviation south of Rosecrans,
- Inglewood south of Imperial,
- Hawthorne south of Imperial, and
- Rosecrans west of Hawthorne?

Response:

The summary of the levels of service and impacts for all analyzed links are in Chapter 4.3.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 and, in particular, Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.2 regarding why all potentially impacted links were not included in the traffic study.

SPC00250-19

Comment:

6. Pages 4-254 to 4-261. Figure S4.3.2-4, Year 2015 Alternative D Levels of Service (Adjusted Environmental Baseline Comparison) - What are the Levels of Service and Impacts for the following Freeway Ramps:

- I-405 NB off-ramp and El Segundo,
- I-405 SB off-ramp and LA Cienega S/O Century,
- I-405 NB off-ramp and Rosecrans, and
- I-405 NB off-ramp and Inglewood?

Response:

The summary of the levels of service and impacts for all analyzed freeway ramps are in Chapter 4.3.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 and, in particular, Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.2 regarding why all potentially impacted freeway ramps were not included in the traffic study.

SPC00250-20

Comment:

7. Pages 4-265 to 4-269. Table S4.3.2-8, Year 2008 Alternative D Levels of Service (Adjusted Environmental Baseline Comparison) - Concerns regarding status of Intersections, Links, and Freeway Ramps expressed in comments 4 to 6 above also apply to this table and supporting analysis.

Response:

The summary of the levels of service and impacts for all analyzed intersections, links, and freeway ramps are in Chapter 4.3.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Further details for the analyzed intersections can be found in Technical Report S-2b and Attachment I of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 and, in particular, Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.2 regarding why all potentially impacted intersections, links, and freeway ramps were not included in the traffic study.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00250-21

Comment:

8. Page 4-273, 4.3.2.7.2 Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, Third Paragraph - Another Project to be considered is the construction of up to 750 units comprising a mix of single-family detached homes, attached and detached town houses, and high quality condominiums on the southeast corner of El Segundo and Aviation Boulevards in Hawthorne. The City Councils of El Segundo and Hawthorne recently approved this project, Pacific Glen.

Response:

The analysis for Alternative D used 2001 as a base year for related projects. Projects approved after that year could not be included in the analysis.

SPC00250-22

Comment:

9. Page 4-273, 4.3.2.8 Mitigation Measures - The statement in this paragraph: The following mitigation measures are applicable only to the extent that the use of airport revenue to fund such measures is permissible under federal law and policies. casts doubt regarding the validity of any proposed mitigation measures. What agency will make the determination regarding use of airport funds? When will this decision be made?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-6.

SPC00250-23

Comment:

10. Pages 4-275 to 4-278, Table S4.3.2-11, Year 2008 Alternative D Mitigation Plan (Adjusted Environmental Baseline Comparison) - The assumed proposed improvement by County of Los Angeles of the Intersection of Aviation and El Segundo is not substantiated by the Coastal Corridor Transportation Study, Phase II, Figure 9. Roadway Improvements Funded, South Bay Cities Council of Governments, 2003. Widening of Aviation is funded, but intersection improvements are not funded.

Response:

At a meeting held on September 5, 2002 at the MTA to discuss Aviation Boulevard, staff from the Public Works Department of LA County stated that the widening of Aviation Boulevard from Imperial Highway to Hawaii Street would be released for construction bids in late 2003. Confirmation of the accuracy of our assumption that this improvement would be in place by 2008 was obtained by Robert Yates of the MTA on November 20, 2003.

SPC00250-24

Comment:

11. Pages 4-275 to 4-278, Table S4.3.2-11, Year 2008 Alternative D Mitigation Plan (Adjusted Environmental Baseline Comparison) and Pages 4-279 to 4-284, Table S4.3.2-12, year 2015 Alternative D Mitigation Plan (Adjusted Environmental Baseline Comparison) - The unstudied Intersections, Links, and Freeway ramps identified in comments 4 to 6 above must be added to planned mitigation measures as appropriate.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2. In particular see Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.2 regarding the study area and facilities analyzed.

SPC00250-25**Comment:**

12. Page 4-295, 4.3.2.10.2 Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, Second Paragraph - Leaving two critical intersections nearest the new Ground Transportation Center and Intermodal Transportation Center (Century at La Cienega and Imperial at La Cienega) unmitigated will lead to serious access problems for vehicles from the South Bay using arterial highways. What is the intended plan? To ignore the issue is not acceptable.

Response:

Vehicles coming from the South Bay area have alternative routes to the proposed GTC and ITC that do not involve traveling through either of the two intersections mentioned. For northbound traffic on Aviation Boulevard, there is a slip ramp proposed north of 111th Street which will connect to the on-airport roadways that lead directly to the GTC. The ITC can be accessed from Aviation Boulevard via 111th Street. South Bay drivers heading to the GTC or ITC could also choose to use the I-405 Freeway and exit at the proposed Lennox Boulevard Interchange onto the airport roadways that lead directly to these facilities.

SPC00250-26**Comment:**

Technical Report S-2a. - Supplemental On-Airport Surface Transportation

1. Pages 24 and 25, Table 5, Key Assumptions/Inputs 2015 Alternative D, Planned - Regional Access/Egress Directional Distributions and Attachment A - What is the basis for allocation of percentages of passengers between entrances and ramps?

Response:

Determining the directional distribution of airport trips was a two-step process. Initially, airport trip generation was estimated, and the regional distribution of trips was determined following the procedures described in Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.13.8. Then the LAX Ground Access Model (off-airport model) was run to obtain estimated traffic volumes on links and turning movements at intersections. The directional turns at airport entry/exit points as estimated by the off-airport model were then fed back into the on-airport model. This process was performed for each airport alternative.

SPC00250-27**Comment:**

2. Page 62, Table 17, Key Assumptions/Inputs 2015 Alternative D, Refined System - Regional Access/Egress Directional Distributions - What is the basis for allocation of percentages of passengers between entrances and ramps?

Response:

Determining the directional distribution of airport trips was a two-step process. Initially, airport trip generation was estimated, and the regional distribution of trips was determined following the procedures described in Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.13.8. Then the LAX Ground Access Model (off-airport model) was run to obtain estimated traffic volumes on links and turning movements at intersections. The directional turns at airport entry/exit points as estimated by the off-airport model were then fed back into the on-airport model. This process was performed for each airport alternative.

SPC00250-28**Comment:**

Technical Report S-2b. - Supplemental Off- Airport Surface Transportation

3. Comments and Responses

1. Page 3 and Figure 1, Revised Study Area and Key Study Locations - Why have study areas been limited to areas north of Rosecrans?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

SPC00250-29

Comment:

2. Page 8, Planned Development Projects Added to Background Assumptions, - Hawthorne should be included in your list for projects.

Response:

It is unclear to which project the commentor is referring. The list of related projects is shown in Chapter 4.3.2 and Technical Report S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00250-30

Comment:

3. Page 15, First Paragraph - Another Project to be considered is the construction of up to 750 units comprising a mix of single-family detached homes, attached and detached town houses, and high quality condominiums on the southeast corner of El Segundo and Aviation Boulevards in Hawthorne. The City Councils of El Segundo and Hawthorne recently approved this project, Pacific Glen.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment SPC00250-21. Please refer to Response to Comment SPC00250-21.

SPC00250-31

Comment:

4. Page 25, 3.2. Geographical Distribution of Trips - As indicate in above comments regarding Technical Report 2a, the basis for trip allocation is not obvious. Here the implication is "Passenger Surveys". Have these surveys been documented? If so where? If the basis is Technical Report 2b, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, LAX Master Plan Off-Airport Existing 1996 Transportation Conditions Report of the Draft EIS/EIR, the validity of this allocation is questionable. The intersections surveyed in that study were biased toward the use of I-405 to access the CTA via Imperial and Century. None of the intersections surveyed were west of I-405 and south of Imperial. Consequently no data was collected regarding LAX traffic from Palos Verdes, Beach Cities, and bailouts from I-405 northbound onto surface streets.

Response:

As described in the LAX Ground Access Model Calibration and Validation Report (October 1998), distribution of airport passenger trips is based on the 1993 Air-Passenger Survey conducted by then the Los Angeles Department of Airports. Intersection surveys were not used to determine airport passenger distribution, but were used to validate the results of the model by comparing estimated percentages of airport trips to observed percentages of airport trips at several select locations throughout the study area.

SPC00250-32

Comment:

5. Page 26, Table S9, Existing and Future Transportation Deficiencies (RTP Background Assumptions) - What is the justification for arbitrarily limiting the study area to north of Rosecrans? If the following intersections, links, and ramps had been included in the analysis, the number impacted would probably be higher:

- Sepulveda and Marine,
- Sepulveda and Manhattan Beach,
- Aviation and Marine,
- Aviation and Manhattan Beach,
- Nash and El Segundo,
- Douglas and El Segundo,
- La Cienega and El Segundo (east of I 405),
- La Cienega and Rosecrans,
- Inglewood and El Segundo,
- Inglewood and Rosecrans,
- Inglewood and Marine,
- Inglewood and Manhattan Beach,
- Hawthorne and El Segundo,
- Hawthorne and Rosecrans,
- Hawthorne and Marine,
- Hawthorne and Manhattan Beach/Artesia,
- Sepulveda south of Rosecrans,
- Sepulveda Tunnel,
- Aviation south of Rosecrans,
- Inglewood south of Imperial,
- Hawthorne south of Imperial,
- Rosecrans west of Hawthorne,
- I-405 NB off-ramp and El Segundo,
- I-405 SB off-ramp and LA Cienega S/O Century,
- I-405 NB off-ramp and Rosecrans, and
- I-405 NB off-ramp and Inglewood.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC01483-21; please refer to Response to Comment PC01483-21.

SPC00250-33

Comment:

6. Page 27, Third Paragraph and Figure S3, Differences in LAX Passenger Trips - 2015 PM Peak Hour - Alternative D - Adjusted Environmental Baseline - What is the basis for the conclusion that shifting passenger access to the eastern end of the airport will cause a measurable shift in traffic using I-405? Should Lincoln be included in the discussion in the third paragraph? Reduction of traffic on Lincoln is not reflected in Figure S3.

Response:

The basis for this conclusion is a comparison between the results of runs using the LAX Ground Access Model, which is described in further detail in Section 2.2 of Technical Report S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The model was run using 2015 traffic volume projections under the Adjusted Environmental Baseline Scenario, and then run using the 2015 traffic volume projections and proposed facilities of Alternative D. Figure S3 graphically represents the difference between the results of those two traffic model runs, as expressed in LAX passenger trip volumes during the PM peak hour.

Although the reduction in LAX passenger trip volumes on Lincoln Boulevard during the PM peak hour in 2015 is smaller than those reductions on Sepulveda Boulevard or La Tijera Boulevard, the LAX ground Access Model does show there to be a reduction in LAX passenger trips on Lincoln Boulevard.

SPC00250-34

Comment:

7. Page 27, Fifth Paragraph and Figure S4, Differences in Total Vehicle Trips - 2015 PM Peak Hour - Alternative D - Adjusted Environmental Baseline - What is the basis for the conclusion regarding traffic shift?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

These conclusions are based on results from the LAX Ground Access Model. The model was first run using 2015 traffic volumes under the Adjusted Environmental Baseline Scenario. Then the model was adjusted to account for the project components and facility ingress/egress locations of Alternative D. Figure S4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR shows graphically the differences in total traffic volumes for the PM peak hour based on the results of those two model runs.

SPC00250-35

Comment:

8. Page 28, Table S10, Master Plan Impacts on Surface Streets, Freeways, and Intersections vs. Adjusted Environmental Baseline: RTP Background Assumptions - See comment 5 above regarding Table S9.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 (Section 1) for a discussion of the study area and facilities analyzed.

SPC00250-36

Comment:

9. Pages 33 and 34, 4.2 Study Area Transportation Benefits, Table 11 Study Area Average Speed and Congested Lane Miles, and Table S12 Study Area VMT and VHT - The conclusions reflected in these tables probably result from the arbitrary conclusion that traffic will shift as a result of the proposed shift in passenger access to the east.

Response:

The conclusions reached are not arbitrary but are based on solid analytical procedures. Forecasts of future year traffic volumes have been developed using the LAX Ground Access Model. Development of this model is described in the "LAX Ground Access Model Calibration and Validation Report (October 1998)." This document is provided in the Draft EIS/EIR, at the end of Technical Report 2b, following Appendix II-O.

SPC00250-37

Comment:

10. Pages 35 and 36, Essential Neighborhood Traffic Management Elements - Does this philosophy extend to neighborhoods outside of the City of Los Angeles? If not, it should. Because of the reference to LADOT procedures in the third paragraph, the impression is created that the intent is to limit to the City of Los Angeles. The new interchange at Lennox and shift of passenger access to the east will not increase the capacity of NB I-405 south of the new interchange. Consequently, the risk of driver bailout using El Segundo, Rosecrans, and Inglewood Off Ramps remains. This may well result in cut through traffic into neighborhoods south of LAX. This should be examined.

Response:

Neighborhood Traffic Management Plans will be considered for jurisdictions outside of the City of Los Angeles as well within the City of Los Angeles. The Neighborhood Traffic Management Plans are intended to study whether airport traffic is cutting through residential neighborhoods and if so, what can be done to discourage or prevent this intrusion. LAWA acknowledges that the appropriate local agency will have responsibility for neighborhood traffic management plans within their respective jurisdictions.

SPC00250-38**Comment:**

11. Page 36, 5.2 Mitigation Measures for Alternative D, third paragraph and Figure S6 Changes in Total Traffic Volumes Due to Lennox/I-405 Interchange and I-105 Ramps - 2015 PM Peak Hour - What is the basis for these conclusions?

Response:

These conclusions are based on results from the LAX Ground Access Model. The model was first run using 2015 traffic volumes without the proposed freeway interchanges on the I-105 and I-405 Freeways. Then the model was adjusted to account for the proposed freeway improvements and the closure of Lennox Boulevard east of the I-405 Freeway. Figure S6 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR shows graphically the differences in total traffic volumes for the PM peak hour based on the results of those two model runs.

SPC00250-39**Comment:**

12. Page 36, 5.2 Mitigation Measures for Alternative D, third paragraph, last sentence - Does this conclusion include the potential for increased bailouts from I-405 as discussed in comment 10?

Response:

This conclusion is based on anticipated 2015 traffic conditions under Alternative D with the proposed interchanges on the I-105 and I-405 Freeways.

SPC00250-40**Comment:**

13. Page 41, First Complete Paragraph - Leaving two critical intersections nearest the new Ground Transportation Center and Intermodal Transportation Center (Century at La Cienega and Imperial at La Cienega) unmitigated will lead to serious access problems for vehicles from the South Bay using arterial highways. What is the intended plan? To ignore the issue is not acceptable.

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00250-25. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-25.

SPC00250-41**Comment:**

13. Page 41, Fourth Paragraph - What agency will decide which mitigation measures will be funded with airport revenues? In the event airport revenues are not to be used to fund the recommended mitigation measures, will the proposed actions cease?

Response:

The Federal Aviation Administration will make the final determination as to which mitigation measures may be funded with airport revenues. If the FAA determines that airport revenue sources cannot be used for a particular mitigation measure, the proposed mitigation would not necessarily become infeasible. LAWA could seek non-airport revenue sources in order to complete the mitigation. Otherwise, an alternative mitigation measure, acceptable to the FAA, LADOT and the appropriate local jurisdiction, would be developed. Additional environmental analysis would be conducted for each alternative mitigation measure, as appropriate.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00250-42

Comment:

14. Page 41, 5.3 Alternative Mitigation Plan for Alternative D, First Paragraph - Which agency has the authority to approve the proposed Lennox Interchange and when will they decide?

Response:

Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration have the authority to approve the Lennox Boulevard interchange. Conceptual approval of the interchange is expected during the first half of 2004. Final approval by Caltrans and FHWA would require the completion of a Project Study Report and Project Report. Those reports will be completed by LAWA at a later date.

SPC00250-43

Comment:

15. Page 41, 5.3 Alternative Mitigation Plan for Alternative D, Fourth Paragraph - Lennox Interchange should be deleted from the mitigation measures in this paragraph since this section addresses an alternative plan.

Response:

Comment noted. The Final EIS/EIR has been revised.

SPC00250-44

Comment:

16. Pages 41 and 42, 5.3 Alternative Mitigation Plan for Alternative D, Last Paragraph, First Sentence - What agency will decide which mitigation measures will be funded with airport revenues? In the event airport revenues are not to be used to fund the recommended mitigation measures, will the proposed actions cease?

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00250-41; please see Response to Comment SPC00250-41.

SPC00250-45

Comment:

17. Attachment B, Geographic Distribution of Airport Trips - Alternative D - What is the basis for determining the distribution. See comment 4 above.

Response:

The basis for this map is described in Section 3.2, "Geographic Distribution of Airport Trips," of the Technical Report S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00251 McCain, Jackie None Provided 11/5/2003

SPC00251-1

Comment:

Culver City certainly not consulted in the new alternative. On April 19, 2001 you spoke to the Culver City Homeowner Assn. on the Master Plan of Los Angeles International Airport Perhaps our group too interested in traffic on the 405 and not runways, so you checked us off the list.

Response:

It is not clear to which group the commentor is referring. Information pertaining to the public outreach undertaken for the Draft EIS/EIR is provided in Appendix B, Public Involvement, of the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00251-2

Comment:

Alternate D accommodates around 78.9 million annual passengers, almost at the same level as no change. While previous plans had almost 19 million more passengers. Less traffic on the 405 for sure.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00251-3

Comment:

The runway extensions seem feasible, however, not really informed on flight safety my comments are not one of an expert. The new parallel taxiway between existing runways does seem like a necessary safety point.

Response:

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

SPC00251-4

Comment:

Looking at Alternate D's Manchester Square you will find many security and safety points. Traffic into the square from the 405 is from Arbor Vitae ST. and Century Blvd. the commercial and private vehicle. Today there does not seem to be safe commercial inspection. To think this has eliminated curbside parking is one great safety factor.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00251-5

Comment:

Ancillary facilities will be consolidated. Maintenance into a smaller area, Fire Station 51 expanded, Fire Station 80 relocated and expanded. The existing police headquarters removed by a new 110,000 square foot airport police building on the northwest corner of Westchester Parkway and Emerson Avenue.

The public parking will consist of three garages, 7,515 stalls both short and long term parking. Even the employees will have a new garage of 12,400 spaces and shuttled to their work sections.

The MTA Green Line will be linked to the passenger terminal by a covered walkway.

Alternative D will require approximately 77 acres of property, the least amount of land of all proposed alternatives.

Response:

Comment noted.

The existing American Airlines, TWA and US Airway maintenance complexes on the west side of the airport (551,000 square feet) would be removed in Alternative D. Two new facilities totaling

3. Comments and Responses

approximately 300,000 square feet would be located on the west side of the airport, south of World Way West.

The existing LAWA police headquarters would be removed and relocated by a new 110,000 square foot facility.

Public parking would be provided in three separate locations: GTC, ITC and in an expanded Lot B. The total number of public parking spaces included on-airport, as part of Alternative D, is 22,112. Please refer to Table 2.3-1, Alternative D - Summary of Public Parking Facilities, on page 2-69 of the Draft Master Plan Addendum.

An enclosed pedestrian connection with power walks would cross over Imperial Highway and under I-105 to connect to the MTA Green Line station at Aviation Boulevard with the ITC. The ITC would be connected to the CTA via the APM.

SPC00251-6

Comment:

Plan D - Construction

Construction workers will park from one mile to fifty miles away and be shuttle bused in. They will not work in peak hours --- 8 a.m. to 9 a. m. - 5 p.m. to 6 p,m, and at the high airport hours -11 a.m. to noon

IMPROVEMENTS at 1-405 and 1-105

A new 1-405/Lennox Boulevard interchange, afly over the existing 1-105/Imperial Highway interchange near Aviation. Provide new ramps between Aviation and LaCienega at the 1-105. Create a new interchange at 1-405 and Lennox Boulevard.

They plan to build future FlyAway remote terminals and bus in passengers. This should cut the traffic to the airport down on the 405 for Culver City.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00251-7

Comment:

In my opinion the Safety and Security of Plan D is designed to be flexible and will accommodate any new requirements.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00251-8

Comment:

GOLFERS:

I would be remiss if I did not tell you - the three (3) holes at Manchester Golf course will be replaced.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00252 Patton, Jasmine 50th Street Block Club 11/4/2003

SPC00252-1

Comment:

As a member of 50th St Block Club and as an Area Representative for the Dept of Neighborhood Empowerment, Neighborhood Development Congress, I have read and approved Alternative D as the best plan for the improvement of the airport at LAX.

However, the addition of shops and consumer locations will add to the already dense traffic, and is not an adequate security alternative to gates. I believe that segment of alternative D should be re-evaluated.

Response:

The traffic study and mitigation plan presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR accounted for all of the proposed facilities under Alternative D.

SPC00253 Patton, Todd 50th Street Block Club 11/4/2003

SPC00253-1

Comment:

I believe that Alternative D to the Master Plan is best for the city. Leave the gates.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00254 Patton, Bruce 50th Street Block Club 11/4/2003

SPC00254-1

Comment:

I approve of LAX Master Alternative Plan "D".

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00255 Beltran, Hector None Provided 11/6/2003

SPC00255-1

Comment:

ENVIRONS (UNDER SIEGE)

Seen enough
The vision gleams (and has been meet) in every air.

Had enough
Sound from loud noise pollutes our skies,
In the evening and in the sunlight of every single day

Known enough

3. Comments and Responses

Oh human! Oh visions! And aching sounds. - Life comes to a halt

Departure from affection and sensitivity,

modern loud roaring raw thundering shining sound,

hovering constantly over us.

I have witness enough

Your are destroying our habitat.

- You and I are fully of that.

- So please help us make them stop and have them come to a halt.

Our normal of going about our daily life is being shatter, a once tranquil environment has been irreversible disrupted by commercial development, perhaps beyond repair. Our senses witness and feel such repercussion.

American naturalists, who once study the natural sounds and recorded their patterns, find today their task increasingly more difficult. Finding a noise-free environment, a refuge from the maddening crows is a more challenging task now than ever before in history. Thus, nature may well become, truly a Sanctuary for those who come to realize and vision what a healthy environment really is and means to some of us.

City officials are unable to respond to our concerns, let alone behave responsibly to demands placed in our environment and to those who happen to live in it. I have witness a blatant disregard to demands for an objective and accurate environmental impact study in our community.

Where I now live each and every single day, seek relief in silence, which I can only find between the midnight hours of 1:30 and 4:30 PM. In spite our pleas for relief, we find ourselves increasingly shut-off from the policy process, and increasingly less able, helpless and more dis-able to respond.

In addition, we ask ourselves will this be a reversible trend? We all are suffering from constant distress and disruption in our daily activities, due to the neglect from private developers and our civil authorities and the unfavorable outcomes from policies issued and improperly enforced.

A sacrilege has been perpetuated on our senses, and our perception of wellbeing perverted.

A psychological assault as a result of this siege

Now more than ever I seek solutions and perhaps become instrumental in finding effective and immediate management of this alarming problem constantly hovering over us.

We have no where to go, so please before we regret future irreversible damage on our senses and our community. Do not neglect to respond to our request. The potential faculties of future generations are stake and our well being is in jeopardy.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, impacts on biological habitat in Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses were provided in Appendix D, Appendix J, and Technical Reports 1, 7, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-H, and Technical Reports S-1 and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process, Topical Response TR-LU-1

regarding impacts on quality of life, Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

SPC00256 **Haglund, Jr.,** **None Provided** **10/30/2003**
Howard

SPC00256-1

Comment:

- Where is the fuel storage system in Alternatives A&B

Response:

As indicated on page 3-33 and Figure 3-7 in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative A, the fuel farm would be relocated from its existing 20-acre location on the west side of the airport along World Way West to a new 13-acre location on the airport just west of the south entrance to the Sepulveda tunnel.

As indicated on page 3-44 in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative B, the fuel farm would be relocated off-airport to either the Scattergood Generating Station located in Los Angeles or an oil refinery located approximately one mile south of LAX in El Segundo. Please see Chapter V of the Draft LAX Master Plan for the locations for the off-site fuel farm proposed under Alternative B.

SPC00256-2

Comment:

- I don't see in alternatives A&B where the incremental work justifies the marginal increase in daily operations potential.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternatives A and B would add one new runway either on the south airfield complex or on the north airfield complex. The added runway increases runway capacity to serve more aircraft operations than Alternatives D and C and No Action/No Project Alternative.

SPC00256-3

Comment:

- Encourage more passenger efficient aircraft by having cost incentives for larger aircraft - get rid of RJ's, turbo prop traffic etc & small Boeing aircraft

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00222-1.

SPC00256-4

Comment:

- Don't worry about increasing capability at LAX, the freeway systems nearby can hardly handle what you have now. Develop the other airports or new airports as a region - just because you don't own other airports be practical and solve jointly with BUR, LGB, SNA the problem.

Response:

Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand.

3. Comments and Responses

LAWA is currently preparing Master Plan updates for both Ontario and Palmdale, in order for them to play their part in addressing the anticipated regional demand. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 for more detail about planning for LAX and the other airports in the region, and Topical Responses TR-RC-1 and TR-RC-5 regarding LAWA's planning for Ontario and Palmdale.

The Southern California Regional Airport Authority (SCRAA) is a joint powers agreement among the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino, and the City of Los Angeles. The Authority was formed to develop and implement a regional approach of providing airport capacity. After dormant for many years, the SCRAA was reactivated in March 2001 to deal principally with two issues: the proposed expansion of LAX, and the proposed conversion of El Toro to a civilian airport. The decline in air travel demand due to the economic recession, the events of September 11th, the war in Iraq, and SARS has largely driven the Authority back to inactivity. Riverside County voted in July 2002 to withdraw from SCRAA.

In October 2003, political leaders from the Inland Empire and Los Angeles announced a new coalition to plan as a region for the growth of air traffic in Southern California.

The decision to develop an airport is the responsibility of the local airport proprietor. There is no single federal or local government or similar organization that has the authority to make and implement decisions for the further development of all the various airports in Southern California.

SPC00256-5

Comment:

- Don't increase the airport size - yes I am a Westchester landowner!!

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00257

**unreadable,
unreadable**

**Los Angeles County Economic
Development Corporation**

11/6/2003

SPC00257-1

Comment:

THE CHALLENGE

Modernization of LAX is not an alternative, it is an economic necessity! As the region's most important economic engine, LAX is our front door to the world, welcoming visitors and business travelers, moving more than 2 million tons of air cargo with a value of \$60.9 billion annually and enabling more than 20 million residents to travel and do business regionally and internationally. In fact, LAX is currently the world's busiest arrival and departure airport and fifth busiest cargo airport. Yet it has not been significantly modernized since 1984 when it was upgraded to handle 40 million annual passengers per year (MAP). Prior to 9-11, LAX served 67 million passengers per year. It is currently operating at 59 MAP.

J.D. Powers recently ranked LAX 18th out of 20 major international airports in terms of passenger satisfaction. Doing nothing is unacceptable. Southern California must meet the growing needs for air travel and commerce or forfeit the economic benefits. Other metropolitan areas like Phoenix, Denver, Las Vegas, San Francisco, and Vancouver have been aggressively expanding their airports to attract the business. A regional solution is required for Southern California and should include Ontario, Burbank, Long Beach, John Wayne, Palmdale, San Bernardino, March, George (and yes, El Toro) airports. Given the limitations at these airports, however, LAX is vital because of its unique mix of international and regional carriers, and its proximity to the region's frequent flyers and international air cargo shippers. LAX will remain Southern California's pre-eminent airport.

Starting the Master Plan and EIR process over is not an option. We must maintain the "legal" viability of this process which is based on an aging 1996 baseline. Unfortunately the process has already consumed 10 years of the 20-year planning horizon. Building incrementally to address each future crisis will merely result in the continuing deterioration and obsolescence of LAX. We are therefore compelled to operate within the existing record and the limits of the worst-case environmental statement it provides. Our only realistic choice is to identify and support those elements of the proposed alternatives or alternatives which can be assessed in the final EIR process which make the most economic, operational, security and financial sense today. Other alternatives may need to be considered in a supplemental or subsequent EIR process.

LAX needs to address the economic future of the region, as well as a potential terrorist event. Plans to modernize LAX should be based first on function, usability and economic impact, closely followed by due consideration for safety and security. Otherwise, an inefficient reconfiguration of airport operations on the transportation and economy of Southern California could impose unacceptable economic costs with questionable security and safety trade offs. In the aftermath of 9-11, the need for airport security has taken on new importance. Protecting people and facilities from a terrorist attack is a daunting challenge because "terrorism is dynamic and terrorists adapt their methods to suit changes in weaponry and defense tactics." Technology developments will offer new protection options in the future. Flexibility in current planning as opposed to massive, irreversible reconfiguration of airport operations is clearly advisable at this time.

Impacts on local communities need to be considered and economically rational solutions developed. However, it seems that LAX modernization, as critical as it is to the region, has become the poster child of the "not-in-my-backyard" movement. When residents in Orange County decide they don't want the impacts of having their own airport at El Toro and suggest "L.A." needs to solve its "own airport problems" at the expense of local residents in El Segundo, Westchester and Inglewood, issues of equity and burden sharing are painfully evident. Communities surrounding LAX understandably want other regional airports to share the growth in passenger and cargo needs.

Mayor Hahn should be commended for taking the political risk to try to move LAX modernization (and the El Toro alternative) forward. The Mayor is in an unenviable position. The burden of developing a solution for a region of some 180+ cities and communities has fallen largely on a single proprietary department in one city (albeit the largest). Without the rejuvenation of a Southern California regional airport authority to represent the common interests of this mega-region, our economic future is at risk. Mayor Hahn has invited public input at this point regarding his Alternative D, and we appreciate the invitation to share the insight and experience of the LAEDC's Critical Infrastructure Council.

The LAEDC's Critical Infrastructure Council is comprised of experts in planning, transportation, airport and airline operations, engineering, safety and security, economics and business. This assessment draws on meetings and dialogue with LAWA, the Mayor's Office for the City of LA, El Segundo's Mayor Gordon, SAIC, RAND and other security experts, the airlines and the Westchester Alternative E Group.

The Critical Infrastructure Council recommends that four guiding principles be applied in the final decision-making for the LAX Master Plan:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00257-2 through SPC00257-5 below.

SPC00257-2

Comment:

1. Flexibility

In this post-9-11 world, planning for something as important as the modernization of LAX and the future of a regional airport system in Southern California is fraught with uncertainties. How quickly will passenger service rebound? How will passenger demand and market forces develop? What will be the mix and relationship of international and short-haul service? Will the new large body A380 Group VI type aircraft dominate international service? What will the TSA ultimately adopt as required airport security measures and what technologies will develop to address these needs? These unknowns argue strongly for a flexible plan which can adjust to future market and security requirements.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The components of Alternative D are designed to allow for flexibility with regard for advances in security technology, airline allocations, and type of operations to allow LAX to continue to efficiently function beyond the 2015 horizon.

SPC00257-3

Comment:

2. Passenger Convenience

Without world-class user-friendly facilities and service, our region will suffer as a global competitor. Ease of access to and use of all of our airports should be a top planning goal.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D is designed to provide such a facility.

SPC00257-4

Comment:

3. Security

LAX will remain a terrorist target. Security is an obvious priority. Any new plan must address improvements in security of both airport operations and passenger safety. We must consider and address the trade off's inherent in such planning.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00257-5

Comment:

4. Cost Effectiveness

The airline industry remains financially unstable. Landing and passenger fees do provide one source of funding but are also a competitiveness factor for LAX and its carriers. The plan should seek the most cost-effective solutions to the needs being address.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00257-6

Comment:

ALTERNATIVE D

ECONOMIC IMPACT

Economic impact should be a primary consideration in the development of LAX and our regional airport alternatives. The Master Plan EIR sheds significant light on such impact. The "no growth" and "Alternative D" scenarios, which cap LAX at 78 million annual passengers (MAP), result in regional economic outputs of some \$18-20 billion less than Alternatives A, B or C which support 89-98 MAP. While this comparison is not by itself determinative, policy makers and residents need to understand that this factor alone equates to potentially foregoing the benefit of the economic equivalent of more than 500,000 jobs for our future regional economy if Alternative D is implemented and other regional airports fail to meet the needs of travelers and cargo operations (estimated direct passenger and cargo

related jobs approach 100,000. See Schedule A). With California facing fiscal crisis and future population growth of five million more people in Southern California by 2020, such a plan could lead to economic strangulation. The economic equivalent of half a million jobs equate to more than \$1 Billion in annual tax revenues to support schools and governmental services.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00257-7

Comment:

The region must not cap its future with a "No Growth" plan for LAX. Market forces and user preferences will determine which airport alternatives in Southern California meet our future passenger and cargo needs. Burbank, Long Beach and John Wayne airports are already constrained or capped. Even Ontario with its substantial expandability has not generated sufficient traffic for Jet Blue, Aloha Air, and Air Canada for their passenger service. Use of our other regional airports for expanded passenger and dedicated cargo operations is a desirable goal. But, any plan which creates a real physical or capped limitation on LAX is unacceptable from an economic impact standpoint. A "planning capacity" is one thing. A legal or physical cap is something else. The goal of a distributed regional airport system is something everyone can support. But any plan must be flexible enough to address changing market forces and the traveling publics' ultimate choices of air service and airports.

Response:

LAWA only controls the operations and potential improvements at LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Other jurisdictions are responsible for developing the other regional airports. LAWA is currently preparing Master Plan updates for both Ontario and Palmdale, in order for them to play their part in addressing the anticipated regional demand. At the direction of Mayor Hahn, LAWA has planned Alternative D to be in compliance with SCAG's 2001 and Draft 2004 RTP allocations to LAX. It is up to the other regional airport operators to meet a larger percentage of the regional demand. LAWA does not have the authority to make and implement decisions for airports it does not own.

SPC00257-8

Comment:

GETTING TO THE AIRPORT

The concept of capping MAP can be misleading. Today's capacity limitations are not the number of flights our airports can accommodate; they are the number of passengers current modes of ground transportation can move to and from our airports. If the number of ground trips can be reduced and the number of passengers per ground trip increased, capacity can be improved and congestion can be reduced.

LAX is physically constrained today by the limits of ground access to move passengers and cargo to and from the airport via Century and Sepulveda Boulevards. Alternatives to improve this "connectivity" include:

1. Expansion of direct light rail service eliminating the multiple transfer issues currently extant on the Greenline. (Rail service could also incorporate a pre-check in flyaway service component discussed below).
2. A satellite system of dedicated "flyaway" bus service to LAX (and other regional airports) with pre-checked baggage service.
3. Remote check-in options outside the Central Terminal Area. (CTA)

Alternative D proposes the creation of a new offsite Ground Transportation Center (GTC) at Manchester Square adjacent to the 405 freeway, approximately two miles from the Central Terminal Area (CTA). The current parking structures would be eliminated and a new CTA constructed in the center of the airport. Direct truck and vehicle access would be replaced with an Automated People Mover (APM)

3. Comments and Responses

between the CTA and the GTC. It is unclear at this point whether passengers will be able to check their baggage at Manchester Square or will have to carry baggage through the GTC screening, onto the APM and into the CTA. Alternative D does propose limited flyaway service with direct bus access to the CTA. It also proposes an Intermodal Transportation Center where people can transfer from the Green Line and buses to the APM.

From a ground access standpoint, the option of a remote drop off and check in facility could enhance connectivity to LAX. However, due to its location the Manchester Square site raises unanswered questions regarding bottlenecks and back ups onto the 405 freeway as well as limitations regarding access from other highways and streets in the area. Timing regarding acquisition of the necessary land (200 acres) for Manchester Square is also highly speculative and could delay the project 7-9 years into the future. A site nearer LAX already under LAWA's control such as the Lot C area appears to offer a more viable and flexible alternative.

However, the most immediate and cost effective opportunity to alleviate traffic congestion around LAX is the creation of a world class "Flyaway" system of offsite check-in locations (e.g., Burbank, Downtown, Ontario, Long Beach, Orange County, etc.) where passengers can pre check- in luggage and board high quality dedicated buses designed for business travelers to travel via freeway diamond lanes direct to their airline terminal with their luggage delivered directly to baggage screening for aircraft load on.

Rail and bus systems like this are being used at many other airports including Hong Kong and London, and have now been approved by the TSA for use in Orlando. This option in Alternative D should be the focus of major funding support at this time, not massive irreversible airport reconfiguration. Alternative D will only add a .2 MAP of access capacity at a cost of approximately \$5 billion Imagine what \$1-2 billion would buy in terms of a network of flyaway options. Not only could flyaway service reduce traffic at LAX, high quality, low cost flyaway service to other regional airports (e.g., from Orange County to Ontario) would also stimulate more passenger interest in the use of other regional airports to further reduce demand on LAX. (One future opportunity if the Anaheim to Las Vegas high speed Maglev system is constructed would be a spur line to Ontario as a dedicated high-speed flyaway service.) Additionally, these flyaway facilities would provide for the ability to disperse traffic to other airports in the region by allowing passengers to leave from one airport and return to another with no concern about where their car is parked. Currently some business passengers are reluctant to use a secondary airport because of uncertainty about their return schedule. Having a network of flyaway services covering the regions' airports would alleviate this concern, promote use of other regional airports and significantly alleviate access congestion to all airports.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPC00154-5 regarding why Lot C is not recommended to be used for the Ground Transportation Center.

LAWA agrees that a series of remote terminal FlyAway facilities would provide airport passengers with an attractive alternative to taking their private vehicles to the airport. Alternative D includes new FlyAway facilities, with the additional incentive that the FlyAway buses would be the only passenger vehicles permitted into the Central Terminal Area, with direct curbside access to the airline terminals. Remote check-in of luggage at these facilities will be allowed, if approved by the FAA and Transportation Security Agency.

LAWA is currently preparing a Master Plan for Ontario International Airport. The viability for FlyAway service to that airport will be considered as part of the traffic study for that plan.

SPC00257-9

Comment:

RUNWAY SAFETY

The need for safety enhancements and center taxiways for the South runway complex are already overdue. By completing these improvements now, LAX will be capable of accepting the new A380 Group VI large (600 passenger) aircraft which a handful of international airlines will begin operating in 2007.

However, the massive reconfiguration of the north runway complex, especially the elimination of Terminals 1, 2, and 3 is of questionable value. Heathrow Airport has only two parallel runways yet plans to accommodate in excess of 80 MAP using new Group IV aircraft, suggesting LAX's reconfigured south runways plus one of the north runways should be adequate for LAX.

Elimination of Terminals 1, 2, and 3 to accommodate Group VI international aircraft is a highly questionable trade off, especially when one considers the impacts of reduction in gate capacity and the elimination of low-cost short-haul flights and service provided by low-fare airlines such as Southwest. Short-haul airline traffic is critical to feed LAX's national and international flights. Forty percent of all international passengers using the Bradley Terminal at LAX depend upon short-haul connections. Elimination of short-haul capacity is counter-productive to supporting international flights and service to LAX. SFO learned this when they lost more than 20% of their international flights after the departure of Southwest Airlines to Oakland. Baltimore-Washington International Airport on the other hand has seen a 20% increase in international traffic and a return to pre-911 travel levels due to Southwest Airlines expanding operations there. We need both types of service to be competitive.

Short-haul flights have grown much faster than international flights post 9-11. Loss of low fare service would also cause competitor's fares at LAX to rise. Without Southwest, Denver's commuter fares are some of the highest in the nation. Our region needs low cost airline service to remain economically competitive. Any modernization plan for LAX must maintain the flexibility to serve a changing mix of short-haul and international passenger demand. Unfortunately a change in fixed gates which dramatically shifts LAX capacity to dedicated gates for new Group IV large aircraft will eliminate three short-haul gates for every large aircraft gate created. Should north runway separation ultimately be needed, shifting the northern runway to the north would be the preferable option, not elimination of Terminals 1,2, and 3.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D was developed to offer a regional approach alternative for the LAX Master Plan to ensure representation of the communities' full range of priorities as well as to increase the safety and security of the airport. From the following content we inferred that the new Group IV aircraft mentioned by the commentator here may refer to the new Group VI aircraft. Heathrow Airport has two parallel runways and one cross wind runway and it serves about 60 million annual passengers. The numbers of passengers served by airports differ widely due to many other factors such as fleet mix even when the airports have the same number of runways. For example, a commuter aircraft would carry fewer passengers than a Boeing 747-400 or A380, but require nearly an equal share of airfield capacity. LAX's four runway configuration in Alternative D has the same capacity as its existing airfield. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00021-3 regarding aircraft runway operations under Alternative D.

The purpose of eliminating Terminals 1, 2, and 3 is not to accommodate Group VI aircraft as the commentator stated. The purpose of moving Runway 6L/24R and Runway 6R/24L further apart is to gain enough separation for a center taxiway between the two parallel runways. The purpose of the center taxiway is to enhance safe aircraft operations and reduce the potential for runway incursions. At the same time the center taxiway would be designed to meet the Group VI aircraft standards. Alternative D does not eliminate short-haul operation by eliminating commuter gates. Alternative D would provide a total of 153 contact and commuter gates in 2015 which is less than the existing number of gates. However, the existing number of gates includes 48 remote positions. The use of remote gates is not efficient operations since it requires longer ground time due to busing the passengers. Alternative D would require the use of fewer gates to achieve the same level due to the higher utilization rates of contact gates. Also Alternative D provides the same number of commuter gates (32 positions) as the No Action/No Project Alternative as described in Table 2.2-3, Number of Gates by Aircraft Group, in Section 2.2, Aircraft Gates (subsection 2.2.7), of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum. The gate facilities are planned and constructed to handle the anticipated aircraft fleet mix at the airport in the future, which includes a wide range of aircraft sizes, from small commuter aircraft to the new Airbus 380 (Group VI aircraft).

The commentator suggested moving the northernmost runway north similar to Alternative C. The suggested runway location would create larger noise impacts to the communities north of the airport compared to moving the inboard runway in the north airfield complex south as proposed by Alternative D.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00257-10

Comment:

AIRPORT & PASSENGER SECURITY

Post 9-11, airport security standards are undergoing continuous change. The Transportation Safety Administration continues to review a broad range of threats posed by terrorists. New technologies are under development to address the protection of passengers and facilities. Warnings have again been issued regarding potential hijacking threats even after cockpit cabin doors have been hardened. Now concentrations of people appear to be the preferred target. Security is a moving target and committing now to an expensive, irreversible and radical change in airport passenger operations based on a single threat scenario is not the best strategy.

Alternative D and the SAIC Security Report are based on the premise that car or truck bombs are the primary threat to future LAX operations. RAND on the other hand cites historical evidence that attacks on aircraft and luggage bombs pose a more frequent and greater threat to passengers. RAND also points out the risks created by concentrating large numbers of people in confined areas.

Basic security doctrine recognizes that the more geography and facilities requiring protection, the greater the size and cost of the necessary security forces and protection equipment and the greater the margin for error due to the lack of sufficiently trained personnel. Even though Alternative D appears to be primarily focused on protection of airport operations as opposed to passengers, the new passenger access system proposed in Alternative D actually creates three new targets of opportunity for terrorists: The Ground Transportation Center (GTC), the exposed, three-mile long Automated People Mover System (APM) and the new Central Terminal Area (CTA). These facilities not only concentrate passengers as targets, they also present distinct new opportunities to halt LAX operations if damaged or destroyed. A hijacked private or commercial plane could be aimed at the new Central Terminal Area where upwards of 20-25,000 passengers could be transiting on a major holiday, rendering LAX totally unoperational at untold human cost.

When one further considers the potential for 7-9 years of delay due to property acquisition issues, "hassle factors" for passengers and congestion on the 405 freeway, initial screening at the GTC using as yet unproven technology, a two-mile journey on the Automated People Mover System (APM) and yet another final security check at the Central Terminal Area (CTA), and the value, if any, of this added security, major operational reconfiguration of LAX requires further critical evaluation, especially if this huge cost in the early years of the project delays needed improvements for international air travel at the Bradley Terminal.

Response:

The traffic modeling showed that much of the non-airport traffic on I-405 would shift to Sepulveda Boulevard and to a lesser extent, Aviation Boulevard, after the CTA is closed to future private vehicles and more capacity becomes available on those streets. That is, the capacity of Sepulveda and I-405 would balance itself, regardless of whether the traffic is airport- or non-airport related. As a result, I-405 would not be burdened with both non-airport traffic that it would accommodate if the CTA was open and the new airport traffic generated by the GTC. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security-related aspects of the comment.

SPC00257-11

Comment:

AIR CARGO - A REGIONAL ECONOMIC IMPERATIVE

In 2002, air cargo exports from the region reached \$31.5 billion in value. Imports were \$29.4 billion. Cargo exported through our ocean ports was valued at \$30.5, less than that shipped by air. Air cargo service to and from the region is critical to the future growth of our economy. Hundreds of thousands of high-value jobs here depend on just-in-time shipments and deliveries of goods via air. The Southern California Association of Governments projects a tripling of air cargo over the next 20 years, from 3 million tons in 2000 to 8.9 million tons in 2020. Alternative D assumes a growth at LAX from 2.0 to 3.1

million annual tons. The capacity shortfall of 5.8 million tons will need to be accommodated at other regional airports such as Ontario, Norton, March, Palmdale and George, or the business and jobs will be rerouted to Phoenix and Las Vegas. Not addressed in Alternative D are the regional enhancements in ground access necessary to accommodate truck access to and from these regional airports and the thousands of business and retail locations throughout Southern California.

Dedicated cargo carriers such as UPS and EVA have already agreed to operate out of Ontario. Others such as Fed Ex might also be capable of using non-LAX alternatives. However, most of our air cargo currently moves in the bellies of passenger aircraft and this makes it difficult or too costly for airlines to provide cargo operations at a location distant from their primary passenger operations. Alternative D does not address a solution to this problem. It merely limits LAX to 3.1 million annual tons. Alternatives A, B, and C capped LAX air cargo at 4.2 million tons. Either we address the 50- 65% cargo capacity shortfall regionally or forfeit the business and related jobs to other regions. (Using the economic data developed by LAWA for the master plan suggests that every additional million tons of air cargo for the region equates to 50,000 additional jobs.)

Response:

The ground access improvements needed at other regional airports are beyond the scope of the LAX Master Plan and EIS/EIR.

LAWA is working with the LAX all-cargo airlines and freight forwarders to provide incentives to use Ontario and Palmdale for cargo destined for or originating near the airport. LAWA cannot force these companies to use Ontario or Palmdale.

At the direction of Mayor Hahn, the passenger and cargo capacity of LAX under Alternative D is approximately equal to the capacity of the existing facility. It will be incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional cargo demand, or that cargo tonnage will be handled outside of the region.

SPC00257-12

Comment:

CONSIDERATION OF COSTS AND BENEFITS

The new Denver Airport was built at a cost of \$3 billion, albeit constructed on open land far from the metropolitan area. SFO has been modernized with major new ground access for cars, trucks and now BART at a cost of \$5 billion. The Mayor of San Francisco has clearly made expansion of capacity and convenience at SFO a strategic and economic priority for his region. Given the questionable enhancements relative to security at LAX, the downsizing of future gate capacity (from 163 to 153) to impose a 78 MAP physical cap and the added hassle factors for ground access, one must question the expenditure of \$9 billion dollars for the results to be achieved. As previously noted, for a much lower price tag, a system of remote fly away locations could better address commute times, remote security and reduction of local airport congestion.

LAX today has some of the lowest landing fees in the nation and we must finance needed improvements. The key is to choose the improvements wisely. Due to airline cost per enplaned passenger three times higher than LAX (\$6 vs. \$18), SFO has not only lost short-haul and international flights, its bond ratings have been lowered twice. SFO has now proposed discounting its landing fees to \$12 to attract more carriers and customers. Market forces are always at work and cannot be ignored.

Consolidation of rental car facilities is a clear benefit and could be served by APM or bus, depending upon its ultimate location and can be financed through user fees. An Intermodal Transportation Center could also be of value if and when light rail service is enhanced to LAX eliminating today's problems of multiple transfers. Both of these elements would help reduce congestion around LAX in the longer term.

Response:

Much more than \$3 billion was spent on Denver International Airport prior to its opening in early 1995. These expenditures were also in early-1990s dollars. The replacement cost would be considerably higher today.

3. Comments and Responses

LAWA believes the airlines will be charged cost-beneficial rates to improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking. The design of the improvements incorporated in Alternative D was given much thought and review.

The consolidated rental car facility would be accessed by APM and financed through user fees. The Intermodal Transportation Center would also allow seamless access between rail lines and the passenger terminals via APM.

SPC00257-13

Comment:

PASSENGER CONVENIENCE IS CRITICAL TO A COMPETITIVE, WORLD CLASS AIRPORT

In a global economy, regions which rely on global commerce for their future have made their international airport a key strategy for economic growth. Hong Kong, Shanghai, Beijing, Malaysia, Singapore, Seoul, and San Francisco are all recent examples. When they market their regions, they all point to the ease of access through their world-class airports.

Modernization of the Bradley Terminal is a necessity now. Foreign visitors frequently express frustration with the lack of user friendliness, waits in the customs lines, difficulty in accessing destinations, etc. Many business travelers express a clear preference to use SFO when traveling on business to California. An international ranking of 18 out of 20 for LAX is unacceptable for a region so dependent on global commerce and tourism. Postponing these improvements to the later years of the plan risks further erosion of business and visitor travel and commerce for the region. The Bradley Terminal can be renovated now in conjunction with the addition of a new interconnected west terminal facility. It appears this option has been delayed to the later years (2020?) of the project due to the cost of the GTC, APM and CTA reconfiguration and the 78 MAP gate capacity limitations.

The added "hassle factors" of 405 Freeway congestion, an offsite Ground Transportation Center and a two-mile long Automated People Mover System (particularly if passengers are required to "schlep" their luggage to the Central Terminal Area) is far from a world-class system. Anyone who has experienced Hong Kong's remote downtown luggage and passenger check-in and the ride on a dedicated light rail system into the Hong Kong airport without worrying about luggage being delivered to the plane, appreciates the convenience and looks forward to the next trip. When one considers the Alternative D impact on convenience and time in transit, one has to ask "Why would a businessman in London, Tokyo or Shanghai want to use LAX if they could use San Francisco, Las Vegas or Phoenix to conduct their business?" We must answer this questions affirmatively - "because of convenience and access to our markets!"

Response:

Comment noted. Reconfiguration of TBIT to include aircraft gates on its west side would require the relocation of Taxiways S & Q which currently function as the primary taxi routes between the north and south airfields at LAX. Reconfiguration of TBIT and a West Satellite Concourse are planned components of Alternative D. Figure S3-15, 2015 Alternative D Conceptual Summary Schedule, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identifies 2012 as a target date for completion of the reconfiguration of TBIT. The TBIT rework is scheduled to occur in Phase III because its construction is contingent upon components of Phases I and II being complete.

SPC00257-14

Comment:

CONCLUSIONS

Alternative D contains many critically needed enhancements to LAX's viability which should move forward now. The LAEDC's Critical Infrastructure Council therefore recommends the following be adopted:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00257-15 through SPC00257-19 below.

SPC00257-15

Comment:

1. South Runway complex modifications to improve safety and enable use by new, large Group IV aircraft through the addition of a central parallel taxiway.

Response:

The purpose of south airfield modifications, including a center taxiway between the parallel runways, is to enhance safe aircraft operations and reduce the potential of runway incursion. At the same time the center taxiway in the south airfield complex would be design to accommodate Group V aircraft.

SPC00257-16

Comment:

2. A comprehensive system of remote check-in "Fly Away" locations throughout the region based on customer demand including dedicated fast bus systems providing direct access to the terminal. LAEDC would be willing to organize a working group to get this project started.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA agrees that FlyAway locations in the region should be based on potential passenger demand. To the extent feasible, the FlyAway buses will use the dedicated HOV lanes on the freeway system to travel between the FlyAway parking lot and LAX. Under Alternative D, FlyAway buses would be the only passenger vehicles permitted into the Central Terminal Area, with direct curbside access to the airline terminals. This would provide a great incentive for travelers to use the FlyAway system.

SPC00257-17

Comment:

3. A consolidated Rental Car Facility. (Alternative locations could include Lot C, Manchester Square or the ITC and could begin with bus access.)

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00257-18

Comment:

4. Modernization of the Bradley International Terminal now, including gates to accommodate the foreign carriers needs for the Group VI aircraft, using a new passenger concourse and an added aircraft gate area on its existing west face.

Response:

The content of this comment is essential the same as comment SPC00298-6; please see Response to Comment SPC00298-6.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00257-19

Comment:

5. Use of state-of-the-art detection and surveillance technology to monitor entry of vehicles into the central terminal areas. This could be combined with limitations on high-risk van and truck access to the central terminal areas.

Response:

Comment noted. As was indicated in Section 3.3.2, Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, and Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D would prohibit private and commercial vehicle access to the CTA.

SPC00257-20

Comment:

Alternative D also contains several elements which would radically and irrevocably change the nature of passenger access and airport operations and raise difficult questions of passenger convenience, security, cost and flexibility, and deserve more critical evaluation. These include (1) closure of the Central Terminal Area to vehicle access and replacement with a Ground Transportation Center at Manchester Square for remote passenger drop-off and an Automated People Mover to a new Central Terminal Area for check-in and (2) North Runway complex modifications to accommodate large Group IV aircraft which include elimination of Terminals 1, 2 and 3 and a substantial portion of LAX's short haul flight capacity.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00257-21 through SPC00257-23 below.

SPC00257-21

Comment:

THE GROUND TRANSPORTATION CENTER CONCEPT - AN ALTERNATIVE

The Manchester Square GTC is proposed as an immediate, radical and irrevocable change to LAX. It is billed as a "Safety and Security" plan for LAX to protect the primary function of the airport. However, it is premised on security technologies which do not yet exist. It also creates other security tradeoffs such as vulnerability of the APM and concentration of passengers in the CTA. It presents major issues of customer convenience unless some form of baggage check-in and handling can be accommodated at the GTC so passengers do not have to carry their luggage on the APM to the CTA. The location of Manchester Square also raises issues of access and impact on the 405 freeway. The GTC concept (with APM and CTA) accounts for approximately \$3 Billion of the overall Alternative D plan. The Critical Infrastructure Council believes the remote Manchester Square GTC concept raises more issue than answers.

However, the Council would like to offer an alternative to Manchester Square if remote drop-off is to be a necessary part of the Mayor's Alternative D plan. When LAX was last expanded in 1984, planners were aware that future growth would require added passenger drop-off capacity. They identified the LAX Parking Lot C area as the likely location for such a facility to supplement direct vehicle access. Connection to the nearby Central Terminal Area via an elevated people mover system was part of the thinking at the time (Pre-9-11 the people mover would have accessed individual terminals on a third level, but it could also serve a single central terminal alternative). (See Attachment B: Map) Moving the GTC to the Lot C area has the following benefits over Manchester Square:

(1) Lot C is already owned and operated by LAX and within its existing operating envelope. It is available now as compared to an indefinite future date for Manchester Square. (Additional underutilized land is also available on the south side of 96" street.

3. Comments and Responses

(2) Proximity to LAX reduces the security envelope to be protected and enables security enhancements at least 5 years sooner than Manchester Square.

(3) Proximity to LAX also substantially reduces the costs and enhances the viability of customer friendly APM system and a baggage check-in and handling system at the GTC since it is 1-1/2 miles closer and within the controlled area of LAX.

(4) The Lot C area location enables vehicles to use all existing surface access routes to LAX without concentrating backup impacts on the 405 freeway.

(5) Lot C's proximity to LAX enables a "staged" development which can use bus transport to LAX until the APM and new CTA are completed. This provides the flexibility to design and develop the GTC, the APM, the baggage handling system and the CTA over a more reasonable period of time in order to incorporate developing security and baggage handling technologies. Staging also enables LAX to address the renovations at the Bradley Terminal now rather than 2020.

(6) Since LAX plans to maintain the access roadways around the CTA, the proximity of the Lot C area would allow emergency bus service to LAX as a backup in the event of a terrorist incident.

(7) Lot C also offers the opportunity to pursue with the help of state funding, a dedicated "collector/distributor" access road from the 405 freeway along Arbor Vitae Street into the ground transportation center (and returning to the freeway) to incent users to avoid accessing the main terminals and reducing the potential for stack up on the 405 freeway.

(8) If creation of construction jobs is a key consideration in the Mayor's plan, Lot C enables the creation of more near term jobs since the Lot area is already owned and controlled by LAX.

Response:

Several sites were considered for construction of the GTC. Manchester Square was determined to be the most suitable.

The primary determination for elimination of Lot C from consideration for the GTC site is the fact that it is located directly east of LAX Runways 6L-24R and 6R-24L. The areas off of the runway ends are restricted to land uses that do not include public use facilities with large congregations of people. Additionally, the GTC would require the use of cranes during construction phases. Construction cranes would not be able to be located in an area where low flying passenger aircraft are operating.

Additionally, the access system to the Manchester Square site is adequate and closer to the 405 and 105 freeways with direct access from the proposed interchange entrances. Travel time and distance to LAX would be reduced relative to the Lot C site improving passenger convenience. This would also have the potential to reduce the impacts of airport related traffic congestion on the surface streets in the Westchester Neighborhood.

The APM would be the same length regardless of whether the GTC was in Lot C or in Manchester Square because the APM links the proposed RAC and ITC in addition to the GTC which is located between the ITC and RAC. In fact, a greater percentage of the APM right of way would be able to be shared by locating the GTC in Manchester Square.

Lastly, construction of the GTC in Manchester Square would minimize impact to airport operations. Closure of Lot C for GTC construction would reduce available airport parking further inconveniencing passengers.

Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues.

SPC00257-22

Comment:

CONTINUING LIMITED CENTRAL TERMINAL ACCESS

3. Comments and Responses

The Critical Infrastructure Council would also suggest that rather than closing the Central Terminal Area to vehicles, that LAWA consider creating a limited access system based on pricing constraints to the use of the CTA vehicles with a low-risk profile. With a remote Lot C check-in option, creation of a time-based fee for access to and use of the Central Terminal Area by low-risk profile vehicles would enable those willing to pay, such as business passengers, to use the CTA (similar to current parking rate structures). Revenues generated could then be used to subsidize and enhance other forms of access and security such as flyaway and Lot C drop-off services, thereby incenting non-CTA access. This would reduce congestion in the CTA and enable the use of bomb sensing technologies to check vehicles entering the CTA. Users would then pass through tollgates leaving LAX. Frequent users could purchase electronic passes or tickets which can be read by readers similar to those used on the toll roads. In the event of condition orange or red, the CTA could be closed down and all vehicles routed to Lot C avoiding much of the current back up on Sepulveda and Century Boulevards during emergency conditions.

Response:

Comment noted. This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00257-23

Comment:

THE NORTH RUNWAY AND TERMINALS 1, 2 AND 3

The plan to widen the north runway to expand capacity for the large Group VI aircraft is based on several critical assumptions about the future nature of international air service. The 600-seat Airbus A380 aircraft, is designed for international major market to major market ("point to point") service by some of the overseas carriers. Boeing, and many of the overseas and long haul carriers, however, believe that the more likely model is "hub and spoke scatter" service relying on a more flexible system using more conventional aircraft connecting to hubs where passengers can use short haul flights to reach multiple destinations.

Widening LAX's south runways is not only necessary now for safety reasons, but should enable LAX to accommodate a high volume of large Group IV aircraft using both south runways and one north runway simultaneously. It is highly questionable whether the north runway widening will be necessary. The elimination of Terminals 1, 2 and 3 would also disable much of LAX's hub and spoke short-haul capacity. Fortunately, this element of Alternative D is phased toward the end of the plan.

The Critical Infrastructure Council recommends that the north runway project be deferred until market developments warrant. In the event widening is necessary this should be accomplished by moving the north runway further north. This is a prime example of the flexibility needed in this post 9-11 environment.

Response:

From the above comment, it was inferred that the commentor meant increasing runway separation between the closely spaced parallel runways by moving the runways further apart when the word widen was used. The purpose of relocating runways is to gain enough separation for a center taxiway between the two closely spaced parallel runways. The purpose of the center taxiway is to enhance safe aircraft operations and reduce the potential for runway incursions. The center taxiway on the north airfield complex would be designed to accommodate the Airbus A380 which is scheduled to enter commercial service in 2006. The A380 would likely be operated on international long haul routes connecting major international air markets such as LAX. One objective of Alternative D is maintaining LAX's role as the primary International Gateway to Southern California.

From the above comment, it was inferred that the Group IV aircraft the commentor mentioned may refer to the Group VI aircraft. Alternative D provides the same number of commuter gates (32 positions) as the No Action/No Project Alternative as described in Table 2.2-3, Number of Gates by Aircraft Group, in Section 2.2, Aircraft Gates (subsection 2.2.7), of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum. The gate

3. Comments and Responses

facilities are planned and constructed to handle the anticipated aircraft fleet mix at the airport in the future, which includes a wide range of aircraft sizes, from small commuter aircraft to the new Airbus 380 (Group VI aircraft).

The commentor suggested moving the northernmost runway north similar to Alternative C. The suggested runway location would create larger noise impacts to the communities north of the airport compared to moving the inboard runway in the north airfield complex south as proposed by Alternative D.

SPC00257-24

Comment:

CONCLUSION

Mayor Hahn has asked for public input. The Critical Infrastructure Council encourages LAWA to fully consider these and other suggested alternatives before moving into the final planning stage. Alternative D can be improved.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments above.

SPC00257-25

Comment:

ATTACHMENT A

[See original document.]

Response:

The table in Attachment A appears to be the commentor's interpretation of data contained in Technical Report S-3 to the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, providing a side-by-side comparison of the five alternatives being considered for the LAX Master Plan. The table does not include any specific comment on the Draft EIS/EIR or the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00258 Raney, Leah

Continental Airlines, Inc.

11/6/2003

SPC00258-1

Comment:

Continental Airlines ("Continental") hereby provides its comments to the Supplement (the "Supplement") to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (the "DEIS") for the Los Angeles Airport Master Plan (the "Master Plan") and, in particular, the "Alternative D" plan addressed in the Supplement. As discussed in detail below, Continental believes that the DEIS and Supplement (collectively, the "Environmental Documents") do not satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") and California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") in that: (1) they do not adequately consider and evaluate certain environmental impacts or risks relating to ongoing and planned environmental remediation projects at LAX, particularly in the vicinity of the Continental aircraft maintenance facility (the "ACMX Facility") and the LAWA properties to the immediate west and south of the ACMX Facility, where there are significant known and suspected groundwater and soil impacts; and (2) they do not adequately analyze all available feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives that would substantially lessen or avoid the aforementioned significant environmental impacts.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00258-2

Comment:

Executive Summary

The Alternative D plan contemplates extensive demolition, excavation and construction activities throughout LAX. These demolition, excavation, and construction activities are likely to exacerbate, disturb or otherwise impact known and suspected groundwater and soil contamination at the airport, including interference with significant planned or anticipated environmental remediation projects at the airport. Most significant, Alternative D calls for the construction of two new aircraft maintenance facilities (the "New Maintenance Facilities") totaling approximately 300,000 square feet on the west side of the airport, south of World Way West, and just west of the ACMX Facility. This area overlays known jet fuel and halogenated volatile organic compound ("HVOC") plumes in the groundwater, and suspected soil impacts. The ongoing and planned remediation of such groundwater and soil contamination would be greatly hindered, and such contamination might be greatly exacerbated, by the construction activities related to Alternative D. The Environmental Documents do not adequately analyze either of these significant adverse environmental impacts, or the feasible mitigation measures or project alternatives that are available to avoid or significantly lessen these environmental impacts. As such, the Environmental Documents do not meet the requirements of NEPA and CEQA. The LAX airport's proposed "Alternative D" Plan conflicts with Continental's approved, but voluntary jet fuel clean up plan. The Environmental Documents do not address this conflict. Continental is unwilling to proceed with clean-up until this conflict is resolved.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00258-3 through SPC00258-12 below.

SPC00258-3

Comment:

I. Known and Suspected Soil and Groundwater Contamination Near ACMX Facility

A. Jet Fuel Impacts and Remediation Efforts

There is widespread jet fuel contamination at LAX, including but not limited to a large plume of "Jet-A" fuel (the "Free Product Plume") that is floating on top of the groundwater under the ACMX Facility, the adjacent LAWA parking lot and undeveloped lot just west of the ACMX Facility, and in the taxiway just south of the ACMX Facility. Under the oversight of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board ("RWQCB"), Continental has been investigating and developing remediation plans for the Free Product Plume.

Continental has been investigating soil and groundwater in the vicinity of the ACMX Facility since 1988. Investigative efforts include the installation of more than 300 soil borings on and around the ACMX Facility, soil gas surveys, installation of groundwater monitoring wells, and quarterly groundwater monitoring. Continental also has conducted some very preliminary remediation activities (limited "passive" free product removal from groundwater), and recently submitted a workplan and received RWQCB approval for the installation of an extensive vacuum-enhanced free product recovery system in and around the ACMX Facility.

Installation of the new free product recovery system is set to commence in late 2003 or early 2004. This effort will include the installation of 244 to 330 six-inch diameter free product recovery wells in the area of the ACMX Facility, the adjacent LAWA parking lot and undeveloped lot just west of the ACMX Facility, and in the taxiway just south of the ACMX Facility. Jet fuel will be pumped from the free product recovery wells using down-hole pneumatic pumps. An extensive network of piping will connect the product recovery wells to an aboveground treatment facility located on the adjacent LAWA parking lot. Extracted jet fuel will be shipped offsite for recycling. At present, the projected expense of this free product recovery system is at least \$20 million, and possibly much more. The wells and related equipment are scheduled to be installed in late 2003 or early 2004. The free product recovery project is not expected to be completed until at least 2010.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified all known and suspected contamination at LAX, including the contamination at the Continental Airlines (CAL) aircraft maintenance facility (the ACMX Facility). (See Table 4.23-1, Figure 4.23-1, and page 4-968 of Section 4.23, Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIS/EIR; Table 7, Table 11, Figure 1, and page 18 of Technical Report 13, Hazardous Materials Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR; Table S4.23-1, Figure S4.23-1, and page 4-594 of Section 4.23, Hazardous Materials, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR; and Table S4, Table S7, and Figure S1 of Technical Report S-8, Supplemental Hazardous Materials Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.)

SPC00258-4

Comment:

B. Solvent Impacts and Potential Remediation Efforts

Continental's groundwater monitoring data has indicated that the groundwater underlying the LAWA parking lot and undeveloped lot just west of the ACMX Facility, and the taxiway just south of the LAWA undeveloped lot is impacted by solvents or Halogenated Volatile Organic Compounds (HVOCs), including chlorinated solvents such as trichloroethylene ("TCE") and cis-1,2- dichloroethylene ("cis-1,2-DCE"). As discussed below, these areas may be impacted by Alternative D construction activities, including the proposed New Maintenance Facilities and the new West Employee Parking Garage.

To date, the HVOC Plumes in these areas remain under study. The vertical and lateral extent of the HVOC Plumes has not been fully delineated, nor the sources identified. Moreover, there has been no assessment of the risks posed by such contamination, the need for remediation of this contamination, nor the viable means for conducting such remediation. As such, to the extent such remediation ultimately is required, it is unlikely that it would commence before late 2004 or sometime in 2005, at the earliest.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified all known and suspected contamination at LAX, including the contamination at the Continental Airlines (CAL) aircraft maintenance facility (the ACMX Facility). (See Table 4.23-1, Figure 4.23-1, and page 4-968 of Section 4.23, Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIS/EIR; Table 7, Table 11, Figure 1, and page 18 of Technical Report 13, Hazardous Materials Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR; Table S4.23-1, Figure S4.23-1, and page 4-594 of Section 4.23, Hazardous Materials, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR; and Table S4, Table S7, and Figure S1 of Technical Report S-8, Supplemental Hazardous Materials Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.)

Table S4.23.1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed soil and groundwater contamination at LAX and the remediation status of the contaminated sites. This table summarized known past and present contamination within the specific footprint of the ACMX facility. Additionally, Section 4.23 (subsection 4.23.3, page 4-594) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR specifically identified the area referred to in CAL's comments as containing significant groundwater contamination and undergoing remediation activity. The area located west of the CAL aircraft maintenance base was identified as an area of potential contamination due to land farming treatment operations.

SPC00258-5

Comment:

II. Alternative D Construction Activities Proposed Near the ACMX Facility

According to LAWA's June 2003 Addendum to the LAX Master Plan (the "2003 Addendum"), the Alternative D Plan calls for, among other things, the construction of two New Maintenance Facilities totaling approximately 300,000 square feet on the west side of the airport, south of World Way West. This location is just west of the ACMX Facility, in an area that overlays the Free Product Plume and HVOC Plumes. According to the "Construction Sequencing Plan" for Alternative D set forth in section 2.10 of the 2003 Addendum, construction of the New Maintenance Facilities would be step one of

3. Comments and Responses

"Phase II" of the construction activities to implement the Alternative D Plan. More specifically, according to the Conceptual Summary Schedule included in section 2.10, construction of these New Maintenance Facilities would commence in 2007 (or earlier) and be completed in 2008 (i.e., three years prior to the "best-case" optimistic estimate for completion of the jet fuel recovery project).

In addition to the New Maintenance Facilities which are to be constructed over the Free Product Plume and HVOC Plumes, the Alternative D Plan also calls for the construction of a new 12,400 stall employee parking structure on the west side of the airport, south of World Way West (the "West Employee Parking Garage"), a short distance west of the new Maintenance Facilities. The West Employee Parking Garage may overlay portions of the HVOC Plumes. According to the "Construction Sequencing Plan" for Alternative D set forth in section 2.10 of the 2003 Addendum, construction of the West Employee Parking Garage would be part of "Phase I" of the construction activities to implement the Alternative D Plan. More specifically, according to the Conceptual Summary Schedule included in section 2.10, construction of the West Employee Parking Garage is scheduled to commence in 2004 and be completed in 2005. Again, as with the New Maintenance Facilities, to the extent that any of the West Employee Parking Garage construction activities would occur in the area of potential HVOC remediation, the remediation could be delayed or otherwise hindered. In addition, an appropriate safety plan would have to be prepared to ensure that proper measures would be taken to minimize exposure to construction workers.

Response:

As noted in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR there are areas at LAX containing significant groundwater contamination and undergoing remediation. Groundwater cleanup projects, such as those planned or appropriate for the ACMX facility, typically can be built and operated effectively around existing and new development. In addition, the contaminated groundwater that such a system would treat lies approximately 100 feet below ground surface, and is unlikely to pose any hazard to the public or to construction workers.

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR acknowledged that construction of Master Plan improvements would likely occur prior to the completion of remediation at some sites. The documents identified that conflicts with ongoing remediation activities would have the potential to result in significant environmental impacts and potential safety impacts for construction workers. Master Plan Commitments HM-1 and HM-2 were developed to specifically address these potential impacts. These commitments include specific measures aimed at ensuring the continued implementation of ongoing remediation efforts with the involvement and approval of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, proper handling of contaminated materials encountered during construction, and protection of construction workers. Performance criteria are included in Master Plan Commitment HM-1 to ensure its effectiveness. These measures would apply to remediation activities expected to be underway at the ACMX facility.

SPC00258-6

Comment:

III. Conflict Between Alternative D Plan and Soil and Groundwater Remediation

As discussed above, Alternative D calls for construction of the New Maintenance Facilities in 2007 and 2008, while the RWQCB-approved cleanup plan for the Free Product Plume contemplates a completion date no earlier than 2010. Moreover, although 2010 is the present target date for completion of the jet fuel remediation project, this target date has always been considered aggressive. Actual completion of the jet fuel remediation (even without interference by airport redevelopment activities) might not occur until 2015 or later (for example, if the radius of influence of the recovery wells proves to be less than projected). Thus, the Alternative D Plan calls for construction of the New Maintenance Facilities at least three years, and possible as many as five or ten years, before completion of the free product recovery project.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPC00258-5.

SPC00258-7

Comment:

Construction of the New Maintenance Facilities, according to the plans proposed in Alternative D, would require extensive and expensive alterations to the free product recovery system. Specifically, since the free product recovery will not be completed by the commencement of construction of the New Maintenance Facilities, any extraction wells or related equipment in the area of such construction would have to be abandoned, removed, and/or relocated. Such abandonment, removal and/or relocation of recovery wells or other equipment "in midstream" of the remediation project would require extensive redesign and reconstruction of the system. One hundred or more of the free product recovery wells might have to be removed and/or relocated. Moreover, there is no guarantee that any replacement system could ever be as effective as the system now set for installation (i.e., it may be physically impossible or otherwise infeasible to remove substantially all of the free product without the extraction wells and related equipment contemplated by the approved plan now in place). In sum, this interference could delay, and might even prevent attainment of the cleanup standards established for this site by RWQCB.

Any HVOC remediation determined to be necessary in this area may face a similar fate. As mentioned earlier, the HVOC Plumes are still under investigation. RWQCB has not yet ordered any party to perform remediation of the HVOC Plumes. Thus, any such HVOC cleanup is unlikely to commence before late 2004 or 2005. Thus, to the extent such HVOC remediation is required in this area, it is highly likely that Alternative D construction activities would interfere with such remediation, for all of the reasons discussed above with respect to the jet fuel remediation project (i.e., relocation of wells, etc.). Again, this interference could delay and increase the cost of any such HVOC remediation, and could even prevent the attainment of cleanup standards established by RWQCB.

Response:

Table S4.23.1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed soil and groundwater contamination at LAX and the remediation status of the contaminated sites. This table summarized known past and present contamination within the specific footprint of the ACMX facility. Section 4.23 (subsection 4.23.3, page 4-594) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified the area referred to in CAL's comments as containing significant groundwater contamination and undergoing remediation activity. Additionally, subsection 4.23.6 of the Final EIS/EIR has been revised to specifically identify the potential conflict between the remediation planned for the ACMX facility and the proposed improvements under Alternative D.

Although the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR did not specifically call out the ACMX facility remediation in its discussion of impacts to current or planned remediation projects associated with Alternative D, as indicated above, this site was identified in multiple places within the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Therefore, this information does not constitute significant new information in the context of CEQA (Section 15088.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines). Moreover, the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified that conflicts with ongoing remediation activities would have the potential to result in significant environmental impacts. Master Plan Commitments HM-1 and HM-2 were developed to specifically address these potential impacts. These commitments include specific measures aimed at ensuring the continued implementation of ongoing remediation efforts with the involvement and approval of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, proper handling of contaminated materials encountered during construction, and protection of construction workers. Performance criteria are included in Master Plan Commitment HM-1 to ensure its effectiveness. These measures would apply to remediation activities expected to be underway at the ACMX facility.

SPC00258-8

Comment:

IV. Inadequate Consideration of these issues in the Environmental Documents

The DEIS recognized that the then-ongoing free product removal at the ACMX Facility (i.e., the very limited "passive" free product recovery effort) was likely to be affected by the construction of certain

3. Comments and Responses

facilities contemplated by the various Master Plan alternatives. Specifically, in Section 4.23 Hazardous Materials, at page 4-986, the DEIS stated as follows:

Due to the extent of excavation needed for the proposed improvements it is likely that part, or all, of the remediation systems in operation at [the ACMX Facility and another LAXFUEL facility] would have to be removed during construction. This would entail destruction of the extraction wells and removal of underground piping and aboveground tanks. Removing the active remediation systems at the LAXFUEL BFSF and the Continental Maintenance Facility for an extended period would interfere with existing cleanup efforts.

The DEIS (again, in Section 4.23 Hazardous Materials, at page 4-986) then proposed the following mitigation measure to address this otherwise significant environmental impact:

To prevent Master Plan-related construction from interfering with planned or ongoing remediation such that environmental contamination is exacerbated or permanent cleanup of sites prevented. LAWA would implement Master Plan Commitment HM-1, Ensure Continued Implementation of Existing Remediation Efforts. Implementation of this commitment would ensure that remediation projects would be completed to the extent possible and necessary before constructing Master Plan improvements, or that alternate clean up methods would be implemented during construction to prevent contaminant migration, if necessary. As part of this commitment, remediation systems would be reinstated following the completion of construction, if required. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant (emphasis added).

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR recognized that ongoing remediation projects at the ACMX and elsewhere at LAX could be disrupted by some aspects of Master Plan development. Consequently, Master Plan Commitment HM-1, Ensure Continued Implementation of Existing Remediation Efforts (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), was developed to accelerate remediation efforts, where possible, and, where not possible, to assure that any disrupted remediation projects are appropriately reinstated after Master Plan construction. This commitment is not limited to remediation efforts underway at the time of EIS/EIR publication or approval. Rather, the commitment includes provisions for LAWA to conduct pre-construction surveys to identify remediation efforts underway at the time of construction. Please see Section 4.23, Hazardous Materials (subsection 4.23.5), of this Final EIS/EIR for the full text of Master Plan Commitment HM-1.

SPC00258-9

Comment:

The DEIS contained no discussion or analysis of whether the proposed mitigation measure, Master Plan Commitment HM-1, was practical or feasible, nor the extent to which it might successfully mitigate any environmental impacts. Among other things, there was no discussion as to whether free product recovery was even possible once a building had been placed on top of the Free Product Plume (i.e., whether "horizontal wells" or some other alternative remediation method was physically and/or economically feasible under these circumstances). In addition, the DEIS (and its accompanying Technical Report #13, Hazardous Materials Technical Report) considered only the very limited "passive" free product recovery system in operation at the ACMX Facility at that time (consisting of a mere handful of extraction wells, without vacuum enhancement), as opposed to the much more extensive vacuum-enhanced system that is about to be installed at the site (i.e., 244 to 330 vacuum-enhanced extraction wells and related piping and equipment). The DEIS also did not evaluate any other feasible mitigation measures or project alternatives (e.g., moving new airport facilities to areas other than those overlying the contamination plumes). As discussed below, these omissions were repeated, continued and exacerbated in the Supplement.

Response:

As indicated above, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified all known and suspected contamination at LAX, including the contamination at the ACMX Facility. Table S4.23.1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed soil and groundwater contamination at LAX and the remediation status of the contaminated sites. This table summarized known past and present contamination within the specific footprint of the ACMX facility. Additionally, Section 4.23 (subsection 4.23.3, page 4-594) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR specifically identified the area referred to in

CAL's comments as containing significant groundwater contamination and undergoing remediation activity.

Although the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR did not specifically call out the ACMX facility remediation in its discussion of impacts to current or planned remediation projects associated with Alternative D, as indicated above, this site was identified in multiple places within the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Therefore, this information does not constitute significant new information in the context of CEQA (Section 15088.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines). Moreover, the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified that conflicts with ongoing remediation activities would have the potential to result in significant environmental impacts. This included remediation efforts known at the time the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were prepared, as well as remediation efforts that were only in the planning stages at the time the Draft EIS/EIR was prepared and remediation efforts that may occur in the future. Master Plan Commitments HM-1 and HM-2 were developed to specifically address these potential impacts. These commitments include specific measures aimed at ensuring the continued implementation of ongoing remediation efforts with the involvement and approval of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, proper handling of contaminated materials encountered during construction, and protection of construction workers. Performance criteria are included in Master Plan Commitment HM-1 to ensure its effectiveness. These measures would apply to remediation activities expected to be underway at the ACMX facility. The Master Plan commitment referenced in this comment will prevent adverse environmental impacts from occurring as a result of disrupted soil and groundwater remediation efforts.

SPC00258-10

Comment:

The Supplement and its Technical Report S-8, Supplemental Hazardous Materials Technical Report (dated June 2003) offers no discussion of the magnitude of the new free product recovery system and the severity of likely interference caused by Alternative D. Notwithstanding that as of June 2003, LAWA and its consultant, Camp Dresser and McKee (CDM), were in possession of the detailed RWQCB-approved plans for the new vacuum-enhanced free product recovery system underway at the site; and the Alternative D project plans and schedules showing the serious interference and interruption to be caused to that remediation system by the construction of the New Maintenance Facilities beginning in 2007. Instead, the Supplement offers only the following discussion of its mitigation measure, HM-1:

Prior to initiating construction of a Master Plan component, LAWA will conduct a pre-construction evaluation to determine if the proposed construction will interfere with existing soil or groundwater remediation efforts. For sites currently on LAX property, LAWA will work with tenants to ensure that, to the extent possible, remediation is complete prior to construction. If remediation must be interrupted to allow for Master Plan-related construction, LAWA will notify and obtain approval from the regulatory agency with jurisdiction, as required, and will evaluate whether new or increased monitoring will be necessary.... As soon as practicable following completion of construction in the area, remediation will be reinstated, if required by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) or another agency with jurisdiction. In such cases, LAWA will coordinate the design of the Master Plan component and the re-design or the remediation systems to ensure that they are compatible, and to ensure that the proposed remediation system is comparable to the system currently in place. If it is determined during the pre-construction evaluation that construction will preclude reinstatement of the remediation effort, LAWA will obtain approval to initiate construction from the agency with jurisdiction.

Response:

At the time the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was being prepared, additional soil and groundwater investigations by CAL and LAWA subcontractors were underway. Since that time, CAL has developed a remediation design for the jet fuel impacted groundwater plume located beneath the CAL aircraft maintenance facility. As stated by the commentor, these plans were not approved until June 2003, after the analysis contained within the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR had been completed. However, in light of this information, Section 4.23.6 of the Final EIS/EIR has been revised to specifically identify the additional environmental data pertaining to the ACMX facility and the proposed remediation design relative to Alternative D. Please see Response to Comment SPC00258-9 regarding Master Plan commitments.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00258-11

Comment:

This passage ignores substantial relevant information in the possession of LAWA and its consultant CDM at the time it was written, and misleads the reader on a number of points critical to any meaningful analysis of the environmental impacts that will result from Alternative D. Most important, the documents in hand - that is, the RWQCB-approved plan for vacuum-enhanced free product removal at the ACMX Facility, the 2003 Addendum, the Alternative D "Construction Sequencing Plan", and "Conceptual Summary Schedule" - make clear that construction of these Maintenance Facilities would commence in 2007 and be completed in 2008, approximately three years prior to the "best-case" optimistic estimate for completion of remediation project. The Supplement simply ignores this obvious conflict. Instead, as mentioned above, the Supplement suggests that "[P]rior to initiating construction of a Master Plan component, LAWA will conduct a pre-construction evaluation to determine if the proposed construction will interfere with existing soil or groundwater remediation efforts" [emphasis added]. Since there already is conclusive evidence that construction of the New Maintenance Facilities will interfere with the free product recovery system at the ACMX Facility, this portion of the Supplement is inaccurate and misleading. Simply put, NEPA and CEQA require that all relevant information bearing on environmental impacts be included in the EIR/EIS to ensure that the decision-makers are making fully informed decisions. In this case, the Supplement appears to intentionally understate the certainty and the extent of the interference caused by the Alternative D construction activities to the ACMX free product recovery system.

The Supplement (and, hence, any Final EIS/EIR) should and must include a proper analysis of the likelihood and severity of the conflict between the Alternative D construction activities and the ACMX free product recovery system and, just as important, the feasible mitigation measures and project alternatives that are available to avoid or lessen the interference, including but not limited to the possible relocation of the New Maintenance Facilities to avoid the interference. The Supplement does not even consider the possibility of such a relocation, but the significance of this omission is obscured by the failure to discuss the substantial evidence of certainty and substantiality of impact - that is, by understating the certainty and severity of the interference, the Environmental Documents mislead the decision-makers into believing that relocation of the New Maintenance Facilities need not be considered as a viable project alternative to avoid or substantially lessen the impact of the interference between Alternative D and the ACMX Facility remediation system.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR did not ignore the potential conflict between proposed Master Plan improvements and known and suspected contamination at LAX including the CAL aircraft maintenance facility. Please see Response to Comment SPC00258-3 for a detailed list of pertinent references in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to the CAL facility. Moreover, the Draft EIS/EIR acknowledged that it is unlikely that the remediation at the CAL facility would be complete prior to construction of Master Plan facilities (Draft EIS/EIR, page 4-986). The purpose of the pre-construction evaluations identified in Master Plan Commitment HM-1 is to identify remediation efforts underway at the time of construction, which may not be known now. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00258-7, SPC00258-9, and SPC00258-10 regarding potential conflicts between the CAL remediation project and proposed Master Plan improvements and related Master Plan commitments, and Response to Comment SPC00258-12 regarding the evaluation of alternatives.

SPC00258-12

Comment:

In evaluating (or forecasting) future environmental impacts, CEQA requires that a public agency use its best efforts to discover and disclose all reasonably pertinent information. CEQA Guidelines Section 15144. The agency is required to forecast that which could be reasonably expected under the circumstances. *Id.*; *Laurel Heights Improvement Ass'n v. Regents of the University of California*, 47 Cal. 3d 376 (1988). Under the circumstances here, LAWA had extensive detailed information relating to the likelihood and severity of the impact posed by the interference between the Alternative D construction activities and the free product recovery project, but utterly failed to discuss or disclose such information. As such, the Supplement and DEIS understate the likelihood and severity of the impact, and create the

false impression that this interference will not be a substantial environmental impact and that the evaluation and analysis of mitigation measures and project alternatives are unnecessary.

CEQA provides that a public agency may not approve a project as proposed if feasible mitigation measures or feasible project alternatives are available that would substantially lessen or avoid a project's significant environmental impacts. Thus, to the extent available, CEQA requires agencies to adopt feasible mitigation measures or feasible environmentally-superior project alternatives to substantially lessen or avoid otherwise significant adverse environmental impacts. Pub. Res. Code sections 21002 and 21081(a). To effectuate this requirement, an EIR must set forth an evaluation of feasible mitigation measures and project alternatives that decision-makers can adopt at the findings stage of the process. Pub. Res. Code section 21100(b)(3). The evaluation of feasible project alternatives is an even more stringent requirement under NEPA. An EIS must rigorously evaluate and compare all reasonable alternatives to provide a clear basis for the choice of options, and the degree of analysis devoted to each alternative must be substantially similar to that devoted to the proposed action. 40 C.F.R. section 1502.14. Again, in this case, LAWA failed to consider and evaluate feasible and available project mitigation measures and project alternatives that might avoid or substantially lessen the interference between the Alternative D construction activities and the environmental remediation at and around the ACMX Facility. Most important, the Supplement failed to consider or evaluate the potential re-location of the New Maintenance Facilities to somewhere other than directly on top of the Free Product Plume and HVOC Plumes.

As such, the Supplement and, hence, the DEIS in its entirety, violate CEQA and NEPA because they omit and/or conceal relevant evidence pertaining to the interference between the Alternative D construction plans and the ongoing and planned environmental remediation projects in and around the ACMX Facility. They thereby understate the likelihood and severity of such interference and the magnitude of environmental impact resulting therefrom, and they fail to properly consider and evaluate feasible mitigation measures and project alternatives that are available to avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impact,

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR contain sufficient information to determine if the Master Plan alternatives would have a significant impact related to hazardous materials contamination, as defined by the thresholds of significance in Section 4.23, Hazardous Materials (subsection 4.23.4). Mere disruption of an ongoing remediation project alone is not considered a significant project impact. All information necessary to determine if such an impact would occur was disclosed and measures were identified (in the form of Master Plan commitments) that would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level that is less than significant. As individual Master Plan components - such as the proposed maintenance building and West Employee Parking Garage - are implemented, additional environmental clearance may be required, at which time potential environmental impacts associated with these specific facilities would be considered, if warranted.

Further, as to project alternatives, NEPA and CEQA require LAWA and FAA to consider a reasonable range of alternatives for the entire LAX Master Plan project, not for each one of the individual components of the Master Plan development program. LAWA has considered a reasonable range of alternatives for the entire project, as explained in Topical Response TR-ALT-1. LAWA is not obligated to consider alternative locations for the new maintenance facility or any other specific facility in Alternative D as part of the Master Plan approval.

SPC00258-13

Comment:

V. Conclusion

The Supplement (and, hence, any Final EIS/EIR) should and must include a proper analysis of the likelihood and severity of the interference between the Alternative D construction activities and the ACMX free product recovery system and, just as important, the feasible mitigation measures and project alternatives which are available to avoid or lessen the interference. This consideration of alternatives must include the possible relocation of the New Maintenance Facilities to avoid the interference. At present, the Supplement does not consider the possibility of such a relocation, but the significance of this omission is obscured by the failure to discuss the substantial evidence of certainty

3. Comments and Responses

and substantiality of impact. Thus, by understating the certainty and severity of the interference, the Environmental Documents mislead the decision-makers into believing that relocation of the New Maintenance Facilities does not need to be considered as a viable project alternative to avoid or substantially lessen the impact of the interference between Alternative D and the ACMX Facility remediation system.

To summarize, at a minimum, CEQA and NEPA require that the final EIS/EIR for this project include a proper analysis (including consideration and disclosure of all relevant information) of the following issues:

- The extent to which the construction activities contemplated by the Alternative D Plan would preclude or interfere with ongoing, planned, or anticipated environmental remediation projects (including an analysis of the likelihood and severity of any interference with the free product recovery project adjacent to the ACMX Facility, as well as the potential HVOC remediation project);

- The extent to which the significant environmental impacts created by the conflict between Alternative D construction activities and soil or groundwater remediation efforts could be avoided or significantly lessened by feasible mitigation measures; and

- The extent to which the significant environmental impacts created by the conflict between Alternative D construction activities and soil or groundwater remediation efforts could be avoided or significantly lessened by feasible project alternatives.

Failure to adequately consider these matters will render any final EIS/EIR deficient under federal and state law.

Response:

This comment summarizes points the commentor makes in more detail in several other comments. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00258-3 through SPC00258-12.

SPC00259 Longcore, Travis Land Protection Partners 10/23/2003

SPC00259-1

Comment:

Re: Supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report Los Angeles International Airport Master Plan

Please find enclosed written comments on the referenced NEPA/CEQA document.

Response:

The content of this comment letter is included as part of the County of Los Angeles' final comment letter on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR (comment letter SAL00014). Please refer to comment letter SAL00014.

SPC00260 Fucci, John Kilroy Realty Corporation 11/7/2003

SPC00260-1

Comment:

Kilroy Realty Corporation is a Southern California-based real estate investment trust active in the commercial office and industrial property markets of the western United States.

Near LAX Airport, Kilroy Realty Corporation owns and manages 1.5 million square feet of office and industrial properties, including

- 909 and 999 North Sepulveda Boulevard, at Imperial Highway and Sepulveda (across the street from LAX), in El Segundo

- 2240, 2250, 2260 East Imperial Highway (Kilroy Airport Center - also across from LAWA-owned LAX property), in El Segundo
- 2031 East Mariposa Avenue, near Nash, in El Segundo
- 181, 185 South Douglas, in El Segundo
- 2260 East El Segundo Boulevard, in El Segundo
- 2265 East El Segundo Boulevard, in El Segundo
- 2270 East El Segundo Boulevard, in El Segundo

As an immediate neighbor to LAX, we have reviewed the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR and offer the following comments:

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00260-2

Comment:

1. Related to the proposed 12,000-space parking structure near Imperial Highway and Pershing Drive for LAX employee parking, there is inadequate analysis in the EIS/EIR concerning the traffic impacts to Imperial Highway from having the majority of LAX employees utilize one central parking area, presumably traversing Imperial Highway for ingress and egress, to the proposed parking site. Further, in the South Cargo Complex-West, an additional 99,000 square feet of cargo facilities will be developed, pursuant to Figure 2.5-1 of the LAX Master Plan EIR, which will create additional truck traffic on Imperial Highway.

Response:

The traffic generated by both the West Employee Parking Garage and the South Cargo Complex West was fully included in the traffic analysis completed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Employees are expected to travel to and from the West Employee Parking Garage either by Imperial Highway or Westchester Parkway.

The project's mitigation plan proposes improvements at various intersections along Imperial Highway, including Continental City Drive/I-105 Freeway ramps, Aviation Boulevard, Douglas Street, Sepulveda Boulevard, Main Street, and Pershing Drive.

SPC00260-3

Comment:

2. In addition to traffic impacts, the isolation of employee parking in one area would appear to create safety and operational impacts, as it segregates employee parking in one primary area, which could create a target for a terrorist incident. There is inadequate analysis in the EIS/EIR related to the safety and operational impacts of segregating most of LAX employee parking into one area, and what a security incident could do to the main arterial - Imperial Highway - leading to and from the parking area.

Response:

As addressed in Appendix I of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the current configuration does not create secure parking locations for employees and does not allow for the screening of employees, their vehicles, or hand carried items prior to entering restricted areas. Alternative D allows for the screening of employees and secure bus transport prior to entering restricted areas. In addition, the concept of designated employee parking areas in Alternative D is part of and supports the concepts of concentric rings of security and protecting, detecting, assessing and responding (PDAR).

SPC00260-4

Comment:

3. Related to the proposed 9,100 parking space structure and proposed 5,500 parking lot at Imperial and Aviation adjacent to the future Intermodal Transportation Center, there is inadequate analysis in the

3. Comments and Responses

EIS/EIR pertaining to traffic and air quality impacts. The creation of a total of 14,600 parking spaces, where today there are virtually no parking spaces, will bring traffic and air quality impacts to an area of Imperial Highway that is already experiencing degradation in Levels of Service and air emissions. There is inadequate analysis in the EIS/EIR as to what mitigation measures will be utilized to bring the traffic and air quality impacts to acceptable levels. The EIS/EIR indicates that the Intermodal Transportation Center at Imperial and Aviation would handle approximately 31% of LAX passengers. Under Alternative D, LAX would accommodate 78.9 million annual passengers. That would mean that almost 25 million passengers would pass through the proposed Intermodal Transportation Center annually, where today no airline passengers come near this area. With 14,600 parking spaces and 25 million annual passengers traversing this area, common sense would indicate that a major traffic bottleneck could occur at Imperial Highway and Aviation from thousands of vehicles trying to access this site for parking or passenger drop-off/pick-up. Yet, there is not adequate analysis in the EIS/EIR related to measures to improve the existing roadway system to mitigate the significant influx of vehicular trips congregating to the area and corresponding air quality impacts.

Response:

The traffic generated by the proposed ITC and the expansion of the existing 4,800-space surface parking Lot B to 5,500 spaces was fully included in the traffic analysis completed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

The project's ground transportation plan proposes direct freeway connections to these airport facilities from the I-405 and I-105 Freeways, a direct connection to/from the Green Line, the widening of surface streets which include Aviation Boulevard, 111th Street, and La Cienega Boulevard, and various intersectional enhancements in the area.

SPC00260-5

Comment:

4. There is mention in the EIS/EIR of a proposed new interchange off the I-405 Freeway to be called "Lennox" interchange. However, no real funds have been identified to pay for such an interchange, nor have funds been identified to pay for the land acquisition to facilitate the interchange. Without identified funding, this interchange is nothing more than a "wish" and should not be used as a mitigation measure related to traffic and/or air quality impacts.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding project funding.

SPC00260-6

Comment:

5. The EIS/EIR's analysis of the noise impacts of moving the southern runway (7R/25L) fifty-six (56) feet closer to Imperial Highway relies on presumption that the new generation of Group VI aircraft, which will presumably be quieter than current aircraft, will replace existing, noisier aircraft on a fairly aggressive timetable. However, there are no guarantees as to how soon and how many future aircraft will be of the Group VI aircraft variety. This could take a generation or more for the predominant aircraft taking off or landing on the southern-most runway near Imperial Highway, to be of the new, quieter generation of aircraft. If the southern runway is moved 56 feet closer to Imperial Highway, and thus 56 feet closer to businesses and residents in El Segundo, there are not adequate mitigation measures described in the EIS/EIR to reduce the noise impacts to acceptable levels if the conversion to the newer Group VI aircraft takes longer than projected. In fact, moving the southern runway 56 feet closer to Imperial Highway seems to be at the top of the list in terms of implementation of the LAX Master Plan, but the new quieter generation of aircraft utilizing 7R/25L is not yet reality. The EIS/EIR does not adequately address what will happen during this interim time, or how these noise impacts will be mitigated to acceptable levels to protect businesses and residents south of Imperial Highway.

Response:

The Airbus A380 is scheduled to enter commercial aviation service in 2006. The Draft LAX Master Plan assumes a number of Group VI or New Large Aircraft (NLA) will serve LAX by 2015. Alternatives A, B,

and C, assume 30 NLA operations per day. NLA operations represent one percent of the design day daily operations for each alternative. Design day activity for Alternative D in 2015 would include 27 NLA operations per day, which also represents one percent of the total daily operations for Alternative D. NLA aircraft totals are identified as 74X for Alternatives A, B, and C in Table IV-A, 2015 Hourly Design Day Total Operations by Aircraft Type in the Draft LAX Master Plan, and for Alternative D, in Table F-3 (5-6), Hourly Design Day Total Operations by Aircraft Type 2015 Alternative D in the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum. The Integrated Noise Model 6.0C which is the FAA approved computer model used to predict noise impacts from aircraft operations does not contain noise data for the New Large Aircraft (NLA) Airbus 380 since the aircraft has not yet been developed. However, all alternatives and mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting appendices include NLA operations through the use of a "substitute" aircraft the Boeing 747-400. Additional noise information, including fleet forecasts used to model noise, can be found in Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.1, Noise and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00260-7

Comment:

6. In addition to noise impacts from moving the southern runway 56 feet closer to Imperial Highway, a new 121,000 square foot General Aviation facility will be developed near the intersection of Imperial Highway and Sepulveda Boulevard on the northwest corner of Imperial and Sepulveda. This additional General Aviation facility will also generate noise impacts in close proximity to existing businesses and residences, though it is not clear from reviewing the EIS/EIR how the noise impacts from the new General Aviation facility will be mitigated.

Response:

As shown on Table S3-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the south airfield runway 7R/25L would be relocated 50 feet south of the existing centerline and therefore 50 feet closer to Imperial Highway under Alternative D. However, as analyzed in Section 4.2 (subsection 4.2.6) and summarized on Table S4.2-29 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative D no areas within the City of El Segundo would be newly exposed to high noise levels and there would be a reduction in area and noise-sensitive uses exposed to high noise levels compared to 1996 baseline conditions. See also Responses to Comments PC01377-9 for further discussion of impacts on the City of El Segundo. See also Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise-sensitive uses and noise impacts identified in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

The 121,000-square foot General Aviation facility at the northwest corner of Imperial Highway and Sepulveda Boulevard is presented in Section 2.6.8 of the Draft Master Plan Addendum. As shown on Figure S4.2-15 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the proposed LAX Plan land use designation of the site is Airport Airside, which includes general aviation activity. Regarding noise impacts that may occur from development of this facility, Sections 4.1, Noise and 4.2, Land Use of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included this facility and its related aviation activity when evaluating noise impacts on noise-sensitive uses. As indicated above, aircraft noise impacts associated with the general aviation facility combined with other aviation activity would not have a significant impact on areas in El Segundo. As a result no mitigation is proposed. Regarding concerns over uses in close proximity, please note that the nearest noise-sensitive uses to this location are approximately 600 feet away and separated by raised portions of the Imperial Highway, intervening buildings, and road rights-of-way. Furthermore, the site is currently used by Airborne Express, which generates noise from its activities, including nighttime operations. See Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise-sensitive uses and noise thresholds.

Although general aviation activity was evaluated at a program level in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, specific impacts associated with near term development involving the relocation of the Mercury Fixed Base Operations (FBO) to the location referenced by the commenter were separately evaluated as an independent project. The proposed Mercury FBO includes approximately 15,000 square feet of development, which is consistent with the existing LAX Interim Plan land use designation of Service Area and zoning designation of Heavy Industrial (M3-1) for the site. The Mercury FBO is also consistent with the proposed LAX Plan land use designation under Alternative D. A Negative Declaration was prepared for the Mercury FBO (dated April 2003) and circulated for public review from April 17 to May 7, 2003. Based on the analysis contained therein, potential noise impacts on surrounding uses resulting from construction activities, vehicle trips, flight

3. Comments and Responses

activity, aircraft ground taxi during ingress/egress on the aircraft parking ramp, truck activity, mechanical loading and towing equipment, maintenance, and parking lot activities would be less than significant. This is primarily due to the limited amount of additional flight activity and slight shifting of general aviation flight activity away from residential areas that would occur, existing traffic noise on Imperial Highway, and site specific barrier/structure attenuation. Therefore, no mitigation measures associated with the Mercury FBO were required.

SPC00260-8

Comment:

7. With the southern runway (7R/25L) moved 56 feet closer to Imperial Highway, there may be vibration impacts due to the proximity of jets taking off, landing and taxiing 56 feet closer to businesses and residents in El Segundo, just to the south of Imperial Highway. However, there is virtually no discussion in the EIR of the vibration impacts as a result of moving the runway closer to existing structures and people.

Response:

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

SPC00260-9

Comment:

The above list is not meant to be exhaustive of our concerns regarding the adequacy of the EIS/EIR's analysis. Given the length of the EIS/EIR, which is 10 volumes and over 5,400 pages in length, we are relying on Section 21177(a) of the California Public Resources Code, which states:

"No action or proceeding may be brought pursuant to Section 21167 unless the alleged grounds for noncompliance with this division were presented to the public agency orally or in writing by any person during the public comment period provided by this division or prior to the close of the public hearing on the project before the issuance of the notice of determination."

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21177(a), we reserve the opportunity to affirm and incorporate certain oral and written comments provided by others to LAWA and the FAA in connection with the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00261 Gibson, Minnie None Provided 11/5/2003

SPC00261-1

Comment:

I live at 10229 S. 7th Ave, in Ing Ca 90303. My house is under the last loud noise before the plan lands

Since a plane needs enough gas to go to the next city until they get an okay to land, where does that fuel go since it's a fire violation to land with fuel?

Response:

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

SPC00261-2**Comment:**

Since the cars/freeway traffic car is making the black spots ({Per air Pollution Plans} in Diamond Bar) aren't they coming to the airport to pick up goods for all of Southern California? Could the debris and black spots or rotten look on [unreadable] be erased with washing- are there any funds for this?

Response:

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

SPC00261-3**Comment:**

Why has the value of my house gone down? Before the airport it was worth more. Other homes are going up and ours are going down. Please tell me why?

Response:

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

SPC00261-4**Comment:**

I received Doors and windows from LAWA. Is there a lien on my house?

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.13 for a description of an avigation easement as related to sound insulation.

SPC00261-5**Comment:**

Are there any funds to replace the broken windows at Morningside Hi School that are broken.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Repair of the windows at this school is the responsibility of the local school district.

SPC00262**Patton, Audrey****50th Street Block Club****11/4/2003****SPC00262-1****Comment:**

The members of our block club have read and approved Alternative D as the best plan for the improvement of the airport at LAX.

See attached rationale and comments, 11 individual comments

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPC00262-2 below and Responses to Comment Letters SPC00263 through SPC00271.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00262-2

Comment:

The attached comments are based on the following rationale:

The City has other airports in Van Nuys, Ontario, and Palmdale. With the increased use of these airports, we would not need increased or extended runways, additional terminals, or land acquisition as Alternatives A, B, and C would require. Also, Increased use of these other airports would decrease automobile traffic (especially on the San Diego Freeway - the 405) which is a nightmare almost any time of day. Incessant lines of planes flying low over the southern end of the City would, hopefully, be decreased with the extension of the other airports - we definitely don't want them increased.

Alternative D improves the security problems found at LAX, without the acquisition of more space; "D" also "eliminates all passenger associated traffic on the Central Terminal Area (CTA) roadways, increasing the ability to secure the environment. There are changes which will cost - the primary change - the re-positioning of existing runways to decrease the danger of accidents, the institution of a shuttle to bring people from parking lots outside of the terminal and the extension of the Green Line ("eliminating all "passenger associated traffic" within the terminal).

The Alternatives A, B, C, feature the creation of jobs as an economic benefit. "Today, in Los Angeles City there are approximately, 158,000 jobs directly linked to LAX. 408,000 in the region, 328,000 in the County." That means over half the jobs (250,000) are NOT in LAX. Anyway, most of the construction jobs are awarded to contractors who, if they employ people from the inner city, only employ a token force.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00262-3

Comment:

There is one problem that I see in plan D - the elimination of gates and replacing them with "shops and such." There's enough congestion as it is when people are boarding or deboarding. It seems that the elimination of gates would only increase this congestion. Also, the supplies needed by the "shops and such" that would replace the gates could breach the security. It would be very easy to bring in harmful devices, masked as supplies. It would make sense to put the "shops and such" out in the parking area.

Response:

Comment noted. Though the terminal and concourse facilities constructed as part of Alternative D would provide a greater volume of available space for concessions, they would be planned to provide sufficient space in the boarding areas to efficiently handle the forecast passenger volume. The configuration of the new terminals would allow better utilization of the available gates to accommodate more passengers with fewer gates than exist today. Goods sold in concession areas on the secure side of all airports in the United States are subject to security screening, as are employees that are granted access to secure airport areas.

SPC00262-4

Comment:

We, in the innercity, are paying exorbitant sewage costs now because of the erection of new central City complexes, buildings, and multiunit structures from which we will see little if any benefit. The money their presence creates for the City does not filter back to the average citizen. Our taxes increase; the City cannot afford adequate police; the City cannot afford adequate schools or quality teachers; our streets are in disrepair; we have to cajole the sanitation department for proper service. But the City keeps building and telling us that it will benefit our economy.

3. Comments and Responses

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

SPC00263 Williams, Otis 50th Street Block Club 11/4/2003

SPC00263-1

Comment: Master Plan Alternative D. That will Enhance our community - Better than the other Plans.

Response: Comment noted.

SPC00264 Guzman, Maria 50th Street Block Club 11/4/2003

SPC00264-1

Comment: I would like to see the Master Plan Alternative D. approved.

Response: Comment noted.

SPC00265 Unreadable, George None Provided 11/4/2003

SPC00265-1

Comment: Master Plan "D" appears to be the best plan to go forward with.

Response: Comment noted.

SPC00266 Yarziek, Charles 50th Street Block Club 11/4/2003

SPC00266-1

Comment: I certainly and honestly feel that Master Plan "D" will serve the purpose.

Response: Comment noted.

SPC00267 Roberts, Boldexi 50th Street Block Club 11/4/2003

SPC00267-1

Comment: MASTER PLAN ALTERIVE "D" WOULD BE BEST for the city as A WHOLE

Response: Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00268 Jones, Alice 50th Street Block Club 11/4/2003

SPC00268-1

Comment:

Master Plan D. is our choice

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00269 Blair, Ada 50th Street Block Club 11/4/2003

SPC00269-1

Comment:

Master Plan D is our choice

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00270 Moreno, Carlos 50th Street Block Club 11/4/2003

SPC00270-1

Comment:

I support Alternative D - Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00271 Lemmons, Mary None Provided 11/4/2003

SPC00271-1

Comment:

D Plan

Master Plan D is the best for us.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00272 McCormick, James None Provided 11/7/2003

SPC00272-1

Comment:

CITIZEN COMMENT REGARDING LAX MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVES UNDER CURRENT EIS/EIR PROCESS RECOMMEND REJECTION OF ALTERNATIVE D

3. Comments and Responses

Political decisions made in the wake of the national hysteria following 9/11/2001 have ordained a cobbled together proposal in "Alternative D" that is insufficiently elaborated to establish a valid basis for assessing its environmental impacts or reasonable assurances that its benefits outweigh the costs to the public or the environment.

The objective of enhanced security is an important element of any conception of modernizing LAX but must not become the "sheep's clothing" under which a poorly conceived of and insufficiently elaborated alternative is rushed through the public review processes.

The magnitude of the importance of effectively addressing the Los Angeles Regions' requirements for an air transportation system for the 21st Century cannot be overstated but the overwhelming evidence in the public's reaction to the solutions advanced as proposals to this date is that we have not yet produced the comprehensive approach that is a satisfactory response to this requirement.

I recommend that we continue our work toward the end of an exceptionally well conceived of and comprehensive approach to the Los Angeles Regions' requirements for an air transportation system for the 21st Century and reject the Recommended Alternative as poorly conceived of and insufficiently elaborated to fully meet the legal tests of adequacy for environmental review.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00273 Flynn, John None Provided 11/6/2003

SPC00273-1

Comment:

Lax Environmental Justice / Expansion Master Plan Growth 2003

This is a letter in response to your Environmental Justice meeting held at Inglewood, Ca., in regards to LAX Expansion. You 'offered' us sound insulation, a nighttime curfew on flights, 'less' pollution, noise, and traffic, and jobs. I find all to be unacceptable and not doing enough to assist residents east of LAX. Instead of working harder for residents to the east of LAX, LAX recently passes a law that aimed to stop Hare Krishna and other religious groups from soliciting donations in open areas, but restricting them to out of the way booths." LAX officials say the law is needed because solicitors are annoying, distracting, increase congestion " from the Daily Breeze April, May 2003. Funny, that is how a lot of us feel about LAX, in our communities to the east. Annoying, Distracting, Increase congestion. I hope this is taken into account for our communities.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00273-2

Comment:

The Residential Sound Insulation / soundproofing does not appear to be going in noise order across all affected communities. Why is it separated into multiple (at least three) programs? Houses here in Inglewood are done in an apparent 'random' order, probably to placate residents in various neighborhoods. I was never invited to participate in the program here in Inglewood, despite living under the north runway flight path for many years, and had to apply in person @ the Inglewood Residential Sound Insulation office, even as I watched neighbors being invited to meetings discussing the program, and their houses being done. It also took an excessive (2+ years) amount of time from applying to completion. From the research I have conducted, Manchester Square and other homes in other neighborhoods are not exposed to the same high levels of airport noise, but are receiving more money than Inglewood and Lennox; Numerous friends in the Lennox / La County areas have not heard of the programs, and have not been invited to participate, despite being subject to large amounts of noise & overflights being under the flight paths to the major south runway complex. This inequity needs to be looked at immediately.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. However please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the ANMP. Priority for sound insulation is given to residential properties within the highest noise level band above the 65 CNEL. In an effort to mitigate current noise impacts from LAX operations on adjacent jurisdictions affected by high noise levels, the City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, Inglewood, and El Segundo prepare and administer their respective ANMPs. Implementation of the ANMP by other jurisdictions is outside the direct control of LAWA; however, LAWA is working with other jurisdictions to improve and accelerate their soundproofing efforts. Concerns about the implementation of the ANMP in Inglewood and Los Angeles County should also be directed to these jurisdictions at the telephone numbers provided in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.11.

Regarding funding for Manchester Square, the voluntary acquisition and relocation of residential properties within Manchester Square is presently underway as a separate program from the LAX Master Plan and is further described in Topical Response TR-MP-3. Funding for jurisdictions within the ANMP is based the number of incompatible uses that need to be mitigated for high noise levels either through sound insulation or acquisition. Acquisition requires a higher cost per dwelling unit than sound insulation. Availability of funds for soundproofing has not been a limiting factor in Los Angeles County; rather it has been a lack of progress in completing mitigation with existing funds.

See Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. As stated under Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA would accelerate fulfillment of existing commitments to owners wishing to participate within the current ANMP boundaries prior to proceeding with newly eligible properties and provide additional technical assistance to local jurisdictions to support more rapid and efficient implementation of their respective ANMPs.

SPC00273-3

Comment:

In regards to the promised nighttime flight curfew, I find this amusing. I had filed complaint forms with the LAX Noise website numerous times in 2002. Eventually (6+ months, on average), I received responses back. Included in that information, it appears Westchester, Playa Del Rey, and El Segundo (to the north and south of LAX 'benefit the most' from a 10:00 PM - 7:00 AM curfew on the outer runways, as well as various restrictions on engine run ups and maintenance. Many flights overflow my neighborhood and there was no explanation given as to why many of these overflights occurred (unknown was given on the forms mailed to me). There needs to be better communication from LAX, the airlines that commit these 'violations', and the FAA to the affected neighborhoods. Eventually, I believe, after filing many complaints, the amount of complaints investigated was limited to 5 per household per month. No additional measures were implemented to handle relations & communication with affected areas after this limit of 5 complaints was set. If the records were to be checked, it would be apparent that there have been thousands of curfew 'violations' over the years to the neighborhoods to the east. But the residents of Hawthorne / Manhattan Beach / Hermosa Beach etc. received some relief from their overflights. According to the Daily Breeze and other sources, the Hawthorne / Manhattan Beach / Hermosa Beach residents had approximately 91 easterly takeoffs over 18 months. Letters were written to airlines asking them to discontinue this practice. Millions of dollars are being spent on a Part 150 noise study. I see this east takeoff as being used for safety reasons, yet LAX / FAA chooses to accomodate Hawthorne / Hermosa Beach / Manhattan Beach / etc. residents, instead of east neighbors. Yes, safety is as big a concern for me as it is for LAX. But it appears 'safety' is used more when it affects communities to the east, rather than to the north and south of the airport. Do the residents to the east get a soundwall built? Northern (Westchester) residents received them years ago. Where is Inglewood's and Lennox's Part 150 study?

Response:

Comment noted. LAX has no curfew. It does have special operating procedures for late night hours. See Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.1, regarding public confusion over what over-ocean procedures mean. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. 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 LAWAs 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. LAWAs 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 LAWAs Noise Management staff, then the responses (broken down by date, time and block address) are sent to the requesting community members. LAWAs has recently installed a PASSUR system to assist the community in tracking aircraft operations. By going to the LAWAs website www.lawa.org and entering the Noise Management section, community members can specifically identify LAX operations that cross their community. In 2000, LAWAs signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the City of Inglewood that addressed noise mitigation actions east of the airport. In terms of its effect on noise distribution patterns east of the airport, the most important of the terms of that agreement was a commitment by LAWAs to undertake a Federal Aviation Regulation Part 161 Access Restriction Study. As a result, mitigation measure MM-N-5, Conduct Part 161 Study to Make Over Ocean Procedures Mandatory (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), was included in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, mitigation measure MM-LU-2, Incorporate Residential Dwelling Units Exposed to Single Event Awakenings Threshold into Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), will expand the ANMP boundaries to include residential uses newly exposed to single event exterior nighttime noise. Mitigation measures are addressed in Section 4.1.8 Mitigation Measures, of Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2.8, Mitigation Measures, of Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The application of the Part 161 Study does not imply that all easterly departures between midnight and 6:30 a.m. would be eliminated. During periods of Santa Ana weather when easterly winds exceed 10 knots, or during periods of coastal fog when the visibility is severely limited west of the airport, safety considerations will require the use of east flow operations, and all traffic will take off to the east. Such conditions now account for the great majority of easterly takeoffs that occur during the year. No change is proposed for these existing procedures during high wind or low visibility periods. Please see Topical Response TR-N-4, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-4.2 regarding berms, barriers, urban forest, and walls proposed to interrupt ground noise. Please also see Section 7, Noise Mitigation, of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR for information on soundwalls. LAX last completed a Part 150 in 1985. In the event that LAWAs initiates an update to its Part 150 Study the communities of Inglewood and Lennox would be included in the planning process.

SPC00273-4

Comment:

Less pollution and traffic should be given top priority by the LAX expansion project. If the Manchester Square check in center is built, it will greatly increase traffic and pollution in the Inglewood area. La Cienega, Aviation, Century, Airport Blvd. and Arbor Vitae streets will need major improvements to accommodate the larger number of vehicles that will travel there.

Response:

Traffic mitigations are proposed at intersections in the City of Inglewood where the traffic study has revealed that the project has a significant impact. The intersections where traffic mitigations are proposed as part of the preferred traffic mitigation plan in the City of Inglewood are: Arbor Vitae Street & La Cienega Boulevard, Aviation Boulevard & Manchester Boulevard, Florence Avenue & La Cienega Boulevard, La Cienega Boulevard & Manchester Boulevard, Centinela Avenue & La Cienega Boulevard, Hawthorne Boulevard/La Brea Avenue & Century Boulevard, Arbor Vitae Street and Inglewood Avenue, Century Boulevard & Inglewood Avenue, Imperial Highway & Inglewood Avenue, and Arbor Vitae Street & La Brea Avenue. Improvements are also proposed at the intersection of Century Boulevard & La Cienega Boulevard, which is partially within the City of Inglewood. However, this intersection remains partially unmitigated.

Roadway widenings are planned for portions of La Cienega Boulevard, Century Boulevard, Airport Boulevard, and Arbor Vitae Streets, as suggested by the Commentor. These proposed roadway widenings, which will result in additional lanes of traffic on these streets, are located within the City of Los Angeles.

Additional information regarding the traffic study and the traffic mitigation plan is located in Chapter 4.3.2 and Technical Report S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00273-5

Comment:

Why is the Green line not being continued to the Inglewood / Westchester area? This is the perfect opportunity to 'do it right', but I don't believe this project will be 'done right'.

Response:

Federal law prohibits use of airport revenue from being used for extending the Green Line into Inglewood or Westchester. However, Alternative D does not preclude the MTA from extending the Green Line northerly in their right-of-way along the west side of Aviation Boulevard, if it chooses to do so.

SPC00273-6

Comment:

The residents to the east will be forced to deal with more traffic, noise and pollution. Our houses and cars get dirty from the planes and traffic.

Response:

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

SPC00273-7

Comment:

A recent flight path change for takeoffs has benefitted the southern communities (El Segundo, Hermosa Beach, Manhattan Beach, Palos Verdes, etc) while imposing more noise and pollution on communities to the north and east of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It is unclear by the commentor what flight path change has benefitted communities to the south while imposing more noise and pollution to the north and east of LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. Additionally, please see Section 4.1.5 Master Plan Commitments and Section 4.1.8 Mitigation Measures of Section S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00273-8

Comment:

How will construction of the new facilities affect residents to the east? We bear too much of the noise & pollution burden now. We don't want any more.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice, including effects of noise and air pollution, in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-D. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR also addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality.

SPC00273-9**Comment:**

Jobs are important for the residents to the east. I hope this matter is truly open to the residents here. Good paying jobs with a future. Training and education. We will see if LAX can truly make this happen, instead of outsiders and consultants running all projects, except for a small amount of local workers performing menial tasks.

Response:

Please see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Final EIS/EIR and Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding the environmental justice program, economic benefits, and employment benefits.

SPC00273-10**Comment:**

Seeing the process of LAX airport expansion over the years, I have seen many proposals changed to accommodate the north and south neighbors. In my opinion, a third runway should be built to the north, but probably won't due to Westchester local opposition. Please don't forget us to the east. Many things are included in the Environmental Justice plan, but more need to be included. After September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, I immediately thought of how Israel conducts their airplane industry. We need to copy what they have done, not reinvent the wheel and waste countless dollars in the process, accommodating business concessions and special interests in the process. Israel has been very successful. Please study what they have done. Yes, the travellers need to get through the process in a relative short time, but it seems that the whole process is geared to the traveller and business concerns. Please do not relax security just for convenience of travellers, at the expense of residents to the east. Many new improvements could be built into the existing LAX complex, without affecting the eastern communities as much as the Manchester Square check in facility would.

Response:

As described in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative A - Added Alternative North, is among the alternatives being considered for the LAX Master Plan. Regarding effects on communities to the east, see Response to Comment SAL00013-16.

SPC00274**Vuchsas, Gwen****Neighborhood Council of
Westchester/Playa del Rey****11/4/2003****SPC00274-1****Comment:**

Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa del Rey

LAX Master Plan Position Paper

INTRODUCTION

The Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa del Rey (NCWPDR) is the recognized Neighborhood Council for Westchester/Playa del Rey. The Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) is included in the Council's boundaries. Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA), the City of Los Angeles agency that operates LAX has released a Supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Report (EIS/EIR) for the LAX Master Plan (hereafter referred to as "Alternative D" [July 2003]). Many of the stakeholders that comprise our community (residents, businesses and real property owners) expect NCWPDR to take a position on the LAX Master Plan and to ask questions about the EIS/EIR document. This position paper and accompanying questions respond to those expectations.

3. Comments and Responses

NCWPDR represents a community of over 55,000 residents and a variety of businesses, institutions and government facilities. LAX has been a stakeholder in NCWPDR since its inception in 2002. It has been and continues to be the intention of NCWPDR to maintain a positive working relationship with LAX.

The NCWPDR Board of Directors understands the need for a safe and secure airport. The NCWPDR Board also understands the needs of the residents and local businesses to not be negatively impacted by airport operations. NCWPDR stakeholders are also shareholders in City assets such as LAX. There is a reasonable expectation on the part of citizens that government will take good care of publicly owned facilities. Airports are unique government owned facilities as they provide both transportation options and economic development. Airports are also unique in the types of problems that they present for neighbors- noise, traffic, pollution and a potential terrorist target.

There is a long history between LAX and Westchester/Playa del Rey residents where some very important promises on development issues have been made and not been kept - issues such as ground radar and a new passenger airport in Palmdale.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00274-2

Comment:

POSITION PAPER

NCWPDR has examined the Supplement to the LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR. The question used to come to a decision was, "Is the LAX Master Plan beneficial to the community?" The answer is "no." NCWPDR requests that the Board of Airport Commissioners (BOAC), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the Los Angeles City Council and Mayor Hahn reject all LAX Master Plan alternatives produced thus far and start over with active input from the surrounding communities and the airlines to design a new LAX Master Plan which all parties can support.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00274-3

Comment:

REGIONAL SOLUTION

There are other viable alternatives to expanding or modernizing LAX such as a truly regional plan. It is well known and understood that LAX alone cannot meet the future passenger and cargo capacity needs of Southern California. There are several commercial airports in the area that can provide the necessary capacity to meet the projected doubling of worldwide commercial air traffic in 2020. Some airports, notably Burbank and Long Beach, are constrained by noise regulations and field size from handling additional significant growth.

LAWA is in the driver's seat in meeting future airport capacity needs with its ownership and operation of Ontario International Airport and Palmdale Regional Airport. While new master plans are under development for both of these airports, there needs to be the leadership within City Hall to make certain that construction plans are made and literally poured into concrete.

Ultimately, outlying airports such as Ontario and Palmdale will need to be built into modern air terminals with high speed rail and freeway connections integrated into their facilities. The longer we wait, the more expensive and more difficult it will become to complete these projects. As opposed to spending \$9.6 billion at LAX, LAWA can build new over 100 million annual passengers (MAP) capacity at both Ontario and Palmdale for about half of what is proposed for Alternative D. Furthermore, for homeland security purposes, improved airports at Ontario and Palmdale can provide relief capacity in case of a

terrorist attack at LAX. Therefore, Southern California will not be completely cut-off by air from the rest of the nation and the world. Building for the future means that Ontario and Palmdale must be built now.

The LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR must include definitive programs, proposals and plans for LAWA and the City of Los Angeles to put into effect to achieve a regional solution. The City must make a formal commitment to undertake these actions.

Response:

LAWA is not empowered to "achieve a regional solution", but it can cooperate with SCAG, the architects of the regional plan, by preparing a Master Plan for LAX that is consistent with the allocation of the RTP and by providing improvements to ONT and PMD sufficient to allow the growth of air service to those airports as market demand increases. The decision to develop an airport is the responsibility of the local airport proprietor. Constructing a high-speed rail system between airports is beyond the authority of LAWA or the FAA to implement.

The LAX Master Plan and associated EIS/EIR deal only with the proposed development of LAX. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. As noted, master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale. Other jurisdictions are responsible for planning and developing the other regional airports. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 for more detail about planning for LAX and the other airports in the region, and Topical Responses TR-RC-1 and TR-RC-5 regarding LAWA's planning for Ontario and Palmdale.

Alternative D emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for the modernization of LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 for more detail about planning for LAX and the other airports in the region, and Topical Responses TR-RC-1 and TR-RC-5 regarding LAWA's planning for Ontario and Palmdale.

LAWA and Mayor Hahn developed Alternative D in response to comments by the public that the City of Los Angeles should participate in a regional solution for the fair and reasonable distribution of air service. Alternative D is consistent with the "fair share" that is allocated to LAX by SCAG in its regional plan.

Officials from Los Angeles joined political leaders from the Inland Empire to form a new coalition in October 2003 to plan as a region for the growth of air traffic in Southern California.

SPC00274-4

Comment:

PRIOR PROPOSALS

At the outset, it should be absolutely clear that NCWPDR rejects the previous Master Plan Alternatives A, B and C. All three of these plans are designed for the express purpose of increasing the capacity of LAX to handle more passengers and do not even attempt to improve the existing facilities for safety. These plans were too invasive to the surrounding community with the introduction of such elements as a ring road, western terminal and runway reconfigurations that would have placed runways closer to the community and dislocated hundreds of residents and local businesses. The literal purpose of placing a new terminal at the west end of LAX was to create a new second path to the airport directly through our communities. The location of a west end terminal also necessitated the ill-advised "ring road" which in addition to destroying a massive portion of the Westchester Business district, would also disrupt existing traffic flow on North/South surface routes without any mitigation proposed, or for that matter even possible.

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00274-5

Comment:

ALTERNATIVE D - Mayor James K. Hahn's "Safety and Security Plan"

While Alternative D does in fact remove the most abhorrent parts of Alternatives A, B and C, and is preferable to those alternatives, unfortunately it creates a new and different set of problems that ultimately cause the committee to reject it as well. Primary among our concerns is that Alternative D is not a safety and security plan. Second, the proposed cost far outweighs any perceived benefits. Third, Alternative D does not adequately mitigate traffic impacts.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00274-6 through SPC00274-26 below.

SPC00274-6

Comment:

SUMMARY ON CONCLUSIONS

1. The Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa del Rey does not support Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00274-7

Comment:

2. The objective of enhanced security is not met.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00274-8

Comment:

3. The stated cost of Alternative D is excessive relative to all benefits that are described in the plan.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D will improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking.

SPC00274-9

Comment:

4. Unlike the history of LAWA, this Alternative D does not treat the airlines as partners.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00274-10

Comment:

5. Alternative D requires the dislocation of over 7,000 residents, of which 3,500 have already been relocated, at a time all affordable housing is in the shortest supply ever experienced in our region.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing. As was discussed within Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, no residential acquisition is proposed for Alternative D. Acquisition currently underway within the Manchester Square and Belford neighborhoods is occurring as part of a separate ongoing program, and will continue to occur independent of the Master Plan. As required by law, all relocation activities would comply with the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.

SPC00274-11

Comment:

6. Alternative D requires removal and relocation of elementary schools when there is a need for school facilities.

Response:

As shown on Table S4.2-20 in Section 4.2, Land Use of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, no public elementary schools are proposed for removal and relocation under Alternative D. However, Westchester Neighborhood School, a private school serving kindergarten through 8th grade, would be acquired and the school, faculty, and student population relocated to LAX Northside, as indicated on Table 2.7-2, in Chapter 2.7 of the Master Plan Addendum. Refer to Section 4.27, Schools (subsection 4.27.7.1) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a discussion of cumulative enrollment impacts on schools, which would be less than significant.

SPC00274-12

Comment:

7. Alternative D does not utilize LAX's physical facilities, Terminals 1, 2 and 3, that already represent a substantial investment, both public and private.

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to comment SPC00292-15; please see Response to Comment SPC00292-15.

SPC00274-13

Comment:

8. The physical construction of Alternative D will create a long-lasting and disruptive impact on the residents and businesses within the sub-region. The negative impact of this disruption has not been netted out from the projected economic benefits.

Response:

Comment noted. It is difficult, if not impossible, to predict the economic effects that physical construction impacts (e.g., construction vehicle traffic, detour routes, etc.) may potentially have on the surrounding area. A construction plan for Alternative D was discussed in detail in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As was detailed therein, substantial efforts would be made to minimize disruption to the surrounding communities. Additionally, Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a discussion of the potential for temporary impacts associated with

3. Comments and Responses

community disruption of adjacent communities during construction work. As discussed, a number of the Master Plan Commitments proposed would reduce the potential for impacts associated with community disruption, however temporary impacts would be significant. A discussion of the socio-economic effects resulting from construction-related expenditures and employment was provided in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, and Section 4.20, Construction Impacts, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00274-14

Comment:

9. While the plan calls for a 78.9 MAP there is no feasible method of controlling the number of passengers. Alternative D does not adequately address the traffic impacts, mitigation, and transportation operation required for 78.9 MAP on the incremental passengers which could be 10 to 20 million more. The 405, 105, and 110 freeways and major thoroughfares and intersections are at a point where physical traffic mitigation of the impacts generated by 78, 88, or 98 MAP is not feasible. Overriding considerations are not an acceptable strategy for any plan.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D does not cap passenger activity. Facilities that comprise Alternative D are designed to serve approximately 78.9 million annual passengers. As described on page 3-25, in Section 3.3.2, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D is a long-term regional approach to serving air traffic demand in the Los Angeles basin by designing facilities at LAX to accommodate passenger activity levels as projected in regional plans, such as the SCAG RTP.

LAWA determined that constraining the aircraft gate frontage at the terminals is a component of the airport system that is within its control. LAWA can constrain the development of this frontage and believes that this will, in turn, place an effective constraint on total passenger activity at LAX. However, as explained in detail in Section 3.3 in the Draft EIS/EIR, "it is important to understand that the levels of passengers that each alternative is designed to accommodate are not finite limits where the airport would somehow be closed or where aircraft would be redirected to some other facility when this number is reached. These levels are an indication of the number of passengers that can be accommodated at a reasonable level of service."

Under 14 CFR Part 161, only FAA can approve air service restrictions. Given the Congressional mandate to the FAA to increase aviation capacity in major markets, this is improbable.

As the level of service at LAX degrades due to inadequate facilities to meet demand, it would be in the interest of the airlines to shift service to other airports to service the demand in the Los Angeles region.

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR appropriately addresses the impacts of the forecast activity at LAX in 2015 if the components of Alternative D were constructed.

SPC00274-15

Comment:

10. The environmental impacts of Alternative D, particularly air pollution and noise, will be substantial during the physical construction as well as the operation of Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted. Construction noise and air emissions would impact surrounding areas. However, Mitigation Measures MM-N-5 through MM-N-9 (Section 4.1.8.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR) are intended to reduce noise effects from construction activities to the extent practicable and Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-1 (Section 4.1.8.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR) is intended to reduce air emissions. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed construction impacts in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts, 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 for more information on Construction Emissions. 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.

SPC00274-16

Comment:

For any sizeable project in our sub region, at least 2 to 3 years has been required to achieve a reasonably acceptable plan. The EIS/EIR as presented does not adequately satisfy the objectives outlined above. Therefore, we recommend additional study to prepare a revised plan which meets the stated objectives for LAX's modernization.

Response:

Comment noted. As was described in Section 3.1.3, Development Concepts, of the Draft EIS/EIR, the formulation of various options and concepts for the LAX Master Plan began in fall 1995, following the completion of an inventory of existing conditions and the forecasts of air transportation demand. In January 2001, after more than five years of defining, evaluating, and refining those various options and concepts, the Draft EIS/EIR and the Draft Master Plan were released for public review, and underwent a 295-day review period that included nine public hearings. In July 2003, after spending over a year and a half on the formulation, evaluation, and refinement of Alternative D, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was released for public review, and underwent a 120-day review period. Based on the duration and extent to which the proposal for the LAX Master Plan has been evaluated, in full accordance with NEPA and CEQA requirements, the FAA and LAWA feel that the project is now ready for the decision-making process.

SPC00274-17

Comment:

Alternative D does not adequately address safety and security needs.

The chief safety issue that the LAX Master Plan seeks to address is runway incursions. LAWA has proposed center line taxiways between the runways to accomplish this goal. According to FAA records, LAX has not had a runway incursion with an aircraft in the past five years. We also congratulate LAWA on not having any incursions in the past 12 months. In 1996, LAX opened a new control tower that gives controllers an unobstructed view of the whole airfield. The new tower was constructed in response to a 1991 ground collision involving a Skywest turboprop that taxied onto a runway where a USAir 737 jet was coming in for a landing. LAX also eliminated mid-field take-offs for turboprops as a result of the accident. To our knowledge, another recommendation never implemented in the aftermath of the crash was the installation of ground radar. It is essential that the ground radar be installed as soon as possible. As has been proven with signage along the runways and departure procedures for preventing early turns over El Segundo and Playa del Rey, so too can electronic traffic signals along runway exits and arrival procedures be implemented to prevent aircraft incursions.

Response:

As stated in Section 3.3.2, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, FAA published a study entitled, "FAA Runway Safety Report: Runway Incursion Trends at Towered Airports in the United States - CY 1998 - CY 2001" in June 2002. This report identified 38 total runway incursions during the period of the FAA study and annual runway incursions at LAX totaled 12, 10, 8, and 8, respectively, for the years 1998 through 2001. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 for more detailed information. Airport surface radar technology and airport infrastructure implementation at key airports like LAX are some of the strategies identified by FAA to help solve the problem. LAWA has already implemented improvements to airfield lighting, taxiway marking, runway signage, and has sponsored on-going seminars on airfield familiarization with airport users.

FAA commissioned the Airport Movement Area Safety System (AMASS) at LAX in September 2001. AMASS increases the safety of aircraft and vehicles operating on the surface of the airport. However, more improvement is needed. Taxiway system configuration is one of the key infrastructure methods to solving the problem.

3. Comments and Responses

FAA continues to assess Runway Status Lights (RWSL) as a means to reduce runway incursions. The status of the program is as follows: "The RWSL program builds on earlier FAA research and development projects that explored the feasibility and potential operational effectiveness of a surveillance-driven automated system of lights. This lighting system would be used to warn pilots and other airport vehicle operators that it is unsafe to enter a runway. The earlier research projects concluded that such a system was feasible, provided there were substantial improvements in the performance of the underlying surveillance system. The high rate of runway incursions attributed to pilot deviations and recent improvements in surface surveillance technology have brought increased interest in the development of RWSL."

"The current RWSL program will develop and test a software system that accepts fused surface radar and multilateration surveillance inputs to activate lights at runway/taxiway intersection points and runway take-off hold areas to help prevent incursions. System engineering and development was conducted during 2003. This will be followed by additional testing mid-year of 2004 with operational evaluation of RWSL beginning in late 2004."

As stated above, runway status lights are still being evaluated by the FAA. Once the FAA has defined a feasible runway status light program, LAWA will investigate whether runway status lights are suitable for deployment at LAX.

SPC00274-18

Comment:

Another stated goal of the center line taxiway is to accommodate New Large Airplanes (NLA's). The 555 seat A380 super jumbo jet, presently being built by the European consortium Airbus in Toulouse, France, is an NLA. We are aware from reading magazines such as Aviation Week and Space Technology that Airbus officials have met with LAWA officials concerning runway, taxiway and ground handling requirements for the A380 which is scheduled to enter service with such foreign flag carriers as Air France, Lufthansa, Qantas and Singapore in January 2007. LAWA apparently has incorporated some of those requirements into the reconfiguration of the north runway complex, 24L and 24R.

We also understand that several Asian airlines that ordered over 60 A380 aircraft told LAX officials that unless the LAX airfield and gates are ready for the A380 in 2007, they will land elsewhere.

We see from the Airport Layout Plan that LAWA intends to use the FAA's proposed Group VI airfield arrangement. We want to point out that the Group VI airfield specifications have not been adopted by the FAA and that LAWA has "modified" (i.e. diminished) some proposed Group VI airfield specifications towards the east end of the newly relocated 24L, 340 feet south of its current location. We are not satisfied that this new runway arrangement will meet the need of the A380's and other future NLA's by compromising the runway and taxiway arrangements at the outset.

There is also the issue of runway length. The longest runway at LAX is the south inboard runway 25R with 12,000 in length. Although there may be assurances that the A380 can take off on runways less than that length, the aircraft has not been produced and tested to verify projected operational capacities. LAWA should not be reckless with the public's money and begin construction by pouring concrete only to find out not too much later that additional changes are needed. As shown in the experience of building Denver International Airport (Denver International Airport: Lessons Learned), making changes after construction begins will greatly increase costs; this is partially how a proposed \$1.5 billion project became a \$4.5 billion project.

Response:

FAA has incorporated Aircraft Design Group VI standards into Advisory Circular 150/5300-13 Change 7, Airport Design, published October 1, 2002. LAWA has chosen to modify the FAA Group VI standard by using FAA methodology that adapts the general standard to specific aircraft dimensions. The dimensions that LAWA has chosen fully accommodates the Airbus A380 aircraft. Please see Section 3.2.6.3, Justification for the Modified Group VI Standards in Chapter IV of the Draft LAX Master Plan for more information.

Airbus has now publicly stated that the A380 would need about 8,000 feet for arrival operations and 10,000 feet for departure operations at its maximum takeoff weight (MTOW) at LAX. The extended

Runway 6L/24R in the north airfield complex would be approximately 10,420 feet and is capable of accommodating A380 departure operations with MTOW. Past performance by the manufacturer indicates that preliminary information is sufficiently close to actual information to provide a sound basis for airport planning.

The runway lengths at Denver International Airport did not change during the time period of submittal of the final airport layout plan to the opening of the airport. Denver has no project or plan to lengthen its longest runway to accommodate any aircraft.

SPC00274-19

Comment:

While the stated intention of Alternative D is to cap LAX at 78.9 MAP, we do not see how adding center taxiways, and therefore increasing the throughput on the runways, will meet that goal. Airlines will increase flights to meet passenger demand which is expected to rise to 165 MAP regionally during the next 20 years. Even with 11 contact gates removed and the proposed 747-compliant replacement gates along the length of the Terminal 1, 2 and 3 ticketing areas, we still see that the increased runway and taxiway efficiency could more than compensate for the reduced number of gates.

Response:

The number of passengers that would be accommodated by Alternative D is constrained to 78.9 MAP due to the design of the Alternative D gate facilities and the projected airline response to the constrained facilities. The ability to increase aircraft size, thereby increasing passenger levels, would be limited by the number and type of gates available under the Alternative D design.

The purpose of the center taxiway is to enhance safe aircraft operations and reduce the potential for runway incursions. It does not increase capacity. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00021-3 regarding the purpose of the center taxiway and aircraft runway operations of Alternative D.

SPC00274-20

Comment:

Alternative D does not make LAX more secure. By increasing the airport perimeter to Manchester Square and Continental City with the proposed Ground Transportation Center (GTC) and Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) at these respective locations, LAWA is actually making LAX a larger, 1-1/8+ miles of additional target opportunities for terrorists. The EIS/EIS document reads as though protecting buildings are more important than protecting the people inside them. LAWA has already proven that it can make LAX secure. We applaud LAWA for having LAX be the only top 20 airport (Category X) in the United States that met the December 31, 2002 deadline for baggage screening.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues.

SPC00274-21

Comment:

Alternative D relies on security technology that does not exist or is unproven. Again, as in the case with Denver International Airport, LAWA should use only proven off the shelf technology. The automated baggage system was replaced at DIA with a traditional belt system because the automated system had never been used elsewhere. This baggage system replacement was done at great expense was the cause of several delays in the grand opening of Denver International.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00274-22

Comment:

Alternative D does not adequately address traffic issues.

Traffic issues will not be significantly mitigated in Westchester/Playa del Rey with Alternative D. As written in the EIS/EIR, LAWA relies on other government agencies to make street and highway improvements, if they are even feasible. Due to the current state budget crisis, those improvements are unlikely as the Legislature had depleted the state highway building fund in order to balance the 2002-2003 budget.

Response:

If funding is unavailable for a proposed transportation mitigation, alternative transportation mitigations will be pursued. These alternative mitigations may require additional environmental review, and will require approval from LADOT. Also, please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding project funding.

SPC00274-23

Comment:

Although the Ground Transportation Center (GTC) relies on freeway connections, there is not enough freeway capacity to handle the load. As such, travelers will find other alternatives to access the airport such as the consolidated rental car facility (RAC). The RAC's proposed location on 98th Street between Sepulveda and Airport is already a problem because it does not stop the existing problem of motorists cutting through Westchester/Playa del Rey neighborhoods such as Osage Park, Westport Heights, Kentwood and Loyola Village to access the airport.

Response:

The traffic model results indicate that the proposed Lennox Boulevard interchange will encourage airport traffic to use the I-405 freeway over the surface streets. Airport passengers will be able to travel from the freeway to the GTC or ITC without stopping at any traffic signals. In general, the traffic model indicates that as airport-related traffic increases on the I-405 Freeway, non-airport related traffic shifts to the parallel surface streets. However, the impact of these interchanges on the surface streets is limited to a small area. The project also calls for widening surface streets in the vicinity of the GTC and ITC, including Aviation Boulevard, La Cienega Boulevard, Arbor Vitae Street, and 111th Street to improve the movement of traffic on the surface streets. Several intersectional improvements are also proposed.

Based on the results of the traffic model, additional traffic is not expected in the residential streets of Osage Park, Westport Heights, Kentwood, or Loyola Village. However, protecting neighborhoods is one of the four guiding principles of Alternative D. The Supplement to the EIS/EIR provides additional information regarding neighborhood traffic control plans in Technical Report S-2b, Supplemental Off-Airport Surface Transportation Technical Report (subsection 5.1).

SPC00274-24

Comment:

Construction of Alternative D will also bring many traffic detours as a parade of trucks moves dirt and brings in concrete and other building supplies.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-3 regarding construction traffic.

SPC00274-25

Comment:

The proposed cost far outweighs any perceived benefits.

LAWA officials have continually touted the positive economic benefits that LAX provides to the Southern California economy. However, by making the journey from the curb to the gate more cumbersome, LAWA will succeed in driving away passenger traffic- the exact opposite of preserving LAX's touted role as one of the region's economic engines. Planning must be done for queuing of automobiles and people.

Response:

For the typical airport passenger, the trip from regional roadway to airline gate is not considered to be more cumbersome in Alternative D.

Queuing analyses for automobiles and passengers will be conducted in the advance planning and design stages of the project.

SPC00274-26

Comment:

With costs for just the EIS/EIR work already having spiraled out of control, we are extremely worried that the projected \$9.6 billion to implement Alternative D will balloon to an even higher amount and cause extreme financial difficulties for LAX and its tenant airlines. It is generally considered that contingency costs (i.e. construction overruns) are 3% of Alternative D when most projects have a 10% contingency. As stated previously, more capacity can be built for less money at Ontario and Palmdale.

Response:

The contingency costs are in excess of 10 percent of the projected costs and are adequate under current projections. Alternative D emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports in order for these airports to address their part of the projected regional demand.

The airlines will only provide service from Palmdale and add new flights from Ontario when sufficient demand can be demonstrated. The airlines select airports to best serve their customers and minimize costs. Just because capacity is available at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports, does not mean the airline will initiate service.

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 that discusses LAWA's efforts to encourage operations at Palmdale, planned improvements at the airport and nearby roadways by LAWA and Caltrans, and the master plan update that is underway.

Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX.

SPC00274-27

Comment:

CONCLUSION

The Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa del Rey rejects LAX Master Plan Alternatives A, B, C and D due to their excessive costs and negative impacts on the community. We further note that Alternatives A, B and C overtly increase capacity. The NCWPDR Board of Directors supports a truly

3. Comments and Responses

regional solution for meeting Southern California's airport capacity needs by building out airports in Ontario and Palmdale. While the NCWPDR Board has rejected the LAX Master Plan alternatives presented thus far, the Board does support a safe and secure LAX and would be willing to work with LAWA, the airlines and other communities in developing a LAX Master Plan which is directly tied to a truly regional solution with implementation budgets and schedules.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00274-3 through SPC00274-26 above.

SPC00274-28

Comment:

QUESTIONS ON THE LAX MASTER PLAN EIS/EIR

1. What programs or activities are the FAA and LAWA participating in or working towards creating a regional airport plan other than Ontario International Airport (ONT) as recommended by SCAG?

Response:

In addition to membership in the Southern California Regional Airport Authority, officials from Los Angeles joined political leaders from the Inland Empire to form a new coalition in October 2003, to plan as a region for the growth of air traffic in Southern California. LAWA is currently preparing Master Plan updates for both Ontario and Palmdale, in order for them to play their part in addressing the anticipated regional demand. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX. Please also see Response to Comment SPC00274-3.

The decision whether to develop an airport or not, is the responsibility of local government, not the federal government. The FAA does not have the authority to create a regional system plan. FAA's statutory responsibility is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace.

SPC00274-29

Comment:

2. Is there any cost analysis showing the impact of increased costs at LAX if Alternative D were to be constructed? What is the breakdown of costs to the passengers, airlines, bondholders, concessionaires? For what period of time will those increased costs be in effect? Will Passenger Facility Charges (PFC's) increase? How much for each carrier?

Response:

A cost analysis of this type is not required for the Master Plan or the EIS/EIR under NEPA or CEQA.

SPC00274-30

Comment:

3. Where is the cost analysis showing the impact on neighboring communities in terms of businesses during construction? Health issues such as loss of hearing, increased respiratory diseases, cancers, and stress? Loss to employers and employees for sick time due to these health issues?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00274-13 regarding economic impacts associated with project construction. Specific construction-related impacts were addressed in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Due to the nature of human health risk impacts, construction impacts were considered together with operational impacts in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

SPC00274-31**Comment:**

4. How will LAWA retain low cost airlines (e.g. Southwest, Frontier, etc.) at LAX who will be displaced from their existing passenger terminal facilities by Alternative D?

Response:

Airlines currently serving LAX would have the opportunity to relocate to different facilities if their existing facilities at LAX are planned to be reconfigured as part of Master Plan Alternative D. For example, Southwest Airlines would be offered the opportunity to utilize at least an equivalent number of gates as their lease agreement provides elsewhere at the airport because Terminal 1 would be demolished as part of Alternative D.

SPC00274-32**Comment:**

5. What other costs that are not a part of the projected \$9.6 billion will need to be borne by the City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, State of California and the United States of America for impacts related to LAX? What costs will be incurred by these levels of government for health issues created by LAX?

Response:

Health related mitigation costs associated with the construction of Alternative D are included in the project cost estimate, including contingencies. Certain roadway improvements will be funded in part by a combination of state and federal grants to mitigate traffic congestion.

SPC00274-33**Comment:**

6. If 78.9 million annual passengers (MAP) is the proposed maximum number of passengers to be handled at LAX in a calendar year, then what do you anticipate will be the number of passengers per gate when you reach that level?

Response:

78.9 MAP is the forecast number of annual passengers that would be accommodated at LAX in 2015 with construction of the constrained gate facilities proposed in Alternative D. It is not the maximum number of passenger to be handled at LAX in a calendar year.

78.9 MAP divided by the proposed Alternative D gate total of 153 would result in 515,686 passengers per gate per year.

SPC00274-34**Comment:**

7. Does the budget for the LAX Master Plan include potential litigation costs? What is the budget amount? Are litigation expenses included in costs analyses? Are settlement costs budgeted and for what amount?

Response:

Potential litigation costs are routinely included in the implementation budget for projects of this magnitude. Litigation budgets, including settlement costs, are believed adequate to address all potential challenges.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00274-35

Comment:

8. Is the financing to acquire the properties in Manchester Square and Belford Square considered to be a part of the financing for the LAX Master Plan?

Response:

The acquisition of Manchester Square is being accomplished under the airport's ANMP program which is separate from the Master Plan. The cost to acquire properties in Manchester Square and Bedford Square are included in the project budget. These properties will be acquired whether or not Alternative D is implemented. A voluntary property acquisition program began in 1997.

SPC00274-36

Comment:

9. What amount of property is to be acquired via eminent domain?

Response:

The City of Los Angeles would use the most appropriate and practical measures available (e.g., voluntary acquisition, leasing, and/or public condemnation) to acquire necessary properties in order to implement the LAX Master Plan. At this point in the planning process, it is impossible to predict which, if any, properties will be acquired by exercising eminent domain rights. However, those properties that have been identified for acquisition are listed in Table A-3, Parcel Detail of Acquisition Areas Alternative A, Table B-3, Summary Statistics of Acquisition Areas Alternative B, and Table C-3, Summary Statistics of Acquisition Areas Alternative C, in Appendix P to Chapter V of the Master Plan, Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan, and Table 2.7-2, Alternative D - Parcel Detail of Acquisition Areas, in Chapter 2.7 of the Master Plan Addendum. The total amount of property to be acquired would vary based on the build alternative implemented, as follows: Alternative A - 273 acres (330 businesses and 84 dwelling units); Alternative B - 345 acres (323 businesses and 84 dwelling units); Alternative C - 216 acres (239 businesses and 84 dwelling units); and Alternative D - 77 acres (38 businesses and no dwelling units).

SPC00274-37

Comment:

10. How many Airbus A380 aircraft are expected to fly into LAX? How many flights per day? To what extent must passenger terminals be redesigned to accommodate these aircraft? How many gates will be established for these aircraft and at which terminal buildings?

Response:

Table F3, Hourly Design Day Total Operations by Aircraft Type 2015 Alternative D, in Appendix F of the Draft Master Plan Addendum identifies 27 NLA operations per day in 2015.

The Airbus A380 is approximately 30 feet longer and 50 feet wider than the Boeing 747-400, which is currently the largest passenger aircraft operating at LAX requiring at least 30 additional feet of gate depth and 50 additional feet of gate width versus a Boeing 747-400.

Alternative D includes six gates that would accommodate the A380 at all times. Additionally, Alternative D includes several swing gates that, depending on the aircraft type at the adjacent gate, would be able to accommodate the A380.

The gates designed to accommodate the A380 would be located at the new north linear concourse, the reconfigured TBIT, and the West Satellite Concourse.

SPC00274-38**Comment:**

11. Why are some numbers explained as percentages in the draft EIS/EIR document? Can you explain the numbers instead of a percentage?

Response:

The comment is not specific as to which percentages or numbers are in question and/or are in need of an explanation. In general, percentages are used in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to put "raw" numbers and amounts into perspective. For example, page 4-13 of the Draft EIS/EIR and page ES-26 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR include the statement: "Roughly 95 percent of aircraft takeoffs at LAX and nearly all late-night takeoffs and landings are over the ocean, placing much of the 65 CNEL exposure pattern over the ocean away from populated areas." If this statement were to have otherwise been presented strictly in terms of the number of aircraft takeoffs, the point of the statement - that the vast majority of takeoffs are towards the west, consequently the majority of the 65 CNEL area occurs over the ocean, and not over populated area - would not have been readily apparent.

SPC00274-39**Comment:**

12. In the LAX Master Plan press kit, a section covering noise mitigation notes some of LAWA's initiatives- residential acquisition, soundproofing and enforcement of over-ocean operations during the night. How effective has sending letters to the Chief Pilots of airlines been in affecting compliance with LAX noise regulations? What other enforcement measures has LAWA used and is legally available to LAWA to use to mitigate noise?

Response:

Comment noted. While the letters to pilots are helpful in reminding aircraft operators about LAWA's over-ocean procedures for reasons of safety, current noise rules allow pilots to deviate from the over-ocean procedures. 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. Under Mitigation Measure MM-N-5 Conduct Part 161 study to Make Over Ocean Procedures Mandatory (Alternatives A, B, C, and D) 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-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. Additionally, please see Section 4.1.5 Master Plan Commitments and Section 4.1.8 Mitigation Measures of Section S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for noise related master plan commitments and mitigations measures.

SPC00274-40**Comment:**

13. Why are there no studies being conducted to study the health effects of LAX on surrounding residents?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and Response to Comment PC00599-5 regarding jet exhaust.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00274-41

Comment:

14. Is LAWA recording and tracking low frequency noise generated at LAX? What mitigation measures are being employed to reduce low frequency noise? Low frequency noise must be studied, mitigated and abated.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA does not currently monitor, track or mitigate low frequency noise. There is no state or federal requirement that mandates LAWA to record or track low frequency noise, nor is a standard of significance established for low frequency noise because there is no accepted correlation between low frequency noise and community disturbance or classroom disruption/nighttime awakening. However, LAWA has sought to decrease low frequency noise generated by run-ups in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR through the development of Ground Run-up Enclosures (GRE). For each development alternative LAWA incorporates the construction of one or more GRE within which all run-up activity would be conducted. These facilities, when properly designed, achieve a reduction of approximately 20 decibels over run-ups conducted without enclosure. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-5.3 regarding night run-up activity and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures and enforcement. The noise analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was done in complete compliance with scientific principles and FAA Order 1050.1D and Order 5050.4A. Noise barriers are limited in their ability to mitigate noise 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 Subtopical Response TR-N-4.2, regarding berms, barriers, urban forest, walls, proposed to interrupt ground noise. Vibrations created by low-frequency noise from aircraft operations at LAX are not of significant magnitude to cause physical residential damage. Please see Topical Response TR-N-8, regarding noise-based vibration. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding that there is no scientific evidence or other basis for determining the nature, extent, or significance of noise-related health effects due to any Master Plan alternative.

SPC00274-42

Comment:

15. At what location do you anticipate placing the run-up enclosure? Will the enclosure prevent high and low frequency noise from going out into the surrounding community? What will the hours of operation be for the run-up enclosure? How will aircraft be moved to and from the enclosure- aircraft under power, electric tugs, etc.?

Response:

There are four primary sites on the revised Alternative A airfield where aircraft run-up activity will occur. All of the sites are located east of the terminal core, between the runway complexes and south of Century Boulevard. Under Alternative B there is one primary site on the airfield, located east of the terminal core and between the runway complexes, where aircraft run-up activity will occur. Under Alternative C airfield layout and operating procedures will include relocation of run-up areas. Three sites are planned to be operational by 2005, and only two sites would be in use in 2015. Two sites on the Alternative C airfield lie between the runways, while a third site lies north of Century Boulevard. The third site would be closed in 2015. Changes in the Alternative D airfield layout and operating procedures will include relocation of run-up areas. Alternative D would include two new 90,000-square foot Ground Run-up Enclosures (GRE) at the airport. One GRE would be located on the west side of the airport, south of World Way West and east of the airline maintenance complex. An additional GRE would be located on the east side of the airport, south of the existing Delta airlines maintenance facility.

Each development alternative incorporates the construction of one or more Ground Run-up Enclosures (GRE) within which all run-up activity would be conducted. These facilities, when properly designed, achieve a reduction of approximately by 15 to 18 decibels over run-ups conducted without enclosure. See Topical Response TR-N-5.3 regarding night run-up activity and Topical Response TR-N-7

regarding noise abatement measures and enforcement. The hours of operation and operational requirements to get the aircraft to and from the GRE is a policy decision that will be made by LAWA when the GRE is constructed. Ground Run-Up noise is addressed in Section 3. Future Aircraft Operating Conditions of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 2.6.2 Ground Run-Up Enclosure of Alternative D Development and Refinement of the LAX Master Plan Addendum. Nighttime single event noise impacts and mitigation are addressed in Sections 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting information in Appendix SC and Technical Report S-1.

SPC00274-43

Comment:

16. How will biological incursions by non-native plants, animals and insects be handled?

Response:

The proposed project is unlikely to introduce or spread invasive plant species. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR include maps of the biotic communities, including non-native grassland and landscaped areas, for each of the project alternatives as well as existing conditions. All of the project alternatives will reduce the amount of non-native invasive plant species at LAX.

All landscaping associated with future improvements, including the planting of mature trees associated with Mitigation Measure MM-BC-3, will avoid establishing non-native vegetation where it could impact native dune or grassland communities. Locally native plants will be used to the greatest extent feasible in the landscape areas and invasive exotic plant species shall not be introduced to the landscaped areas adjacent to or near mitigation or open space areas. Landscaping with locally native plant species would not require installation of permanent irrigation; only a temporary irrigation system would be utilized. The temporary irrigation system would provide water to native plantings to supplement seasonal moisture. Irrigation to support the new landscaping in winter months may be necessary if precipitation is substantially less than normal. Irrigation in the summer months following initial planting may also be necessary to assure plant establishment. These precautions will avoid impacts due to the invasive tendencies of some plant species.

Exotic plant species that shall be avoided in the planting of mature trees associated with MM-BC-3, and all future landscaping, include those on the most recent lists A&B of the California Exotic Pest Plant Council list of "Exotic Pest Plants of Greatest Ecological Concern in California."

A component of LAWA's management efforts in the Los Angeles/EL Segundo Dunes includes the removal of non-native pest plant species. Over the past decade, these management efforts have contributed to a general upward trend in numbers of El Segundo blue butterflies.

Installation and maintenance of native plants, in conjunction with non-native plant species removal, will discourage incursions by non-native animals and insects. In addition, LAWA has identified those non-native animal and insect species that if present, may conflict with the goals and objectives of habitat restoration and sensitive species relocation. As a result, LAWA has included efforts to control these species under the appropriate circumstances. Please see Response to Comment AS00005-17 regarding red fox and the San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit, mitigation measures MM-BC-4 and MM-BC-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding mosquitofish, bullfrogs and the western spadefoot toad, and Response to Comment AL00033-179 and AS00005-15 regarding argentine ants and non-native landscaping.

SPC00274-44

Comment:

17. What is the amount of time each runway will be out of service when a runway is moved and/or extended?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

As indicated on Figure S3-15, 2015 Alternative D Conceptual Summary Schedule, in Section 3.3.2, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Runway 25L and its adjacent center taxiway would be constructed in approximately 18 months in Phase I. During Phase III, Runway 24L and south parallel taxiways would be constructed in approximately 18 months and Runway 24R and its adjacent center taxiway would be constructed in approximately 12 months.

SPC00274-45

Comment:

18. What is the construction route? Will existing streets be blocked and/or detours put into place? For how long will these happen? What will the operating hours of the construction route?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-3 regarding construction traffic.

SPC00274-46

Comment:

19. Why didn't you use World Health Organization (WHO) documentation to support your Federal Interrogatory Committee on Aircraft Noise (FICAN) information? Also, why was FICAN not used for Sound Exposure Level (SEL)?

Response:

Comment noted. The WHO documentation provides guidelines to the evaluation and management of noise issues, but does not carry federal endorsement. While sleep disturbance and awakenings have been the subject of much research, the Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise (FICAN) in a 1997 report selected one study as the most widely accepted information upon which to base the advisory group's selection of a defensible relationship between single event noise and awakenings. The FICAN report cites a study conducted by Finegold and Fidell, which relates the proportion of persons awakened by noise events at differing Sound Exposure Levels (SEL). The Finegold report includes a formula that allows the user to compute, for any given SEL, the percentage of the population that may be awakened by an aircraft single event. For a determination of the nighttime thresholds, please see Section 4.1.4.1.1 CEQA Thresholds of Significance of Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 6.1.1 Threshold of Significance, of Appendix S-C1, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. There is no federal threshold of significance for single event noise impacts. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addresses nighttime single event noise impacts associated with Alternative D in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Studies by FICAN and FICAN were used due to their data being accepted by the FAA.

SPC00274-47

Comment:

20. What mitigation measure did you include for SEL? If there were none, then why were they not included? What abatement measures have been done elsewhere for any kind of single event noise, not limited to airports? How successful were those abatement measures?

Response:

Single event level mitigation measures are identified as MM-LU-2, MM-LU-3 and MM-LU-4 in Section 4.2.8 Mitigation Measures, of Section 4.2, Land Use of Section S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Furthermore, each mitigation measure related to aircraft operation, as described in Section 4.1.8 Mitigation Measures of Section 4.2, Noise of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR will contribute to the reduction of single event SEL levels over portions of the communities surrounding the airport.

Noise Abatement measures for non-aviation related events were not researched or addressed. Subsequent to the publication of the Los Angeles Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR, the California Court of Appeal found that, for purposes of CEQA, an evaluation of the effects of single event aircraft noise levels would be required of the Oakland Board of Port Commissioners in its development of a nighttime air cargo facility at Oakland International Airport. In that case, referred to as Berkeley Jets throughout this section, the Court of Appeal ruled that, to provide a more accurate and complete picture of a project's noise impacts and to provide more comprehensive mitigation, a single event noise analysis must supplement an EIR's cumulative noise analysis, including use of appropriate thresholds of significance and mitigation of significant event.

Although the Draft EIS/EIR provides single event noise levels at many locations throughout the airport environs for 1996 baseline and future alternative conditions, no attempt was made at that time to assess the significance of those levels or to mitigate their effects. Comments received during the public review period for the Draft EIS/EIR included concerns regarding the potential for increased aircraft activity (i.e., number of arriving or departing flights) occurring at night to result in increased nighttime awakenings. Concerns were also expressed regarding potential disruption of classrooms and the educational process by over flights of additional aircraft during school hours. This Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR includes a comprehensive analysis of single event noise to address such concerns, in a manner consistent with, and responsive to, the Berkeley Jets ruling.

As such, LAWA, as the lead CEQA agency for the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR, has developed thresholds of significance regarding single event noise effects, based on a comprehensive review of existing studies and research literature pertaining to the issue. It should be noted that the thresholds of significance developed by LAWA are intended solely for use in the CEQA evaluation of the LAX Master Plan, as addressed in this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The mitigation of single events, as opposed to cumulative average noise levels, is not widely addressed at airports in the United States, largely in response to general public policies to focus mitigation into the most impacted areas. The mitigation program associated with this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is one of the first attempts to systematically address single event noise effects that fall outside the 65 CNEL contour.

SPC00274-48

Comment:

21. Where else in the world, and in the United States in particular, has habitat relocation been attempted? Has this effort been successfully implemented? If it is not successful, then what penalty will LAWA suffer for non-compliance with the EIS/EIR?

Response:

Habitat restoration and the relocation of sensitive species is a common practice. There are several fields of scientific study, including biological conservation and ecological restoration which investigate both the theoretical and practical application of approaches to restoring and conserving biodiversity. The results of these investigations (many of which are successful) are published in peer-reviewed journals and books. LAWA has used the best available scientific resources (which also includes consultation with local and regional experts) to determine the most appropriate methods of habitat restoration and sensitive species relocation.

With regard to the latter part of the comment, the mitigation and monitoring plan for habitat restoration and the relocation and monitoring plan for sensitive species relocation include performance criteria (appropriate to determine the success of a mitigation effort) which must be attained before completion of any mitigation effort is approved by the appropriate regulatory agency. If performance criteria are not attained, LAWA shall undertake the necessary measures to attain those performance criteria.

SPC00274-49

Comment:

22. In cases of Single Event Noise/Sound Noise Level, what would be the AdBA for serious annoyance and speech intelligibility and moderate annoyance?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-73 regarding annoyance and Section 6.2.1, Thresholds of Significance, of Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for information on speech disruption.

SPC00274-50

Comment:

23. How does LAWA propose to evaluate and mitigate noise impact on the learning process of students in schools?

Response:

For the proposed evaluation and mitigation of classroom disruption please see mitigation measures MM-LU-3 and MM-LU-4 in Section 4.2.8 Mitigation Measures, of Section 4.2, Land Use of Section S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Classroom disruption is addressed in detail in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00274-51

Comment:

24. Why is there no specific noise study in the community on schools impacted by LAX?

Response:

As part of the mitigation measures identified a study will be done. Mitigation Measure MM-LU-3, Conduct Study of the Relationship Between Aircraft Noise Levels and the Ability of Children to Learn (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), does commit LAWA to study the relationship of aircraft noise levels and children learning abilities. However, while Mitigation Measure MM-LU-3 is being completed, Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1, Implement Revised Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), will address those schools identified and eligible in the current ANMP. Mitigation measures are addressed in Section 4.1.8, Mitigation Measures, of Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2.8, Mitigation Measures of Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00274-52

Comment:

25. Why is there not a report of the origin and destination of passengers at LAX?

Response:

The historical and forecast origination and destination tables and discussion are in Chapter III, Aviation Activity Forecasts, of the LAX Master Plan.

SPC00274-53

Comment:

26. Why does the EIS show an improvement in air quality in the area north and east of Manchester Square under Alternative D vs. No Action No Plan even though Alternative D relocates an enormous amount of vehicular traffic to the immediate area?

Response:

In Table S4.6-13 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the interim year for No Action/No Project and Alternatives A, B, and C is 2005. For Alternative D the interim year is 2013 (see footnote 3 in Table S4.6-13). The emission factors produced by the CARB's vehicular emission factor model, EMFAC2002, incorporate both improved inspection and maintenance procedures as well as the expected

manufacturers' trend towards building more fuel efficient and alternatively-powered vehicles. Therefore, EMFAC2002 calculates progressively lower per-vehicle-mile-traveled emission factors for future years. The implication is not necessarily an improvement in traffic, but an improvement in the emissions of the vehicles themselves.

The commentor should notice that for the horizon year 2015, the Alternative D concentrations of CO at the modeled intersections in the Manchester Square area are often slightly higher than those for the No Action/No Project Alternative, reflecting the increase in vehicular traffic in the area when comparing identical years.

SPC00274-54

Comment:

27. How were the projected 2015 levels of air pollution arrived at for the area north and east of Manchester Square for the No Action No Plan Alternative in the EIS? Were mitigation measures implemented by LAWA between the 1996 baseline and the present accounted for in the projections?

Response:

A detailed description of the methodology and data used in modeling CO impacts at intersections is presented in Section 4.6.2.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 2.2.4 of Appendix G to the Draft EIS/EIR, Attachments A and Q of Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.6.2.3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 2.2.4 of Appendix S-E to the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and Attachment L to Technical Report S-4 to the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Table 4.6-12 in the Draft EIS/EIR and Table S4.6-13 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR present the unmitigated local CO concentrations at off-airport intersections. These values include background concentrations, but do not include the effects of mitigation measures.

SPC00274-55

Comment:

28. It would seem that the reconfiguration of the north runway complex proposed under Alternative D leaves room for a fifth runway on the north side of LAX. What measures are included in Alternative D that would prevent the construction of such a runway at a later date?

Response:

The re-configuration of the north airfield complex proposed in Alternative D does not leave any room for a fifth runway in the north airfield complex. A separate environmental process would take place if there is any new runway proposed in the future.

SPC00274-56

Comment:

29. What fleet mix was anticipated in Alternative D for 2015? Airlines continue to purchase turbo prop aircraft. Were these aircraft included in the noise projections?

Response:

Turboprop aircraft were included in the noise modeling. The aircraft fleet mix for noise analysis is included in Table S7, 2015 Average Annual Day Operations and Fleet Mix Alternative D, of Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00274-57

Comment:

30. Why was there an assumption that the current Part 161 study would develop mitigation actions. Nothing can be assumed until the study is complete.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Approval of a Part 161 Study by LAWA is not guaranteed, However, even if the Part 161 Study was not approved, mitigation measure MM-LU-2, Incorporate Residential Dwelling Units Exposed to Single Event Awakenings Threshold into Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), will expand the ANMP boundaries to include residential uses newly exposed to single event exterior nighttime noise. In 2000, LAWA signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the City of Inglewood that addressed noise mitigation actions east of the airport. In terms of its effect on noise distribution patterns east of the airport, the most important of the terms of that agreement was a commitment by LAWA to undertake a Federal Aviation Regulation Part 161 Access Restriction Study. As a result, mitigation measure MM-N-5, Conduct Part 161 Study to Make Over Ocean Procedures Mandatory (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), was included in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Mitigation measures are addressed in Section 4.1.8, Mitigation Measures, of Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of Section S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for noise related master plan commitments and mitigations measures.

SPC00274-58

Comment:

31. Where is a firm commitment by LAWA and the city of Los Angeles to the CNEL and over-ocean procedures included in the EIS/EIR?

Response:

Over-ocean operations have been used at LAX since the early 1970's. LAWA has recently initiated a Request For Qualifications to prepare a 14 CFR Part 161 Study for Los Angeles International Airport. LAWA is seeking to establish a partial curfew at LAX that would prohibit the easterly departure of all discretionary aircraft, with certain exemptions, between the hours of 12:00 Midnight to 6:30 a.m. when LAX is in Over-Ocean Operations. 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 stated in Section 4.1.8 Mitigation Measures of Appendix S-C1, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Mitigation Measure MM-N-5 Conduct Part 161 Study to Make Over Ocean Procedures Mandatory (Alternatives A, B, C, and D) shall be initiated to seek federal approval of a locally-imposed restriction on departures to and from the east when over-ocean procedures are in effect. This restriction would not impact airport operations in the event that the airport is in east flow operations. Master Plan Commitments, which includes over-ocean operations, are addressed in Section 4.1.5, Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Insulation or Acquisition of properties within the highest CNEL measurement zone is addressed in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00274-59

Comment:

32. Where are the studies of increased traffic on 6L and 6R during easterly operations.

Response:

Operations on Runway 6L and 6R are addressed 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.

SPC00274-60

Comment:

33. Where is the study on single-event noise generated by easterly take-offs?

Response:

Easterly departures are included in the modeling process albeit for only 5 percent of the time. The single event noise footprints provided in Section 6, Typical Noise Footprints of the Operating Fleet, of

3. Comments and Responses

Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR will allow the commentor to project the noise levels that might be present in areas east of the airport if the traffic flows were reversed.

SPC00274-61

Comment:

34. Over 20,000 would be newly exposed to 94dBA SEL noise under the EIS/EIR. What time of day would these impacts occur? What mitigation measures were included for SEL impacts?

Response:

The commentor is not clear in defining what the 20,000 newly exposed to 94 dBA SEL is and under what alternative. Nighttime single event analysis is limited to the hours between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Mitigation measures are addressed in Section 4.1.8, Mitigation Measures, of Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2.8, Mitigation Measures, of Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please note that there is no federal threshold of significance for single event noise impacts.

SPC00274-62

Comment:

35. To reach the proposed Ground Transportation Center (GTC) at Manchester Square, people will continue to exit the 405 Freeway at the Howard Hughes Center and then cut through Westport Heights and Osage seeking airport access. Why were the following intersections and/or roadway links not studied: Airport Blvd and 74th, 76th, and 78th; La Tijera and 74th, 78th-79th, and 83rd; Hindry and Aviation; Osage and Manchester?

Response:

Generally, non-signalized intersections such as Airport Boulevard and 74th Street are not included in traffic impact analyses. Furthermore, it is not a requirement to analyze every signalized intersection within a geographical area. Based on the entry points for the GTC and ITC, it is not expected that traffic would use residential streets to access these proposed facilities. The results of the traffic model supports this belief.

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology. In particular, TR-ST-2.2 regarding the study area and facilities analyzed.

SPC00274-63

Comment:

36. The GTC could not have all the protection for hazardous materials, decontamination, bomb detection and disposal that the airfield would have. How would all the necessary emergency vehicles, materials, and staff gain access to the GTC? To come from the airfield, they would have to travel on city streets which would be clogged in the event of an attack or accident.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00274-64

Comment:

37. How could the GTC be evacuated in the case of an emergency or attack? What roads could/would be used? Where would pedestrians and vehicles be directed? How could security get people and vehicles out of the danger zone and still maintain security? And be sure that the parties responsible were not escaping?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00274-65

Comment:

38. What amount of traffic is being assumed for the LAX Northside area? It seems that the NA/NP figures are higher than the Alternative D figures. Were the impacts (in terms of traffic and air pollution) for the full entitlement under the 1983 EIR charged to the NA/NP, but not to Alternative D?

Response:

As was indicated in the description of Alternative D, specifically on page 3-48 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D includes a proposed reduction to the existing trip cap for LAX Northside. The proposed reduction would provide for a reduction of 50 percent in the LAX Northside trips allowed during the A.M. peak hour and a 57 percent reduction in LAX Northside trips allowed during the P.M. peak hour. Those reductions to the existing trip cap would not occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. As such, the amount of traffic associated with LAX Northside, as addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would indeed be higher than that of Alternative D.

SPC00274-66

Comment:

39. What is the cost difference for Alternative D if non-union labor is used instead of union labor? Will a Project Labor Agreement (PLA) be used for Alternative D? What is the cost difference between the PLA, union and non-union labor?

Response:

There is no requirement under CEQA or NEPA to evaluate the potential differences between the use of union versus non-union labor for the proposed project. Therefore, the information the commentor is asking for has not been determined.

SPC00274-67

Comment:

40. In 2002, American Airlines published a volume regarding human health risk assessment for their operations at LAX. Why did not LAWA publish a similar comprehensive human health risk study for the LAX Master Plan?

Response:

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.

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.

SPC00274-68

Comment:

41. Why were the comments submitted by November 2001 not answered before (or with) the release of the Alternative D Plan in July 2003? (Executive Summary, page 24)

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the impacts associated with Alternative D, and provided other important new information and analysis associated with the other alternatives, such as related to single-event aircraft noise. The Final EIS/EIR includes comments and written responses to those comments as related to the Draft EIS/EIR and as related to the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As such, the public, agencies, and decision-makers are provided with a single comprehensive compilation of all comment and written responses on the two documents that were circulated for review and comment. This basic format and process are consistent with the procedures and requirements of NEPA and CEQA.

SPC00274-69

Comment:

42. Numerous data issues were identified in 2001. How is the integration of more data into questionable data expected to be satisfactory? (Executive Summary, page 24)

Response:

As part of the Final EIS/EIR, written responses have been provided for all comments received during the review period for the Draft EIS/EIR, including those comments that questioned the adequacy and accuracy of the analysis data. Similarly, any such comments submitted during the review period for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR have also been addressed by written Responses provided in this Final EIS/EIR.

SPC00274-70

Comment:

43. If the purpose and need for the LAX Master Plan has not changed since the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR and there have been significant political event changes in addition to the Mayor's no expansion pledge, why is one of the three major project objectives to "Ensure that new investments in airport capacity are..." Also, we are told that the major emphasis is for "Security and Safety." Why is this not even mentioned in the list of project purpose and need? (Executive Summary, page 24)

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SAL00017-70.

SPC00274-71

Comment:

44. Based on 2.8% growth from present we will be at 78 MAP in 2015. Is this a realistic growth rate? (Executive Summary, page 25, table ES-1)

Response:

Alternative D would be designed to serve approximately 78.9 MAP, the level of passenger activity identified by Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for LAX in the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Therefore, the growth rate from present to 78.9 MAP in 2015 in Alternative D does not represent the unconstrained growth rate of the forecast actual demand which is much higher. The Alternative D design would encourage other airports in the region to develop facilities to accommodate regional demand beyond the level served at LAX.

SPC00274-72

Comment:

45. Compare this runway spacing with other statements in the document which appear to differ. This one is 340 ft south of existing centerline. (Executive Summary, page 26, table ES-2)

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

As indicated on page ES-3, in Executive Summary, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Table ES-2, Summary of Features - Comparison of Alternatives, correctly stated that Runway 6R/24L would be moved 340 feet south of existing centerline in Alternative D. The 340-foot relocation of Runway 6R/24L was also correctly indicated in Section 3.3.2, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00274-73

Comment:

46. 2.8M sq ft of terminal space added by Alternative D without any capacity enhancement? If the capacity is not expanding why are there about 4600 more employee parking spaces? (Executive Summary, page 27, table ES-2)

Response:

As shown on Table 4.3.1-8, the demand for employee parking remains the same under the No Action/No Project Alternative and the four build alternatives, at 12,400 spaces. However, under the No Action/No Project Alternative, parking demand exceeds the capacity by over 37 percent. The 13,600 spaces proposed under Alternative D will provide sufficient parking for airport employees.

SPC00274-74

Comment:

47. How are the schools impacted/removed related between Alternative D and NA/NP? Alternative D shows a private elementary and a Hollywood CPR(?) not in the NA/NP. (Executive Summary, page 28, table ES-2)

Response:

As also shown on Table S4.2-20 in Section 4.2, Land Use of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the Westchester Neighborhood School and Hollywood CPR Training School would be acquired to accommodate proposed airport facilities and improvements under Alternative D. Although Table ES-2 indicates that the 98th Street Elementary School would be acquired under the No Action/No Project Alternative, this action is assumed to occur under the voluntary residential acquisition program for Manchester Square and Belford that is currently being implemented by LAWA and is independent of the LAX Master Plan. See also Topical Response TR-MP-3 for further discussion of this voluntary acquisition program.

SPC00274-75

Comment:

48. What are the values of NA/NP for Office Use, Retail Use Acquired and Hotel Use that are not shown in the table? How does this compare to Alternative D? More or less? Why? (Executive Summary, page 28, table 11 ES-2)

Response:

As was indicated on page 3-26 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the No Action/No Project Alternative accounts for continued implementation and completion of the existing property acquisition program at Belford Avenue and Manchester Square. This program includes the acquisition of the 279 single family dwellings and the 2,285 multiple family dwellings indicated in Table ES-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. There is, however, no acquisition of office use, retail use, or hotel use under that program; hence, no values are shown relative to those uses for the No Action/No Project Alternative in that table.

SPC00274-76

Comment:

49. This table assumes the higher value of development of LAX Northside in NA/NP and Alternative D but Westchester South (the reduced) for A, B, C. Why? Isn't this assumption different in other areas of the documentation? (Executive Summary, page 29, table ES-2)

Response:

As was explained in Note 6 of the subject table, Alternative D includes a proposed reduction to the existing trip cap for LAX Northside. While LAX Northside has current entitlements for up to 4.5 million square feet of new development, the reduced trip cap would prevent that full amount of development from ever occurring. The exact nature and amount of development that could occur under the reduced trip cap is not known at this time. To provide for a conservative impacts analysis, the evaluation of Alternative D assumed development of the full 4.5 million square feet for all environmental disciplines except traffic and traffic-related air quality and noise.

SPC00274-77

Comment:

50. If LAWA doesn't own Manchester Square, why does it assume airport use in all but Alternative A? How is it going to be procured? Eminent Domain? Why is it in conflict with the Westchester-Playa del Rey Community Plan? (Executive Summary, page 29, table ES-2)

Response:

Manchester Square is not planned for airport use under No Action/No Project Alternative as well. The acquisition in the Manchester Square area, in support of LAWA's ANMP, is currently underway. However, should the ANMP land acquisition for the Manchester Square and Belford areas not be completed by the time the Master Plan is approved, the City of Los Angeles will use the most appropriate and practical measures available (e.g., voluntary acquisition, leasing, and/or public condemnation) to ensure that the designated areas are vacated consistent with the Master Plan Construction Sequencing Plan. These measures would be available for all build alternatives to pursue any needed acquisition that cannot be obtained through negotiations. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00001-4 regarding validity of the acquisition in Manchester Square, and Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.3 regarding the status of the acquisition in Manchester Square. In addition, please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.6 regarding General Plan and zoning.

SPC00274-78

Comment:

51. Greater outside impacts under Alternative D. Why? What specific areas? (Page 4-215, last paragraph)

Response:

The last paragraph referenced by the commentor states that impacts would remain significant after mitigation for residential properties with exterior habitable areas or outdoor community areas that are newly exposed to noise levels of 75 CNEL or greater. As stated on page 4-175 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative D no residential uses or parks would be newly exposed to noise levels of 75 CNEL or greater compared to 1996 baseline conditions. Therefore the last paragraph of page 4-215 of the Supplement to the Draft has been corrected to state that significant outdoor noise levels would not occur under Alternative D. However, it is acknowledged in subsection 4.2.9 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR that, although not considered significant, increases in outdoor noise levels within the 65 to 75 CNEL contours may be perceptible and could affect outdoor speech and the quality of certain outdoor activities. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for additional discussion of outdoor noise levels.

3. Comments and Responses

The subject correction has been incorporated into Section 4.2, Land Use, of this Final EIS/EIR.

SPC00274-79

Comment:

52. What is the threshold of significance for outdoor noise levels? How were they determined and applied? (Page 4-216, "Although increases in outdoor noise levels within the 65 to 75 CNEL contours would occur under the build alternatives, these increases would not exceed thresholds of significance.")

Response:

The threshold used to identify significant outdoor noise levels is 75 CNEL, as defined by FAR Part 150 and Title 21 (see Section 4.2., Land Use (subsection 4.2.6) of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR). Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for additional description of how significant outdoor noise levels were determined and applied in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00274-80

Comment:

53. Alternative D more extensive changes than other alternatives. Is it so extensive that a new EIS/EIR required? (Page 4-217)

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SAL00013-31 regarding the use of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to address the impacts of Alternative D.

SPC00274-81

Comment:

54. Since 2008 is the peak construction period for Alternative D and 2004/2013 for the others, how does this impact noise distribution due to flight track differences. (Page 4-217)

55. What are the construction model assumptions and where are they delineated? (Page 4-217)

Response:

As stated in Section 3, Future Aircraft Operating Conditions of Appendix S-C1 Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR; The first phase of development of Alternative D also includes the relocation of Runway 25L/7R 50 feet to the south. If the runway were limited to arrival operations with occasional departures, as was suggested for 2015 in the other build alternatives, the noise pattern along the approach from the east to the south complex would shift by 50 feet to the south. During the final phase of development, the runways in the north airfield complex would be relocated. At that time, the contour along the north side of the airport would shift south by 100 to 500 feet in those areas exposed predominantly to departure noise west of Lincoln Boulevard. East of the airport, the contour east of the north runway complex would shift northward in close alignment to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Construction noise model assumptions and related contours for each build alternative are addressed in Section 3, Future Aircraft Operating Conditions of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, please see Response to Comment SPC00309-37 regarding the impact of construction-related activity on aircraft flight tracks.

SPC00274-82**Comment:**

56. Does inbound and outbound counts refer to the upper and lower levels (aircraft arrivals/departures)? Otherwise they should be equal. Is there an explanation for inbound consistently higher increases? (Page 4-221)

57. Why are the peak hours that different? What are the correct ones? (Page 4-221)

Response:

Table S4.3.1-1 addressed vehicle traffic peak hours not aircraft traffic peak hours. There are differences in the inbound and outbound traffic counts due to passengers dropping off and picking their vehicles for various periods of time. Please see Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for information on surface transportation. The footnotes in Table S4.3.1-1 identified what month and time frame were used for determining peak hour periods. Please see Response to Comment SPC00309-40 regarding the selection of peak traffic periods.

SPC00274-83**Comment:**

58. Why isn't there pollution and health studies for aircraft engines while idling and taking off?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address 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-C1 and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Aircraft engine emissions estimates presented in Section 4.6, Air Quality, include emissions from four aircraft modes (taxi/idle, takeoff, climbout, and approach). These modal emissions are specifically presented in Attachment V of the Draft EIS/EIR and in Attachment N of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The health and safety analyses presented in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, incorporate aircraft emissions from all four aircraft modes.

SPC00274-84**Comment:**

59. Why do some of the charts have dates of 2001 and 2002 while the data represented on those charts has dates of 1996 and 1997?

Response:

Without reference to specific tables, a meaningful response cannot be provided. However, if the commentor is referring to the source date provided on the bottom of each table, that date represents the publication date of the source, if it is document, or the date the data were compiled for publication in the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00274-85**Comment:**

Proposed amendments to reports

LAX Master Plan Position Paper

Several suggestions to be submitted separately by Barry Weiss.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

No comments on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were submitted by Barry Weiss.

SPC00274-86

Comment:

Community Questions on the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR

I would like to add a few questions to those already posed. In my review of the LAX Master Plan there has been almost no attention to cargo handling facilities and their role in public safety.

Why have cargo handling facilities also not received the same scrutiny over security as passenger facilities?

Why are cargo facilities, after implementation of any of the alternatives of the LAX Master plan, still located all over the place without regard to a security plan?

What security measures does the LAX Master Plan have in place for the handling of cargo that will insure the safety of the public? Both in the air and on the ground.

Why aren't cargo facilities centralized in order to insure the safety of the public?

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

Relating to centralized cargo facilities -

- Facilities are highly efficient as they currently exist and new federal cargo security requirements are being implemented at these existing operations.
- The LAX Master Plan has a stated goal to maximize the use of and protect the investment in existing infrastructure like the existing cargo buildings.
- To centralize cargo facilities would require a very large block of land that is not available on existing LAX property. Further, truck traffic would be concentrated into one location to the detriment of the collective users.

SPC00274-87

Comment:

Why does the LAX Master Plan spend so much money on facilitating the A-380, a yet to be built, unproven European aircraft based in Toulouse, France, while American aircraft manufacturers struggle to stay alive?

Submitted by: David Coffin, NCWPDR District 10 Seat

Response:

The preliminary improvements proposed for LAX would benefit all airport users and all sizes of aircraft currently using the airport. Specific application of FAA's Airplane Design Group VI Standards are marginal increases to the Group V Standards already employed at LAX. Alternatives A, B, C, and D are designed to accommodate NLA including the Airbus A380 because several airlines that operate flights to and from LAX have signed commitments to buy the aircraft from Airbus and stated their interest in operating the A380 on routes to and from LAX. As for the "nationality" of the A380, Airbus reports that 40 percent of the procurement of the A380 is being provided by U.S. companies.

SPC00274-88**Comment:**

The airlines serving LAX feel strongly that the airport needs to be modernized in order to effectively serve the traveling public and remain the key economic engine to the region. They further support the planning objectives of a safer, more secure and user- friendly LAX; however, Alternative D to the LAX Master Plan falls short of reaching these objectives which the carriers think could be better achieved through a modification of Alternative D.

To that extent the airlines appreciate the opportunity to work with the Westchester/Playa del Rey community, and discuss alternatives that address the LAX master plan objectives. The airlines, having recently been provided with a copy of the Alternative E-1 concept, are very encouraged with our progress to date and believe that we are close to identifying a concept that is acceptable to the City of Los Angeles and the key stakeholders, including the local community and the airlines.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPC00035-4 regarding the residents' concept, Alternative E.

SPC00275 Kenton, Jack LAX Area Advisory Committee 11/5/2003

SPC00275-1**Comment:**

The LAX Area Advisory Committee (LAXAAC) members have been appointed by the governing city mayor or county supervisor in the following areas surrounding LAX: El Segundo, Lennox, Hawthorne, Inglewood, Culver City, Marina del Rey, and the Westchester and Playa del Rey sections of Los Angeles. These areas tend to be the most severely impacted by noise, traffic, and air pollution due to LAX operations. We were created to advise the Board of Airport Commissioners and other interested groups.

The members of LAXAAC strongly support a regional approach to air traffic in the Los Angeles basin. Any proposal for improvements to LAX must include specific, detailed procedures that could be undertaken by LAWA and the City of Los Angeles to achieve a more equitable sharing of the air passenger and cargo traffic.

The members of LAXAAC find serious deficiencies, inadequacies, omissions, and inaccuracies in the EIS/EIR LAX Master Plan, Alternative D. Therefore, we find this proposal to be fatally flawed.

While it is noted that Alternative D would not be as onerous as Alternatives A, B, or C, the No Action/No Project alternative is still this committee's preference.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00275-2**Comment:**

Alternative D has been deemed a safety and security attempt - yet it would not provide either safety or security for the traveling public or the surrounding communities. It would provide a modicum of security for the CTA, but our committee thinks that protecting facilities at the expense of people is the wrong approach.

There have been very few Category A runway incursions at this airport, especially after the new control tower came on line. In fact, the LAX air traffic controllers handled more than 1 million take-offs and

3. Comments and Responses

landings since June 2002 with no operational errors. Congratulations are in order for the FAA's air traffic controllers at LAX.

LAWA also is to be congratulated for being the only major airport to achieve the December 31, 2002, federal security requirements - a major accomplishment!

The Manchester Square location for the proposed Ground Transportation Center is of particular concern to the surrounding communities. This area was not part of LAX in 2002 when all the mayoralty candidates signed the ARSAC pledge, which included, in Section 2, a commitment to not increase LAX beyond its existing boundaries. Since the pledge was signed, LAWA has been acquiring the residential properties in Manchester Square. However, due to various reasons, including litigation over the process and monetary issues, the area may not be available until 2008 or beyond.

LAX will be required, therefore, to continue to meet security requirements with its present configuration - a requirement that can and will be met without spending over \$9 billion. Although the funding for Alternative D would officially come from various sources, the ultimate payers would be air passengers, air cargo shippers and receivers, and tax payers.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-3 regarding the use of Manchester Square in Alternative D. In addition, the proposed Master Plan improvements under all of the alternatives would be funded with a combination of FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, airline fees, and other state/federal grants. No taxpayer dollars will be used to pay for any of the proposed on-airport improvements.

SPC00275-3

Comment:

We also ask the Los Angeles City Attorney of the potential conflict of interest of LAWA Commissioner Miguel Contreras to vote on various proposals coming before the Commission to expand/modernize the airport, given that he spoke out in favor of Alternative D as a representative of a labor union at a public meeting held at the Furama Hotel on August 23, 2003.

Response:

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

SPC00275-4

Comment:

An overall question raised by our committee is why do so many of the mitigations or requirements for action cited in the EIR/EIS require action by other agencies, and not on the part of LAWA?

Response:

LAX is a major transportation facility located in an urbanized area, having many local jurisdictions, and operating within the regulatory environment of many agencies. As such, the potential impacts and regulatory authority over mitigation of those impacts may involve many agencies outside of LAWA. NEPA and CEQA require the presentation of mitigation measures for identified significant impacts irrespective of whether the lead agency has control of implementation of those measures. For mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for which control and responsibility of the mitigation measures lie outside of LAWA's and FAA's jurisdiction, the lead agency shall participate in a fair-share manner to implement the measures, or otherwise encourage or promote the responsible agency to implement the measures as appropriate. In addition, only those mitigation measures that are feasible are included in the Draft EIS/EIR, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and this Final EIS/EIR.

SPC00275-5

Comment:

Our committee's comments on the Alternative D proposal are attached. We look forward to the response to our questions and concerns.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments SPC00275-6 through SPC00275-86 below.

SPC00275-6

Comment:

Questions and Comments

1. EIR/EIS Section and Page Number: Executive Summary, pp. ES-6. ES-20; Section 3, p. 3-56; Section 4.20, Construction Impacts, p. 4-540.

Question or Statement: The executive summary indicates that there were 20 acres devoted to fuel farms in 1996 and that that number would stay the same under the No Action, No Project Alternative, but would diminish to 14 acres under Alternative D. The reconfiguration is expected to start in 2010, but there does not appear to be a discussion of how it will be reconfigured. This reconfiguration raises a number of questions:

How would that reduction be accomplished?

Where are the six acres located?

How would the remediation of those six acres be accomplished?

What would the cost of that remediation be?

Where is all of this described in the EIR/EIS?

Response:

As described on page 4-738 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the existing On-Site Fuel Farm would remain in its current location on the west side of the airport just north of World Way West under Alternative D. The overall footprint of the fuel farm facility would be reduced from 20 acres to 14 acres by having a better utilization of the existing space available. The northern portion of the existing fuel farm would be removed to allow for reconfiguration of Taxiways D and E and Runway 6R/24L.

Soil remediation would be carried out in compliance with all applicable regulations. The cost of any remediation would be determined during advanced planning.

An updated list of the known spills within the Master Plan boundaries, including materials spilled and dates of spills, was presented in Table S6, Reported Spills, LAX, Acquisition Areas, Off-Site Fuel Farm Locations, and LAX Expressway Alignments, 1989 to 2001, in Technical Report S-8, Supplemental Hazardous Materials Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Further information regarding remediation activity can also be found in Technical Report S-8, Supplemental Hazardous Materials Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00275-7

Comment:

2. EIR/EIS Section and Page Number: Executive Summary, ES-41, and 4.9.1, p. 4-438

3. Comments and Responses

Question or Statement: Alternative D does not require the relocation of Hangar One, as did one of the prior alternatives. Given that Hangar One is a National Register listed historic property that is currently not open to the general public, would it make sense and is it possible to relocate Hangar One to an area that would be accessible to the public?

Alternative Solutions or Options: Relocate Hangar One.

Response:

No relocation of Hangar One is proposed under Alternative D. Important aspects that contribute to the significance of the historic resource include its original setting and location, therefore relocation is not recommended to avoid impacts on the resource.

SPC00275-8

Comment:

3. EIR/EIS Section and Page Number: 4.6 Air Quality, pp. 4-355-356, 4-383, 4-386, and 4-387-392.

Question or Statement: How many of the "extensive list of mitigation measure components" that LAWA proposes to implement are measures that it could implement under the No Action/ No Project alternative and how many of them are dependent upon Alternative D's adoption? Have these currently available mitigation measures been taken into account in the estimations of the operational emissions for the No Action/No Project alternative?

Alternative Solutions or Options: It would appear that many of these measures are ones LAWA could currently adopt without waiting for approval of Alternative D or another alternative, including:

- Require or promote the conversion of airport tenant and user equipment to alternative fuels.
- Establish a network of remote transit facilities serviced by LAX-dedicated clean fuel buses,
- Promote the expansion of LAWA's ride-sharing program to include all airport tenants,
- Develop infrastructure to allow employee telecommuting and video-conferencing,
- Provide fee-incentives and preferential parking locations for low emissions vehicles, and
- Reduction in aircraft maintenance activities at LAX, shifting them out of South Coast Air Basin (p. 4-386). (How will this be accomplished?)

Additional Comments: The mitigation measures discussed at pages 3-387-392 do not appear to have been considered for the No Action/No Project alternative, yet many of them could be adopted without waiting for final approval of the EIR/EIS and would have substantial effect on the air quality related to the No Action/No Project alternative. It is inappropriate for LAWA to ignore the impact of such measures on the No Action/No Project alternative.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SAL00018-53 regarding the applicability of proposed project-related mitigation measures to the No Action/No Project Alternative.

SPC00275-9

Comment:

4. EIR/EIS Section and Page Number: 4.6 Air Quality, p. 4-356 - 357

Question or Statement: The EIR/EIS recognizes that none of the alternatives would meet the California Ambient Air Quality Standards for fine particulate matter. What is the impact of violating such standards other than that specified on page 4-357, regarding the preparation of an analysis and conformity determination? Is it clearly legal to violate these standards?

Alternative Solutions or Options: Were any alternatives considered that would meet California Ambient Air Quality Standards?

Additional Comments: Although certain of the alternatives are proposed as better than others for meeting the California Ambient Air Quality Standards, it does not seem appropriate to propose an alternative that admittedly does not meet such standards, particularly given the amount of money and effort involved in adopting the alternative.

Response:

The commentor is incorrect to characterize predicted exceedances of the PM10 California ambient air quality standards (CAAQS) summarized in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR as "violations" of those standards. A violation of an ambient air quality standard occurs only if ambient measurements exceed the proscriptions of the standard. No single emission source, whether direct or indirect, necessarily causes an ambient air quality standard to be exceeded. Ambient air quality represents the aggregate contributions from thousands of emission sources in an area such as the South Coast Air Basin. It should be noted that SCAQMD states in the 2003 AQMP (Appendix V Chapter 2) that, even with the implementation of emission controls, neither the PM10 annual average CAAQS nor the PM10 24-hour average CAAQS will be met in either 2006 or 2010 in the South Coast Air Basin. This high background PM10 contributes to the inability of the LAX Master Plan to show compliance with the PM10 CAAQS. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR presented an enhanced discussion of air quality mitigation measures for Alternative D in Section 4.6.8 and in Appendix S-E Section 2.3. Because the PM10 CAAQS are predicted to be exceeded with or without the project, no reasonable alternative, by itself, would result in the South Coast Air Basin achieving attainment of the PM10 CAAQS in 2006 and 2010. The selected alternative will require implementation of and compliance with all recommended air quality mitigation measures. Also, please see Response to Comment AF00001-14 regarding the general conformity determination.

SPC00275-10

Comment:

5. EIR/EIS Section and Page Number: 4.6 Air Quality, p. 4-360

Question or Statement: Does the fact that the modeling method for carbon monoxide emissions for Alternative D involved 24 more intersections than that used for the other alternatives skew the results? Why did you not do the analysis using those 24 intersections for the No Action/No Project alternative, even if not Alternatives A, B and C?

Alternative Solutions or Options: Conduct the analysis of carbon monoxide emissions using the same information for all alternatives.

Response:

The air quality analysis for each alternative begins with an initial analysis of the same intersections, except to the extent the proposed improvement program for any given alternative eliminates or adds any intersection. The intersections analyzed essentially include all those intersections on major thoroughfares in an area bounded by the Marina Freeway (SR 90) to the north, the San Diego Freeway (I-405) to the east, Rosecrans Avenue to the south, and Vista Del Mar to the west. Traffic modeling is then applied to each of these intersections based on expected traffic patterns for each alternative, to determine the most congested intersections for further study. The most congested intersections, therefore, can be different for each alternative.

Seventeen intersections were modeled for Alternatives A, B, and C and the No Action/No Project Alternative. The 24 additional intersections were only analyzed as part of the Alternative D traffic analysis and therefore, information comparing these additional intersections to the environmental baseline is not provided. Because of this, the criterion that required the comparison of increases in congestion from the environmental baseline to the project alternative could not be used for this selection process. The remaining four selection criteria were used in determining which intersections were to be modeled. These criteria included: (1) overall congestion levels; (2) intersection location, to allow the determination of impacts to various communities surrounding the project area; (3) overall size/traffic flow of the intersection; and (4) proximity to on-airport CO emission sources (e.g., runway queues) in order to provide data to determine the combined on- and off-airport maximum CO impacts.

3. Comments and Responses

An additional two intersections (not 24 as the commentor states) were modeled for Alternative D (La Cienega and Centinela, and Lincoln and Washington). The intersections with the greatest potential increase in project-related traffic, based on level of service and traffic volume, were included in the air quality analyses.

SPC00275-11

Comment:

6. EIR/EIS Section and Page Number: 4.6 Air Quality, p. 4-386

Question or Statements: This section notes that Alternative D's unique proposed Ground Transportation Center ("GTC") and Intermodal Transportation Center ("ITC") would move parking and traffic emissions to a new location, around the GTC and ITC, however, there does not seem to be a specific discussion of air quality impacts on the neighborhoods immediately adjacent to the GTC and ITC. Has LAWA evaluated the impact of Alternative D on those neighborhoods, comparing and contrasting it with the No Action/No Project alternative?

Additional Comments: Without an analysis of the environmental impact of the GTC and ITC on the neighborhoods that would abut these new facilities, the EIR/EIS is incomplete.

Response:

On-airport, on-road mobile emissions, including emissions from parking structures and on-airport roadways are included in the on-airport, operational emission and concentration analyses. Please see Section 4.6.2.2, Emission Estimates, of both the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for regarding the calculation of emissions from these sources. As noted in Section 4.6.2.4 of the Draft EIS/EIR, receptor grids were placed to extend a distance beyond the airport property, including the adjacent neighborhoods. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-10 regarding model receptor locations.

SPC00275-12

Comment:

7. EIR/EIS Section and Page Number: 4.24, p. 4-613 and p. 4-614

Question or Statement: Like the prior comment, it appears that the Human Health and Safety Risk for residents in the area immediately adjacent to the GTC and ITC will be adversely affected, but the EIR/EIS does not appear to discuss this with any specificity. This section notes that "Some health risks for maximally exposed individuals... would increase slightly in small areas adjacent to the airport...." but notes that these increases are "less than significant." Precisely what are these areas, how many people are affected, and can anything be done to mitigate this "slight" increase?

Moreover, given that the EIR/EIS recognizes (p. 4-614, under "Methods for Estimating Impacts to Human Health") that studies of inhalation of toxic air pollutants from airport operations are out-of-date, having been conducted more than 15 years ago, what confidence does LAWA have that its determination that the supposed "less than significant" increase health risks in this area is in fact, accurate?

Additional Comments: LAWA clearly recognizes the inadequacy of the data used for this determination, but it seems that this issue is important enough not to be decided on the basis of antiquated data. LAWA should require additional studies of the health risks of inhalation of toxic air pollutants from airport operations.

Even where the increase in cancer risks or other non-cancer health risks is "less than significant," as defined by CEQA, it would probably be considered "significant" to those individuals who are affected. Accordingly, as a matter of environmental justice, this risk should be spelled out so that those affected are informed of the increased risks.

Response:

The text referred to by the commentor summarizes primary findings of the human health risk assessment. Supporting information and discussions of the analysis may be found in sections following the introduction and in Technical Report S-9a of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Both Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, and Technical Report S-9a of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR presented risks and hazards graphically as "risk or hazard isopleths." These figures provided an illustration of how risk and hazards might be distributed in communities around the airport. These maps were produced for estimated incremental risk and incremental chronic hazards for Alternatives A, B, C and D and the No Action/No Project Alternative under pre-mitigation and post-mitigation conditions for horizon years 2005, 2013 and 2015 compared with baseline year 1996 and Year 2000 conditions.

The specific text referred to by the commentor regarding small areas with slight increases is in reference to Alternative D compared to 1996 baseline and 2000 conditions. The small areas with slight cancer risk increases were shown in Figures S4.24.1-1, S4.24.1-5, S4.24.1-6, S4.24.1-9, and S4.24.1-18 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The small areas with slight non-cancer risk increases were shown in Figures S4.24.1-4, S4.24.1-8, S4.24.1-12, and S4.24.1-15 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

The HHRA relied upon the best data and methodologies available. Risk assessment is an evolving and uncertain process. Large uncertainties exist in the estimation of emissions of TAPs from airport mobile sources, the dispersion of such TAPs in the air, actual human exposure to such TAPs and the health effects associated with such exposures. In light of the uncertainties, and consistent with state and federal guidance on risk assessment in other contexts, the methods used in the HHRA were conservative. That is, methods were used that are more likely to overestimate than underestimate possible health risks and hazards. For example, cancer risks were calculated for hypothetical individuals living at locations where TAP concentrations were predicted to be highest. These individuals were assumed to be exposed for 24 hours per day on almost all days of the year and for 30 or 70 years (essentially a lifetime) to maximize estimates of how much chemical a person might inhale while living near LAX. In addition, people were assumed to be outdoors where TAP concentrations in air are highest during the entire time that exposure takes place, despite the fact that people spend considerably more time indoors than outdoors. Lower indoor air concentrations, as are often observed in urban areas, were not considered in the analysis. Cancer risk estimates based on these conservative exposure assumptions represented upper bound, or worst-case, predictions that may be associated with breathing chemicals released from LAX during and after implementation of the Master Plan. Actual members of the population near LAX that are not as highly exposed would be expected to face lower health risks. Therefore, although the figures roughly identify the small areas near the airport where there are slight increases in risk, the exact number of people who could be potentially affected cannot be definitively determined.

As stated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the estimated health risk is less than significant based on the most conservative estimates. Nonetheless, various air quality measures, which would reduce TAP emissions, have been proposed as part of the LAX Master Plan. For a detailed description of the air quality mitigation measures to be implemented as part of the LAX Master Plan, please refer to Section 4.6, Air Quality (subsection 4.6.8) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Please refer to Section 4.4, Social Impacts (subsection 4.4.3.5.3, Human Health Risk), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a discussion of environmental human health risk issues that have the potential for disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and/or low-income populations. In addition please refer to Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities. This Topical Response addresses comments on the potential health effects of air emissions on minority and low-income communities with emphasis on new information presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also refer to Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

The section under "Methods for Estimating Impacts to Human Health" referred to by the commentor does not refer to inhalation studies as inferred by the commentor. The statement referred to reads, "The basis for most of the TAP emission factors for commercial aircraft is from data derived from the testing of one aircraft type conducted over 15 years ago." As such, the statement refers to one of the sources used for TAP emission factors. Please refer to the Response to Comment SPC00296-43 for further discussion regarding the use of currently available sources of emissions data. Response to Comment SAL00015-284 further describes the emission factor databases reviewed in developing the TAP emission inventories, many of which were published more recently than 15 years ago.

3. Comments and Responses

Please refer to TR-HRA-2, regarding epidemiological studies linking airport emissions to adverse health effects. The studies referenced in the topical response were published in 2001 by the Illinois Department of Public Health and in 1999 by the Washington State Department of Health.

SPC00275-13

Comment:

8. EIR/EIS Section and Page Number: 4.6 Air Quality, p. 4-387

Question or Statement: The EIR/EIS analyses the impact of the Playa Vista development on Alternative D, but does not appear to consider its impact on the No Action/No Project alternative. Has this been done? What impact are traffic improvements required by or associated with the Playa Vista project likely to have on the No Action/No Project alternative?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2 regarding cumulative impacts associated with Playa Vista Projects. Cumulative transportation impacts were analyzed following the requirements of NEPA and CEQA. They are discussed in Section 4.3.2.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00275-14

Comment:

9. EIR/EIS Section and Page Number: 4.6.8.1, p. 4-392-393

Question or Statement: Similar to Comment 3 above, the EIR/EIS does not appear to take inventory of the operational mitigation measure components with respect to the No Action/No Project alternative. Has such an analysis been made? If not, what is the impact of any operational mitigation measure components that could be adopted without approval of any of the other alternatives?

Alternative Solutions or Options: Consider the impact of all presently available operational mitigation measure components on the No Action/No Project alternative.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SAL00018-53 regarding mitigation measures for the No Action/No Project Alternative.

SPC00275-15

Comment:

10. EIR/EIS Section and Page Number: 4.6.8.6, p. 4-397 and 4.6. 9, pp. 4-397-4-402.

Question or Statement: The footnotes to Table S4.6-22 appear to contemplate that the No Action/No Project alternative would be included in this analysis of mitigation measures, but the actual chart does not include that alternative. Where is the analysis of the mitigation operational air pollutant concentrations for the No Action/No Project alternative?

Additional Comments: Unless mitigation measures that are available to LAWA regardless of approval of the Master Plan are analyzed for their impact on the No Action/No Project alternative, the comparisons of air quality for that alternative with the other alternatives are biased and inadequate.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SAL00018-53 regarding the applicability of proposed project-related mitigation measures to the No Action/No Project Alternative. The footnotes in this table are revised in the Final EIS/EIR for clarification.

SPC00275-16

Comment:

11. EIR/EIS Section and Page Number: Section 4.19.5, p. 4-534 and 4.19.8, p. 4-537; Section 5.2, p. 5-10.

Question or Statement: Just as certain air quality mitigation measures could be implemented without approval of the Master Plan, so too might certain solid waste generation mitigation measures be adopted. Has the EIR/EIS evaluated the impact of implementing such mitigation measures on the No Action/No Project alternative?

Alternative Solutions or Options: Certainly LAWA could implement a more aggressive recycling program (pp. 4-534 and pp. 5-10) without approval of the Master Plan.

Additional Comments: To avoid biasing the analysis, the impact of such mitigation measures should be considered for the No Action/No Project alternative.

Response:

In the absence of a discretionary action by FAA or the City of Los Angeles, such as would occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative, there is no mechanism that would trigger the need to adopt or implement mitigation measures. However, as indicated in Section 4.19, Solid Waste (subsection 4.19.6.1) of the Draft EIS/EIR, under the No Action/No Project Alternative, LAWA would continue to implement existing programs aimed at reducing waste generation by at least 50 percent in compliance with AB 939, including the LAX on-site recycling program, and participation in the city's diversion program.

SPC00275-17

Comment:

12. EIR/EIS Section and Page Number: 4.20 Construction Impacts, p. 4-544 and Technical Report S-4, Attachment D, Construction Activities Emissions Inventories

Question or Statement: Is the analysis here premised on average vehicle occupancy of two people? If so, what data support that assumption?

Alternative Solutions or Options: As the South Coast Air Quality Management District ("SCAQMD") pointed out in its comments on the initial draft EIR/EIS, dated September 21, 2001, it is optimistic to assume that each vehicle will contain two people. Instead, the SCAQMD suggested that "a more conservative" assumption of one person per vehicle should be used unless LAWA can support its assumption of two people with actual data.

Additional Comments: Given the EIR/EIS's apparent assumptions, the emissions from construction activities appear to be substantially understated.

Response:

The construction analysis is not based on an assumption that construction workers will carpool to work or that an AVR of 2.0 will be achieved. Construction workers will be encouraged to carpool and will be arriving on-site at approximately 6:00 am, but no emission reduction "credit" was taken in the calculations for these measures.

SPC00275-18

Comment:

13. EIR/EIS Section and Page Number): 5.2, p. 5-3

3. Comments and Responses

Question or Statement: What is the purpose of the community outreach efforts, including public notification and public meetings, when new development on airport property is in proximity to and could potentially affect nearby residential uses?

Additional Comments: Although the LAXAAC is obviously in favor of public involvement in airport development, such development should be intended to afford the people living in the airport vicinity a voice in determining the future of the airport or at least to help mitigate the impact of LAX building projects on them. Public meetings should not be merely for window dressing or as a requirement to check off before proceeding as planned. If the public's input is not valued and is not considered, public meetings should not be held.

Response:

An essential component of the NEPA and CEQA process is to provide public review and obtain public comment on proposed projects. As an example, extensive opportunities for public participation were provided for the LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, including public hearings and an extended public review period, as described in Topical Response TR-PO-1. Since the Master Plan and Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are being completed at a program-level of consideration, as key components of the LAX Master Plan (i.e., LAX Northside, RAC, GTC, ITC, and APM) are advanced for implementation, the opportunity for additional public review and comment will be provided. The intent of the community outreach efforts referenced in Master Plan Commitment LU-4 is to obtain input from nearby residents to help identify and address the environmental effects associated with subsequent major proposals and to evaluate and refine proposed mitigation measures. The LAX Community Noise Roundtable and LAX Area Advisory Committee, described in Topical Response TR-LU-5 would also provide ongoing avenues for public participation.

Although Master Plan Commitment LU-4 has been modified since publication of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, it continues to support community outreach efforts for subsequent develop of major components of the LAX Master Plan.

Public input obtained at public meetings is considered for project design and mitigation. For example, in response to public comments received during the review period of the Draft EIS/EIR a regional approach alternative was proposed under Alternative D to encourage other airports to accommodate future air travel demand.

SPC00275-19

Comment:

14. EIR/EIS Section and Page Number: Sections 5.2, pp. 5-2 - 5-15

Question or Statement: It does not appear that LAWA has formulated definite plans for its Master Plan commitments about what it would do under the various alternatives proposed to mitigate the environmental impacts on the community. Most of the matters discussed here are discussed in generalities, so that what will eventually be accomplished cannot be evaluated at this time. For example, at p. 5-8, LAWA indicates that it will prepare a specific Standard Urban Storm water Mitigation Plan to address water quality and drainage issues; at p. 5-9, it states that it will implement a utilities relocation program to minimize interference with existing utilities. Several other examples exist. As a result, not only is the environmental impact of LAWA's proposed alternative impossible to assess, so is its ultimate cost.

Alternative Solutions or Options: Prior to proceeding with any alternative, LAWA should have a better understanding of what will be required to be done and its likely cost. Does this exist within LAWA?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AR00003-63.

SPC00275-20

Comment:

15. VOLUME ONE PAGE 2-1 Purpose and need for the proposed action?

The Executive Summary of the Draft EIS/EIR summarizes the purpose and need for the LAX Master Plan as follows:

The purpose of the LAX Master Plan is to help provide a level of airport passenger and freight improvements that will support the future economic growth and vitality of the five-county Los Angeles region. An overarching consideration during the planning process has been to achieve the project objectives in an environmentally sound manner. In particular, the Master Plan project objectives are to:

1. Respond to local and regional demand for air transportation during the period 2000 to 2015, taking into consideration the amount, type, location, and timing of such demand.
2. Ensure that new investments in airport capacity are efficient and cost-effective, maximizing the return on existing infrastructure capital.
3. Sustain and advance the international trade component of the regional economy and the international commercial gateway role of the City of Los Angeles.

Response:

The comment accurately restates the introductory portion of Chapter 2, Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00275-21

Comment:

16. Alt D is a safety and security plan and a 'modernization' plan

The LAX Master Plan Supplemental to the Draft EIS/EIR Question and Answer handout by LAWA has on page 2, Q6, 'How would safety be affected by the Master Plan? The first sentence in the answer to that question is, "LAX operates safely today and it will operate safely tomorrow."

Why, then, is there a need to spend billions of dollars for safety improvements if LAX is already safe. Please comment.

Response:

This is like asking why automobile manufacturers continue to spend billions of dollars engineering safety improvement for passenger cars though most of us would agree that driving is safe.

Portions of Alternative D are proposed because LAX safety is critically important and the potential to further improve safety will always remain possible. It is true that LAX operates safely today. However, there are a number of ways in which Alternative D modifies the airfield to be sure that LAX operates with an even greater degree of safety in the future.

One example would be the proposed relocation of two runways and construction of center parallel taxiways between each of the existing runway complexes which would further reduce the likelihood of runway incursions at LAX through the elimination of the high speed taxiway exits that directly link the outboard and inboard runways.

Commercial aviation is arguably the safest form of public transportation. However, airports, airlines, aircraft manufacturers and agencies such as FAA strive to further advance aviation safety. LAWA's commitment to the people of Southern California is no different. Ideally LAWA would eliminate any and all threats to the flying public. Until this is possible, LAWA will continue to improve LAX to enhance its safety and security to the greatest degree possible. Alternative D is a major step in this direction and would help make LAX one of, if not THE, safest, most secure airport in the world.

SPC00275-22

Comment:

17. According to the EIS/EIR, Alternative D would improve the level of passenger service throughout the CTA by including new passenger and baggage processing facilities where the public parking garages are located today. Does removing public access to the CTA by placing the GTC one or two miles to the east improve the level of passenger service?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Public access to the CTA would not be prohibited with implementation of Alternative D. As described in Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D would limit private vehicle access to the CTA reducing risk to airport users while also protecting the airport infrastructure and its link to the economy. By creating additional space for passenger terminals, efficient passenger and baggage screening facilities can be implemented at the airport thus improving the level of passenger service. Additionally, construction of the GTC would reduce transit time to the Airport as compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative also improving level of service.

SPC00275-23

Comment:

18. In addition, Alternative D states that it would provide for construction of new aircraft parking gates as well as demolition of some existing gates. As a result, Alternative D would have fewer total gate positions than the existing conditions or the No Action/No Project Alternative. As a result, all aircraft parking would be adjacent to a terminal or concourse, eliminating the current need to bus passengers to remote aircraft parking positions. When would the removal of remote gates take place? Is there an expectation that some of the remote gates later could be reinstated, once again to improve service to the passengers?

Response:

The removal of remote gates would not occur prior to the commissioning of the proposed West Satellite Concourse, the reconfiguration of TBIT to include aircraft gates on the west side and the proposed north linear concourse. The remote gates would not be reinstated for passenger use after the completion of the 153 contact gates.

Alternative D proposes other aviation uses for the ramps presently used for remote gates. The modifications to TBIT diminish the usability of remote gates to serve the terminal.

Please see Response to Comment SAL00015-14 regarding the aircraft gates and Response to Comment SAL00015-323 regarding the construction phasing.

SPC00275-24

Comment:

19. "Deterrence and prevention of terrorist attacks are essential considerations of the Alternative D plan. Its elements include

(1) avoiding concentration of people in the public areas, to the greatest extent possible, so as to reduce the likelihood and potential lethality of terrorist attacks with bombs or firearms." The term "greatest extent possible" is left to the discretion of the BOAC and staff. Doesn't having three entrance areas leave the possibility of a greater concentration of people than 7 or 8 entry points?

(2) moving passengers and their baggage through check-in and security screening and into the secure areas as quickly as possible. How quick is "quickly as possible"? And

(3) permitting only known, screened, and controlled vehicles into the Central Terminal Area (CTA), and avoiding concentration of unscreened vehicles and people at the curbs of the proposed Ground Transportation Center (GTC), Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC), and the Consolidated Rental Car (RAC) facility. Alternative D would use an expanded LAWA-operated Flyaway program throughout the region to disperse passenger processing. This service would include remote check-in of passengers and baggage, and provide direct access into the CTA. Al though we are referred to Appendix I for a detailed assessment of the security and safety features of Alternative D, Appendix I doesn't indicate how and where the vehicles will be checked prior to entering the CTA? Why?

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX. In addition, please see Appendix I of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum.

Under Alternative D, authorized vehicles entering the CTA roadway would be stopped and searched for explosives using a combination of existing screening techniques and vehicle screening technology. The exact screening location for authorized vehicles entering the CTA is not yet determined. This location would be determined based on the final facility layout design developed to best support and protect the CTA and the airport users.

SPC00275-25

Comment:

20. The RAC would include fueling, car washing, maintenance and repair facilities etc. What safety and security measures are included for these facilities? How close to residential areas will these facilities be located?

Response:

Level 1 passenger security measures associated with the RAC would be the same as those provided for the GTC and ITC. Passengers would be screened for explosives and weapons prior to entering the APM platform that would access the train to the CTA. Baggage check in facilities would be strongly considered in this facility to provide this service to RAC customers. The feasibility and cost effectiveness of this service would be studied during the implementation of the RAC facility. The exact locations of each fueling, car washing and maintenance/repair facilities would be designated in the design of the RAC. All facilities at the RAC would meet all applicable public safety standards associated with the designated uses and their required setbacks from residential land uses.

SPC00275-26

Comment:

21. According to the EIS/EIR, Alternative D would consolidate parking and curb front areas at a new GTC. This facility would become the primary point of pick-up and drop-off for passengers using LAX. The facility would combine a controlled and monitored roadway access system with first-level passenger security screening and profiling to further enhance the safety and security of all passengers using LAX. How would LAX and others treat an unidentified object left in the GTC or ITC or RAC, especially in the GTC? Would it be different from the program LAX now uses in the existing CTA?

Response:

The law enforcement response to an unidentified object left unattended in the GTC, ITC or RAC would be similar to the procedure used throughout the existing airport. Objects are secured, identified, and impounded. If an object is determined to be threatening, the area is secured and the object may be identified and secured by the Airport Police bomb squad. Once an object is rendered safe, attempts are made to identify and locate its owner.

The major difference between current procedures and those contemplated for the facilities in Alternative D is a future facility design that would allow for isolation areas that would not close the entire facility. Occasionally entire terminals in the existing CTA are closed when an object is found or when an object is scanned and the owner cannot be immediately identified. This is often the result of the existing terminal designs that did not contemplate the need to quickly secure a portion of the building without completely closing and evacuating the facility. Modern airport terminals have begun incorporating this design requirement. Alternative D design would extend the state of the art on this concept.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00275-27

Comment:

22. According to the EIS/EIR, a new ITC would provide a more efficient connection than currently exists between the existing MTA Green Line station and the CTA. The airport's rental car facilities would be in one location, referred to as the RAC, to simplify passenger access to these services. On paper this is a good idea.

A new Automated People Mover (APM) system would connect the GTC, ITC, and RAC to the redeveloped CTA. The end goal of this design concept is to achieve a new balance between the needs of both passenger security and passenger convenience. How is passenger safety and security to be incorporated on the APM? Wouldn't the multi-mile APM be more difficult to protect from whatever security risks exist?

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00275-28

Comment:

23. North (24L 340") and South (25L 50") runway movements are not necessary as far as safety and security is concerned. Of the ten surface incursions in the first ten months of fiscal 2003, two were category B, two C and two D AND NO CATEGORY 'A'. The taxiway between the runways will not stop aircraft from crossing from the outer runways across the inner runways to the terminals.

The statement of the EIS/EIR that "The new center taxiways will improve airfield safety and reduce the possibility of runway incursions" is an accurate statement. If we put traffic signals on the freeway we could reduce traffic accidents and improve safety. Regardless of what anyone says, the moving and extending of any runway is a modernization, (expansion, improvement) program.

25L runway allows aircraft to depart that runway and cross diagonally while the modernization program would have the aircraft cross perpendicular to 25R. What are the safety gains of this procedure?

Response:

As indicated on page 3-41, in Section 3.3.2, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, there were total of five Category A runway incursions at LAX during the period of the 2002 FAA report and none of the five resulted in a collision. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 for more detail. Every runway incursion has the potential to cause enormous loss of life and property. The geometry of the existing airfield must be changed to enhance the potential for keeping the number of runway incursions low, or preferably, their total elimination. Relocation of runways in north and south airfield complex and construction of a center taxiway between the closely spaced parallel runways would be the key component to remedy the problem.

The existing airfield requires landing aircraft to exit the outboard runways onto high-speed taxiway exits (diagonally cross the runway) that provide an unimpeded route to a neighboring parallel runway on which simultaneous aircraft departures are occurring. Alternative D would eliminate all high-speed taxiways between runways and provide connecting taxiways which would intersect runways in a 90-degree angle. The reduction or elimination of unimpeded high-speed access for arriving aircraft to the neighboring departure runway would reduce the likelihood of a pilot inadvertently taxiing beyond a runway hold bar and into the path of a departing aircraft.

SPC00275-29

Comment:

24. Los Angeles LAX 1.29 incursions per 100,000 operations

Runway incursion as defined by the FAA. What is an incursion? Most dramatically referred to as a "near-miss," an incursion can actually take an almost benign form. For example, the least dangerous form might apply if a pilot edged the nose of his plane over a "stop line," akin to going a little too far when approaching a stop sign on the road. And an incursion isn't merely when two planes are headed for a collision; about 20% of cases involve pedestrians and vehicles.

Types of Incursions by Severity.

The National Airspace System managed 268 million takeoffs and landings at 488 towered airports from 1998-2001. Of that number, 1,460 resulted in "runway incursions"; all 1460 occurred in 84 of the 488 airports studied; the other 404 had no incursions at all.

The FAA groups incursion severity into four categories: Category D: "Little or no chance of collision but meets the definition of runway incursion," as in the stop sign analogy above. The danger factor: pretty much zilch.

Category C: "Separation decreases but there is ample time and distance to avoid a potential collision." Danger level is low.

Category B: "Separation decreases and there is a significant potential for collision." Danger level increases considerably.

Category A: "Separation decreases and participants take extreme action to narrowly avoid a collision, or the event results in a collision."

A Category A incursion is what most of us would call a "near-miss"; in other words, darn near a collision. (In fact, an actual collision is a type of Category A incursion, but even then the collision might be with a runway sign or some other relatively impermanent object.) The FAA calls this a "severe situation where the margin of safety is so low that a collision is barely avoided." The danger level: extremely high.

Distribution of the 1460 Incursion,
1998-2001

Category A: 6% Category B: 11 % Category C: 35% Category D: 48%

1999-2002-

Category A: 5% Category B: 10% Category C: 33% Category D: 52%

LAX had 34 incursions from 1999 to 2002 and no category A incursions.

So, nearly half the incursions were of the nature of an airplane sliding a couple feet past a stop line, a dog running across the tarmac, or a fuel truck being slightly out of position.

Response:

The commentor states that nearly half of the 34 incursions at LAX were of the nature of an airplane sliding a couple of feet past a stop line. The commentor seems to imply that runway incursions are not a serious problem. We feel this is analogous to asking why drunken driving laws are enforced if most drunk drivers make it home safely? Is the commentor suggesting that it's reasonable to permit 17 annual incursions?

We should be extremely thankful that runway incursions are rare and usually benign. This is a testament to the tremendous skill and concentration present among pilots and air traffic controllers who are tasked with the responsibility of safely moving hundreds of thousands of people through LAX every day.

Considering the potential for enormous loss of life present with each runway incursion LAWA feels that the only acceptable number of annual runway incursions is zero. FAA, LAWA, and the airlines are working hard to significantly reduce, if not eliminate, the potential for runway incursions at LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

Alternative D serves to supplement the various other methods of reducing the risk of runway incursions at LAX through modifications to the airfield that will provide a safer air operations area at LAX, namely the elimination of high-speed runway exits directly linking the outboard runways with the inboard runways.

SPC00275-30

Comment:

25. Types of Incursions by Cause: Who, What, and Why?

The FAA has three "error categories" to classify the who, what, and why of incursions: (1) pilot deviations, (2) operational errors, and (3) vehicle/pedestrian deviations.

Pilot deviations account for the majority of incursions at 58%. These errors include failing to stop on time at a "hold-short" line in simple cases, or taking off without clearance at the other extreme. The year 2000 was a particularly bad year for pilot deviations, but 2001 saw considerable improvement.

Operational errors, which account for 23% of incursions, include miscommunications such as "hear back/read back" errors, mistaking the location of an aircraft or vehicle on a runway, or use of a closed runway.

The third and least common errors are "vehicle/pedestrian deviations," instances of people or vehicles entering a runway without authorization, which are pretty much what they sound like; folks and vehicles (e.g., fuel trucks, fire trucks, tug-vehicles) in places they're not supposed to be.

Incursions by Plane Type

The FAA also has three classes of flights: commercial, general aviation, and military. General aviation planes account for more than 65% of incursions, with commercial flights at 38% and military flights at 4-5%.

A recent report indicated that LAX has not had a serious incident in more than 14 months (more than 1,000,000 operations).

Why do you insist that the moving and/or lengthening of three of the four runways are being done for reasons of safety? Isn't it obvious, with this FAA information, that the cost associated with the alterations is outside the realm of reality? Please explain your rationale.

Response:

Comment noted. Pilot or air traffic controller errors cause runway incursions. However, airport layout and design can play a contributory role in runway incursions where there is minimal runway spacing between parallel runways or multiple exits from runways in areas of complex ground operations. Please see Response to Comment AL00025-66 for more information.

LAX ranked the first as the airport that had the greatest number of runway incursions for the four-year period based on 2002 FAA Safety Runway Report. Please see Response to Comment SAL00023-3 regarding the need to provide airport infrastructure implementation at LAX for enhancing safe aircraft operations and reducing the potential for runway incursions.

The proposed Master Plan improvements under all of the alternatives would be funded with a combination of FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, airline fees, and other state/federal grants.

SPC00275-31

Comment:

26. Page 4-715 It states "...not all safety areas and safety zones surrounding the four LAX runways universally meet today's recommended dimensions for new airport development." Is this statement a demand for runway relocations and extensions? Please explain a yes or no answer. Would the airport be closed down if there was no reconfiguration of the runways? Please explain a yes or no answer.

Response:

No, the No Action/No Project Alternative would maintain the existing runways in their existing positions and would allow the airport to continue operating. However, airport efficiency passenger safety and security would be compromised.

SPC00275-32

Comment:

27. CTA

The removal of most vehicles from the Central Terminal Area (CTA) is a positive safety and security program because it limits the possibility of a large explosive device being carried in a vehicle. It makes it more difficult to have large structural damage and great loss of life in the CTA.

This change, however, also creates a problem of how to get the passengers to the terminals. The Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS has a Ground Transportation Center (GTC), an Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC), Consolidated Rental Car Facility (RAC). All of these centers rely on an Automated People Mover (APM) to transport passengers via the APM. This increases the area that must be covered to curtail terrorist activity. To say that the GTC, ITC, RAC and the APM will have a less than significant impact (ES 4.26.2) on the number of security personnel, the type of equipment and the utilization of that equipment is not reasonable or logical. It is critical to insure the safety and security of the passengers. A closing down of any of these centers would have a very negative effect

The CTA has several terminals for passenger access through various means of transportation at the present time. As the past several months have shown, a suspicious article has caused a particular terminal to close down and to have passengers removed from the area. If the GTC were to have a similar type of a problem, many terminals would be affected and create a greater problem depending on the severity of the problem at the GTC. The same could apply to the RAC and ITC, only not as severe a problem.

The term 'Level One' security check of passengers and baggage has not been easy to determine, at least as yet. The method and procedure is very important. The GTC, ITC, and RAC are all to have Level One security checks BEFORE anyone boards the APM. Questions to still be investigated are the methods vehicles would be checked as they come into those areas and the procedure for getting the passengers and luggage to the security check area are still undetermined.

Arriving passengers, as now, will have been checked at some other airport. An area of concern would be how to get the arriving passengers and baggage back to their point of landside surface departure if the APM is malfunctioning for whatever reason.

The "concentric rings of security" as illustrated in Figure 4-1, imply that because of the distant location of the GTC, ITC, RAC etc., law enforcement personnel will have additional time to assess any inappropriate activity prior to the problem reaching the APM or CTA. This could be a positive security measure depending on the programs that are set up.

The Flyaway buses need to have at least Level One security for passengers and baggage at the depots, given that they will be allowed to go directly to the CTA. As of this time, we do not know of any planned inspection of vehicles allowed into the CTA to service the concessionaires. Where and when will the inspection of the Flyaway vehicles be inspected after leaving the Flyaway station and before entering the CTA?

28. We have heard that LAX is as safe as it can get. The airport, airlines and all other airport-related activities encourage the public to use the airlines and airport. They encourage the public to travel. Yet all the consultants, including the Comparative Study Analysis hired by LAWA, can find NOTHING good about the system now employed. In every instance cited by the consultants Alt. D noted as superior to NA/NP. Who would want to travel in an airport with as many flaws as the NA/NP that we are using at the present time? We must question the validity of any report that presents only the positives of one program and the negatives of another. Credibility would be questioned if anyone were to evaluate Alt. D in the same way EIS/EIR has evaluated NA/NP.

3. Comments and Responses

Please explain what constitutes an Aircraft Accident and an Aircraft Incident as shown in Table S4.24.3-1. Please describe the accidents and incidents listed in that same Table. Based on that Table, it appears LAX operates a relatively safe airport

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPC00064-8 regarding the airport area to be secured and the size and configuration of the associated police force. Please see Response to Comment SPC00275-26 regarding law enforcement response to unattended objects in the airport terminals. Please see Appendix I of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum regarding Level 1 security screening at all landside facilities including the existing and planned Flyaway stations and vehicle inspections prior to reaching the ITC, GTC and RAC. The Draft EIS/EIR includes the NTSB definitions for aircraft accident and aircraft incident and it also discusses the accidents and incidents listed in Table S4.24.3-1 on pages 4-1087 and 4-1088 of Section 4.24.3, Safety (CEQA).

SPC00275-33

Comment:

29. Section 4.24.3.6.2 refers to environmental impacts related to safety located in 4.24.3.6. There is not any information in the later section pertaining to Environmental Consequences. Section 4.24.3.6.2 states, "The ability to accommodate future federal airport security requirements under the NA/NP Alternative MAY be constrained by the space limitations of existing facilities, particularly the CTA." Do you know what the future federal requirements may be? How could LAWA improve the CTA to handle potential federal requirements? What would the consultants discover if they were told to find additional space in the CTA area? What other interim measures could be incorporated by modifying the existing CTA facilities?

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX. In addition, please see Appendix I of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum.

SPC00275-34

Comment:

30. 9/11/01 was a day when aircraft, fully loaded with fuel, destroyed buildings and killed people. Terrorists using commercial aircraft would find it much more difficult to conduct a similar activity today. However, with more than 40 airfields in the area, how will can the GTC, ITC, and RAC be protected from other aircraft, loaded with explosives, causing great harm to facilities and passengers?

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00275-35

Comment:

To summarize, although the LAXAAC considers Alternative D preferable to Alternatives A, B and C, it considers Alternative D to have significant flaws and to be less preferable to the No Action/No Project alternative.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments above.

SPC00275-36

Comment:

Additional points, Noise Committee:

31. The number of residents in Manchester Square that would lose their housing is over 7,000 (12.5 percent of the population of the Westchester area). There is very little affordable housing available in this area for them. Where was the negative economic impact on the local communities included for removing these residents in Manchester Square? Are the costs of relocation, litigation and eminent domain included in the Draft EIS/EIR?

Response:

The acquisition of Manchester Square is independent of the residential acquisition necessary for Master Plan implementation. The Manchester Square area is being acquired through the existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program, in support of LAWA's ANMP. The relocation of residences and businesses in Manchester Square area has always been and will continue to be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Act, thereby minimizing community disruption, limiting adverse economic impacts and protecting human rights. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.2 regarding relocation, and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding affordable housing. The comment on the negative economic impact on the local communities is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, the estimated costs and funding sources of the relocation for the voluntary acquisition program was addressed in LAWA's "Final Relocation Plan - Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program for the Areas Manchester Square and Airport/Belford," which was published in June 2000.

SPC00275-37

Comment:

32. What flight mix was anticipated in Alt. D? Would the flight mix be able to achieve the LAX noise abatement program (e.g., take-offs on in-board runways, and over-ocean operations)?

Response:

The aircraft fleet mix used for noise analysis is included in Table S7, 2015 Average Annual Day Operations and Fleet Mix Alternative D, of Appendix S-C1, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. All aircraft identified in the Alternative D fleet mix would be able to comply with the LAWA's noise abatement procedures.

SPC00275-38

Comment:

33. Although moving runway 24L 340 feet south is obviously planned to accommodate the New Large Airplanes (NLA), this runway may not be long enough for the NLAs. According to literature on the yet-to-be-released aircraft, they need a runway at least as long as 25R. Counting the unpaved ground at either end of 24L as part of the qualifying length is specious and potentially dangerous.

Response:

The purpose of moving Runway 6R/24L 340 feet south is to gain enough separation for constructing a center taxiway between the two north parallel runways. The purpose of the center taxiway is to enhance safe aircraft operations and reduce the potential for runway incursions. The center taxiway is designed to design Group VI standards and would accommodate the Airbus A380, which is scheduled to enter commercial service in 2006. Airbus has publicly stated that the A380 would need about 8,000 feet for arrival operations and 10,000 feet for departure operations at MTOW.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00275-39

Comment:

34. Why was the A-380 single-event noise not included?

Response:

Since the A380 has not been built it cannot be modeled. The Draft LAX Master Plan assumes a number of New Large Aircraft (NLA) will serve LAX by 2015. Alternatives A, B, and C, assume 30 NLA operations per day. NLA operations represent one percent of daily operations for each alternative. Design day activity for Alternative D in 2015 would include 27 NLA operations per day, which also represents one percent of the total daily operations for Alternative D. The Integrated Noise Model 6.0C which is the FAA approved computer model used to predict noise impacts from aircraft operations does not contain noise data for the New Large Aircraft (NLA) Airbus 380 since the aircraft has not yet been developed. However, all alternatives and mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting appendices include NLA operations through the use of a "substitute" aircraft the Boeing 747-400. Additional noise information can be found in Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.1, Noise and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00275-40

Comment:

35. The 94 SEL noise level used for the threshold of significance for sleep interference is too high. The levels selected by the World Health Organization (55 SEL outside, 35 SEL indoors) should be used.

Response:

Comment noted. While the World Health Organization does provide noise related guidelines, FICAN and FICON guidelines were used since they are accepted by FAA. The 35 decibel interior Leq(h) standard from ANSI is similar to what WHO identified in its classroom disruption guidelines. The WHO guidelines identified by the commentor were developed as goals to be sought, rather than as standards that should be achieved by any governmental body. While sleep disturbance and awakenings have been the subject of much research, the Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise (FICAN) in a 1997 report selected one study as the most widely accepted information upon which to base the advisory group's selection of a defensible relationship between single event noise and awakenings. The FICAN report cites a study conducted by Finegold and Fidell, which relates the proportion of persons awakened by noise events at differing Sound Exposure Levels (SEL). The Finegold report includes a formula that allows the user to compute, for any given SEL, the percentage of the population that may be awakened by an aircraft single event. For determination of a 94 dB SEL threshold, please see Section 4.1.4.1.1 CEQA Thresholds of Significance of Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 6.1.1 Threshold of Significance, of Appendix S-C1, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. There is no federal threshold of significance for single event noise impacts. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addresses nighttime single event noise impacts associated with Alternative D in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00275-41

Comment:

There is an assumption that the Part 161 Study will develop mitigation actions; this can not be counted on nor included until the Part 161 Study is complete (and it is doubtful that there will be any real mitigation measures recommended).

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00274-57 regarding Part 161 as a mitigation measure.

SPC00275-42**Comment:**

Has irregular terrain been considered in formulating CNEL contours?

Response:

The terrain within the 65 CNEL is essentially flat and topographical issues were not addressed. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3.5 regarding effect of elevation on noise contours

SPC00275-43**Comment:**

36. Why is low-frequency noise not addressed?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00274-41 regarding low frequency noise.

SPC00275-44**Comment:**

37. Noise from construction should never exceed maximum allowable noise levels. What provisions have been made to insure this is the required policy?

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.20, Construction Impacts, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR used similar methods to assess construction noise impacts. Details regarding the methodology used to assess such impacts were provided in Section 4.1.2, General Approach and Methodology, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As described in that section of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, analyses regarding construction noise are subject to state guidelines set forth under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). With the exception of federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirements for the protection of individual workers from high levels of construction noise, there are no federal standards that address the acceptability of construction equipment noise.

There are no "maximum allowable" construction noise levels. Rather, guidelines set forth under CEQA were used for this project to determine the level of significance of construction noise impacts. Where noise levels are predicted to exceed CEQA thresholds, mitigation would be implemented to minimize, to the extent possible, significant impacts. As described in Section 4.1.4.3, Construction Equipment Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, a significant noise impact from construction would occur if the direct and indirect changes in the environment in the environment that may be caused by the particular project alternative would potentially result in one or more of the following future conditions:

- Construction activities lasting more than one day would exceed existing ambient exterior noise levels by 10dBA or more at a noise-sensitive use;

- Construction activities lasting more than 10 days in a three month period would exceed existing ambient noise levels by 5 dBA or more at a noise-sensitive use; or

3. Comments and Responses

- Construction activities would exceed the ambient exterior noise levels by 5 dBA at a noise-sensitive use between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Monday through Friday, before 8:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on Saturday, or at anytime on Sunday.

Based upon the project's noise impact criteria of an exceedance of 5 dBA or more above ambient levels, temporary but significant noise impacts from construction activities are predicted at noise-sensitive locations near construction sites; these noise exceedances would occur intermittently during construction. Figure 4.1-6, Potential Construction Noise Impacts - All Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Figure S4.1-5, Potential Noise Impacts - Alternative D, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR show where significant impacts are predicted to occur.

Mitigation measures for construction noise - as listed in Section 4.1.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR - would reduce noise levels to the extent possible, although generally not to a level below significance. As described in Section 4.1.8.3, Construction Equipment Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR the following mitigation measures (MM) are proposed to reduce, to the extent possible, the adverse effects of noise from construction equipment:

MM-N-7. Noise Control Devices - Noise control devices shall be used, such as equipment mufflers, enclosures, and barriers. Natural and artificial barriers such as ground elevation changes and existing buildings can shield construction noise.

MM-N-8. Construction Staging - Construction operations shall be staged as far from noise-sensitive uses as possible.

MM-N-9. Program Maintenance - All sound reducing devices and restrictions shall be maintained throughout the construction period.

MM-N-10. Equipment Replacement - Noisy equipment shall be replaced with quieter equipment (for example, rubber-tired equipment rather than track equipment) whenever possible.

MM-N-11. Construction Scheduling - The timing and/or sequence of the noisiest construction operations shall avoid sensitive times of the day.

Section 4.3.2.5, Master Plan Commitments, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided the following additional mitigation measures to reduce the adverse effects of noise construction resulting from off-airport surface transportation:

ST-10. Designated Truck Routes (Alternatives A, B, and C) - For dirt and aggregate and all other materials and equipment, truck deliveries will be on designated routes only (freeways and non-residential streets). Every effort will be made for routes to avoid residential frontages. The potential designated routes are identified in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR.

ST-11. Stockpile Locations (Alternatives A, B, and C) - Stockpile locations will be confined to the eastern area of the airport vicinity. Multiple stockpile locations will be provided.

ST-16. Designated Haul Routes (Alternatives A, B, C, and D) - Every effort will be made to ensure that haul routes are located away from sensitive noise receptors.

Additional off-airport mitigation measures beyond those listed above that could help minimize construction noise impacts were discussed in Section 4.3.2.5, Master Plan Commitments, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00275-45

Comment:

Notes on Alt. D Noise, Section 4.1
General comments:

38. None of the noise analyses deal with low-frequency noise, yet this form of noise has been identified as extremely detrimental to overall health, not just to hearing. Residents in areas that had not previously expressed concern about noise impacts (Ladera, for instance) are probably being impacted by low-frequency noise. Low-frequency noise needs to be recorded, integrated in the contours, and mitigation measures included.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPC00274-41 regarding low frequency noise.

SPC00275-46

Comment:

39. The only noise contour in the Noise section that shows projected 2015 Alt. D noise is Figure S6 (from the Supplement), Alternative D 2015 (with Part 161 Mitigation) vs. Alternative D 2015 Without Mitigation. Figure S6 is in error for showing mitigation measures generated from the Part 161 study - this study is currently underway; no mitigation measures have been recommended nor adopted from the study as of this time.

Response:

Figure S6, Alternative D 2015 (with Part 161 Mitigation vs. Alternative D 2015 without Mitigation, of Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is included to provide a comparison of contours with and without the approval of Mitigation Measure MM-N-5, Conduct Part 161 Study to Make Over-Ocean Procedures Mandatory (Alternatives A, B, C, and D).

In addition to any restrictive measures that may be implemented resulting from completion of Mitigation Measure MM-N-5, the boundaries of the ANMP will be expanded to include residential uses newly exposed to single event exterior nighttime noise levels of 94 dBA SEL, based on the Master Plan Alternative that is ultimately approved as defined in MM-LU-2, Incorporate Residential Dwelling Units Exposed to Single Event Awakenings Threshold into Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (Alternatives A, B, C, and D). It is extremely important that the mandatory use of over-ocean procedures not be overestimated. The application of the measure does not imply that all easterly departures between midnight and 6:30 a.m. would be eliminated. During periods of Santa Ana weather when easterly winds exceed 10 knots, or during periods of coastal fog when the visibility is severely limited west of the airport, safety considerations will require the use of east flow operations, and all traffic will take off to the east. Such conditions now account for the great majority of easterly takeoffs that occur during the year. No change is proposed for these existing procedures during high wind or low visibility periods.

SPC00275-47

Comment:

40. There is no contour map included showing 1996 baseline, the Year 2000, and projected Alt. D 2015 impacts. There are some figures, (S4.2-16 through S4.2-19) that do compare a noise contour for Alt. D 2015 with 1996, NA/NP, and Single Event noise, but they are included in the Land Use section, not the noise section of the Alt D EIS/EIR.

Response:

Comment noted. Figure S4.1-2, Year 2000 Conditions vs. 1996 Baseline Aircraft Noise Exposure Contours, of Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Figure S4.2-16, Alternative D 2015 vs. 1996 Baseline Areas Newly Exposed, and Figure S4.2-17, Alternative D 2015 vs. No Action/No Project Alternative Areas Newly Exposed, of Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to Draft EIS/EIR, and Figure S10, Alternative D 2015 vs. Year 2000 Conditions Areas Newly Exposed, of Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provide the commentor with the comparisons identified by the contour.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00275-48

Comment:

A firm commitment to the CNEL and over-ocean procedures needs to be clearly defined in the EIS/EIR. The over-ocean procedures were established as extending to 7:00 a.m. However, at several locations in the proposal, the time has changed to 6:30 a.m. The EIS/EIR should state what the original procedure was and, if it has been officially changed, when and how it was changed. Otherwise, the 7:00 a.m. time should be reaffirmed and language clearly delineating LAWA's unequivocal commitment to it must be included. As an inducement to follow the over-ocean procedure, LAWA should formally request that the FAA establish a procedure to track pilot (or FAA) requests for an easterly take-off when LAX is in the over-ocean mode. These requests must list weather conditions and the reasons an easterly take-off was requested. Monthly reports of these requests should be made to the public.

Response:

Comment noted. The over-ocean procedures at LAX never had a 7:00 a.m. ending time frame. It is not identified as such in the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. LAWA's over-ocean procedures were originally implemented in December 1972 with an 11:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. time frame. On June 7, 1974, Resolution 8372 was passed by the City of Los Angeles changing the time frame to 12:00 a.m. to 6:30 a.m. The FAA's primary function is to ensure safety. Noise abatement/mitigation is secondary to safety. Normal practice within the FAA is to notify pilots of their deviations from standard operating procedures, such as low flying over the communities and to inform them that the areas are noise sensitive. Easterly departures during over-ocean operations are not a violation of FAA regulations. 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. The commentor may request data from the FAA through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). LAWA is addressing discretionary easterly operations during over-ocean operations through a 14 CFR Part 161 Study. As stated in Section 4.1.8 Mitigation Measures of Appendix S-C1, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Mitigation Measure MM-N-5 Conduct Part 161 Study to Make Over Ocean Procedures Mandatory (Alternatives A, B, C, and D) shall be initiated to seek federal approval of a locally-imposed restriction on departures to and from the east when over-ocean procedures are in effect. This restriction would not impact airport operations in the event that the airport is in east flow operations. LAWA does not create an easterly operations document or monthly report for public dissemination. 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. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement/enforcement.

SPC00275-49

Comment:

41. Table S4.1-1, Aircraft Noise Exposure by Noise Level Range - 1996 and Year 2000 Conditions: It is not stated whether the Manchester Square area is included as residential in the 1996 and 2000 figures. For an analysis of Alt. D, the estimated noise exposure must be included for 2015.

Response:

Manchester Square was included as a residential area impacted by high noise levels under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, as shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As further described in Topical Response TR-MP-3, acquisition of Manchester Square as part of LAWA's existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program is currently underway and is independent of the LAX Master Plan. The estimated timeframe for completion of this Program is during calendar year 2006. As shown on Figure S3-8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Manchester Square is proposed to be developed as a Ground Transportation Center (GTC) under Alternative D by 2015. Therefore, no noise-sensitive uses within Manchester Square would be exposed to 65 CNEL and greater noise levels by 2015 and no additional analysis of noise impacts on Manchester Square under Alternative D is necessary. However, Alternative D noise exposure effects that include the Manchester Square area are shown on Figure S4.2-16 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00275-50

Comment:

42. Table S20 (from Supplement), Grid Points Within Future Alternatives That Experience Significant or Other Reportable Increases in CNEL - Comparison of Future Alternatives to 1996 Baseline, Year 2000 Conditions, and 2015 No Action/No Project Alternative: This data is shown only in a table. It must also be shown in a contour map form.

Response:

Comment noted. It would not be feasible to develop a noise contour for every conceivable grid point identified in Table 20, Grid Points Within Future Alternatives That Experience Significant or Other Reportable Increases in CNEL-Comparison of Future Alternatives to 1996 Baseline, Year 2000 Conditions, and 2015 No Action/No Project Alternative of Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. This data is incorporated in to the contours that are used in those noise impacts are addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00275-51

Comment:

Section 4 Noise Screening of Alt. D Track Changes above 3,000 Ft Altitude

Response:

Noise Screening of Alternative D Track Changes Above 3000 Feet Altitude is addressed in Section 4, of Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise and Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00275-52

Comment:

43. On what basis is the assumption made that the Alt. D flight tracks would not increase noise by at least 5 decibels? What aircraft mix was assumed? Turbo- props are still being purchased by the airlines; were they included in the mix?

Response:

It is unclear as to where the commentor is determining the lack of a 5 dB increase in Alternative D. Table S13, Regular and Special Grid Point Assessment - Aircraft CNEL, Comparison of Build Alternatives to 1996 Baseline, Year 2000 Conditions, and 2015 No Action/No Project Alternative of Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR does identify grid locations where increases of 5 dB do increase. Please see Response to Comment SPC00274-56 regarding turbo props and fleet mix used in Alternative D.

SPC00275-53

Comment:

44. Moving 24L/6R 340 feet to the south would certainly have a serious impact on Inglewood and south Los Angeles; on both take-off and landing aircraft would be below 3,000 feet. This would impact areas that are clearly eligible for Environmental Justice relief.

Response:

Aircraft noise impacts associated with the relocation of Runway 6R/24L 340 feet to the south 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

3. Comments and Responses

Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Aircraft noise impacts were determined by changes to the noise exposure patterns under Alternative D compared to 1996 baseline conditions and were based on the number of landings and takeoffs, forecast fleet mix, and flight tracks (including elevation). Note that under normal operating conditions aircraft would depart over the ocean and therefore departures associated with the runway would not result in a noise impact on Inglewood and South Los Angeles. Areas within Inglewood that would be newly exposed to high noise levels as a result of the relocation of Runway 6R/24L (i.e., the inner runway on the north runway complex) were shown on Figures S4.2-16 and S4.2-18 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As also shown on these figures no areas within South Los Angeles would be newly exposed to high noise levels either by the relocation of Runway 6R/24L or other runway modifications proposed under Alternative D. As shown on Figure S4.2-17 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative D only some areas within Inglewood would be newly exposed to 65 CNEL noise levels compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. As shown on Figure S11 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative D the 94 dBA SEL noise contour does not extend to South Los Angeles. In addition the overall residential area within Inglewood exposed to the 94 dBA SEL under Alternative D would decrease compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative, as shown on Tables S15 and S63 of the Supplemental Land Use Technical Report. As stated under mitigation measures MM-LU-1 and MM-LU-2 residential areas newly exposed to 65 CNEL or 94 dBA SEL noise levels would be eligible for sound insulation under the revised ANMP. See Topical Responses TR-LU-3 for a description of the ANMP and TR-LU-5 regarding noise impacts and mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Minority and low-income communities newly exposed to high noise levels were evaluated for environmental justice relief as described in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As concluded therein, under Alternative D compared to 1996 baseline conditions, 87 percent of population newly exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels and 85 percent of the population newly exposed to 94 dBA SEL noise levels are located in minority and low-income communities. As shown on Figures S4.4.3-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR these communities are located in Inglewood and none are located in South Los Angeles. See also Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits proposed in light of identified disproportionately high and adverse aircraft noise impacts on minority and low-income communities.

SPC00275-54

Comment:

45. As shown on Figure S4, easterly departures from 6L and 6R would go directly over the Osage area of Westchester at altitudes considerably below 3,000 feet. Where did the EIR/EIS study include studies of increased traffic on these runways during easterly operations? Was there any study done of more commuter aircraft being routed to the north? Especially to 6L? Where is the study on single-event noise generated by easterly take-offs over this area? These issues must be addressed.

Response:

The commentor is correct. Figure S4 does show aircraft operations crossing over the Osage area of Westchester below 3000 feet. The incidence of eastbound departures from LAX is forecasted to be used 2.6 percent of the time by light and turboprop aircraft. The runway utilization percentages and fleet mix that are used in Alternative D are incorporated into the noise modeling. Noise impacts are addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Single-event noise impacts are addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

SPC00275-55

Comment:

46. During normal operating conditions, if commuter aircraft are routed to the north complex, specifically to 24R, there is a greater opportunity for early approaches coming in over eastern Westchester and early turns on take-off over Playa del Rey which would be considerably lower than 3,000 feet in altitude. Where is the study of these eventualities? Especially the single-event noise impacts?

Response:

Comment noted. Efforts to eliminate early turns over El Segundo and Playa del Rey are incorporated into the recommended mitigation actions for each project alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3.3 regarding early turns over areas north and south of airport. Single-event noise impacts are addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

SPC00275-56

Comment:

47. The eastern part of Westchester (the Osage area) is already subjected to serious aircraft noise, in both easterly and westerly operating conditions. Alt. D would have the potential to greatly increase this noise impact to more than unacceptable levels.

Response:

Potential aircraft noise impacts on the community of Westchester (including the Osage area) 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. As shown on Figures 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and S1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR the Osage community is not subject to high noise levels, as defined by the 65 CNEL contour, under 1996 baseline or Year 2000 conditions. As also indicated on these figures, the Osage community is not located within the ANMP boundary, which determines areas that are eligible for soundproofing. In addition, as analyzed in Section 4.2.6 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, no areas within the Osage area would be newly exposed to 65 CNEL or 94 dBA SEL noise levels under Alternative D. See also Topical Responses TR-LU-2 regarding potential noise effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester, TR-LU-3 for a description of the ANMP, and TR-LU-5 regarding significant noise levels. See Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding the difference between single event and CNEL noise levels.

SPC00275-57

Comment:

What is the aircraft fleet mix upon which the 2015 noise estimates were made? How many aircraft take-offs and landings were assumed to be during the day, evening, and night? Airlines are still purchasing turbo-prop aircraft. Were these included in the noise estimates?

Response:

Aircraft fleet operations are broken down by departures, arrivals and day, evening or night operations. Please see Response to Comment SPC00274-56 regarding aircraft fleet mix and turboprop operations.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00275-58

Comment:

48. Alt. D estimates that cargo will triple by 2015. What cargo aircraft fleet mix was assumed? Many of the loudest nighttime aircraft are cargo flights taking off between 12:00 midnight and 2:00 a.m. How many cargo aircraft take-offs and landings were assumed to be during the day, evening, and night in the 2015 noise estimates?

Response:

Comment noted. Air cargo operations will not triple under Alternative D. Daily cargo operations are forecast to grow 2.3 percent annually. The commenter may be confused with the annual tons of cargo for the No Action/No Project Alternative. The aircraft fleet mix for noise analysis is included in Table S7, 2015 Average Annual Day Operations and Fleet Mix Alternative D of Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1, regarding air cargo activity/demand regarding air cargo activity and demand. Additionally, Table F-8 (1 of 3) through Table F-8 (3 of 3) located in Appendix F, Aircraft Operations and Passenger Activity Profiles, of the LAX Master Plan Addendum provides hourly breakdowns for forecast cargo operations. Also please see Subtopical Response TR-N-5.4 regarding the relationship of air cargo flights and night noise impacts.

SPC00275-59

Comment:

49. In Figure S4.2-16, Alt. D vs. 1996 Baseline, there is an indication that there would be over 1.5 dB increase in noise for the area near Sepulveda and Westchester Parkway, and an area extending eastward from the end of Runway 24L to approximately Western Ave, which is as wide as 9-10 blocks from La Cienega to La Brea. It is estimated, however, that these areas would still remain within the 65 dB contour. Are these 1.5 dB increases due to the New Larger Airplane (NLA) departures?

Response:

The commenter is correct in paraphrasing that there is a 1.5 dB increase identified in Figure S4.2-16, Alternative D 2015 vs. 1996 Baseline Areas Newly Exposed, of Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to Draft EIS/EIR. The increase in 1.5 CNEL can be attributed to the moving of Runway 6R/24L 340 feet south of the current centerline and 1,280 feet east. Additionally, there is a projected shifting of heavy operations to the north complex of which some will be NLA. The Draft LAX Master Plan assumes a number of New Large Aircraft (NLA) will serve LAX by 2015. Design day activity for Alternative D in 2015 would include 27 NLA operations per day, which also represents one percent of the total daily operations for Alternative D. The Integrated Noise Model 6.0C which is the FAA approved computer model used to predict noise impacts from aircraft operations does not contain noise data for the New Large Aircraft (NLA) Airbus 380 since the aircraft has not yet been developed. However, all alternatives and mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting appendices included NLA operations through the use of a "substitute" aircraft the Boeing 747-400. Additional noise information can be found in Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00275-60

Comment:

50. Was it assumed that the NLAs would be departing only from the north complex? Literature on the NLAs indicates that they would need a runway at least as long as 25R. Runway 24L would not be as long, even if the changes in Alt. D came to pass. Was the ground at either end of the runways included as runway length when determining aircraft safety requirements? Considering the size and weight of the NLAs, unimproved, unpaved ground is not adequate for problems that may occur during take-offs or landings. What would happen if the longest runways were not available, e.g., during maintenance or an accident?

Response:

The lengthening of runways in the Master Plan alternatives is to accommodate not only the New Large Aircraft (NLA) Airbus 380 which are projected to begin service in 2006, but also the aircraft in the current fleet like the Boeing 747s, Boeing 737-300 and MD-11. Runways that are lengthened to 12,000 feet in the LAX Master Plan Alternatives are to accommodate departures by the above aircraft at maximum takeoff weight in hot day conditions, reduce airfield congestion and eliminate excessive coordinated crossings in the air, thus reducing departure delays. Please see Response to Comment AL00040-153 regarding the A380 aircraft. Additionally, please see Response to Comment AL00022-188 for a more detailed discussion on the need for runway extension at LAX. Runoff areas are included as part of the designated runway length used for departure. In the event that the longest runway were not available it would be the respective airlines decision to determine whether to cancel a flight, divert the aircraft or depart using a shorter runway with a lighter payload.

SPC00275-61

Comment:

51. Figure S4.2-18 shows two areas, that would experience new exposure to 94 dBA SEL noise under Alt. D (as compared to the 1996 baseline). One area would be a rather narrow (3 to 6 blocks wide) corridor north of the north complex, running from La Tijera to almost Prairie Ave. The other area lies between the approaches to the north and south complex, running from La Cienega to Van Ness and from Century Blvd up to Manchester Blvd. Much of these areas qualify for Environmental Justice relief. Alt D. would expose almost 20,000 more people to this noise which is approximately equivalent to a gas lawn mower at 3 feet. What is not shown is what time of day these new noise impacts would occur - day, evening, or night? The time of day (or night) needs to be clearly defined. Also, there need to be specific mitigation measures included to handle single event noise impacts.

Response:

Minority and low-income communities newly exposed to single event high noise levels were evaluated for environmental justice relief as described in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice and shown on Figure S4.4.3-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. See also Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits proposed in light of identified disproportionately high and adverse aircraft noise impacts on minority and low-income communities.

As presented in Table S4.2-27 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative D, 18,050 residents would be newly exposed to 94 dBA SEL noise levels compared to 1996 baseline conditions. In addition, as stated in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.6.1.5.4.1) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the shift of the 94 dBA SEL noise contour associated with Alternative D, when compared to 1996 baseline conditions would result in the removal 19,300 residents from within the area exposed to significant nighttime single event noise levels. Regarding the time of day that new noise impacts would occur, as described in Section 4.1, Noise and 4.2, Land Use of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR the 94 dBA SEL noise contour represents single event noise levels that result in the awakening of 10 percent of the residents at least once every 10 days, between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

Regarding the number of times a day that single event noise thresholds are exceeded, these are not presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR since the 94 dBA SEL is based on an average frequency that would occur once in 10 days on average. Since the 94 dBA SEL that would occur under the build Alternative are modeled based on future conditions, the actual 94 dBA SEL will be reevaluated and adjusted by LAWA based on annual average conditions. This approach would be similar to evaluation of the 65 CNEL contour under the current ANMP and would therefore exclude any short-term 94 dBA noise levels that may have occurred as a result of abnormal operating conditions. Although the 94 dBA SEL is the single event noise threshold evaluated for nighttime events in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Tables S16, S17, S18, and S19 of Technical Report S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included an analysis of time in minutes above (TA) 65 dBA, 75 dBA, 85 dBA, and 95 dBA that would occur under the Master Plan Alternatives at a variety of locations based on average annual conditions.

Regarding specific mitigation measures for single event noise impacts, as stated in Section 4.2.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, MM-LU-2 would expand the boundaries of the ANMP to include residential uses newly exposed to high single event noise levels late at night that are outside the ANMP

3. Comments and Responses

boundaries based on the Master Plan alternative that is ultimately approved. Actual adjustments to the ANMP contour would be based on periodic reevaluation of the 94 dBA SEL noise contour by LAWA that would result from actual operating conditions under the Master Plan alternative that is ultimately approved. See Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the ANMP.

SPC00275-62

Comment:

52. Why are the predicted noise contours for Alt. D and NA/NP in 2015 about the same? The expected MAP and cargo in 2015 would also be about the same as NA/NP. So, if we would be able to handle the traffic with NA/NP, why go to a \$9 billion expense that would not provide more security, but would just transfer the security risk to the community?

Response:

Comment noted. 2015 No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D contours are similar due to the limitations on operations imposed by the use of four runways rather than five, as proposed for Alternatives A and B. Additionally, Alternative D (2,121) will only accommodate average annual day operations counts similar to those average annual day operations of the No Action/No Project Alternative (2,119). Please see Section 3.1.1, Alternative D Aircraft Operations and Fleet Mix, of Appendix S-C1, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, have required all airports to carefully consider airport design and projects to enhance airport safety and security. Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues.

SPC00275-63

Comment:

53. As we have the capability to explore "single event" cases for pollution sake, we believe noise pollution to be as dangerous as air or water pollution and therefore feel it should be studied within the EIR in both the single event and cumulative form.

University studies have documented that exposure to noise artificially raises blood pressure by at least 10 to 25 points. This presents a very real health threat and as the effects were noted to retain the higher pressure for at least 10 minutes, we feel the elevation can remain constant during peak noise times causing potential life threatening health risks. Can we please see what studies have been compiled to negate or create a mitigation for this problem in the EIR?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise. In addition, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise 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.

SPC00275-64

Comment:

54. We have read many studies documenting the noise levels surrounding many types of "plants" such as industrial and airport. The noise created by these uses create problems in the central nervous system resulting in low concentration levels, lower test scores and higher instances of A.D.D. Why is there no study discussing how to counteract these problems created by "Plan D" which calls for runways to be moved closer to residential areas?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise. Aircraft noise impacts associated with proposed changes under Alternative D, including the shift in the noise contour that would result from the relocation of runways closer to residential areas, were described in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft

EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analysis 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.

As further analyzed in subsection 4.2.6 and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D would result in a decrease in overall area and residential area exposed to high noise levels (defined by the 65 CNEL) and high single event noise levels (defined by the 94 dBA SEL) compared to future conditions that would exist if the LAX Master Plan was not approved, as represented by the No Action/No Project Alternative.

As described in subsection 4.1.4.1.1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, thresholds were developed to address single event noise levels and the ability of children to learn in the classroom. Sound insulation would be provided to eligible schools newly exposed to single event noise levels that result in classroom disruption, as stated under Mitigation Measures MM-LU-3 and MM-LU-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Additional mitigation measures are also presented in subsection 4.2.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to expand residential soundproofing under the ANMP to include residential and other noise-sensitive uses newly exposed to high noise levels or high single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening compared to 1996 baseline conditions.

SPC00275-65

Comment:

55. The FAA and LAWA have repeatedly admitted to the extreme noise levels created by this airport by designing and paying for "sound-proofing". Why is there no explanation of what steps they will take to mitigate the increased noise of moving the runways closer to El Segundo? As it is LAWA's choice to increase the size and nearness of the runways and to include the use of the newer airbus, why is there no mention of what noise levels we can expect from these combined incidents?

Response:

Comment noted. All mitigation measures with the related build alternatives 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-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The commentator is correct that under all build alternatives there will be some form of upgrade and relocation of the existing runways. Please see Response to Comment SPC00260-6 regarding NLA operations and noise levels. For more information on the NLA and its facility requirements please see Chapter IV, Facility Requirements of the LAX Draft Master Plan and Chapter 2, Alternative D Development and Refinement of the LAX Master Plan Addendum. Additional noise information can be found in Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.1, Noise and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, please see Response to Comment SAL00023-2 regarding the adequacy of noise-related mitigation measures and Response to Comment PC01377-9 for a discussion of potential noise impacts on the City of El Segundo.

SPC00275-66

Comment:

56. There have been some relatively new studies tying various forms of "rage" (road rage, line rage etc.) to noise exposure. In a plan that has been created to reduce risk and insure safer operations, why is there no allowance to further examine the validity of these studies on stress caused by noise exposure?

Response:

The above comment does not provide any specific scientific evidence or other basis for determining the nature, extent, and significance of noise-related health effects (including stress) due to any of the Master Plan alternatives. Pursuant to the intent and requirements of NEPA and CEQA, the purpose of the EIS/EIR is to assess, disclose, and compare the effects of each alternative currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. As stated in the Draft EIS/EIR, "Although there is consensus that

3. Comments and Responses

noise has some health effects, there is no agreement as to the degree of the effects or the level at which they become significant." Lacking any standards, scientific basis or other proven means for discerning the nature, level, and conditions at which a demonstrable effect on human health would or would not occur from aircraft noise, it would be speculative to draw conclusions regarding the health effects of noise related to stress particular to each alternative. Such speculation is contrary to the purpose and requirements of NEPA and CEQA. It should be noted that for each of the build alternatives, LAWA has concluded that the increases in operations at LAX would result in "potentially significant and unavoidable" adverse health effects. In addition, LAWA has proposed numerous steps to reduce exposure to aircraft noise. With the exception of hearing damage, there are no quantifiable standards to be used as a basis for impact assessment with respect to the health effects of noise. However, 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. In addition, please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a description of the various mitigation measures proposed to address significant noise impacts on sensitive surrounding land uses.

SPC00275-67

Comment:

57. Why are there NO guarantees that the southern or western most gates will not "reappear" to accommodate additional needs in upcoming years and where are the studies to reflect the effects on the overall noise contours of these potential uses?

Response:

In Alternative D, the north airfield modifications would eliminate the remote gates at the existing west pad facility and this area would be prohibited from use as a remote passenger boarding location. The new west satellite concourse would be constructed at one of the two locations of the existing remote commuter gates. One of the two ground run-up enclosure (GRE) facilities would be located on the existing Delta Airlines maintenance apron adjacent to the existing United Express maintenance facility at the other remote commuter aircraft boarding area.

The environmental analyses in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, including noise and air quality, have addressed the potential impacts under the most practical and most likely activity level for each alternative including Alternative D. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

SPC00275-68

Comment:

58. What is currently being done and where is the future plan to control the extensive ground noises frequently experienced by communities surrounding the airport, as they will exponentially increase? Since the north and south runways will be moved closer to residential areas, why haven't noise studies been done in regards to go-arounds/overflights impact on these neighborhoods?

Response:

Each development alternative incorporates the construction of one or more Ground Run-up Enclosures (GRE) within which all run-up activity would be conducted. These facilities, when properly designed, achieve a reduction of approximately 15-18 decibels over run-ups conducted without enclosure. For additional information regarding GRE's please see Response to Comment SPC00274-42. See Subtopical Response TR-N-5.3, regarding night run-up activity and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. Noise barriers are limited in their ability to mitigate noise 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 Subtopical Response TR-N-4.2, regarding berms, barriers, urban forest, walls proposed to interrupt ground noise. It is anticipated that the "fly around" (missed approach) pattern in the area will remain unchanged to assure safety of flight. For those alternatives with projected numbers of daily operations equivalent to baseline conditions (Alternatives No Action/No Project, C and D) the numbers of missed approaches should not change, and improved separation criteria and sequencing of operations may reduce them. For those alternatives with substantially increased operations (Alternatives A and B) the average number of arrivals on the runway will be reduced because a third approach runway is added in each alternative. Consequently, the number of missed approaches should be reduced. For further information about turns over El Segundo, please see Topical Response TR-N-3, regarding aircraft flight procedures.

SPC00275-69

Comment:

59. Is there going to be any time restriction on east-west overland operations such as the 12 midnight to 6 A.m. curfew that had recently been put in place on behalf of eastern corridor cities?

Response:

No curfews have recently been put in place on behalf of eastern corridor cities. However, LAWA's over-ocean procedures are in effect from 12:00 a.m. to 6:30 a.m. Please see Response to Comment SPC00275-48. LAWA will be pursuing a FAR Part 161 Study where east to west overland operations will be addressed. Mitigation Measure MM-N-5, Conduct Part 161 Study to Make Over Ocean Procedures Mandatory (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), shall be initiated to seek federal approval of a locally-imposed restriction on departures to and approaches from the east when over-ocean procedures are in effect. If passed this restriction will not impact airport operations when the airport is in east flow. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. Additionally, please see Section 4.1.5, Master Plan Commitments, and Section 4.1.8, Mitigation Measures, of Section S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00275-70

Comment:

60. The proof of the accuracy of noise studies should have been supplied by the applicant of the EIR that is asking for so many physical changes, which will create noise abuse to surrounding communities and negate the "friendly neighbor" statements including in the EIR.

Response:

Comment noted. The technical details of, and assumptions for, the noise analysis completed for the Draft EIS/EIR are provided in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report. Similarly, such information as related to the noise analysis completed for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is provided in Appendix S-C, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report. This information was made available for review and comment, including as related to any specific questions or concerns regarding its accuracy, by the public and agencies during the respective review periods for the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00275-71

Comment:

61. In reporting on noise sufficient for awakenings of persons adjacent to the airport, why did you not report on noise sufficient for annoyances? The decibel level used in the EIR for awakening levels is stated as 94 dBA for exterior and 81 dBA for interior. These levels are not compatible and in concert with the more widely accepted noise levels, both exterior and interior as stated currently by the World Health Organization. Why, for these tests and potential mitigation were the more universally acceptable standards of the World Health Organization used by LAWA?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-73 regarding annoyance and Response to Comment SPC00275-40 regarding use of FICAN for developing the nighttime noise analysis metric. There is no federal threshold of significance for single event noise impacts.

SPC00275-72

Comment:

62. Why is there no mitigation proposed for the severe noise cited for the People Mover?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00236-30 regarding the mitigation of APM noise.

SPC00275-73

Comment:

63. What provision has been made for the mitigation of noise, vibration, traffic and parking during construction? Specify the mitigations by phase of construction.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts related to noise, vibration, traffic, and parking that could occur during construction, as well as proposed mitigation measures to reduce or avoid such impacts, in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts.

SPC00275-74

Comment:

Notes on Transportation

64. We are now in the year 2003. Yet many of the estimates are based on 1996 (or, at best, 2000) data. Traffic on the 405 and 105 freeways has increased greatly from 2000 to the present. During the same period, there has been reduced airport traffic, so baseline figures need to be revised. Why are current traffic figures not used?

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addresses the baseline update in Appendix S-B, Existing Baseline Comparison Issues - 1996 to 2000.

Also, Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology. In particular, please see Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.12.2 regarding a summary of 1995 model validation and 1996 model update.

SPC00275-75

Comment:

65. Most traffic data seem to reflect peak-hour traffic, yet traffic has increased all during the day and night. Why are 24-hour traffic figures not included?

Response:

It is standard practice by LADOT and the Public Works Department of the County of Los Angeles to conduct traffic studies for AM and PM peak-hour traffic because those times reflect the worst case conditions during the day. If the project mitigates a significant impact during worst case conditions, then it will also mitigate that intersection during times when there is less traffic. LAWA agreed at the beginning of the project to also analyze airport peak-hour (11 AM to Noon) traffic conditions in addition to the usual AM and PM periods.

SPC00275-76

Comment:

66. Tables S4/3/2-3, S4.3.2-4, and S4.3.2-8, which discuss the number of intersections and freeways that would be affected, does not identify what the basis is for the baseline. This must be clearly stated and must reflect current figures.

Response:

As shown in Tables S4.3.2-3, S4.3.2-4 and S4.3.2-8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the baseline used is the Adjusted Environmental Baseline.

For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology. In particular, please see Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.5 regarding the No Action/No Project and Adjusted Environmental Baseline alternatives.

SPC00275-77

Comment:

67. Table S4.3.2-8 does not include the impact on off-airport surface transportation facilities during the a.m., p.m., and airport peak hours during the peak construction year (2008). Instead the Alt. D proposal states that "the project would be managed to ensure that there would not be any notable construction-related traffic generated by the project during those critical hours." How the traffic would be managed must be included.

Response:

Construction traffic would be managed through the contractors' contract requirements and overseen by LAWA's Ground Transportation Construction Coordination Office. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-3 regarding construction traffic.

SPC00275-78

Comment:

68. People will increase their efforts to avoid traffic on the freeways by using Culver Blvd and Pershing Drive. The levels of impact would be much higher than indicated in the tables listed. Also, drivers would continue to exit at the Howard Hughes Center and then spread out through the Westport Heights and Osage areas of Westchester, seeking access to the airport. Yet none of these intersections and/or roadway links was studied (Airport Blvd and 74th, 76th, and 78th; La Tijera and 74th, 78th-79th, and 83rd; Hindry and Aviation; Osage and Manchester). These traffic impacts must be included and mitigation measures must be included to prevent this cut-through traffic.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00274-62.

SPC00275-79

Comment:

69. What amount of traffic is being assumed for the LAX Northside facility? It seems that NA/NP figures are higher than Alt. D for this area. What was the assumption based on? This area has not been developed since the EIR was approved in 1983. Were the full entitlements charged (in terms of traffic and air pollution) to the NA/NP figures?

Response:

As was indicated in the description of Alternative D, specifically on page 3-48 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D includes a proposed reduction to the existing trip cap for LAX Northside. The proposed reduction would provide for a reduction of 50 percent in the LAX Northside trips allowed

3. Comments and Responses

during the A.M. peak hour and a 57 percent reduction in LAX Northside trips allowed during the P.M. peak hour. Those reductions to the existing trip cap would not occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. As such, the amount of traffic associated with LAX Northside, as addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would indeed be higher than that of Alternative D.

SPC00275-80

Comment:

70. How would trucks hauling dirt out and bringing construction materials in get from Westchester Parkway to the proposed Employee parking lot at the west end of the airport? Would they use airport property or Pershing Drive?

Response:

Trucks would use two routes to access the proposed employee parking lot on the west end of the airport. An on-airport access road would also be used on the south side of the airport, and Westchester Parkway-to-Pershing Drive-to World Way West.

SPC00275-81

Comment:

71. The extensive roadway bringing traffic into the proposed Ground Transportation Center (GTC), along with the adjacent people mover (APM), would create a terrorist target, as would the concentration of people in the proposed GTC. Terrorists do not target facilities alone, they target concentrated groups of people. Our committee members do not want the GTC, along with the terrorist opportunities, traffic problems, and air pollution, placed in the Westchester community and adjacent to the City of Inglewood.

The GTC could not be protected with hazardous materials, decontamination, bomb detection and disposal materials and staff. These would have to be transported from the airfield along city streets which would be immediately clogged and impassable if there were to be any kind of attack or accident. This leaves the traveling public and the community completely vulnerable. How would all the necessary emergency vehicles be able to gain access to the GTC? How could the GTC be evacuated in case of an emergency? What roads could/would be used? How would airport personnel be able to achieve an evacuation?

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX. In addition, please see Appendix I of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum.

SPC00275-82

Comment:

72. How would the general public be prohibited from entering the taxi holding area at the proposed GTC (especially if the entrance to the area is on Arbor Vitae)?

Response:

The general public would not be physically prohibited from the Commercial Vehicle Holding Area. However, the entrance would be signed to allow only commercial vehicles. There is no advantage for the general public to enter this facility since the exit from the CVHA to the GTC curbs would be controlled.

SPC00275-83

Comment:

73. Proposed parking areas for construction and airport employees need to be specified in detail, along with the access roads and additional traffic impacts.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR depicts the proposed parking areas for construction and airport employees in Figure S17 of Technical Report S-2a, Supplemental On-Airport Surface Transportation Technical Report. Details such as specific access and egress points for these areas will be developed during the design stage of the project. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR discusses the construction impact analyses in Technical Report S-2a, Supplemental On-Airport Surface Transportation Technical Report.

SPC00275-84

Comment:

74. While some of the proposals in Alt. D bear investigation, they could be done without expending over \$9 billion to achieve them. The LAXAAC would be interested in seeing some improvements made in the freeway access - especially the 405 and 105 freeway access into LAX. The Lennox interchange should be thoroughly explored.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00275-85

Comment:

75. Our committee members are in favor of the Fly Away program. Again, this program could continue to be expanded without developing Alt. D.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00275-86

Comment:

Comments on Definitions

76. In order to understand the potential impacts of Alternative 'D, ' it is extremely important to know the definition and interpretation of words that are used in this document. One of the more important words the public needs to understand is the word 'significant.'

The word "significant" is used throughout the SUPPLEMENT TO THE DRAFT EIS/EIR MASTER PLAN for LAX. We have come to the conclusion, after making several inquiries about the definition of the word "significant" to high-level Deputy Executive Directors of LAWA and others, that there is no one definition capable of applying to all instances of its use. The Executive Summary of this Supplemental Draft EIS/EIR does not address the definition of "significant." Therefore, it is necessary to ask the same question about similar but different statements included in the Supplemental Draft EIS/EIR. Please refer to the Executive Summary, Volume One of the Supplemental Draft of the EIS/EIR for titles and page numbers of the Executive Summary Tables. It would be helpful for the reader to have the definitions of the term "significant" (and similar qualifiers) spelled out where the term is used, so that the impacts described can be readily understood. Please do not use words that are synonymous with 'significant' to explain, define, and interpret the word 'significant,' Some of the words to avoid in explaining the definition are: important, meaningful, weighty, notable, profound, pivotal, serious, momentous,

3. Comments and Responses

substantial, and other synonyms of this type. Facts, figures, noise levels, estimated values, decibels, and comparisons would be greatly appreciated. Where NEPA or CEQA or other laws or agencies have defined thresholds for significance, it would be useful to include them or annotate them where the conclusions are reported.

In other words, be specific.

ES pages 51 through 76

4.1 Noise

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
7. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Roadway Noise

8. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
9. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Construction Noise

10. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.2 Land Use

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
7. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
8. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
9. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
10. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
11. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
12. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Surface Transportation

4.3.1 On-Airport

4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
7. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
8. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.3.2 Off-Airport

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.4.2 Relocation of Residences and Businesses

2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.4.4. Community Disruption from Alteration of Surface Transportation

2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.5 Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement)

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.6 Air Quality

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.9 Historic/Architectural, and Archeological/Cultural Resources

4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

7. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.92 Paleontological Resources (CEQA)

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.10 Biotic Communities (including both flora and fauna)

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

9. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

14. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.11 Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.12 Wetlands

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.13 Floodplains

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.14 Coastal Resources

3. Comments and Responses

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
7. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.17 Energy Supply and Natural resources

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.17.2 Natural Resources

3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.18 Light Emissions

3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.19 Solid Waste

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.21 Design, Art, and Architectural Application/Aesthetics

4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.22 Earth/Geology (CEQA)

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
7. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
8. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.23 Hazardous Materials

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
7. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
8. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
9. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.24 Human Health and Safety

4.24.1 Human Health Risk Assessment (CEQA)

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'Beneficial' as it is used in the sections of 2,5, and 6.

4.24.2 Health Effects of Noise (CEQA)

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.24.3 Safety (CEQA)

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.24 Public Utilities (CEQA)

4.25.1 Water Use (CEQA)

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.25.2 Wastewater (CEQA)

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.26 Public Services (CEQA) 4.26.1 Fire Protection

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
6. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
7. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.26.2 Law Enforcement (CEQA)

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
5. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.26.3 Parks and Recreation (CEQA)

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.26.4 Libraries (CEQA)

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

4.27 Schools (CEQA)

1. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

3. Comments and Responses

2. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
3. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.
4. Please define, explain, quantify, and interpret the word 'significant' as it is used in this section.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01835-10 regarding an explanation of thresholds of significance and where thresholds of significance were identified in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00276 Weis, Brian None Provided 11/6/2003

SPC00276-1

Comment:

The Sepulveda tunnel passes under all the south runways and taxiways for LAX. The location of the tunnel relative to the runway length is about at the 40% length position. This 3-lane roadway is also Pacific Coast Highway which is a major north/south corridor providing access to the communities in the South Bay and West side of Los Angeles, in addition to access into and around LAX.

The world witnessed how a truck bomb made with ordinary fertilizer and diesel fuel destroyed the massive Federal Building in Oklahoma City, OK. Such an attack could destroy the south runways and taxiways. Assuming nothing is done to totally eliminate the possibility of such an attack from occurring, i.e. move the start of the south runways west of the tunnels, or eliminate the tunnels by rerouting the road, and an attack occurs.

Such an attack could destroy the south runways and taxiways. Assuming nothing is done to totally eliminate the possibility of such an attack from occurring, i.e. move the start of the south runways west of the tunnels, or eliminate the tunnels by rerouting the road, and an attack occurs. Assuming LAWA will not

How will LAWA shield itself from the catastrophic economic fallout of the lost revenue from lost cargo operations and the attendant loss of passenger traffic? The fall from losing 50% of the runways at LAX and essentially all the cargo capacity from such a disaster would be devastating.

The public outcry, critics and politicians would most likely not allow LAWA to rebuild a tunnel ever again, even with improvements and vehicle limitations, etc.

What would be LAWA's contingency plan be to get the south runways operational again? Why does LAWA not address this huge security problem (the tunnels) that no other major airport has in the world?

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX. In addition, please see Appendix I of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum.

SPC00277 Weis, Brian None Provided 11/6/2003

SPC00277-1

Comment:

Security by definition requires the restriction of access. Security can only be as strong as the easiest access point to the area trying to be secured (a chain is only as strong as its weakest link).

The Sepulveda tunnel passes under all the south runways and taxiways for LAX. The location of the tunnel relative to the runway length is about at the 40% length position. This 3-lane roadway is also

3. Comments and Responses

Pacific Coast Highway which is a major north/south corridor providing access to the communities in the South Bay and West side of Los Angeles, in addition to access into and around LAX.

The world witnessed how a truck bomb made with a few hundred gallons of diesel fuel and ordinary fertilizer destroyed the massive Federal Building in Oklahoma City, OK. A similar attack but much larger in size several thousand gallons could destroy the south runways and taxiways. Assuming nothing is done to totally eliminate the possibility of such an attack from occurring, i.e. move the start of the south runways west of the tunnels, or eliminate the tunnels by rerouting the road, and an attack occurs.

Will LAWA carry sufficient "Terrorist Act Insurance" to prevent the tax payers from ultimately servicing the debt of the project, since the project debt will no longer be paid by landing fees from the airlines, LAX related concessions and bonds holders, which will experience an overwhelming loss of business?

The Federal Government may cover the replacement of the damaged buildings, etc., but certainly not all the lost revenue over the time to return operational.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX. In addition, please see Appendix I of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum.

SPC00278 Weis, Brian None Provided 11/6/2003

SPC00278-1

Comment:

Building any of the alternatives, except no change alternative will involve a tremendous level of disruption to the surrounding community in regards to construction traffic, noise, dirt and dust, etc., which will last for several years. This will undoubtedly have a negative effect on the quality of life as well as the value of the homes forever after.

Has LAWA included the cost of litigation and settlements for class action suit plaintiffs over airport changes that effect the noise level and value of the homes after the project?

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to traffic, noise, air quality, and other quality of life-related topics that would occur during construction in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed 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-2, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding residential property values, and Topical Response TR-ST-3 regarding construction traffic.

The comment regarding the cost of litigation and settlements is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00279 Weis, Brian None Provided 11/6/2003

SPC00279-1

Comment:

Alternative D includes creating rental car parking lots and extending the north runway further east and moving the southern most runway further south. Both of these changes, compared to the no change alternative will undoubtedly greatly increase the noise levels and traffic for residents in the adjacent area.

Has LAWA included the cost of litigation and settlements for class action suit plaintiffs over airport changes that effect the noise level and value of the homes after the project?

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 and S-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

The comment regarding the cost of litigation and settlements is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00280 Weis, Brian None Provided 11/6/2003

SPC00280-1

Comment:

Increasing capacity at LAX does nothing to reduce the traffic on the 405 which carries the bulk of all passengers to LAX. The huge building growth in Orange County will only continue to add to the traffic burden to the 405 going to LAX.

Why does LAWA continue to "put all the eggs in one basket" with LAX and not advocate a regional approach that would add some redundancy and traffic mitigation?

Response:

Federal law prohibits LAWA from using airport revenues to reduce existing traffic congestion on the I-405 Freeway or other off-airport roadways. LAWA is further prohibited from using airport revenues to prevent future traffic congestion caused by non-airport development. However, off-airport roadway and intersection improvements are proposed when they are needed to offset traffic impacts expected by implementation of the LAX Master Plan. These proposed mitigations are described in Section 4.3.2.8 of Chapter 4.3.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

LAWA does support a regional approach to aviation demand in Southern California. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

SPC00281 Weis, Brian None Provided 11/6/2003

SPC00281-1

Comment:

How can LAWA justify spending many billions of dollars on a LAX which only adds about an additional ten million annual passengers over the maximum carried in during the peak travel year? In comparison

3. Comments and Responses

to the advantage provided by having another larger capacity airport in the region which, would add some redundancy and traffic mitigation.

Response:

LAWA and Mayor Hahn have developed Alternative D in response to the concerns of the public that the City of Los Angeles should participate in a regional solution for the fair and reasonable distribution of air service. Alternative D is consistent with the "fair share" that is allocated to LAX by SCAG in its regional plan.

Alternative D emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. Alternative D will improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand.

LAWA has recently made large investments at Ontario, including a new terminal building. A Master Plan is currently underway that will recommend further improvements to meet the projected demand for this Inland Empire airport.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 that discusses 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 underway.

Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 for more detail about planning for LAX and the other airports in the region, and Topical Responses TR-RC-1 and TR-RC-5 regarding LAWA's planning for Ontario and Palmdale.

SPC00282 Weis, Brian None Provided 11/6/2003

SPC00282-1

Comment:

How will LAWA guarantee that the project is paid for not by the taxpayers, but as planned through landing fees from the airlines, LAX related concessions and bonds holders in the event of unforeseen cost overruns and the possibility of future terrorist events which would greatly reduce travel to LAX?

Response:

The proposed master plan improvements would be funded with a combination of FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, and other state/federal grants. No general tax dollars will be used to pay for any of the proposed on-airport improvements.

The bonds being used one of the project funding sources are general airport revenue bonds. These bonds are repaid from airport revenues generated from airport users. The bonds are guaranteed only by the revenues from the airport. They are not backed by the City of Los Angeles or the State of California.

SPC00283 Weis, Brian None Provided 11/6/2003

SPC00283-1

Comment:

Security by definition requires the restriction of access. Security can only be as strong as the easiest access point to the area trying to be secured ("a chain is only as strong as its weakest link").

The Sepulveda tunnel passes under all the south runways and taxiways for LAX. The location of the tunnel relative to the runway length is about at the 40% length position. This 3-lane roadway is also

3. Comments and Responses

Pacific Coast Highway which is a major north/south corridor providing access to the communities in the South Bay and West side of Los Angeles, in addition to access into and around LAX.

The world witnessed how a truck bomb made with ordinary fertilizer and diesel fuel destroyed the massive Federal Building in Oklahoma City, OK. Such an attack could destroy the south runways and taxiways. Assuming nothing is done to totally eliminate the possibility of such an attack from occurring, i.e. move the start of the south runways west of the tunnels, or eliminate the tunnels by rerouting the road, and an attack occurs.

How would a massive, multiple truck bomb attack, which could easily be carried out by simply driving trucks or busses into the tunnels and simultaneously detonating them be prevented?

What is LAWA's contingency plan to handle all the cargo carriers, since nearly all cargo carriers are located east of the tunnels which would cutoff access to load planes if such a disaster occurs?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00276-1.

SPC00284 Weis, Brian None Provided 11/6/2003

SPC00284-1

Comment:

Security by definition requires the restriction of access. Security can only be as strong as the easiest access point to the area trying to be secured ("a chain is only as strong as its weakest link").

The Sepulveda tunnel passes under all the south runways and taxiways for LAX. The location of the tunnel relative to the runway length is about at the 40% length position. Accordingly, the runway is needed for both take offs and landings. This 3-lane (each direction) roadway is also Pacific Coast Highway which is a major north/south corridor providing access to the communities in the South Bay and West side of Los Angeles, in addition to access into and around LAX.

What other major airports in the world have unrestricted public highways that pass under the mid section of the runways?

If any exist, how do they secure their tunnels to prevent a massive truck bomb attack?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00276-1.

SPC00285 Hetz, Matthew None Provided 11/5/2003

SPC00285-1

Comment:

I write regarding the proposed expansion of Los Angeles International Airport, LAX, under plans put forth by the Los Angeles World Airport, LAWA, and James Hanh, the Mayor of Los Angeles. The favored plan is no Schedule D. I am concerned about security, particularly the grouping of all passengers onto one area outside the airport proper. I think this would make it easier for acts of terrorism to occur as the grouped masses of people would make for easier targets.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00285-2**Comment:**

I also do not see how this would solve ground transportation problems at LAX.

Response:

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

SPC00285-3**Comment:**

However, in whatever configuration that is approved, or even if the changes keep the basic configuration of LAX as it now stands, there must be better mass transit to LAX. This includes the continuation of the Green Line light rail closer to the airport and connected to some type of transit system that would move passengers from the Green Line to the airport. There is a proposal from LAWA for an automated People Mover system, which is acceptable, but it must be directly connected to the Green Line. LAWA must also assume financial responsibility for any mitigation efforts that may be required to deal with any electromagnetic and or electronic interference that may hypothetically occur between the radar and communication signals of the jets and ground communication and the Green Line power lines. This must be done to ensure that the Green Line continues north to Westchester and beyond so that residents north of LAX have mass transit options. Schedule D plan has no consideration for mass transit for residents north of LAX.

Response:

Federal law prohibits use of airport revenue from being used for extending the Green Line. This would include assuming financial responsibility for mitigation efforts that may be required to deal with any electromagnetic and/or electronic interference that may occur between the radar and communication signals of the jets and ground communication and the Green Line power lines. However, Alternative D does not preclude the MTA from extending the Green Line northerly in their right-of-way along the west side of Aviation Boulevard, if it chooses to do so. Also, please see Response to Comments SPHL00022-2, SPHL00026-1 and SPHL00004-6 regarding the Green Line.

SPC00286**Allen, William****HFH Ltd.****11/6/2003****SPC00286-1****Comment:**

H.F.H., LTD. has owned property in the Westchester Central Business District for close to 20 years. I wish to express our grave concerns with Alternate D proposed Master Plan Improvements for LAX. We very much oppose this plan for several reasons:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00286-2**Comment:**

1. The forced relocation of residents of Manchester Square seems unfair and will have a disastrous effect upon local business that now serve those residents.

Response:

Comment noted. The Manchester Square area is being acquired through the existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program, in support of LAWA's ANMP. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.2 regarding relocation.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00286-3

Comment:

2. Plan D, now pegged to cost in excess of \$8 billion, appears to offer no real security enhancements. It would be very wasteful of taxpayer's money.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see 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. Alternative D is designed to improve the safety and security of the airport.

SPC00286-4

Comment:

3. Plan D will likely result in excessive inconveniences for LAX passengers. The extended demolition/construction period will be incredibly disruptive to the local area for several years.

Response:

As was described in Section 4.20.3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, construction associated with Alternative D is anticipated to last approximately 10 years. The potential for community disruption due to construction activities associated with Alternative D was described in Section 4.4.4.6.3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As stated therein, during construction there would be the potential for temporary detours and congestion from construction traffic, although haul routes and construction areas would generally be to the south of the Westchester Community and north of El Segundo. Master Plan Commitments and mitigation measures to reduce construction impacts are presented in Sections 4.20.5 and 4.20.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Implementation of Master Plan Commitments C-1, ST-9, and ST-12 through ST-22 would reduce the potential for community disruption impacts from construction activities. These commitments involve establishing a ground transportation/construction coordination office, managing construction traffic, developing a detour plan and designated truck routes, limiting short-term lane closures and imposing closure restrictions on existing roadways. However, even with the implementation of these commitments construction-related traffic impacts would be significant at Century Boulevard (between Aviation Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard).

SPC00286-5

Comment:

4. I am aware that Mr. David Janssen, the Chief Administrative Officer of the County of Los Angeles has contacted you citing several elements of the environmental review which are seriously flawed. It would be a shame to waste any more taxpayers' money in an attempt to fix the EIR as well as trying to "spin" this disastrous plan to appear more palatable.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00286-2 through SPC00286-4 above. Also, The County of Los Angeles' October 28, 2003 and November 3, 2003 comment letters on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are identified as comment letters SAL00013 and SAL00014, respectively. For responses to these comments, please see responses to comment letters SAL00013 and SAL00014.

3. Comments and Responses

noise. Mitigation measures are addressed in Section 4.1.8, Mitigation Measures, of Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2.8, Mitigation Measures, of Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The application of the Part 161 Study does not imply that all easterly departures between midnight and 6:30 a.m. would be eliminated. During periods of Santa Ana weather when easterly winds exceed 10 knots, or during periods of coastal fog when the visibility is severely limited west of the airport, safety considerations will require the use of east flow operations, and all traffic will take off to the east. Such conditions now account for the great majority of easterly takeoffs that occur during the year. No change is proposed for these existing procedures during high wind or low visibility periods. The commenter's concerns regarding lack of local airport control are acknowledged. However, federal laws regarding airports and their related noise preempt any state or local laws regarding aircraft noise levels. 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 Section 4.2, Land Use, human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00288-2

Comment:

Alternative D has been proposed as an attempt to provide safety and security. In reality it simply relocates at great expense any possible threat closer to and into residential neighborhoods

The concept of bringing all passengers to one security checkpoint (Ground Transportation Center) provides a much better target for even the least skilled of terrorist. If anyone would foolishly believe that deterring terrorism is the goal, why on earth would you gather potential victims together into one bigger target as opposed to spreading potential victims out at several smaller targets?

Response:

As discussed in Section 2.2.8, Ground Transportation Center (GTC), of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum, Alternative D would separate the commercial and private vehicle landside components from the passenger terminal facilities and gates in the CTA. This would eliminate the threat of blast in close proximity to large congregations of queuing passengers at functions, such as ticketing and baggage claim. While the threat of a vehicular blast can never be fully eliminated, limiting large congregation of passengers by moving ticketing, security screening, and baggage claim to the CTA would improve passenger safety and security. Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which discusses how the GTC would decrease concentrations of people compared to the existing CTA.

SPC00288-3

Comment:

The Alternative D plan only serves as a flimsy veil to disguise the incremental footprint expansion of a greedy cash hungry entity.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00288-4

Comment:

That a fly away is considered just a three major intersection drive from the GTC is further insult to the community already suffering from significant noise impacts, air quality issues, and traffic congestion. To imply that traffic is reduced by the flyaway is simply untrue. Passengers will still come to the area in personal vehicles. The vehicles will not avoid the freeways, nor will they avoid the surface streets. They will simply speed through our residential neighborhoods, barely missing most of our pedestrians, spew more toxins in our community and provide another target for terrorism in our neighborhood when they drive to and park at the fly away. While some might suggest that the Hollywood Park property is perfect

3. Comments and Responses

since it is has been a parking lot for many years that logic fails to take into consideration that the racing season is an extremely limited number of days and certainly was not a 24 hour/ seven day operation.

Response:

LAWA will work in close coordination with the City of Inglewood regarding the location and design of the proposed FlyAway facility. The necessary environmental approval for a FlyAway would need to be obtained from the City of Inglewood. If the City of Inglewood does not approve of a FlyAway in their city, then LAWA will pursue other locations.

SPC00288-5

Comment:

The Consolidation of Rental Car Facilities claims to reduce the number of shuttle vans in the Central Passenger Area. News Flash! Fewer shuttle van trips could currently be realized if a shuttle van financed by several rental agencies delivered customers to various car rental agencies. This would simply reverse what they do when the car return customers/airline passengers are dropped off at various airline terminals. The same traffic reduction concept could be used for all Century to La Cienega area Hotels. Much of the concern about lost car rental return drivers could be solved by making the roadside directional signs large enough to read (They currently are in small print in unlit areas. Only those stopped near the signs with excellent vision can read the "directional signage").

Response:

Because the rental car companies are competitors and located in various locations, it is difficult for LAWA to force them to consolidate their bus operations. Each company wants to provide their customers with premium service, and as such, wants to be the first company whose customers are dropped off after leaving the airport. However, a rental car courtesy bus reduction program is currently being tested. LAWA is also working with the LA Visitors and Convention Bureau to see whether a consolidated shuttle bus operation could work for the hotel shuttle bus operators.

SPC00288-6

Comment:

Out of date statistics, absolute contradictions (i.e.: There will be no home acquisitions Vs, relocation and eviction costs), insufficient data, and unrealistic conclusions fill the pages of the EIR.

Response:

The comment does not provide any specific examples or section citations of where such problems occur in the Draft EIS/EIR or the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Property acquisition and relocation impacts were addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00288-7

Comment:

Among the most ridiculous is that the same entity which eliminated so many homes in its prior growth spurts (Playa Del Rey, Westchester, Airport Junior High) would somehow now manage to function at the proposed 78 Million Annual Passenger level. It is no secret that LAWA does not turn airplanes away per FAA restrictions. To pretend that voluntary cut back in flight schedules would happen is less than sincere, much like believing a bowl of candy in an grammar school lunch area would not be emptied if children were told one time that the candy was for those promising to do all their homework. The SCAG concept of limiting capacity to 78 MAP is already violated by the .9 million addition within the EIR!

To imply that such a capacity limit will be implemented is not followed through with even a single realistic method for limitation. If a full 78 MAP is reach by October 15th of any year, are local residents to believe the airport will magically close its skyward doors and place a "Sorry we're closed" sign in the air? We've lived the ALWAYS OPEN experience!!

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SAR00005-18 regarding the ability of LAWA and federal government to limit the activity at LAX and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels.

SPC00288-8

Comment:

With an anticipated increase in Cargo, what better target for terrorism could be created? Not only would the local areas be at risk, 75% of the goods serving the entire SCAG region could be halted. The Orange County elite somehow seems to believe their essential goods should pollute the air, cause sleepless nights, and present traffic problems only for others. Master plan designers have demonstrated their agreement with that opinion. This action reminds me of the school yard children that bully a weaker child because the teacher hasn't stopped them. To concentrate cargo deliveries in one area one must assume the cargo does not get to Orange County or San Diego by magic carpet. The failure to address the ground traffic impact is consistent with the other "send the problem to Minority Communities like Lennox and Inglewood" attitudes which are prevalent throughout the EIR/EIS.

Response:

Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than passenger and cargo capacity increases. Cargo cannot be moved simply to suit the needs of the airport. The airlines select airports to best serve their customers and minimize costs. LAWA is working with the LAX all-cargo airlines and freight forwarders to provide incentives to use Ontario and Palmdale for cargo destined for or originating near the airport. LAWA's master plan updates for Ontario and Palmdale will likely provide for increased cargo capacity at both airports. Neither LAWA nor the FAA can force these companies to use Ontario or Palmdale.

SPC00288-9

Comment:

It is short sighted to present the proposals of "Safety and Security" as anything more than a cash grabbing attempt to place even a further burden on those least able to defend themselves. To believe that the community leaders (Inglewood City Council, Inglewood Unified School District and the Inglewood Chamber of Commerce) actually represent the wishes and interests of the people of Inglewood, one must ignore some basic facts. The residents were throughout the comment period NEVER given the opportunity, by their own City Elected, to see a presentation of the Master Plans Alternatives complete with impacts, to contribute their thoughts on the plan, or to vocalize their concerns regarding what comments were to be submitted on their behalf. These same politicians currently face a lawsuit regarding their unwillingness to adhere to the roll back of their 400% Salary Increase. This despite 70% of the voters desire that they reverse the full time pay for the less than part time attendance.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

SPC00288-10

Comment:

The historic practice of the wealthy getting wealthier at the expense of the health and well being of the less fortunate by simply paying off a few, appears to be no strange concept to the LAX Safety and Security plan. The burdens of the greater society once again will be placing an even greater significant burden on those of color and less financially able to hire environment justice attorneys, this may in fact be a significant part of the plan. The elected may be comfortable exchanging the health, safety and future livability of the community for the trinkets of a few low paying jobs and contract arrangements for their friends. Those who agree to the Master Plan may be viewed by historians as similar to the greedy Slave traders-who sold their countrymen in the name of economic development. They may also be

3. Comments and Responses

compared to the too trusting Indian Leaders who accepted the disease carrying blankets from the "thoughtful" army, or the unwise original occupants of Manhattan who traded for a few necklaces.

Response:

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

SPC00288-11

Comment:

The obvious political pay back of tax dollars amongst family members and friends should not be overlooked:

Former LAWA Executive Director Lydia Kenard persuaded the Inglewood City Council to approve the February 6, 2001 Memorandum of Understanding. This document was not made available for public comment but rather voted on in closed session without public disclosure until after it was voted on. Her sister Gail Kenard later received a consultant contract to design the City's Senior Citizens Center. Then surprise, surprise, behind closed doors the City response to the EIR/EIS, again without public input calls for a "firm, binding commitment to fund new senior housing."

Coincidentally the Ministers of the Church now occupying the once fabulous Forum appeared at SCAG to sing the need for the Arbor Vitae Interchange for its Congregation. You know, the one that meets on Sunday when there is no rush hour traffic, which rarely has any events scheduled other than Sundays except when they get the Taxpayers to pay \$20,000 for the one High School Graduation event. Is it a mystery which church is meant in the City's EIR response of a "firm binding commitment to sound attenuate .. noise impacted churches"

The most entertaining of course is "a firm, binding commitment to fund the replacement of the existing YMCA at 102nd Street and Prairie" This must be the one carefully disguised to resemble a tumbleweed patch - so well done, not a single child has enjoyed the non-existent basketball court or non-existent swimming pool. But hey, it sounds good! Just like the "New Police Station Property" which Inglewood residents were promised as a gift from Hollywood Park for their "no negative impact" casino improvements - AKA: the hooker magnet

Lest I forget, there's the golly, gee whiz, wow you'll get so much tax revenue Casino itself which of course was granted a Tax Relief Schedule after it so passionately appealed before SCAG that its traffic generation alone required the Arbor Vitae Interchange. Now the City EIR response stipulates a "firm binding commitment to locate a fly away facility at the proposed location of the corner of Prairie Avenue and Century Blvd Is this yet another example of the great return value of campaign contributions?

Alas, alas, I do believe one does not need corrective lasik surgery to see the connections My community will be paying dearly with their quality of life for those well invested (in campaigns) to fly to and play with those in the big houses to the North Does anyone actually believe this proposal would be considered for even a minute if it weren't for those election time donations and carefully crafted pleas of Inglewood's Partners for Oppression? In the final analysis the Safety/Security and Expansion Plans of LAX are no less disgusting than the imitation irritation we exhibit over third world child labor issues. As long as a few can reap the benefit the majority are content that many are abused in the name of Profit Margin.

Isn't that a wonderful legacy for the generation to come? No doubt history will repeat itself, I only hope it will not be Inglewood where the destruction of homes, neighborhoods, and an entire community is overlooked in the name of greed, with only a footnote to describe the incredible sacrifice.

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

SPC00289

Galanter, Ruth

Galanter and Company

11/5/2003

SPC00289-1

Comment:

Having followed for over 16 years the various master plans proposed for LAX expansion, I wish to state unequivocally that you still haven't got it right. Alternative D is different, but it is not an improvement for the following reasons:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00289-2

Comment:

it requires rebuilding a substantial part of the existing airport, tearing down terminals, parking lots, and other facilities in order to rebuild them elsewhere

it requires construction of new roadways, which will necessarily involve displacement of other (job- and revenue-producing) activities

Response:

Comment noted. These improvements to safety, security, and ground transportation efficiency will meet the long-term needs of LAX and permit the airport to generate higher levels of employment and create other economic benefits.

SPC00289-3

Comment:

it will remove desperately needed housing, which will not be replaced

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing.

SPC00289-4

Comment:

it will decimate those commercial centers LAX has left standing from previous expansions, which removed substantial amounts of the customer base

Response:

Comment noted. The Master Plan is considered separate from growth and expansion that has occurred at LAX in the past. Relative to businesses in Westchester that may be affected by Master Plan implementation, please see Response to Comment PC00013-5 and Response to Comment AL00018-1. As discussed therein, under all of the Master Plan alternatives the LAX Northside/Westchester Southside property would be developed as a community commercial "village" with a variety of land uses intended to benefit Westchester residents and accommodate many of the displaced uses. Additionally, Alternative D would not involve acquisition of any businesses, including community-serving retail businesses, located within the Westchester Business District. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding the potential effects of the Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

SPC00289-5**Comment:**

construction will disrupt both airport operations and the surrounding communities for at least a decade, probably more

Response:

Comment noted.

Figure S3-15 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is a Conceptual Summary Schedule for construction of components of LAX Master Plan Alternative D. According to this conceptual schedule and if the appropriate approvals are received, construction would begin in the third quarter of 2004 and cease in the fourth quarter of 2014.

Construction would be carried out in a manner consistent with environmental laws in place that require the mitigation, to the greatest extent possible, of impacts on communities in the airport area.

Please see the Construction Impacts section of Chapter 4.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00289-6**Comment:**

alleged increases in safety and security are unproven and have been seriously challenged by several expert reviews

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00289-7**Comment:**

all these activities will create deterioration of air quality, ground mobility, and public health for no conceivable benefit except somebody's giant ego trip.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses were provided in Appendix G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, and 14a of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, S-4 and S-9a of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00289-8**Comment:**

Alternative D is bad aviation planning, and it is bad public policy. It is bad aviation policy because intensifying concentration of aviation at one difficult-to-access location means passengers and cargo must travel ever more hours to reach the airport. A regional approach, diversifying closer to where the people and the cargo originate, would save time and aggravation, produce less air pollution, and decrease the chances of a terrorist act or an accident wiping out air capacity in the region.

Response:

The commentor ignores the constraints on LAX under Alternative D or its relationship to the regional demand for air transportation services. Alternative D emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other

3. Comments and Responses

airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

SPC00289-9

Comment:

It is bad public policy because it will intensify both the acute housing shortage and the acute shortage of school classrooms, both of which cost more to replace than to maintain.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing. Under Alternative D only one private school, Westchester Neighborhood School, is proposed for acquisition and relocation. As indicated in Table 2.7-2, Alternative D - Parcel Detail of Acquisition Areas, in Chapter 2.7 of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum, this school is targeted for relocation at LAX Northside. Refer to Section 4.27, Schools (subsection 4.27.7.1), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a discussion of cumulative impacts on schools, relative to enrollment, which would be less than significant. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, in particular Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.15 regarding the existing and proposed ANMP related to schools.

SPC00289-10

Comment:

It will also, I suspect, eliminate as many jobs as it might create.

Response:

Comment noted. Employment impacts associated with Alternative D were evaluated in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As discussed therein, during the initial years of the Master Plan under Alternative D, employment growth similar to that projected for the other alternatives would occur; by 2015 Alternative D would support about 350,557 jobs in the Los Angeles region. As further described in Technical Report S-3, Supplemental Economic Impacts Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the decline in total jobs over the planning period shows that productivity increases over time, which would occur irregardless of Alternative D, would outweigh the net additional jobs associated with the limited growth in annual passenger and cargo levels under this alternative.

SPC00289-11

Comment:

That said, let us look at the DEIS/DEIR. The entire DEIS/DEIR is seriously flawed by its failure to include as a project alternative the dispersion of airport capacity. All you have done is compare proposals for expanding LAX, leaving the Board of Airport Commissioners and the Mayor and City Council with inadequate information to make a sensible decision benefiting the maximum number of people and communities. Furthermore, Alternative D is arguably a totally different project from Alternatives A, B, and C with which you do compare them. Since the proposed road system is different, the configuration of terminals is different, the traffic patterns for passengers are different, you need different studies, not just extra paragraphs tagged on to the old ones for the earlier projects.

Response:

Comment noted. The analysis of Alternative D completed for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included comprehensive studies similar to those completed earlier for the Draft EIS/EIR evaluation of the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, and C. As such, a comprehensive evaluation of all of the alternatives has been completed, and includes and addresses the project characteristics particular to each alternative. It should be noted that NEPA requires that the impacts of the proposed action alternatives be compared to the No Action Alternative, and CEQA requires that the impacts of the proposed project and the project alternatives be compared to the environmental baseline

(i.e., existing conditions). There are no requirements under NEPA or CEQA for direct comparisons of the alternatives themselves.

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

SPC00289-12

Comment:

The single biggest environmental issue in Southern California is our air quality. No adequate study has been done to evaluate the effect on local residents, schools, and recreation areas of additional air traffic and the additional ground traffic proposed in this plan on congestion, resulting additional air pollution from ground traffic, and air toxics from airplane fuel. Surely the LAUSD or some entity with the US Department of Health and Human Services has the means to determine what will happen to the children of Lennox (and their teachers and parents), but this has not been done. Why not?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses were provided in Appendix G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Please see Response to Comment PC00599-5 for a discussion of epidemiological studies (studies of human populations).

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

The health risk assessment assessed risks and hazards for locations throughout a large geographic area, extending into communities adjacent to, and north, east, and south of LAX. Risks were calculated for individuals assumed to be exposed for almost all days of the year and for many years (up to 70) to maximize estimates of possible exposure. Risks and hazard estimates for communities including Lennox were discussed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR; also included in this section were figures presenting the geographical extent of incremental cancer risks and health hazards by community under post-mitigation conditions in 2015 for Alternatives A, B, C, and D. Additional figures presenting the geographical extent of incremental cancer risks and health hazards by community under pre-mitigation conditions and for interim years are available in Technical Report S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

After implementation of mitigation measures, the build alternatives would reduce predicted impacts to human health compared with the No Project/No Action Alternative. Implementation of any of the build alternatives is therefore anticipated to reduce future health impacts for most people living, working or going to school near the airport. However, as was indicated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, predicted chronic non-cancer human health impacts for maximally exposed residents under Alternatives B and C are slightly higher for some areas than those predicted with the No Project/No Action Alternative. Alternative D was added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. As stated in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment (subsection 4.24.1.7.3) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAX emissions under Alternative D would reduce cumulative cancer risks for all areas near the airport relative to the other future year alternatives, including the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00289-13

Comment:

Much has been written about the negative economic impacts as well as the negative environmental impacts arising from traffic jams, but not in this report. Your report should evaluate the difference in congestion increases between this plan and regional dispersion of the anticipated increase in air traffic. Surely the studies of congestion caused by trucks going to/from the Port of Los Angeles have lessons to teach us here.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identify project-related traffic impacts and propose mitigation of these impacts.

To the degree that our plan fails in regional dispersion of air traffic, we do indeed evaluate these impacts. However, the SCAG dispersion of air traffic is not considered to be a realistic goal of this Master Plan; thus, its traffic benefits are not evaluated.

With respect to the regional air traffic, LAWA is currently preparing separate Master Plans for Ontario International Airport and Palmdale Airport. Surface transportation in the vicinity of these LAWA facilities will be studied as part of those Master Plans.

SPC00289-14

Comment:

In light of the fact that prevailing winds will blow any increased air pollution over the communities of Lennox, Inglewood, and South Los Angeles, what is the differential impact of this proposal on majority and minority communities? How does that compare with the potential impacts of a dispersed regional expansion instead of a concentration at LAX?

Response:

Please refer to TR-EJ-3 regarding regional aviation demand and environmental justice. Please refer to Section 4.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.4.3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding impacts on minority and low-income populations. Figures presenting the geographical extent of incremental cancer risks and health hazards by community under post mitigation conditions in 2015 for Alternatives A, B, C and D are presented in Section 4.24 Human Health and Safety (CEQA) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Figures presenting risk and hazards for communities include: Figure S4.24.1-13 Geographical Extent of Incremental Cancer Risks and Health Hazards, Compared to Baseline 1996, Horizon Year 2015 Post Mitigation Conditions, Alternative A, Figure S4.24.1-16, Geographical Extent of Incremental Cancer Risks and Health Hazards, Compared to Baseline 1996, Horizon Year 2015 Post Mitigation Conditions, Alternative B, Figure S4.24.1-17, Geographical Extent of Incremental Cancer Risks and Health Hazards, Compared to Baseline 1996, Horizon Year 2015 Post Mitigation Conditions, Alternative C, and Figure S4.24.1-18, Geographical Extent of Incremental Cancer Risks and Health Hazards, Compared to Baseline 1996, Horizon Year 2015 Post Mitigation Conditions, Alternative D. Alternative D is the regional airport alternative. It is designed to accommodate 78 million annual passengers (MAP), which is below the unconstrained demand forecast demand of 98 MAP for LAX in 2015. This deficiency in capacity would place greater pressure on other regional airports to accommodate the unmet travel demand for LAX. Additional figures presenting the geographical extent of incremental cancer risks and health hazards for horizon years 2005, 2013 and 2015 under pre-mitigation conditions and for interim years under post-mitigation years are available in Attachment B of Technical Report S-9a, Supplemental Human Health Risk Assessment Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00289-15**Comment:**

Proponents of expanding LAX argue that it will increase jobs, but where in your report is the other side of the equation: the jobs that will be eliminated?

Response:

Employment impacts associated with Alternative D were evaluated in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, and Technical Report S-3, Supplemental Economic Impacts Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As discussed therein, a net decline in total jobs would occur under Alternative D over the planning period (through 2015). This net employment loss results from productivity increases over time, which would occur irregardless of Alternative D, that would outweigh the net additional jobs associated with the limited growth in annual passenger and cargo levels under this alternative. This effect would occur in every industry sector, particularly the manufacturing sectors related to air cargo activity, as indicated in Table S7, Direct Employment Impacts in the So. California Region, Alternative D, by REMI Model Sector, 1996, 2005 and 2015, in Technical Report S-3, Supplemental Economic Impacts Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Response to Comment SPC00289-10.

SPC00289-16**Comment:**

LAWA has repeatedly stated that LAX is safe and secure today. Why then is it necessary to undertake this massive construction "for safety and security?" Where is the study proving that LAX will be safer and more secure, and again how does that compare with the safety and security of a regionally dispersed airport system in which disruption at any single facility leaves the rest in operation?

Response:

Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP and Draft 2004 RTP, which call for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 and Topical Response TR-SEC-1 for more detailed discussion on safety and security under Alternative D.

SPC00289-17**Comment:**

In sum, this plan needs significantly more and better environmental studies before decisionmakers will be adequately equipped to adopt a plan. Most significantly, the EIS/EIR must compare the environmental impacts (and the economic impacts wouldn't hurt either) of concentrated versus dispersed airport capacity investments.

Thank you for your attention. I look forward to your thoughtful response.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments above.

SPC00290**Hetz, Matthew****None Provided****11/5/2003**

The content of this comment letter is identical to SPC00285; please refer to the responses to comment letter SPC00285.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00291 Smith, Robert Westchester Association

SPC00291-1

Comment:

I am writing to you on behalf of the Members of the Board of Directors of the Westchester Association. The Westchester Association is comprised of 43 property owners in the Westchester Business District and their properties are located on the east side of Sepulveda Boulevard, between Manchester Avenue on the North, and Westchester Parkway on the South.

At a recent meeting of the Board of Directors, a very lengthy discussion was held regarding Mayor James Hahn's Airport Plan, "Alternative D". The Board members have all previously had the opportunity to read and hear about the Alternative D plan, and they wish to go on record as being strongly opposed to this particular plan.

The Board of Directors are very much concerned that this plan will cause approximately 6200 citizens of Westchester to be relocated from both the Manchester Square and Belford areas of the community and that this plan would have a very negative impact on their tenants and businesses. Some of the Board members have been in this area for many years and they remember years ago when the airport expanded and approximately 10,000 residents had to move out of the area. That airport expansion caused many of the businesses to close their doors permanently, and the Board is afraid that will happen again.

Therefore, the Board wishes to go on record as being strongly opposed to "Alternative D".

Response:

Comment noted. As discussed within Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, no residential acquisition is proposed for Alternative D. Acquisition currently underway within the Manchester Square and Belford neighborhoods is occurring as part of a separate ongoing program, and will continue to occur independent of the Master Plan. Residents in the Manchester Square and Belford areas approached the airport in 1997 and requested that their properties be acquired rather than soundproofed due to existing impacts from noise, traffic, and incompatible adjacent land uses. In addition, in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D would not involve acquisition within the Westchester Business District. It should be noted that the Master Plan is considered separate from growth and expansion that has occurred at LAX in the past.

SPC00292 Drollinger, Howard H.B. Drollinger Co. 11/5/2003

SPC00292-1

Comment:

The purpose of this letter is to voice our strong concerns about the SDEIS/EIR released July 9, 2003 for public comment and Plan D relative to modernizing LAX. While we agree that LAX needs modernizing in order to effectively serve the traveling public and continue to remain a key economic engine in our region, Plan D and the supplemental EIS/EIR fail in these goals.

According to Jim Ritchie, Deputy Director at LAWA, at his 11/3/03 presentation to the Westchester Vitalization Board of Directors and his 10/28/03 presentation to the Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa del Rey Board of Directors, LAX is being operated in a very safe and secure manner today. Mr. Ritchie went on to say LAX is continuing to improve its security by adding perimeter security cameras, additional police officers & security dogs, plus TSA has over 2,000 employees at LAX continually screening luggage and passengers with "modern technology devices", as well as more customary x-ray and visual screening. Mr. Ritchie assured both Boards that LAX is operating safely and securely.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00292-2**Comment:**

That being said, it is the opinion of the H. B. Drollinger Co. that LAWA is proposing to implement a flawed project, and that LAWA has developed an inadequate environmental document to review the project. The following are just a few issues that support our position:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00292-3 through SPC00292-18 below.

SPC00292-3**Comment:**

- Plan D will not constrain growth at LAX. In fact, it adds capacity at gates by increasing the speed aircraft may be loaded/unloaded by up to 50% and does not remove any concrete.

Response:

Alternative D does not increase gate capacity by increasing the speed of aircraft loading and unloading by 50 percent. Alternative D includes 153 contact gate positions. The No Action/No Project Alternative would include 163 gates including 48 remote positions. Alternative D would require the use of fewer gates to achieve the same passenger level due to the higher utilization rates of contact gates at a level of service that exceeds the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Section 2.2, Aircraft Gates (subsection 2.27), of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum for more information.

SPC00292-4**Comment:**

- Plan D does not meet its safety and security goal for which Plan D was formulated as outlined in the Rand Report July 2003 and LA County Supervisors official position report dated October 15, 2003.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00292-5**Comment:**

- Plan D's security plan relies heavily on technologies, some of which have been discredited (facial recognition surveillance). Over-dependence on security technology may lead to higher risk of error, and, ironically diminished protection.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00292-6**Comment:**

- Use of a Supplement to the 2001 Draft EIS/EIR was improper under guidelines of CEQA. LAWA should have addressed Plan D in a comprehensive revised draft EIS/EIR in which the full record of information was available for review.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SAL00013-31 regarding the use of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to address the impacts of Alternative D.

SPC00292-7

Comment:

- The SDEIS/EIR relies on a baseline now 7 years old; conditions in 1996 do not represent the baseline of 2003, especially after the events of 9/11/01.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SAL00004-6 regarding the 1996 baseline and TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues in general.

SPC00292-8

Comment:

- The 2001 DEIS/EIR was found to lack even the most elementary NEPA requirements for environmental justice; many deficiencies remain in the 2003 SDEIS/EIR. In particular, Plan D shifts many impacts toward the more economically disadvantaged communities east and northeast of LAX and appears to protect biological resources at the expense of residents in Lennox, Inglewood, Manchester Square, Westchester, and Playa del Rey.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00003-5.

SPC00292-9

Comment:

- The report fails to disclose issues and concerns raised in Environmental Justice (EJ) workshops, defers evaluation of critical environmental justice impacts (including air quality and health effects) due to lack of data, offers ill-defined mitigations, and offers a preferred project that protects butterflies at the expense of residents and schoolchildren.

Response:

Regarding disclosure of issues and concerns raised in environmental justice workshops, see Response to Comment SAL00013-55 and Topical Response TR-EJ-2. Regarding environmental justice impacts and lack of data concerning air quality and health effects see Topical Response TR-EJ-1. The comment regarding ill-defined mitigation measures is not clear, however, see Response to Comment SAL00013-61, and the full set of mitigation measures reflecting changes based on comments received on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR in Chapter 5, Environmental Action Plan, of the Final EIS/EIR. Regarding butterflies at the expense of residents please see Response to Comment SAL00013-16.

SPC00292-10

Comment:

- The 2001 EIS/EIR acknowledged that it omitted quantitative assessment of toxic air pollutant exposure due to lack of time; the 2003 document also omitted this assessment, but did not so note.

Response:

Contrary to the statement made in the comment, both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provide detailed quantitative assessment of exposure to toxic air pollutants. Human health impacts are addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14a of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9a of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The objective of the Human Health Risk Assessment presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and the

3. Comments and Responses

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was to determine the potential for increased incremental health risk, if any, associated with the implementation of Master Plan alternatives for people working at the airport and for people living, working, or attending school in communities near the airport.

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was prepared to integrate a new alternative, Alternative D, into the existing environmental review process and to incorporate supplemental information and analysis for the LAX Master Plan. In response to public comment on the Draft EIS/EIR, additional human health risk assessment analyses were presented in the Human Health Risk Assessment subsection in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and are summarized in the Executive Summary of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

As described in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment (subsections 4.24.1.6 and 4.24.1.9) health risks (cancer, non-cancer chronic and non-cancer acute) for the majority of nearby residents would be lower for Alternative D than for 1996 baseline, Year 2000 conditions and the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D provides for airfield improvements that would enable aircraft to move more efficiently, thereby reducing air pollutant emissions from aircraft operating in taxi/idle mode, and provides substantial improvements to the on-airport and off-airport surface transportation systems, thereby reducing air pollutant emissions from motor vehicles. Additionally, Alternative D, unlike the No Action/No Project Alternative, includes Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions.

SPC00292-11

Comment:

- The stated cost of Plan D is excessive relative to all benefits described in the Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00292-12

Comment:

- Unlike the history of LAWA, Plan D does not trust the airlines as partners.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00292-13

Comment:

- Plan D requires the dislocation of over 7000 residents at a time all affordable housing is in the shortest supply ever experienced in our region. Please recall in the early seventies the airport eliminated 3400 homes and dislocated 10,000 people in the name of airport expansion and this plan does it again.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00274-10 as well as Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing. For clarification, the past relocation of residents and removal of homes in the El Segundo Dunes area did not occur as a result of airport expansion, but rather due to exposure to high levels of aircraft noise, particularly noise associated with older Stage 1 aircraft that were in operation at LAX at the time. To further clarify, the Master Plan would not necessitate the relocation of over 7,000 residents; Alternatives A, B, and C would each involve the acquisition of 84 dwelling units and the relocation of an estimated 172 residents, while Alternative D does not propose any residential acquisition. Residential acquisition currently underway within the Manchester Square and Belford neighborhoods is occurring as part of a separate ongoing program, and will continue to occur independent of the Master Plan. Residents in the Manchester Square and Belford areas approached the airport in 1997 and requested that their properties be acquired rather than soundproofed due to existing impacts from noise, traffic, and

3. Comments and Responses

incompatible adjacent land uses. Furthermore, the Master Plan is considered separate from growth and expansion that has occurred at LAX in the past.

SPC00292-14

Comment:

- This plan requires removal and relocation of 98th Street Elementary School site, when there is a need for school facilities (LAUSD has determined a need for over 60,000 seats in schools over the next five (5) years).

Response:

The removal and relocation of the 98th Street Elementary School would not occur under Alternative D, but rather would occur as a result of the voluntary residential acquisition program for Manchester Square and Belford that is currently being implemented by LAWA and is independent of the LAX Master Plan. The impact of the relocation of the 98th Street Elementary School was previously addressed in LAWA's Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration - Manchester Square and Airport/Belford Area Voluntary Acquisition Project (June 2000). As referenced in that Initial Study the closure of 98th Street Elementary School would be mitigated through consultation between LAUSD and LAWA which may result in a purchase of the property, provision of modular classrooms, or other appropriate measures. As concluded in Section 4.27, Schools (subsection 4.27.7.1), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, cumulative enrollment impacts on schools would be less than significant.

SPC00292-15

Comment:

- Plan D does not utilize LAX's physical facilities that already represent a substantial investment both public and private.

Response:

Comment noted.

Though LAX Master Plan Alternative D would result in the reconstruction of various components of the Airport's infrastructure, the majority of existing facilities would remain in place and be utilized in future years. Maintaining a safe, secure and efficient airport for Los Angeles requires continuing investment in new or improved facilities.

SPC00292-16

Comment:

- The physical construction of Plan D will create a long-lasting and disruptive impact on the residents, businesses and negatively impact over 20,000 jobs that are likely to be lost in the Westchester/Inglewood area and throughout the sub-region (the negative impact of this disruption has not been netted out from the projected economic benefits).

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00274-13 regarding economic impacts associated with project construction. Also see Response to Comment PC02204-14 regarding the net change in jobs associated with airport operations under Alternative D. While it is acknowledged that a net job loss would occur due to productivity increases that overwhelm net additional jobs associated with the alternative, it should be noted that a decline in jobs would occur over time in conjunction with such productivity increases (i.e., technological advances), regardless of Master Plan development. New jobs associated with Alternative D actually would reduce the effects of this anticipated loss.

SPC00292-17

Comment:

- While the plan calls for a map of 78 million there is no feasible method of controlling the number of passengers (the Plan D does not adequately address the traffic impacts), mitigation, and transportation operation required for 78 map on the incremental passengers (10-20 million) more that are likely to come. The 405, 105, and 110 freeways and major thoroughfares and intersections are at a point where physical traffic mitigation of the impacts generated by 78, 88, or 98 map is not feasible (overriding considerations are not an acceptable strategy for any plan). There is no way a City can restrict the number of passengers at LAX unless they go through a judicial proceeding like Long Beach did for its airport traffic.

Response:

The forecast passenger activity level of 78.9 MAP in 2015 under Alternative D is based on the design of the Alternative D gate facilities and the assumed airline response to the constrained gate facilities. There is no federal law or regulation that would permit the FAA or a local airport sponsor to prohibit the use of a public use airport. It is in the interest of the airlines to provide sufficient service to meet demand. If sufficient capacity is unavailable at a given facility, such as LAX, an airline would be remiss not to serve that demand from an alternative facility in a demand intense region.

The environmental analyses in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, including traffic, noise and air quality, have addressed the potential impacts under the most practical and most likely activity level for each alternative including Alternative D. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

SPC00292-18

Comment:

- The environmental impacts of Plan D particularly air pollution and noise will be substantial during the physical construction as well as the operation of Plan D.

Response:

Comment noted. Construction noise and air emissions would impact surrounding areas. However, Mitigation Measures MM-N-5 through MM-N-9 (Section 4.1.8.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR) are intended to reduce noise effects from construction activities to the extent practicable and Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-1 (Section 4.1.8.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR) is intended to reduce air emissions. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed construction impacts in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts, 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 for more information on Construction Emissions. 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.

SPC00292-19

Comment:

For any sizeable project in our sub region, at least 2/3 years has been required to achieve a reasonably acceptable plan. Therefore, we recommend additional study to prepare a revised plan which meets the stated objectives for LAX's modernization. The EIS/EIR as presented does not adequately satisfy the objectives outlined above.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The comment is essentially the same as Comment SPC00274-16; please see Response to Comment SPC00274-16.

SPC00292-20

Comment:

In light of the above referenced items, we are respectfully asking for answers to these concerns.

In conclusion, The H. B. Drollinger Co., a 56 year old property management and development company, located just 1/4 mile north of LAX, does not support Plan D and believes LAWA is proposing to implement a flawed project and that the process is further compromised by an inadequate environmental review. The SDEIS/EIR falls short of satisfying safety/security concerns, relies on out dated baselines, has incomplete analysis of noise, air quality including toxic air emission data, inadequate and misleading assessment of impacts on biological habitat.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00292-2 through SPC00292-19 above, which address all of the specific issues identified in the comment, except as related to biological habitats. Impacts on biological habitat were addressed in Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix J and Technical Report 7 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-H of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-BC-1 regarding the Habitat Evaluation Procedure (HEP) and use of modified HEP methodology.

SPC00292-21

Comment:

We agree with all five (5) of the LA County Supervisors, City council of Culver City and other elected officials, business leaders in our area, and the Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa del Rey that the problem with the 2001 and 2003 environmental documents are so serious, pervasive, and universal that the only practical remedy is to start the process over again and prepare a truly comprehensive revised EIS/EIR.

The revised document would need to provide comprehensive scoping, an updated and consistent baseline, identify and assess a reasonable range of feasible alternatives, be free of internal inconsistencies after proper levels of analysis and explanation and present an entirely new impact assessment that does not defer critical decisions. Only with these extensive modifications can the LAX Master Plan and associated EIS/EIR be rendered adequate.

I hope the federal government will join me in seeking to maintain a quality environment for Residents and businesses as well as airplanes.

Response:

Comment noted. As part of the Final EIS/EIR, written responses have been provided for comments from the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, the City Council of Culver City, and the Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa del Rey - see Responses to Comment Letters AL00022, SAL00005, and SAL00006 regarding comments from the County Board of Supervisors; AR00006, AL00010, AL00011, AL00012, and SAL00020 regarding comments from Culver City; and SPC00274 regarding the Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa del Rey.

Please see Response to Comment SAL00013-31 regarding the use of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to address impacts of Alternative D, Responses to Comments AL00022-17 and SAL00013-41 regarding scoping, and Topical Response TR-ALT-1 and Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding the range of alternatives and environmental baseline issues.

SPC00293 Day, Mark

El Segundo Chamber of
Commerce

11/6/2003

SPC00293-1

Comment:

While we applaud the efforts by the Hahn administration to work toward limiting air traffic at LAX to 78 million annual passengers (MAP), and encourage continued implementation of a regional airport system, we have two overriding concerns with the EIS/EIR.

- 1) It is not clear how this plan can ensure that 78 MAP will be an absolute maximum in practice.
- 2) Traffic mitigation plans are woefully inadequate for 78 MAP and earlier plans were never implemented for the 1980 expansion to 40 MAP.

We will summarize our concerns in this letter and the attached comments. We respectfully request that you address these issues.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00293-2

Comment:

We believe a strong regional economy requires a regional air transportation system capable of continued accommodation of demands for such services. In this regard, we find projected shortfalls of 10 to 30 million annual passengers (MAP) disconcerting. Furthermore, when LAX was expanded in the early 1980s, the EIS/EIR called for expansion to be capped at 40 MAP. Obviously, that cap proved meaningless.

That experience vividly points out the fact that an effective regional airport system demands that some entity other than the airlines to determine which airports are served. We are not advocating the return to a regulated environment and reestablishing the Civil Aeronautics Board abolished by the federal Airline Deregulation Act. However, we are pointing out that under the current unregulated environment, any identified caps on numbers of flights are meaningless. Additionally, the suggested allocations of future demand aren't realistic unless and until the sponsors of the other regional airports make changes to their airports to handle their share.

Response:

Comment noted. LAX and the U.S. airlines operate under the laws of the United States and the State of California. These laws assign responsibility for developing and operating airports to the airport sponsors and responsibility for operating airlines and providing air service to the airline companies. Under current law, LAWA does not have the authority to dictate what occurs at airports other than the ones it sponsors (LAX, VNY, ONT, and PMD). Additionally, LAWA and the FAA do not have the authority to dictate which airports the airlines should serve and what level of service they should provide.

Airport operators such as LAWA can constrain growth of traffic at an airport by physically limiting key facilities. In Alternative D, the critical limiting facility is aircraft gates. The constrained aircraft gates and resulting constraint on passengers was discussed in Chapter 3, Alternatives, Section 3.3.2, Alternative D Constrained Activity Forecast, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR beginning on page 3-26.

Decisions to develop an airport are the responsibility of local government not the FAA. The FAA's role in the development of airports is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace.

LAWA only controls the operations and potential improvements at LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Other jurisdictions are responsible for developing the other regional airports. Master

3. Comments and Responses

plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports in order for these airports to address their part of the projected regional demand.

LAWA and Mayor Hahn have developed Alternative D in response to the concerns of the public that the City of Los Angeles should participate in a regional solution for the fair and reasonable distribution of air service. LAWA has planned Alternative D to be in compliance with SCAG's 2001 and Draft 2004 RTP allocations to LAX. It is up to the other regional airport operators to meet a larger percentage of the regional demand.

SPC00293-3

Comment:

Because of our proximity to LAX, many of our business members participate in international trade and will benefit from increased air transportation into and out of LAX. Yet because of this proximity, they (and their employees) disproportionately feel the negative impacts of increased automobile and truck traffic into and out of our area from any growth at LAX. For this reason, our attached detailed assessment is focused on those portions of the Addendum and Draft EIS/EIR Supplement dealing with surface transportation and ground access.

Previous experience strongly suggests that our concern about the caps on the number of flights, the inadequacy of identified traffic mitigation measures, the lack of funding for mitigation measures, and the historic non-implementation of the identified mitigation is completely justified. When the airport was expanded in the early 1980s, the traffic mitigation measures identified at that time were inadequate (and similarly not funded) at the 40 MAP level, let alone at today's level of operations. Our issues with traffic mitigation plans are two-fold.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00293-4

Comment:

1) The plans largely ignore areas south of the airport and focus primarily on areas within the LADOT jurisdiction. An effective mitigation plan MUST address areas as far south as it does north, if the impacts of the project indeed occur to the south as we believe they do. Specific areas are addressed in the attachment.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-14 and Response to Comment SPC00250-3.

SPC00293-5

Comment:

2) A strategy for funding these mitigation measures must be developed to access all funding sources (city, county, state and federal). Our understanding of CEQA is that improvements offered as "mitigations" must be feasible and must be financed by the project. To identify a "mitigation program" and then to question the availability of funding in the DEIR is to admit that there is no mitigation program.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00274-22.

SPC00293-6

Comment:

In addition, this plan must contain specific funding sources, schedules, legally binding commitments to implement signed by the responsible agencies, and remedies in the case of non-performance. Without such funding sources, implementation commitments and remedies, any mitigation measures must be considered illusory.

Response:

Prearranged funding source commitments, legally binding commitments and schedules signed by responsible agencies and remedies in the case of non-performance are not NEPA or CEQA requirements for a program level document. Specific commitments to various mitigation measures are identified in the Final EIS/EIR and appropriately referenced or specifically described in the FAA's Record of Decision.

SPC00293-7

Comment:

For the reasons previously stated, we would like to be supportive of this Addendum and Alternative D. However, we cannot until the issues we raise in this letter and enclosure are resolved. We will work with you as necessary to see to their resolution. If you have any questions or require clarification of any of our comments, please contact me.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00293-2 through SPC00293-6 above and SPC00293-8 through SPC00293-45 below.

SPC00293-8

Comment:

LAX Master Plan Addendum
And
Supplement to Draft EIS/EIR
Comments

General

1. Considerable uncertainty regarding Los Angeles World Airports' (LAWA's) intention to complete proposed mitigation measures is raised by the following comment:

"Mitigation measures are applicable only to the extent that the use of airport revenues to fund such measures is permissible under federal law and policies." (Technical Report 2a, page 41 and elsewhere as indicated by specific comments below.) CEQA requires that mitigation be feasible. If you cannot guarantee that the project will indeed fund the mitigation program, you do not have an acceptable mitigation program.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments SPC00250-41 and SPC00274-22.

SPC00293-9

Comment:

2. As with the 2001 Draft Master Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report Draft EIS/EIR, the study area for Off-Airport Ground Access is primarily north of LAX. Little attention is paid to streets and freeways south of the airport. More significantly, mitigation measures

3. Comments and Responses

appear to be limited to LADOT jurisdictions with little regard to traffic problems created in surrounding areas outside of the City of Los Angeles. How was the study area defined?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-14 and Response to Comment SPC00250-3.

SPC00293-10

Comment:

EIS/EIR Supplement, Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures

1. Page 4-2 to 4-3, Mitigation Measures Bullet, - The comment - "It should be noted that mitigation measures, as well as Master Plan commitments, are applicable to the extent that the use of airport revenue to fund such measures and commitments is permissible under federal law and policies." creates considerable uncertainty regarding the validity of any proposed mitigation measures.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comment SPC00274-22.

SPC00293-11

Comment:

2. Page 4-3, The Environmental Baseline, - Using the 1998 Revision to CEQA Guidelines - "as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published...." as a basis for establishing an environmental baseline ignores all environmental impacts since LAX was expanded in the 1980s and 1990s from 40 MAP to the current baseline. Unmitigated impacts have resulted in uncontrolled traffic growth with significant impact on neighborhoods north, south, and east of LAX.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR uses the CEQA guidelines that are required by law. LAWA is only required to mitigate significant impacts caused by the proposed project, and not existing problems.

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

SPC00293-12

Comment:

3. Pages 4-3 and 4-4, The Environmental Baseline, Third Paragraph - The discussion in this paragraph regarding "incremental" and "cumulative" impacts raises the issue of incremental changes to LAX since the last Draft EIS/EIR of 1978 from 40 MAP to the current baseline. Our view is these incremental changes and their impacts, especially with regard to traffic, should be addressed by this Supplement to allow mitigation to 40 MAP.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00537-7.

SPC00293-13

Comment:

4. Page 4-6, Formulation of Master Plan Commitments and Mitigation Measures, Third Paragraph - What is the timetable for "formulation" of the referenced Mitigation Monitoring Plan? How will mitigation measures be enforced?

Response:

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is included in the Final EIS/EIR. As this plan shows under its "Actions Indicating Compliance" section, the mitigation measures will be enforced by a variety

of methods, and involves various City of Los Angeles departments including LADOT, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Street Services, and Building and Safety.

SPC00293-14

Comment:

EIS/EIR Supplement, Chapter 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation

1. Page 4-243, 4.3.2.2 General Approach and Methodology, Second Bullet, Third Sentence and Figure S4.3.2-1, Off-Airport Surface Transportation Study Areas - What is the rationale for limiting the area of study south of LAX to north of Rosecrans while including a more extensive area north and east of LAX? As indicated in our June 12, 2001 comments, the study area is biased toward those areas within the jurisdiction of LADOT to the exclusion of other neighboring jurisdictions.

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00250-14. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-14.

SPC00293-15

Comment:

2. Page 4-247, Sixth Paragraph, Last Sentence - What is the rationale for limiting coordination to LADOT?

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00250-15. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-15.

SPC00293-16

Comment:

3. Pages 4-248 to 4-250, 4.3.2.5 Master Plan Commitments - Will off-airport traffic control actions, necessitated by these commitments, be coordinated with jurisdictions other than LADOT?

Response:

Master Plan commitments will be coordinated with the appropriate impacted jurisdiction.

SPC00293-17

Comment:

4. Pages 4-254 to 4-261, Figure S4.3.2-4, Year 2015 Alternative D Levels of Service (Adjusted Environmental Baseline Comparison) - What are the pre- and post-project Levels of Service and incremental Project Impacts on the following intersections:

- Sepulveda and Marine,
- Sepulveda and Manhattan Beach,
- Aviation and Marine,
- Aviation and Manhattan Beach,
- Nash and El Segundo,
- Douglas and El Segundo,
- La Cienega and El Segundo (east of the 405),
- La Cienega and Rosecrans,
- Inglewood and El Segundo,
- Inglewood and Rosecrans,
- Inglewood and Marine,
- Inglewood and Manhattan Beach,

3. Comments and Responses

- Hawthorne and El Segundo,
- Hawthorne and Rosecrans,
- Hawthorne and Marine, and
- Hawthorne and Manhattan Beach/Artesia?

Response:

This comment is similar to comment SPC00250-17. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-17.

SPC00293-18

Comment:

5. Pages 4-254 to 4-261, Figure S4.3.2-4, Year 2015 Alternative D Levels of Service (Adjusted Environmental Baseline Comparison) - What are the pre- and post-project Levels of Service and incremental Project Impacts on the following links:

- Sepulveda south of Rosecrans,
- Sepulveda Tunnel,
- Aviation south of Rosecrans,
- Inglewood south of Imperial,
- Hawthorne south of Imperial, and
- Rosecrans west of Hawthorne?

Response:

This comment is similar to comment SPC00250-18. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-18.

SPC00293-19

Comment:

6. Pages 4-254 to 4-261, Figure S4.3.2-4, Year 2015 Alternative D Levels of Service (Adjusted Environmental Baseline Comparison) - What are the pre- and post-project Levels of Service and incremental Project Impacts for the following Freeway Ramps:

- I-405 NB off-ramp and El Segundo,
- I-405 SB off-ramp and LA Cienega S/O Century,
- I-405 NB off-ramp and Rosecrans, and
- I-405 NB off-ramp and Inglewood?

Response:

This comment is similar to comment SPC00250-19. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-19.

SPC00293-20

Comment:

7. Pages 4-265 to 4-269, Table S4.3.2-8, Year 2008 Alternative D Levels of Service (Adjusted Environmental Baseline Comparison) - Concerns regarding status of Intersections, Links, and Freeway Ramps expressed in comments 4 to 6 above also apply to this table and supporting analysis.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment SPC00250-20. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-20.

SPC00293-21

Comment:

8. Page 4-273, 4.3.2.8 Mitigation Measures - The statement in this paragraph: The following mitigation measures are applicable only to the extent that the use of airport revenue to fund such measures is permissible under federal law and policies casts doubt regarding the validity of any proposed mitigation

3. Comments and Responses

measures. What agency will make the determination regarding use of airport funds? When will this decision be made? Will the City of Los Angeles guarantee the mitigation program in the event that federal policies prevent LAX funds from implementing the mitigation program.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments SPC00274-22.

SPC00293-22

Comment:

9. Pages 4-275 to 4-278, Table S4.3.2-11, Year 2008 Alternative D Mitigation Plan (Adjusted Environmental Baseline Comparison) - The assumed proposed improvement by County of Los Angeles of the Intersection of Aviation and El Segundo is not substantiated by the Coastal Corridor Transportation Study, Phase II, Figure 9, Roadway Improvements Funded, South Bay Cities Council of Governments, 2003. Widening of Aviation is funded, but intersection improvements are not funded.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-23.

SPC00293-23

Comment:

10. Pages 4-275 to 4-278, Table S4.3.2-11, Year 2008 Alternative D Mitigation Plan (Adjusted Environmental Baseline Comparison) and Pages 4-279 to 4-284, Table S4.3.2-12, year 2015 Alternative D Mitigation Plan (Adjusted Environmental Baseline Comparison) - The unstudied Intersections, Links, and Freeway ramps identified in comments 4 to 6 above must be added to planned mitigation measures as appropriate.

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00250-24. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-24.

SPC00293-24

Comment:

11. Page 4-295, 4.3.2.10.2 Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, Second Paragraph - Leaving two critical intersections nearest the new Ground Transportation Center and Intermodal Transportation Center (Century at La Cienega and Imperial at La Cienega) unmitigated will lead to serious access problems for vehicles from the South Bay using arterial highways. What is the intended plan? It is critical that this issue is addressed.

Response:

This comment is similar to Comment SPC00250-25. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-25.

SPC00293-25

Comment:

Technical Report S-2a. - Supplemental On-Airport Surface Transportation

1. Pages 24 and 25, Table 5, Key Assumptions/Inputs 2015 Alternative D, Planned - Regional Access/Egress Directional Distributions and Attachment A - What is the basis for allocation of percentages of passengers between entrances and ramps?

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00250-25. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-25.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00293-26

Comment:

2. Page 62, Table 17, Key Assumptions/Inputs 2015 Alternative D, Refined System - Regional Access/Egress Directional Distributions - What is the basis for allocation of percentages of passengers between entrances and ramps?

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00250-27. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-27.

SPC00293-27

Comment:

Technical Report S-2b. - Supplemental Off- Airport Surface Transportation

1. Page 3 and Figure 1, Revised Study Area and Key Study Locations - Why have study areas been limited to areas north of Rosecrans?

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00250-28. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-28.

SPC00293-28

Comment:

2. Page 8, Planned Development Projects Added to Background Assumptions, - Hawthorne should be included in your list for projects.

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00250-29. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-29.

SPC00293-29

Comment:

3. Page 25, 3.2. Geographical Distribution of Trips - As indicated in above comments regarding Technical Report 2a, the basis for trip allocation is not obvious. Here the implication is "Passenger Surveys". Have these surveys been documented? If so where? If the basis is Technical Report 2b, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, LAX Master Plan Off-Airport Existing 1996 Transportation Conditions Report of the Draft EIS/EIR, the validity of this allocation is questionable.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment SPC00250-31. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-31.

SPC00293-30

Comment:

The intersections surveyed in that study were biased toward the use of I-405 to access the CTA via Imperial and Century. None of the intersections surveyed were west of I-405 and south of Imperial.

Consequently no data was collected regarding LAX traffic from Palos Verdes, Beach Cities, and bailouts from I-405 northbound onto surface streets.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment SPC00250-31. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-31.

SPC00293-31

Comment:

How does the geographic distribution of project trips reported in the DEIR compare to the distribution of trips in the SCAG model used to develop the Regional Transportation Plan and to the distribution of airport and airport-related trips in the City of Los Angeles General Plan model? If there are differences, please explain the rationale for using the assumptions in the Airport DEIR.

Response:

When the LAX Ground Access Model was calibrated and validated, and model runs of several airport alternatives were completed, trip tables were given to SCAG for incorporation into the SCAG regional model. The trip tables provided enabled SCAG to use the same geographic distribution of airport trips that is being used in the LAX Ground Access Model.

With respect to the City of Los Angeles, the Framework Model is the basis for both the General Plan Model and the LAX Ground Access Model. The trip distributions are consistent for these models.

SPC00293-32

Comment:

4. Page 26, Table S9, Existing and Future Transportation Deficiencies (RTP Background Assumptions)
- What is the justification for arbitrarily limiting the study area to north of Rosecrans? If the following intersections, links, and ramps had been included in the analysis, the number impacted would probably be higher:

- Sepulveda and Marine,
- Sepulveda and Manhattan Beach,
- Aviation and Marine,
- Aviation and Manhattan Beach,
- Nash and El Segundo,
- Douglas and El Segundo,
- La Cienega and El Segundo (east of I 405),
- La Cienega and Rosecrans,
- Inglewood and El Segundo,
- Inglewood and Rosecrans,
- Inglewood and Marine,
- Inglewood and Manhattan Beach,
- Hawthorne and El Segundo,
- Hawthorne and Rosecrans,
- Hawthorne and Marine,
- Hawthorne and Manhattan Beach/Artesia,
- Sepulveda south of Rosecrans,
- Sepulveda Tunnel,
- Aviation south of Rosecrans,
- Inglewood south of Imperial,
- Hawthorne south of Imperial,
- Rosecrans west of Hawthorne,
- I-405 NB off-ramp and El Segundo,
- I-405 SB off-ramp and LA Cienega S/O Century,
- I-405 NB off-ramp and Rosecrans, and
- I-405 NB off-ramp and Inglewood.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

This comment is identical to SPC00250-32. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-32.

SPC00293-33

Comment:

5. Page 27, Third Paragraph and Figure S3, Differences in LAX Passenger Trips - 2015 PM Peak Hour - Alternative D - Adjusted Environmental Baseline - What is the basis for the conclusion that shifting passenger access to the eastern end of the airport will cause a measurable shift in traffic using I-405? Should Lincoln be included in the discussion in the third paragraph? Reduction of traffic on Lincoln is not reflected in Figure S3.

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00250-33. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-33.

SPC00293-34

Comment:

6. Page 27, Fifth Paragraph and Figure S4, Differences in Total Vehicle Trips - 2015 PM Peak Hour - Alternative D - Adjusted Environmental Baseline - What is the basis for the conclusion regarding traffic shift?

Response:

This comment is identical to Comment SPC00250-34. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-34.

SPC00293-35

Comment:

7. Page 28, Table S10, Master Plan Impacts on Surface Streets, Freeways, and Intersections vs. Adjusted Environmental Baseline: RTP Background Assumptions - See comment 5 above regarding Table S9.

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00250-35. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-35.

SPC00293-36

Comment:

8. Pages 33 and 34, 4.2 Study Area Transportation Benefits, Table 11 Study Area Average Speed and Congested Lane Miles, and Table S12 Study Area VMT and VHT - The conclusions reflected in these tables probably result from the arbitrary conclusion that traffic will shift as a result of the proposed shift in passenger access to the east.

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00250-36. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-36.

SPC00293-37**Comment:**

9. Pages 35 and 36, Essential Neighborhood Traffic Management Elements - Does this philosophy extend to neighborhoods outside of the City of Los Angeles? If not, it should. Because of the reference to LADOT procedures in the third paragraph, the impression is created that the intent is to limit to the City of Los Angeles. The new interchange at Lennox and shift of passenger access to the east will not increase the capacity of NB I-405 south of the new interchange. Consequently, the risk of driver bailout using El Segundo, Rosecrans, and Inglewood Off-Ramps remains. This may well result in cut through traffic into neighborhoods south of LAX. This should be examined.

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00250-37. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-37.

SPC00293-38**Comment:**

10. Page 36, 5.2 Mitigation Measures for Alternative D, third paragraph and Figure S6 Changes in Total Traffic Volumes Due to Lennox/I-405 Interchange and I-105 Ramps - 2015 PM Peak Hour - What is the basis for these conclusions?

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00250-38. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-38.

SPC00293-39**Comment:**

11. Page 36, 5.2 Mitigation Measures for Alternative D, third paragraph, last sentence - Does this conclusion include the potential for increased bailouts from I-405 as discussed in comment 10?

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00250-39. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-39.

SPC00293-40**Comment:**

12. Page 41, First Complete Paragraph - Leaving two critical intersections nearest the new Ground Transportation Center and Intermodal Transportation Center (Century at La Cienega and Imperial at La Cienega) unmitigated will lead to serious access problems for vehicles from the South Bay using arterial highways. What is the intended plan? To ignore the issue is not acceptable.

Response:

This comment is similar to Comment SPC00250-25. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-25.

SPC00293-41**Comment:**

13. Page 41, Fourth Paragraph - What agency will decide which mitigation measures will be funded with airport revenues? In the event airport revenues are not to be used to fund the recommended mitigation measures, will any further growth in MAP cease?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

This comment is similar to Comment SPC00250-41. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-41.

SPC00293-42

Comment:

14. Page 41, 5.3 Alternative Mitigation Plan for Alternative D, First Paragraph - Which agency has the authority to approve the proposed Lennox Interchange and when will they decide? If they decide against the proposed interchange, how will the conclusions of the traffic growth change?

Response:

This comment is similar to comment SPC00250-42. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-42.

SPC00293-43

Comment:

15. Page 41, 5.3 Alternative Mitigation Plan for Alternative D, Fourth Paragraph - Lennox Interchange should be deleted from the mitigation measures in this paragraph since this section addresses an alternative plan.

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00250-43. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-43.

SPC00293-44

Comment:

16. Pages 41 and 42, 5.3 Alternative Mitigation Plan for Alternative D, Last Paragraph, First Sentence - What agency will decide which mitigation measures will be funded with airport revenues? In the event airport revenues are not to be used to fund the recommended mitigation measures, will the proposed actions cease?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-41.

SPC00293-45

Comment:

Attachment B, Geographic Distribution of Airport Trips - Alternative D - What is the basis for determining the distribution. See comment 4 above.

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPC00250-45. Please see Response to Comment SPC00250-45.

SPC00294

Peura, Edwin

Peura Enterprises

11/4/2003

The content of this comment letter is identical to SPC00250; please refer to the response to comment letter SPC00250.

SPC00295

Binkow, Peter

Glancy & Binkow LLP

11/6/2003

SPC00295-1

Comment:

I write this letter in response to your request for public input on the various Los Angeles Airport alternatives. I am an attorney and travel frequently through LAX; last year I flew more than twenty round-trips from our airport. While I have encountered some inconveniences, I believe the airport works very well as currently constituted. If you have not done so, you should undertake a scientific survey of (frequent) travelers.

I am also aware, peripherally, of certain studies which claim the expansion plans will not add capacity or economic value to the region. I have not studied the plans or reports in any detail, but if the main motivating factor behind these plans is to increase efficiency, I believe they are a wasteful use of appreciable public resources, especially during the ongoing budgetary crisis. From my point of view, LAX is not an airport in need of any fix.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00296

**Lopez Mendoza,
Jerilyn**

**LAX Coalition for Environmental,
Economic and Educational
Justice**

11/7/2003

SPC00296-1

Comment:

The LAX Coalition brings together environmental organizations, labor unions, community- and faith-based organizations, and school districts who are concerned about the negative impact of Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) operations on the low-income, minority communities neighboring the airport to the east. The LAX Coalition is dedicated to finding a balance between the development of LAX and the rights of the neighboring communities to a decent quality of life. We seek to protect and improve the health, education, and welfare of our constituents who live and work in the vicinity of LAX. A list of our most recent organizational membership is attached in Appendix A.

The LAX Coalition affirms our intention and commitment to work with the City of Los Angeles, the Airport Commission and Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) to develop a consensus proposal that addresses our concerns through a comprehensive community benefits program. We look forward to a constructive dialogue and negotiation process that will balance the needs of LAX development with the interests of neighboring communities in a healthier environment and better economic opportunities.

Of particular concern to our members are the environmental justice issues that are evident in the potential negative environmental impacts the project will impose disproportionately on low income African-Americans and Latinos in Inglewood, Lennox, Manchester Square, Hawthorne, and South Los Angeles. We are also concerned that the mitigations and benefits promised in the SDEIR/S lack specificity and enforceability.

Our analysis of the SDEIR/S leads us to the conclusion that Los Angeles World Airports and the United States Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) have prepared an inadequate and inaccurate SDEIR/S that must be revised and recirculated to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). We request, and NEPA and CEQA require, that LAWA and the FAA adopt the mitigation measures proposed herein and revise and recirculate the SDEIR/S or commit to implementing these mitigation measures in the Final EIR/S.¹ By complying with this request, LAWA and the FAA have the ability to develop a consensus proposal for the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), one that includes substantive community participation in shaping LAX development to advance our common goals and interests and avoids litigation.

3. Comments and Responses

1 We recognize that the Final EIR/S will provide written responses to comments made on both the 2001 Draft EIR/S and this SDEIR/S. However, several coalition members provided written comments in 2001 that are relevant to this document. As such, we hereby incorporate by reference all comments in their entirety submitted by coalition members in 2001 to the Draft EIR/S including but not limited to the comments submitted by Coalition for Clean Air, Communities for a Better Environment, Environmental Defense, and Natural Resource Defense Council.

Response:

Comment noted. All comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, including those comments submitted by the individuals and organizations referenced above, have been responded to as part of this final EIS/EIR. For responses to comments submitted as part of this comment letter, please see Responses to Comments SPC00296-2 through SPC00296-45 below.

SPC00296-2

Comment:

4. Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures

LAWA and the FAA Must Identify and Adopt Specific Mitigation Measures or Performance Standards Prior to Project Approval

Public agencies cannot approve a project that will have significant environmental impacts without first adopting feasible measures to mitigate or avoid those impacts or committing to meet some realistic performance standard. (Calif. Pub. Res. Code §21081; Sacramento Old City Association v. City Council of Sacramento (1991) 229 Cal.App.3d 1011, 1028-1029; Gentry v. City of Murrieta (1995) 36 Cal.App.4th 1395, 1395-1396.) LAWA and the FAA have yet to adopt mitigation measures or performance standards that will apply to the LAX project. Despite providing a long list of possible mitigation measures (see generally, SDEIR/S Section 5, Environmental Mitigation Plan), they have not committed to any of these mitigation measures. Specifically, in the SDEIR/S, LAWA and the FAA state, "It should be noted that mitigation measures, as well as Master Plan commitments, are applicable to the extent that the use of airport revenue to fund such measures and commitments is permissible under federal law and policies." (SDEIR/S, p. 4-2 to 4-3.) LAWA and the FAA, however, not only fail to cite to the relevant federal law and policies, they do not identify those proposed mitigation measures impermissible under federal law and policies. LAWA and the FAA must identify and adopt specific feasible mitigation measures or performance standards to reduce or avoid significant environmental impacts prior to project approval. Under CEQA, they cannot continue to avoid making commitments by stating that some or all of the mitigation measures may not be implemented because of funding limitations in federal law and policies.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AR00003-63. There are no requirements under CEQA or NEPA that funding sources for mitigation measures be specified. A specific funding plan has not yet been prepared for the Master Plan; however, it is anticipated that a joint funding effort would be pursued, involving Federal and State grants and other efforts. Much of the project would likely be funded with airport-generated revenues, such as concession fees, landing fees, revenue bonds, leases, and passenger facility charges (PFCs). It is not anticipated that any local tax revenue would be used for this project. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the airport's funding abilities outside of the airport. Please note that CEQA requires a mitigation monitoring or reporting program be adopted for this project to ensure the implementation of all required mitigation measures.

SPC00296-3

Comment:

LAWA and the FAA's Master Plan Commitments and Mitigation Measures Should Include Clear and Specific Criteria for Monitoring Implementation, Deadlines, and a Public Right of Enforcement

3. Comments and Responses

We support LAWA and the FAA statement, "Provisions will be made to ensure that those [Master Plan commitments and mitigation] measures are fully enforceable (i.e., zoning conditions, conditions of approval, etc.)." (SDEIR/S, p. 4-6.) This commitment complies with the CEQA requirement that "[m]itigation measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally-binding instruments." (CEQA Guidelines §15126.4(a)(2).² To assure the fulfillment of this commitment, we request that LAWA and the FAA include clear and specific criteria for monitoring implementation, binding deadlines, and a public right of enforcement when adopting its Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures. We ask that the public right of enforcement provide that any board, officer, person, corporation or association or by any person acting for the interests of itself, its members, or the general public have the right to bring a legal complaint to enforce compliance with these commitments and mitigation measures in state or federal court. Providing for a public right of enforcement would be consistent with the promise made in the SDEIR/S and provide the best and most effective guarantee that the Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures will be fully implemented.

² The State Resources Agency has developed specific regulations to implement CEQA, located at California Code of Regulations, Title 14, §15000 et seq., referred to herein as "Guidelines."

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AR00003-63 regarding the mitigation monitoring and reporting program.

SPC00296-4

Comment:

4.1 Noise

With respect to noise pollution currently caused by LAX operations and projected noise impacts from the proposed Alternative D, we are most concerned about the negative impact on children in the affected area. In that regard, we join in the separate comments to the SDEIR/S submitted by the Lennox School District and the Inglewood School District and hereby incorporate those comments in their entirety by reference. We believe those comments provide an appropriate critique of the SDEIR/S as to noise pollution and other environmental issues.

Response:

Comment noted. The Lennox School District's September 21, 2001 comment letter on the Draft EIS/EIR is identified as comment letter AL00034, and November 6, 2003 comment letter on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is identified as comment letter SAL00018. The Inglewood School District's September 21, 2001 comment letter on the Draft EIS/EIR is identified as comment letter AL00035, and November 6, 2003 comment letter on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is identified as comment letter SAL00017. For responses to these comments, please see responses to comment letters AL00034, SAL00018, AL00035, and SAL00017.

SPC00296-5

Comment:

In addition to our concerns about the impact of noise pollution on children's education, we are also concerned about the projected impact of airport-related noise on residential neighborhoods and associated land uses. Several sources of noise pollution were identified in the SDEIR/S, including road traffic noise, aircraft noise, construction traffic noise, construction equipment noise, single-event awakenings, and automated people mover noise. However, the SDEIR/S noise analysis does not address the cumulative impacts of those diverse causes of noise pollution, all resulting from LAX operations, on residents and other sensitive receptors in the impacted area. We believe such an analysis is appropriate and reasonable in light of expressed community concerns, and request that such an analysis be included in the Final EIR/S or discussed in a further supplemental SDEIR/S circulated for public review.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Cumulative impacts are addressed in Section 4.1.7, of Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00296-6

Comment:

As stated in the SDEIR/S, Alternative D would cause 5,100 people in an estimated 1,700 homes to be newly exposed to noise greater or equal to 65 decibels measured as the Community Noise Equivalent Level (expressed as 65 CNEL), and an additional 5,000 in another 1,700 homes would be newly exposed to an increase of at least 1.5 CNEL. (SDEIR/S, p. 4-62.) Perhaps even more alarming, "[A]pproximately 87 percent of the population newly exposed to high noise levels, or 4,430 residents is estimated to be minority and/or low-income." (SDEIR/S, p. 4-324.) Added burdens on this population are the Single Event Noise Effects caused by nighttime eastbound aircraft take-offs. As stated in the SDEIR/S, Alternative D would expose 53,000 people to Single Event Noise Effects, 18,000 of whom are newly exposed. (SDEIR/S, p. 4-66.)

Because the problem of residential noise pollution is of great importance to our coalition members, we request that LAWA directly address noise mitigation as a key component of its Master Plan Commitments. One of the obstacles to noise mitigation measures in some negatively impacted areas is the concern about residents' dwellings that have been deemed uninhabitable or not built to code. As such, these dwellings are not currently eligible for noise mitigation measures as provided by LAWA. As stated elsewhere in our comments, however, Los Angeles County is in the midst of a severe housing crisis, which is most strongly felt by low-income populations who are often forced to live in substandard housing. Because their conditions are already at-risk, it is even more important to provide them with the support and mitigation they need and deserve. As a result, we strongly urge LAWA to work with impacted communities to provide appropriate noise mitigation to these affected residents and offer our assistance in this effort. We request that this issue be addressed in the final EIR/S.

We request that LAWA and the FAA incorporate the following mitigation measures, with appropriate clear and specific criteria for monitoring implementation, binding deadlines, and a public right of enforcement as referenced above, prior to finalizing the LAX EIR/S:

Response:

Regarding noise impacts and noise impacts on minority and/or low-income population, mitigation measures are presented in Sections 4.1, Noise, 4.2, Land Use, and 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to reduce impacts from aircraft noise on noise-sensitive uses and minority/low-income populations. These mitigation measures are also summarized in Topical Responses TR-LU-5, TR-N-4, and TR-EJ-2.

LAWA is currently working with other jurisdictions, including Los Angeles County, to try to resolve issues surrounding building code compliance requirements that have precluded noise mitigation through sound insulation, as described in Topical Response TR-LU-3. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. As stated in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.8), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, mitigation measure MM-LU-1 would reduce or eliminate, to the extent feasible, structural and building code compliance constraints to soundproofing and provide additional technical assistance from LAWA to local jurisdictions to support more rapid and efficient implementation of their land use mitigation programs. It should be noted that availability of funds for soundproofing has not been a limiting factor in Los Angeles County; rather it has been a lack of progress in completing mitigation with existing funds. LAWA has, and will continue to, offer technical assistance to the County to accelerate the rate of soundproofing. See also Response to Comment SAL00013-109 regarding implementation of sound insulation in Los Angeles County.

Regarding mitigation measures with clear and specific criteria for monitoring implementation, binding deadlines, and public right of enforcements, pursuant to Section 21081.6(a) of CEQA, LAWA and the FAA will adopt a mitigation monitoring and reporting program for mitigation measures when making the necessary findings in conjunction with project approval. The mitigation monitoring and reporting

program will specify the timing of, and monitoring responsibility for, implementation of adopted mitigation measures. The mitigation monitoring and reporting program is a means to ensure compliance with mitigation measures during project implementation. Pursuant to Section 1505.2 of NEPA, the Record of Decision (ROD) must include a monitoring and enforcement program for each mitigation measure. Neither NEPA nor CEQA require or encourage the inclusion of the mitigation monitoring and reporting program as part of a Draft EIS/EIR.

Please see Responses to Comments SPC00296-7 through SPC00296-10 regarding specific mitigation measures proposed by the commentor.

SPC00296-7

Comment:

1. Airport Noise Monitoring Program: The LAX Airport Noise Monitoring Program would involve a systematic and independent analysis of noise levels in the project study area. The analysis would be funded by LAWA and the FAA. An independent committee of noise monitoring experts and community stakeholders would select independent contractors to carry out noise monitoring within the project study area. The study will rely not on modeling, but on actual and extensive noise measurements within the project study area. The Program would also include the analysis and study of single-event noise occurrences to establish a standard for single-event noise levels that is less arbitrary than the one adopted in the SDEIR/S. The Program would include specific commitments for mitigation of any residence or other incompatible use shown by this analysis to equal or exceed 65 CNEL and/or the newly established Sound Exposure Level (SEL) standard used to measure single event noise levels.

Response:

Regarding independent analysis and monitoring of noise levels in the project study area, as described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4, the boundary of the 65 CNEL contour is validated through the continuous monitoring of 25 sites in the area surrounding LAX and quarterly noise reports which are submitted by LAWA to Caltrans and the County of Los Angeles. The County of Los Angeles reviews and audits the noise monitoring data to ensure that the data were produced in accordance with an approved monitoring plan and are otherwise prepared pursuant to reporting requirements within the California Noise Standards (Title 21). These reports also are submitted to Caltrans to demonstrate efforts to achieve compliance with Title 21. These quarterly reports are also provided to affected jurisdictions and are available for public review at LAWA Soundproofing Bureau's Community Office and City and County public libraries in the vicinity of LAX. Through these processes, independent analysis and monitoring is achieved and establishment of an independent committee with independent contractors is not considered necessary. Furthermore, the LAX Community Noise Roundtable was created by LAWA to reduce and mitigate adverse noise impacts from LAX operations on the surrounding communities and its members include community representatives of affected areas.

As stated under mitigation measure MM-LU-1 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the expansion of the ANMP boundaries over time to include noise-sensitive uses newly exposed to the 65 CNEL and located outside the current ANMP boundaries would be based on measured data presented in the quarterly noise reports prepared by LAWA. Therefore, mitigation measure MM-LU-1 already includes specific commitments for mitigation of any residence or other incompatible use newly exposed to the 65 CNEL and independent analysis and monitoring is provided as part of submittal and review of quarterly noise reports. In addition, mitigation measure MM-LU-5 would upgrade and expand the existing noise monitoring program to support LAWA and other jurisdictional ANMP's through more accurate and up-to-date data for considering adjustments to the ANMP. Therefore, the recommended changes would not be necessary to achieve mitigation for noise-sensitive uses newly exposed to the 65 CNEL under Alternative D and no changes would be necessary for mitigation measures MM-LU-1 and MM-LU-5. Also these mitigation measures would be enforceable through a mitigation monitoring and reporting program. See also Subtopical Responses TR-LU-3.4 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and TR-LU-3.14 for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP.

Regarding single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening or classroom disruption, as described in Section 4.1, Noise (subsections 4.1.2.1.1 and 4.1.2.1.2) methodology to develop single event noise thresholds was based on a review of recent research literature that was available at the time of preparation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As stated under mitigation measure MM-

3. Comments and Responses

LU-2 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, actual adjustments to the ANMP contour to include residential uses newly exposed to the 94 dBA SEL would be based on periodic reevaluation of the 94 dBA SEL noise contour by LAWA. Therefore, the recommended changes would not be necessary to achieve mitigation for residential uses newly exposed to the 94 dBA SEL under Alternative D and no changes would be required for mitigation measure MM-LU-2. 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.

SPC00296-8

Comment:

2. Airport Noise Mitigation Program Revision: Prior to or immediately concurrent with the Board of Airport Commissioners' (BOAC) review of the LAX Master Plan Alternatives, the BOAC shall adopt revisions to its Airport Noise Mitigation Program. These revisions shall include, at a minimum, the easing of burdensome requirements for residences related to building code compliance, and revision of the terms of the Aviation Easement.

Response:

As stated mitigation measure MM-LU-1, areas and properties that are newly exposed to 65 CNEL and greater noise levels are representative based on modeling of future conditions. Actual adjustments to the ANMP contour would be based on measured data presented in the quarterly noise reports prepared by LAWA. As stated in MM-LU-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, recommended revisions include the reduction or elimination, to the extent feasible, of structural and building code compliance constraints to soundproofing and the reevaluation of the requirement for granting of aviation easements in exchange for residential soundproofing. Therefore, no changes would be required for mitigation measure MM-LU-1 to incorporate the revisions presented by the commentor. Please note that LAWA is working with other jurisdictions to address impediments to completion of sound insulation. Building code compliance constraints are largely within the County of Los Angeles and actions to relieve such constraints rest with the County. See also Response to Comment SAL00013-109 regarding implementation of sound insulation in Los Angeles County.

SPC00296-9

Comment:

3. Expedition of the Implementation of Part 161 Study to Make Over-Ocean Procedures Mandatory: LAWA and the FAA should move expeditiously to complete all necessary steps to implement a moratorium on nighttime eastbound take-offs. Other airports around the world, including Narita International in Tokyo, have imposed a moratorium on flights during normal sleep hours to reduce the noise burden on surrounding communities. LAWA must also immediately establish a monitoring system to track and limit current nighttime eastbound take-offs during the period in which the Part 161 process is underway.

Response:

Comment noted. As a result of Congress passing the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990, LAWA cannot implement any restrictions on Stage 3 aircraft without the completion and approval of a 14 CFR Part 161 Study by the FAA. The commentor is correct in identifying that Narita International Airport has a nighttime 11 p.m. to 6 a.m. curfew. Narita International Airport is not overseen by the FAA thus may implement its own operating restrictions. However, LAWA has recently initiated a Request For Qualifications to prepare a 14 CFR Part 161 Study for Los Angeles International Airport. LAWA is seeking to establish a partial curfew at LAX that would prohibit the easterly departure of all discretionary aircraft, with certain exemptions, between the hours of 12:00 Midnight to 6:30 a.m. when LAX is in Over-Ocean Operations. The application of the 14 CFR Part 161 Study does not imply that all easterly departures between midnight and 6:30 a.m. would be eliminated. During periods of Santa Ana weather when easterly winds exceed 10 knots, or during periods of coastal fog when the visibility is severely limited west of the airport, safety considerations will require the use of east flow operations, and all

traffic will take off to the east. Such conditions now account for the great majority of easterly takeoffs that occur during the year. No change is proposed for these existing procedures during high wind or low visibility periods. LAWA does monitor nighttime operations and recently assessed the frequency of easterly operations during over-ocean procedures and found that over a period of 18 months, 82 such takeoffs occurred. Airlines will schedule their flights where there is a demand by passengers and/or for cargo. Since LAX does not have a curfew, airlines and cargo operators routinely schedule flights during the nighttime hours. Since Narita opens at 6:00 a.m. departures could be initiated as early as 1:00 a.m. at LAX to arrive at 6:00 a.m. in Narita. However, flights scheduled for Asia are not only scheduled during nighttime hours, they are scheduled throughout the day as well. For further information on nighttime operations, please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.1 and Appendix SC of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIS/EIR, and Topical Response TR-N-5, regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

SPC00296-10

Comment:

4. School Noise Mitigation Program: Educational institutions from pre-schools to elementary, middle and high schools are all negatively impacted by noise pollution caused by various LAX noise sources. For purposes of mitigation, specific schools need sound mitigation and in some cases relocation would be the most appropriate mitigation for the noise pollution caused by the LAX modernization.

Response:

Noise impacts on schools 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. Regarding noise impacts on schools from LAX operations, see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of noise mitigation payments, avigation easements, and other provisions of the "Settlement Agreement" that resolved land use incompatibility and aircraft noise mitigation issues between affected schools and aircraft operations. Schools without avigation 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 avigation 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.

SPC00296-11

Comment:

4.3.2 Off-Airport Surface Transportation

4.3.2.3 Affected Environment/Environmental Baseline

Unless Explained, the LAWA and FAA Decision to Treat the Nearly 11% Increase in Traffic Around LAX as "Non-Material" Must Be Considered Arbitrary and Capricious

Federal and state statutes governing administrative procedures prohibit agencies from making arbitrary or capricious decisions. In the Supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement (SDEIR/S), LAWA and the FAA conclude that there has been no material change in off-airport traffic conditions since 1996. LAWA and the FAA state that "the average annual growth for the combined intersections [in the vicinity of LAX] was approximately 1.5 percent and 1.0 percent per year for the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively." (SDEIR/S, p. 4-244.) LAWA and the FAA have not, however, identified the criteria they used to determine that this growth, equivalent to nearly an 11% increase for traffic during the morning rush hours from 1996 to 2003, is not materially different from the 1996 baseline. Unless LAWA and the FAA provide a clear basis for this determination founded upon reasonable criteria, their decision to consider a nearly 11% increase in traffic "non-material" must be considered arbitrary and capricious. This change in traffic density in the vicinity of LAX should be

3. Comments and Responses

considered a material change in baseline peak traffic conditions. LAWA and the FAA should revise their off-airport traffic environmental baseline to reflect current conditions and re-analyze project impacts.

Response:

It is the Adjusted Environmental Baseline, and not the Baseline, which is used for the off-airport analysis. The Adjusted Environmental Baseline properly isolates traffic growth due to the project from all other traffic growth. If the 1996/97 (unadjusted) environmental baseline were used in the comparison, then the increase in traffic due to the project could not be differentiated from increases in traffic due to traffic growth unrelated to the airport.

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR discusses the baseline update in Appendix S-B, Existing Baseline Comparison Issues - 1996 to 2000. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding transportation analysis methodology. In particular, see Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.12.2 regarding a summary of 1995 model validation and 1996 model update.

SPC00296-12

Comment:

The Use of the No Project Alternative as the "Adjusted Environmental Baseline" to Assess Environmental Impacts Violates CEQA

CEQA the CEQA Guidelines, prohibit the use of a "no project alternative" that differs from the existing environmental setting as the baseline for determining the impacts of a proposed project. As established in the CEQA Guidelines, "The no project alternative analysis is not the baseline for determining whether the proposed project's environmental impacts may be significant, unless it is identical to the existing environmental setting analysis which does establish that baseline." (Guidelines §15126.6(e).) LAWA and the FAA use an "adjusted environmental baseline" to evaluate off-airport surface transportation impacts and to develop mitigation measures. LAWA and the FAA base this adjusted environmental baseline on "a comparison of future year traffic conditions with the project to future year traffic conditions without the project." (SDEIR/S, p. 4-244.) Thus, contrary to CEQA, LAWA and the FAA use the "no project" alternative as a baseline for determining the significance of environmental impacts from future year traffic conditions. CEQA specifically prohibits this practice. LAWA and the FAA cannot legally use their "adjusted environmental baseline" to determine the significance of environmental impacts and develop mitigation measures. In order to comply with CEQA, the analyses of future year off-airport traffic impacts must be reassessed based on a comparison of existing environmental conditions and the SDEIR/S must be recirculated for comment.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology. In particular see TR-ST-2.5 regarding the No Action/No Project Alternative and the Adjusted Environmental Baseline.

SPC00296-13

Comment:

4.3.2.7 Cumulative Impacts

LAWA and the FAA Must Update Their Off-Airport Surface Transportation Cumulative Impacts Analysis Based on Current Information About Other Past, Present, and Probable Future Projects

NEPA and CEQA require public agencies to consider potential cumulative impacts. (40 CFR §1508.7; Guidelines §§15216, 15130.) This cumulative impacts analysis must consider past, present, and probable future projects. In the SDEIR/S, LAWA and the FAA state, "The cumulative impacts to off-airport surface transportation associated with Alternatives A, B, and C, in combination with other past, present, and probable future projects have not changed from those described in Section 4.3.1, Off-Airport Surface Transportation (subsection 4.3.2.8), or the Draft EIS/EIR." This is not true. The analysis in the DEIR/S, which was prepared as part of the Final Draft LAX Master Plan in 1996, is based on out-of-date information. (LAX Master Plan, Final Draft, May 1996.) Specifically, the DEIR/S did not anticipate several development projects in the vicinity of LAX, including the impending residential

development of Los Angeles Air Force Base (LAAFB) Area A.3 The LAAFB project will have significant impacts on traffic in the vicinity of LAX. In addition, the LAAFB DEIR/S includes a list of related projects. (LAAFB DEIR/S, pp. 2-30 to 2-33.) Many of these projects do not appear to have been considered in the LAX Master Plan. (Compare LAAFB DEIR/S, pp. 2-30 to 2-33, with Final Draft LAX Master Plan, p. IV-8.5 to IV-8.7.) LAWA and the FAA must update their off-airport surface transportation cumulative impacts analysis based on current information about other past, present, and probable future projects. LAWA and the FAA should also revise their proposed mitigation measures to reduce or avoid significant cumulative impacts identified through this updated analysis.

3 See United States Air Force, et al., Draft EIR/EIS - Los Angeles Air Force Base Land Conveyance, Construction and Development Project, April 2003, California State Clearinghouse No. 2002071106. Note that the City of El Segundo and the City of Hawthorne certified the LAAFB EIR in July 2003, and the U.S. Air Force issued a Notice of Decision for the EIR in August 2003. We incorporate all LAAFB EIR/EIS-related documents by reference into our comments and the Administrative Record for the LAX project.

Response:

Future year scenarios are based on socio-economic forecasts that include planned development projects as identified in Table S3 of Technical Report S-2b, as well as anticipated growth as assumed in the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan. SCAG's regional socio-economic forecasts, summarized in Table S1 of Technical Report S-2b, implicitly include all future development projects (most not yet proposed or even conceived) that will make up the growth from 1995 to 2015. The comment identifies potential future development projects that were identified in the Draft EIS/EIR for the Los Angeles Air Force Base. Many of the projects identified in that table (for example, Playa Vista) have already been incorporated into the analysis and listed in Table S3 of Technical Report S-2b. The others are implicitly included by virtue of the significant growth assumed by the regional socio-economic forecasts. The projects identified in Table 8 of the Draft EIS/EIR for the Los Angeles Air Force Base (including the proposed project and the list of other related development projects) represent a growth of 20,069 dwelling units and 58,030 employees. Socio-economic forecasts used in the LAX Master Plan analysis for the same geographic area (analysis zones) anticipate a growth of 36,977 dwelling units and 157,507 employees. The forecasts used in the LAX Master Plan analysis therefore assume much more growth than has been identified in the Draft EIS/EIR for the Los Angeles Air Force Base. Therefore, the LAX analysis has already taken into account the affect of these projects, as well as numerous other development projects not yet identified, in establishing future year conditions.

SPC00296-14

Comment:

4.4 Social Impacts

4.4.1 Employment/Socio-Economics

Alternative D Is Inconsistent with the Stated Purpose of the Project.

In explaining the need to develop LAX, the SDEIR/S asserts:

[I]f LAX does not increase capacity to accommodate some of the projected increase in demand for air travel services, the demand will be met by other airports in the region or elsewhere in the western United States. Failure to fully meet the demand at LAX would also result in lost economic opportunities, including jobs being lost to other regions. As stated in the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA had concluded that in order to avoid 'significant negative consequences' and sustain the economic growth of the region, at least some portion of the increased demand should be met at LAX....

The purpose and need as stated in the Draft EIS/EIR (summarized above) remains valid today. (SDEIR/S p. 2-1.)

Section 4.4.1 of the DEIR, however, presents evidence that there will be job loss associated with Alternative D. Despite this significant loss, the SDEIR/S states that "the cumulative effects of Alternative D are considered beneficial." (SDEIR/S p. 4-301.) To conform to SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan,

3. Comments and Responses

and to meet the generally desirable goal of a regionalization of air traffic, LAWA has proposed an alternative with a negative impact on regional and local employment. Other benefits of Alternative D potentially outweigh the negative impacts associated with it, but the SDEIR/S must adequately assess any negative economic impacts, and the Final EIR must specify mitigations to address these.

Response:

Comment noted. The local and regional economic impacts of Alternative D are presented in detail in Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As stated on page 4-301 in Section 4.4.1 (employment/Socio-Economics) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, economic or social effects do not constitute a significant effect on the environment, and in the absence of significant effects, no mitigation is required. Overall, Alternative D is considered to be responsive to the Master Plan project objectives, while the No Action/No Project Alternative is not. See also Response to Comment SAL00013-9.

SPC00296-15

Comment:

The SDEIS/R Analysis of Regional Job Loss Understates the Economic Impact of Alternative D and is thus Inadequate.

Undertaking a regional economic impact analysis, the SDEIR/S projects a loss of 57,113 jobs in the Los Angeles region associated with Alternative D, including a loss of 9,261 on-airport jobs. (SDEIR/S p. 4-298.)

Job losses are very significant in the region's high-wage manufacturing sector, while there is a modest increase in regional employment in the traditionally low-paying service sector. The three industries with the highest percentage of job loss have median wages of \$15.29-17.61 an hour. Employment in these industries is typically full-time and includes employer-paid health and pension benefits. By contrast, the service sectors that show sustained growth are ones in which median wages for non-managerial workers range from \$7.21-9.11 an hour. Entry-level employment is typically minimum wage, and these industries characteristically provide neither full-time employment, nor health or pension benefits.⁴

The SDEIR/S understates the economic impact of declining employment by failing to account for the disproportionately greater economic loss from the loss of manufacturing jobs. The Final EIS/EIR must analyze and compare job quality, wage levels, and full-time/part-time ratios in manufacturing and service sectors to reach an accurate assessment of the economic impact of Alternative D.

4 Analysis of industries listed in SDEIR/S Table S.4.4.1-1 is based on Occupational Employment Statistics Survey for Los Angeles County, 2002, and U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2002 and 2003), distributed by the Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division, State of California. (<http://www.calmis.ca.gov/>).

Response:

Comment noted. Economic impacts are not considered impacts on the environment under CEQA or NEPA, but are discussed to an extent to give a more thorough understanding of the Alternatives. The analysis of total economic output at the local and regional levels (stated in constant 1996 dollars), as presented in Technical Report S-3 to the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, accounts for the compensation impacts of all relevant manufacturing and service industries that are affected by Alternative D.

SPC00296-16

Comment:

The SDEIR/S Does Not Address the Impact of Low-Wage Jobs on Public Services

The SDEIR/S neglects to undertake an analysis of direct on-airport employment. From the Master Plan description of Alternative D, it is evident that direct on-airport employment growth will be in the sectors of concession restaurants and retail, security guards, passenger services, janitorial, and parking. While

manufacturing jobs are being lost in the region, the employment gains at the project itself are in low-paying, often part-time jobs that typically lack health insurance, pensions, and job security.

Permanent employment gains at LAX will thus do little to address the acute problem of poverty and inadequate family incomes that exists in the Los Angeles region. Recently released Census data for 2002 shows median income falling and the official poverty rate rising in the state of California. The extent of the problem is far greater than the Census indicates, however, as the Federal Poverty Level is far below the cost of living in Los Angeles. According to the California Budget Project, to meet basic living expenses in Los Angeles County, one needs to work full-time and earn between \$10.49 and \$23.31 an hour.⁵

Low wage jobs create burdens on public services that the SDEIR/S does not address. The shortfall between wages and the cost of living is frequently made up through reliance on public programs such as food stamps, Medi-Cal, child care assistance, and Healthy Families.⁶ The Final EIR/S must explore ways to mitigate the impact of low-wage jobs on public services.

⁵ The range reflects different family size and child-care arrangements. California Budget Project, "Making Ends Meet: How Much Does It Cost to Raise a Family in California?" October 2003.

⁶ Ibid.

Response:

On-airport employment impacts of Alternative D are presented in Table S4-4.1-2, page 4-299, Section 4.1.1 (Employment/Socio-Economics) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As stated on page 4-301 in Section 4.4.1 (Employment/Socio-Economics) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, economic or social effects do not constitute a significant effect on the environment, and in the absence of significant effects, no mitigation is required. In addition, NEPA and CEQA do not require a detailed fiscal assessment of the impact of the proposed LAX Master Plan facilities on the internal finances of local municipalities neighboring the airport or the County government. Please see Section 4.4.3.7 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding job outreach efforts focused on Disadvantaged Business Enterprises and minority and/or low-income residents located east of LAX.

SPC00296-17

Comment:

The SDEIR/S Economic Impact Analysis is Inconsistent with the SDEIR/S Analysis of Benefits Relating to Environmental Justice Issues

The SDEIR/S explains that "in assessing whether a project has disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations, certain benefits of the project may be taken into account." (SDEIR/S, p. 4-339.) The SDEIR/S identifies job creation as one of the "economic benefits directly and indirectly attributable to LAX" and promises to take measures to ensure that LAX jobs are available to members of the minority and low-income communities surrounding the airport. (SDEIR/S, pp. 4-339-40.)

The SDEIR/S does not, however, analyze whether the decline in employment directly or indirectly related to Alternative D will have a disproportionate effect on low-income and minority communities. Furthermore, the SDEIR/S does not identify measures that ensure that these jobs, which are purportedly a "benefit" to impacted communities, will be quality jobs. In the absence of positive measures, low-paying service jobs are as likely to have a negative impact on these communities, by putting a greater strain on their public and civic services.

Response:

There is no inconsistency between the economic impact analysis and the environmental justice analysis contained in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. One of the goals of Alternative D is to encourage the development and use of other regional airports by constraining activity at LAX. This regional approach reduces environmental impacts on minority and low-income communities surrounding the airport compared to the other build alternatives. While it is true that the constrained activity at LAX under Alternative D while reducing environmental impacts would also have economic consequences, the effects on jobs are dispersed throughout the region by various market sectors tied to passenger and

3. Comments and Responses

cargo activity as further described in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio Economics of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The extent to which these jobs within various communities, employment sectors and at different pay scales may accrue to minority or disadvantaged populations is not clear, however, on a more local and direct basis, a relatively small proportion of current LAX jobs are held by residents of neighboring minority and low-income communities. Specifically, see page 4-339, which indicates that of the 59,000 badged employees at LAX, only 2,304 reside in Inglewood. Furthermore, the forecast loss of jobs over time under Alternative D is not a consequence of the alternative, it is due to greater economic output overtime per employee due to expected advances in technology. This downward influence on job growth within the sectors of the economy that relate to activity at LAX, would occur with or without the proposed project. Therefore, even if the demographic consequences of jobs not realized under Alternative D were more clearly understood, any disproportionate effect on minority populations would be independent of the proposed project.

The statement by the commentor that the job opportunities presented as part of the benefits program proposed by LAWA may not be a true benefit and that low-paying service jobs may actually have a negative impact is not consistent with the benefit program proposed in the Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As indicated in the description of the Jobs Outreach Center on page 4-430, LAWA would provide opportunities for jobs at all levels with applicants screened for skills, qualifications and job readiness. Provisions in the program for job training, implementation of aviation curriculum at local schools and establishment of an Aviation Academy, all are intended to help develop skills and make the best possible job opportunities available to those residing in communities most affected by LAX. Also see the final benefits program provided in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Final EIS/EIR.

SPC00296-18

Comment:

4.4.1.8 Mitigation Measures

LAWA Should Adopt Mitigation Measures to Minimize the Negative Economic Impact of the Project and to Render the Project Consistent with its Stated Purposes

The SDEIR/S inadequately and inconsistently addresses a number of issues related to the economic and social impact of Alternative D. Most importantly, the permanent jobs generated by the project will be predominantly low-wage service sector jobs.

We recommend the following mitigation measures be implemented. We also encourage further exploration of additional means to address the negative economic impacts of the project.

1. LAX Master Plan Commitment to Quality Jobs: LAWA should incorporate into the Master Plan existing policies (Living Wage, Responsible Contractor, and Worker Retention Ordinances) that improve the quality of on-airport jobs. LAWA should also explore whether it is appropriate to consider revisions of the Living Wage Ordinance to improve health coverage and increase wages, in order that airport jobs provide adequate family income and health insurance.

2. Community Jobs Development Program: The LAX Community Jobs Development Program would be a community-driven process funded by LAWA and the FAA, where residents living within the project study area would develop a First Source hiring program that promotes local employment. The goal of the program is to set local hiring targets and support the infrastructure of training, employment services, and the like, which will aid residents of the project study area to gain and keep airport-related jobs. LAWA, through Master Plan commitments and BOAC action, shall commit to the local hiring targets set by the program and to funding job-related services.

3. Community Jobs Promotion Program: As the SDEIR/S argued, the indirect economic impact of LAX is of larger significance than the actual on-airport economic activity. Therefore, LAWA and the FAA should do everything possible to promote access by the low-income, minority residents of the impacted areas to airport and aviation-related employment. To this end, LAWA and the FAA should invest in training to qualify local residents for airport and airport-related jobs, including skilled jobs associated with aviation and the air travel industry. LAWA should also provide incentives to companies engaged in airport-related business to encourage them to participate in apprenticeship, internship, training and

other career-development programs for local residents. Providing the foundation for local residents to pursue careers that pay higher wages and offer opportunity for advancement is a benefit that can help to offset the many negative impacts of the project on the surrounding communities.

4. Community Business Development Program: LAWA and the FAA should include additional measures to support and promote the development and growth of local businesses. Providing opportunity to small businesses, particularly to local disadvantaged, minority, or women-owned businesses, could have a large ripple effect in the communities suffering the disproportionate negative impact of LAX. The economic benefits accruing from such a program would help offset the negative environmental impacts of the project. The program would be developed by community stakeholders, aided by independent financial and business consultants and funded by LAWA and the FAA. Examples of programs that would stimulate local business development include: financial incentives for prime contractors to do business with local firms; micro-lending projects, bonding and contracting assistance.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02204-14 regarding the types of jobs and associated wages that will be generated under the Master Plan. The recommendations presented by the commentor have been considered as possible additional components of LAWA's Environmental Justice Program. The Environmental Justice Program, as refined and expanded based on additional environmental justice workshops and other comments received during the public circulation period for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, is presented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of this Final EIS/EIR.

SPC00296-19

Comment:

4.4.2 Relocation of Residences or Businesses

LAWA and the FAA Provide an Incomplete, Inconsistent, and Misleading Description of the Project by Failing to Analyze the Impacts of Residential Acquisition at Manchester Square

LAWA and the FAA must assess the environmental impacts of all reasonably foreseeable phases of the LAX project. (Laurel Heights Improvement Association of San Francisco, Inc. v. Regents of the University of California (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 396-397.) Under CEQA, a project is "the whole of the action, which has a potential for resulting in a physical change in the environment, directly or ultimately." (McQueen v. Board of Directors of the Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space District (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 1136, 1143; CEQA Guidelines §15378.) The SDEIR/S includes an incomplete, inconsistent, and misleading description of the project. LAWA and the FAA fail to comply with CEQA by not assessing the environmental impacts of the reasonably foreseeable phase of the project that requires the acquisition of approximately 2,000 residential units at Manchester Square. At the time of publication of the SDEIR/S, only 21% of the total of approximately 2,500 units had been acquired in the area of the Manchester Square and Belford "Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program." (SDEIR/S p. 4-304.) Yet, LAWA and the FAA make the inaccurate, inconsistent, and contrary claim that "no residential acquisition is proposed for Alternative D" (SDEIR/S p. 4-307), despite the fact that the Ground Transportation Center planned for Manchester Square represents an integral part of the Alternative D project.

The SDEIR/S artificially segregates the analysis of this residential acquisition with the pretense that this acquisition is unrelated to the project. There is no analysis of the impact of the acquisition and relocation of the approximately 2,000 remaining residential units in the area. Yet, the SDEIR/S admits that, if the acquisition is not completed in time for construction of the Ground Transportation Center, "the City of Los Angeles will use the most appropriate and practical measures available (e.g., voluntary acquisition, leasing, and/or public condemnation) to ensure that the designated areas are vacated consistent with the Construction Sequencing Plan." (SDEIR/S p. 4-304.) Considering the numbers of households involved, the difficulty this population will find in securing comparable, decent, safe and sanitary replacement housing within their financial means, and the dearth of available affordable housing in the LAX area specifically and the Los Angeles region generally, the impacts of this action will be significant and must be analyzed in the SDEIR/S.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

As stated in the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, homes in the Manchester Square area are being acquired through the existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation program currently underway within the Airport/Belford and Manchester Square areas near the airport, in support of LAWA's ANMP. The program was instituted after LAWA received a high level of interest from those who reside in the area which is subject to high noise levels. The program was instituted independent of the LAX Master Plan and has separate utility. This program is proceeding and will be completed with or without approval of the LAX Master Plan. The effects of this acquisition are assessed under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Furthermore, as noted in the Draft EIS/EIR, a Mitigated Negative Declaration was approved by the City of Los Angeles for the Manchester Square and Airport/Belford Voluntary Acquisition Program. The Mitigated Negative Declaration addressed the potential impacts of the proposed Program on the Manchester Square and Belford areas. The study was conducted pursuant to the CEQA and LAWA requirements. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.1.2 regarding legality of the acquisition of Manchester Square, Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.2 regarding relocation of homes in Manchester Square, and Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.5 regarding replacement housing. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding affordable housing.

SPC00296-20

Comment:

The SDEIR/S Fails to Analyze the Disproportionate Impact of Residential Relocation on Minority Communities.

The preferred project alternative requires the displacement of a predominantly minority community. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, 4,798 people lived in the Manchester Square area, of whom 58.5% were black and 23.2% were Latino. In addition, the area is predominantly low-income.⁷

The displacement of this minority community should be viewed in the context of the current affordable housing crisis in Los Angeles. "The City of Los Angeles is in the grip of a profound crisis of housing affordability. The majority of the City's households are renters who are paying higher percentages of their incomes for rent than anyone else in California," according to a report of the City of Los Angeles Housing Crisis Taskforce.⁸ Rental vacancy rates are 4.7%, far below the average for other U.S. metropolitan areas, and new housing construction lags far behind demand.⁹

In the area designated for acquisition, 88.8% of 1,912 households present in 2000 were renters. The large numbers of people that will require relocation, combined with the housing shortage in the immediate vicinity and the region, almost certainly guarantee that the minimal assistance provided in accordance with the Uniform Act will be insufficient.

The Final EIR/S must accurately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on the relocation of residences. In addition, LAWA and the FAA should explore measures that go beyond the Uniform Act in order to mitigate the disproportionate impact of residential acquisition on low-income, minority renters. The Airport Noise Mitigation Program should be revised and expanded to provide assistance to tenants seeking relocation to comparable permanent housing.

⁷ Data on Census Tract 2774, U.S. Census, 2000.

⁸ Los Angeles Housing Crisis Taskforce, Report of the Housing Crisis Taskforce (2000).

⁹ Statistics are for the year 2000. Institute for the Study of Homelessness and Poverty at the Weingart Center, Housing and Poverty in Los Angeles, July 2001.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing. Also see Response to Comment SAL00015-48 and Response to Comment SAL00015-49 regarding the demographic characteristics presented in the relocation analysis, acquisition occurring independent of the Master Plan within the Manchester Square and Belford neighborhoods, and the Existing Relocation Plan currently in place for those areas. As stated within the text of Master Plan Commitment RBR-1, Residential and Business Relocation Program (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), presented in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, as part of the Master Plan LAWA will prepare a new Residential and Business

Relocation Plan and expand its current program. Furthermore, the Existing Relocation Plan (i.e., LAWA's Final Relocation Plan - Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program for the Areas Manchester Square and Airport/Belford, dated June 2000) includes provisions for assistance to first time homeowners. A more specific analysis of environmental justice issues was provided in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00296-21

Comment:

The SDEIR/S Is Deficient Because it Fails to Include an Analysis of Urban-Blight Inducing Impacts.

Socio-economic analyses under CEQA have been interpreted by the courts to require an analysis of urban-blight inducing impacts (Citizens for Sensible Development of Bishop Area v. County of Inyo (1985), 172 Cal. App. 3d 151, 171; Citizens for quality Growth v. City of Mount Shasta (1988), 198 Cal. App. 3d 433, 445-446.)

Community leaders are concerned that LAX and airport-serving hotels seem to draw prostitution to the vicinity. Residents in the surrounding residential communities report a high level of prostitution traffic in their neighborhoods, and that prostitutes and their customers frequently discard condoms and other refuse on the streets, alleys, and sidewalks. This constitutes both a disruption to community life and an obvious threat to public health.

Furthermore, the high volume of vehicle traffic destined for the airport, especially trucks serving cargo operations, degrades the roads and sidewalks in the immediately adjacent communities. The consequently dilapidated condition of these roads contributes to urban blight. Although the airport is responsible for the poor condition of these roads, the community is left to bear the cost of fixing the roads and reversing blight.

The Final EIS/EIR must include an analysis of urban-blight inducing impacts. We request that LAWA and the FAA incorporate this additional mitigation measure prior to finalizing the LAX EIR/S:

1. Airport Neighbors Safety and Security Program: LAWA and the FAA should establish a task force including community residents and representatives, local area law enforcement agencies, and other interested parties to develop mitigation measures addressing the distinct needs of airport-adjacent communities. Measures would include a community policing plan, a traffic control plan, a road improvement plan, and a community security plan.

Response:

Urban-blight inducing impacts would not occur as a result of implementation of the Master Plan alternatives. Since, as analyzed in Section 4.2, Land Use of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the proposed improvements under the build alternatives would not change the community character to create blighted conditions or, as described in Topical Response TR-ES-1, result in a decline in residential property values such that blighted conditions would occur or be exacerbated. As described under Master Plan Commitments DA-1 and DA-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the provision of airport buffer areas and use of comprehensive set of design-related guidelines and plans, respectively would enhance the existing aesthetic quality of the area. In addition, under the Environmental Justice-Related Mitigation and Benefits Program, described in Section 4.4.3.7 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the Gateway LAX improvements would be expanded to the east along Century Boulevard through the City of Inglewood.

Regarding current prostitution activity in the communities surrounding LAX, this is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed airport-related crime in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement. As discussed on page 4-1189 of the Draft EIS/EIR, "Crime statistics at LAX show that between 1996 and 1999 the proportion of overall crime at LAX remained steady even with an 11 percent increase in passengers." During this same period, off-airport crime rates in the City of Los Angeles decreased by 30 percent while the population increased by four percent. Based on these statistics, there is no apparent correlation between increased activity at LAX and crime on the airport and in surrounding areas. With implementation of Master Plan Commitments discussed in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement, of the

3. Comments and Responses

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, project-related and cumulative impacts on law enforcement services are considered less than significant.

Regarding the high volume of vehicle traffic associated with LAX and degradation to the roads and sidewalks, as further described in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures proposed under the build alternatives would serve to direct airport traffic away from neighborhood streets and reduce traffic impacts compared to future conditions without the Master Plan. Maintenance of public streets would continue to be performed within the respective jurisdictions. See also Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding impacts to surrounding neighborhoods, including a neighborhood traffic management plan to address airport traffic concerns in specific neighborhoods.

The mitigation measure recommended by the commentor is not considered necessary since no urban blight is expected as a result of the Master Plan, no significant impacts on law enforcement would occur, and mitigation and a neighborhood traffic management program would address traffic concerns as further described in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and pages 5-2 and 5-3 of Technical Report 3b, Off-Airport Ground Access Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00296-22

Comment:

4.4.3 Environmental Justice

The SDEIR/S is Inadequate as a Result of the Deficiencies in the Environmental Justice Analysis

As a result of deficiencies in the SDEIR/S environmental justice analysis, we believe that the SDEIR/S is inadequate. We request that the deficiencies described be addressed in a supplemental SDEIR/S, and that the supplemental SDEIR/S be re-circulated to the public for review and comment. With respect to environmental justice issues, we believe that LAWA ignored environmental justice principles in preparing the SDEIR/S, and further failed to engage low-income and minority populations in the decision-making process. These defects violate both federal and state law. In addition, the SDEIR/S fails to provide reasonable mitigation proposals for articulated environmental justice impacts. The SDEIR/S bases much of its analysis on amorphous or the future development of environmental justice mitigation measures. We believe this violates the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the National Environmental Protection Act ("NEPA").

Response:

The environmental justice analysis contained in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is considered adequate and was conducted in compliance with CEQA and NEPA requirements. Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Final EIS/EIR, has been revised and refined based on public review and comment during the circulation period for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Regarding involvement of minority and low-income populations in the decision making process, LAWA has undertaken extensive public outreach efforts as part of its Environmental Justice Program, as further described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2. Regarding mitigation proposals, see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Final EIS/EIR and note that the benefit program presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR has been revised based on additional public input.

SPC00296-23

Comment:

Environmental Justice Principles Were Not Followed by LAWA 's Public Participation Process

One of the challenges facing LAWA was ensuring that the public had adequate information about the SDEIR/S to provide meaningful comments on the proposed Alternative D of the Master Plan. We recognize that LAWA took certain steps to secure comments from some local communities, but these steps, though perhaps well intentioned, were inadequate. Certain federal statutes and regulations require that LAWA ensure such participation:

3. Comments and Responses

- Title VI states that "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

- "The Environmental Justice (EJ) Orders amplify Title VI by providing that each Federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations." ("Implementing Title VI Requirements in Metropolitan and Statewide Planning," U.S. Department of Transportation, TOA-1/HEPH-1.)

- "Planning and programming activities that shall have the potential to have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on human health or the environment shall include explicit consideration of the effects on minority populations and low-income populations. Procedures shall be established or expanded, as necessary, to provide meaningful opportunities for public involvement by members of minority populations and low-income populations during the planning and development of programs, policies and activities."¹⁰

In spite of specific statutory language and guidance provided by the U.S. Department of Transportation, LAWA has failed in its efforts to provide such meaningful opportunities to the public and specifically minority populations and low-income populations, as shown below:

Copies of the SDEIR/S Were Not Readily Available to Poor Communities: Although LAWA made the SDEIR/S, Master Plan and related documents available for free on its website, this implies that all members of the public have computer access at home or at work, as well as sufficient Internet access to review voluminous documents. This presumption is incorrect - many low-income families simply do not have these kinds of computer resources. For those without computers, the only other options were to review thousands of pages of material at certain local libraries, often open only during working hours, or purchase hard copies of the documents for review at home. LAWA asked for anywhere from \$169 to \$1,302 to provide hard copies of the SDEIR/S and the Master Plan, and most low-income residents simply could not afford hard copies of the documents.

LAWA should have made more free or low-cost hard copies of the documents available for local residents and/or low-income populations. The absence of such provisions erected barriers to the participation of many local residents.

¹⁰ "Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations," U.S. Department of Transportation, Order DOT 5610.2 (emphasis added).

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.

SPC00296-24

Comment:

LAWA Did Not Allow Sufficient Time to Comment: We recognize that there is a sense of urgency among various governmental officials regarding the expansion/modernization of LAX. This should not mean, however, that public comment and hearings should be curtailed or eliminated to facilitate action. In light of the length and breadth of the SDEIR/S, and the need to compare and contrast much of the analysis in the SDEIR/S to the Master Plan analysis completed and circulated in 2000 and 2001, the public needed much more time to appropriately analyze and comment on the new Alternative D. Shortening the time to review and comment has a particularly negative impact on community groups and low-income residents who may have difficulty even getting access to copies of the SDEIR/S to read.

Response:

Comment noted. FAA and LAWA provided a 120-day public comment period on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, substantially longer than the 45-day review period mandated by NEPA and CEQA. In

3. Comments and Responses

addition, twelve public hearings were held throughout the region. Please see Response to Comment SAL00018-76 regarding the availability of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

SPC00296-25

Comment:

LAWA Failed to Timely Address the Environmental Justice Issues Inherent in the Expansion Plan: According to the Environmental Justice section of the SDEIR/S, LAWA has been implementing an "Environmental Justice Community Outreach Program" at least since May 2001. (SDEIR/S pp. 4-336, 4-337.) The SDEIR/S is unclear as to whether this program has continued during the review of Alternative D, and thus if LAWA has fulfilled its self-defined environmental justice commitments for Alternative D. The activities described in the SDEIR/S took place in 2001, and were only relevant to the Master Plan alternatives under discussion at that time. There is no description of outreach activities related to the Alternative D analysis, aside from a vague reference to "more recent community outreach." This is simply not sufficient. A fuller description of the activities of the "Environmental Justice Community Outreach Program"-including a list of community meetings held after November 2001, the agendas and attendance of those meetings, and a description of the outreach conducted related to the meetings - - is necessary in order to evaluate whether LAWA's commitment to environmental justice was met for Alternative D.

Response:

As indicated in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D was formulated as a direct response to the strongly expressed desire of many citizens, as indicated in comments on the Draft EIS/EIR, that implored LAWA to limit activity at LAX in favor of a more regional approach to airport planning in Southern California. This desire was in large part based on the goal of more equitably distributing environmental impacts associated with air travel, and reducing potential future effects on communities surrounding LAX, including disproportionate adverse effects on minority and low-income communities. Also see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding LAWA's commitment to environmental justice throughout the EIS/EIR process. Materials related to EJ Workshops conducted during circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are provided in Appendix F-A, of this Final EIS/EIR.

SPC00296-26

Comment:

LAWA Has Failed to Create and Maintain Importance of a Transparent Public Participation Process with Respect to Environmental Justice: As mentioned above, aside from the "more recent community outreach" it is unclear as to what, if any, community involvement LAWA has engaged in with respect to the SDEIR/S. Unlike the DEIS/DEIR environmental justice analysis, no mention is made here of the "Environmental Justice Task Force" that LAWA engaged in June 2000, what resulted from the work of that task force, who participated, and why it has presumably been disbanded. In addition, there is no mention of the "Environmental Justice Community Outreach Program" on LAWA's website (LAWA's preferred method of educating the public), no contact information for a responsible staff member or any other related material. This lack of access makes meaningful involvement of minority and low-income populations non-existent.

The National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (NEJAC), a federal advisory committee to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, has developed The Model Plan for Public Participation.¹¹ "The Core Values and Guiding Principles for the Practice of Public Participation" includes guidelines for ensuring early involvement of the public. We believe the following core values and guidelines were not followed by LAWA in its public participation process and should be utilized in further engaging the public and preparing the final SDEIR/S.

- People should have a say in decisions about actions that affect their lives.
- Public participation includes the promise that the public's contribution will influence the decision.
- The public participation process communicates the interests and meets the process needs of all participants.

3. Comments and Responses

- The public participation process seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected.
- The public participation process communicates to participants how their input was, or was not, utilized.
- The public participation process provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.
- Encourage early and active community participation.
- Institutionalize meaningful public participation by acknowledging and formalizing the process.
- Create mechanisms and measurements to ensure the effectiveness of public participation. (NEJAC, The Model Plan for Public Participation, p. 13.)

As part of a federally mandated process, we believe LAWA's public participation process was sorely lacking. Specifically, LAWA failed to include early and meaningful participation of low-income and minority populations. For example, the SDEIR/S fails to list any specifics about the "recent community outreach" discussed in the Environmental Justice section of the SDEIR/S, including: what it consisted of; who was invited; who attended; what decision makers (including elected officials, LAWA Commissioners and high level staff) attended; what was the agenda; if input received at those meetings was incorporated into LAWA's Master Plan; how such input was assimilated and incorporated by LAWA staff; what languages were spoken at those meetings; what written materials were distributed; and what efforts were made to engage low-income populations. We request that this information be provided for any Environmental Justice Program outreach conducted since November 2001, and that the detailed information be circulated in a supplemental SDEIR/S to allow for appropriate analysis of LAWA's environmental justice public outreach program.

Although LAWA's SDEIR/S recognizes that environmental justice issues exist, it does not adequately address them. As a result, we believe that the public participation and environmental justice processes engaged by LAWA are deficient.

11 See [http://www.epa.gov/Compliance/resources/publications/ej/model_public part_plan.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/Compliance/resources/publications/ej/model_public_part_plan.pdf).

Response:

LAWA's public participation program for environmental justice has involved extensive efforts which have been disclosed 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. With respect to the "more recent community outreach" referenced in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and community outreach undertaken since circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 and Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of this Final EIS/EIR. Furthermore, Appendix F-A, of this Final EIS/EIR provides a comprehensive accounting of the environmental justice workshops undertaken in association with the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, as well as a matrix that lists the various benefits and measures suggested by the public that were evaluated as part of the Environmental Justice Program. The matrix also indicates which benefits or measures were adopted and why certain measures were not adopted.

While it is acknowledged that there is no specific information relating to the Environmental Justice Community Outreach Program on LAWA's website with contact information for a responsible staff member, efforts at outreach have nonetheless conformed with the values and guidelines cited in the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council's "The Model Plan for Public Participation."

SPC00296-27

Comment:

LAWA Failed to Articulate Sufficient Methods to Offset or Mitigate Well-Defined Negative Impacts on Low-Income and Minority Populations

3. Comments and Responses

As discussed elsewhere in these comments, CEQA requires public agencies to adopt feasible mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate otherwise significant adverse environmental impacts. (Cal. Pub. Res. Code §§ 21002, 21081, subd. a.) For each identified significant adverse environmental impact the EIR must identify specific mitigation measures. (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.4.) However, we believe that the environmental justice mitigation measures suggested by LAWA has not been fully developed and, instead, relies on the deferral of mitigation measures until after some undefined further work is completed by LAWA.

LAWA's SDEIR/S specifically states that increased LAX operations will disproportionately impact minority and low-income populations with respect to noise and air pollution. A simple review of LAWA's SDEIR/S bears out this conclusion:

Noise

"[A]pproximately 87 percent of the population newly exposed to high noise levels, or 4,430 residents is estimated to be minority and/or low-income." (SDEIR/S, p. 4-324);

"[U]nder Alternative D, three public schools would be newly exposed to... greater aircraft noise levels or exposed to an increase of [noise]... These schools... are all within minority and/or low-income areas... and would be exposed to noise levels that could be disruptive to classroom activities." (SDEIR/S, p. 4-324)

"Despite the comprehensive mitigation proposed, the analysis concludes that, after mitigation, certain areas affected by noise would still be faced with adverse effects due to constraints that apply most directly to minority and/or low-income communities." (SDEIR/S, p. 4-429);

Air Quality

"While O3 [ozone] is a region wide problem, minority and low-income populations may be more severely affected because they may be more susceptible to asthma and other chronic respiratory illnesses triggered by high O3 levels. Children within minority communities may be particularly susceptible to health effects of PM10 [particulate matter], ozone and NO2 [nitrogen dioxide] and thus may be more severely affected than other communities exposed to equivalent levels of pollutants, while children living in poverty who lack access to adequate health care may be especially at risk." (SDEIR/S, pp. 4-330 (emphasis added))

4.4.3.7 Environmental Justice Program Mitigation Measures

LAWA's Environmental Justice Program Requires Further Review and Modification

LAWA's plan for environmental justice mitigation measures falls short of solving these environmental problems and of legal expectations. In fact, LAWA's failure to commit to specific environmental mitigation plans, without measurable goals, deadlines and milestones, and an agency accountability program, is dangerously close to relying upon deferred mitigation measures not permitted under CEQA. (See, e.g., *King County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990), 221 Cal. App. 3d 692, 728.) At minimum, LAWA may defer the development and implementation of mitigation measures only when LAWA commits to meet realistic performance standards. (*Gentry v. City of Murrieta* (1995), 36 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1395-1396.)

Such performance standards to alleviate environmental justice, social and cultural impacts are nowhere in LAWA's analysis.

We also believe that LAWA's proposed future mitigation plans also runs afoul of the NEPA mitigation requirements. Because the mitigation measures have not yet been fully developed, it is impossible to gauge if the measure will decrease pollution, alter construction impacts, or provide compensation to affected populations. (See 40 C.F.R. 1508.20.)

1. Environmental Justice Accountability: As articulated above, we believe that LAWA's public participation process needs serious and immediate improvement, including at minimum a more transparent decision-making process regarding the most recently developed build alternative; a comprehensive plan showing how the Environmental Justice Program operates and will continue to work through the construction process; and more inclusion of low-income and minority populations in the decision-making process.

2. Youth and Community Assets Program: The LAX Youth and Community Assets Program would be designed by a community-driven process that would be funded by LAWA and the FAA. The goal of the

Program is to offset the emotional and physical negative health impacts caused by LAX operations and modernization. Specifically, LAWA would work with community groups to determine how to best offset negative air and noise pollution impacts by developing targeted recreation, parks and other open space land use solutions. By working with low-income and minority populations on this issue, LAWA will mitigate significant environmental effects and ensure environmental justice in the impacted areas.

We further request that LAWA be more specific in its work plan for their proposed environmental justice mitigation proposals, and fully adopt the mitigation programs suggested in these comments with respect to economic impacts, air and noise pollution, and negative effects on children and schools. As we have discussed here and elsewhere, low-income and minority populations will bear the heaviest burdens from all aspects of the proposed LAX modernization. Environmental injustice is threaded throughout the SDEIR/S and must be addressed comprehensively and aggressively.

In developing those programs, we request that LAWA include community groups with knowledge of this issue who constitute the low-income and minority communities negatively impacted by the operations LAX. Finally, we request that any future mitigation proposals developed to combat environmental justice impacts to low-income and minority populations be re-circulated in the form of a supplemental SDEIR/S for both procedural and substantive review by the public.

Response:

The mitigation measures outlined in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the Final EIS/EIR, are summarized from other Chapter 4 sections of these documents, including the mitigation measures that address noise and air quality impacts as further described in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.6, Air Quality. While these measures represent those that most specifically address potential impacts on minority and low-income communities that would be affected by the project, many other project design features, Master Plan commitments, and mitigation measures set forth in Chapter 5, Environmental Action Program, also address effects that relate to these communities. The collective mitigation measures provided in Chapter 5, are comprehensive and well defined and incorporate performance standards where appropriate. Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were both forthright about the community outreach program being on-going, and the benefit program contained in both the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the Final EIS/EIR are reflective of this additional input. To have fully defined this program prior to the additional community input received at the Environmental Justice Workshops and during the circulation period for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR would have short-cut the process established under the Environmental Justice Program. The mitigation measures in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were well defined, and the refinement of certain mitigation measures in the Final EIS/EIR has not changed the basic findings for environmental justice. Accordingly, there is no cause for re-circulation of the document due to the deferral of or lack of specificity of mitigation measures. Regarding the extent to which the mitigation measures decrease impacts, see the discussions in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsections 4.4.3.5. and 4.4.3.6), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and under the heading "Level of Significance After Mitigation" in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.9), Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.9), and Section 4.6, Air Quality (subsection 4.6.9) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The presentation of findings in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR as preliminary was based on the need for further community outreach on Alternative D under the Environmental Justice Program to ensure that proposed benefits reflect community needs. The preliminary findings, did not in any way compromise the development and disclosure of a comprehensive set of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, or the documents findings regarding physical impacts on the environment and levels of significance after implementation of mitigation measures. Rather, findings of disproportionately high and adverse effects were identified as preliminary to account for additional benefits that might be developed with community input and how they might further off-set identified disproportionate effects. The changes to the benefits set forth in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, as represented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Final EIS/EIR, appropriately reflect recent community input. These off-setting benefits go beyond the provision of all known feasible mitigation measures as presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and are specifically intended to address remaining adverse disproportionate effects on minority and low-income populations to the extent feasible within funding and legal limits.

Regarding how the Environmental Justice Program will work through the construction process, this will be dependent on continuing coordination with leaders and representatives in affected communities and

3. Comments and Responses

can also be understood by reviewing specific mitigation measures contained in the mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the project.

Regarding the request for more specific proposals and input from community groups as environmental justice programs are further developed, see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Final EIS/EIR, and supporting information in Appendix F-A, which reflect public input received following circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also note LAWA's continued commitment to work with leaders and community groups and representatives in local communities as implementation of the environmental justice program proceeds.

Also please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

SPC00296-28

Comment:

4.6 Air Quality

4.6.1 Introduction

LAWA and the FAA Need to Specify Which Air Quality Mitigation Measures Will Be Required, Which Will Be Promoted, and How Implementation Will Be Monitored

LAWA and the FAA state that they will "[s]upport further conversion of mobile equipment to alternative-fueled engines." (SDEIR/S, p. 4-355.) They also state that, "LAWA would require or promote the conversion of airport tenant and user equipment to alternative fuels." (Ibid.) While we support these air pollution reduction measures, LAWA and the FAA should specify how they will determine whether an airport tenant or user will be required to convert to an alternative-fueled equipment and exactly what measures will be taken to promote the conversion to alternative-fueled equipment. In addition, it will be important for LAWA and the FAA to develop the means to measure the conversion of mobile and stationary equipment to alternative-fuels and the estimated air pollution benefits resulting from the implementation of these mitigation measures.

Response:

Technologically feasible mitigation measures identified to date during the environmental review process will be included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

SPC00296-29

Comment:

LAWA and the FAA also propose mitigation measures to reduce motor vehicle traffic coming into LAX and to reduce motor vehicle idling time in parking lots. (SDEIR/S, pp. 4-355 to 4-356.) We request that LAWA and the FAA include in their LAX Mitigation Plan commitments that include the development and implementation of a program for monitoring motor vehicle traffic coming into LAX and motor vehicle idling time in parking lots.

Response:

Comment noted. Mitigation of on-airport traffic includes both a reduction of vehicles coming into the airport and improvements to parking lots which should minimize idling and drive times.

All feasible mitigation measures will be included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

SPC00296-30

Comment:

LAWA and the FAA Fail to Consider PM2.5 in Their Analysis of Air Quality Impacts

CEQA requires LAWA and the FAA to identify all possible significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposed LAX project. (Calif. Pub. Res. Code §21100(b)(1); Guidelines §15126.2.) LAWA and the FAA indicate that "...modeled air pollutant concentrations were compared to California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) to determine the significance of each build alternative for CEQA purposes." (SDEIR/S, p. 4-356.) LAWA and the FAA, however, do not consider PM2.5 in their analysis of future background concentrations of air pollutants. The California Air Resources Board has revised its CAAQS to include PM2.5. (17 CCR §70200.) LAWA and the FAA must consider PM2.5 in their analysis of air quality impacts in order to identify all possible significant adverse environmental impacts as required by CEQA. It would be arbitrary and capricious for LAWA and the FAA to leave PM2.5 out of an analysis that uses all other CAAQS as the basis for determining the significance of environmental impacts under CEQA. The lack of this PM2.5 impacts assessment prevents the public and decision-makers from being able to understand fully the environmental consequences of the proposed project.

Response:

Because neither the PM2.5 NAAQS nor the PM2.5 CAAQS are fully implemented, and in the absence of any other guidance from EPA, CARB, or SCAQMD pertaining to the analysis of ambient impacts of PM2.5, LAWA and FAA relied on an EPA policy memo to treat compliance with the PM10 ambient air quality standards as a surrogate for compliance with the PM2.5 ambient air quality standards (see the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.3.1). Even if more detailed and specific methods were available to analyze PM2.5, they would not likely alter the conclusions of the air quality analysis in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, i.e., Alternative D, even with all feasible air quality mitigation measures, is significant for particulate matter. Many of the air quality mitigation measures discussed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.8 and Appendix S-E Section 2.3 to limit PM10 will also limit PM2.5.

SPC00296-31

Comment:

4.6.2 General Approach and Methodology

LAWA and the FAA Rely Upon Outdated Air Quality Standards and Must Revise Their Air Quality Impacts Assessment and Mitigation Measures in Accordance With These New Standards

On July 5, 2003, the State of California formally adopted revised regulations establishing new standards for particulate matter (PM) and sulfates.¹² (17 CCR §70200; California Regulatory Notice Register No. 25, p. 960, June 20, 2003.) These new California Ambient Air Quality Standards are more restrictive than those adopted by the federal government and more restrictive than those used in the DEIR/S and SDEIR/S. (DEIR/S, Table 4.6-5 at p. 4-479; DEIR/S, Table 4.6-11 at p. 4-498; SDEIR/S, Table S4.6-3 at p. 4-363.) Specifically, the new standards include a 20 microgram per cubic meter (ug/m3) average annual limit for suspended particulate matter (PM10), based on the arithmetic mean of 24-hour samples (formerly based on a geometric mean), and a 12 ug/m3 average annual limit for fine particulate matter (PM2.5), based on the arithmetic mean of 24-hour samples.¹³ While LAWA and the FAA acknowledge that they expected these new standards to take effect "in summer 2003" (SDEIR/S, Table S4.6-3 at p. 4-363), they base their air quality impacts analysis and corresponding mitigation measures on the old standards. This failure to use the updated standards has resulted in erroneous conclusions about the significance of the interim year PM impacts under Alternative D (36 ug/m3), and the 2015 PM impacts for project alternatives A, B, C, and D (33, 32, 32, 25, and 32 ug/m3, respectively). (SDEIR/S, Table S4.6-12 at p. 4-374.) The revised air quality standards must be met under CEQA and the DEIR/S and SDEIR/S must be amended accordingly.

	California ARB Standard	Federal EPA Standard
	PM10	PM10
Annual Average	20 ug/m3	50 ug/m3
24-Hour Average	50 ug/m3	150 ug/m3

3. Comments and Responses

	California ARB Standard	Federal EPA Standard
	PM2.5	PM2.5
Annual Average	12 ug/m3	15 ug/m3
24-Hour Average	-----	65 ug/m3

Source: California Air Resources Board, www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/pm/pm.htm

LAWA and the FAA state, "Analyses presented in this Supplement to the Draft EIR/EIS address the following issues and provide additional information on the potential for air quality impacts:... assessing air emissions and concentrations against the most current regulations and state and federal ambient air quality standards." (SDEIR/S, p. 4-357.) For this to be true, LAWA and the FAA must revise their air quality impacts assessment based on the newly finalized PM standards. In addition, LAWA and the FAA must revise their proposed PM mitigation measures in accordance with these new regulations.

12 See www.arb.ca.gov/research/aags/pm/pm.htm for background information on PM and sulfates.

13 California Air Resources Board, June 4, 2003, Final Regulation Order for the Rulemaking to Consider Amendments to Regulations for the State Ambient Air Quality Standards for Suspended Particulate Matter and Sulfates, www.arb.ca.gov/regact/aaqspm/revfro.pdf, which we incorporate by reference into our comments and the administrative record for the LAX project.

Response:

The existence of the new PM10 and PM2.5 CAAQS would result in neither a different approach to analyze the impacts of these pollutants nor different conclusions from those reached in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.9, i.e., Alternative D, even with all feasible air quality mitigation measures, is significant for particulate matter. Please also see Response to Comment SPC00275-9 regarding the potential for Alternative D to exceed the PM10 CAAQS and Response to Comment SPC00296-30 regarding the PM2.5 ambient air quality standards. Many of the air quality mitigation measures discussed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.8 and Appendix S-E Section 2.3 to limit PM10 will also limit PM2.5.

SPC00296-32

Comment:

4.6.2.2 Emissions Estimates

LAWA and the FAA Do Not Adequately Identify Air Quality Impacts Resulting From the On-Site Rock Crushing Facility and Stockpiles

CEQA requires LAWA and the FAA to identify all possible significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposed LAX project. (Calif. Pub. Res. Code §21100(b)(1); Guidelines §15126.2.) In their discussion of air quality emissions estimates for construction impacts (SDEIR/S, p. 4-358), LAWA and the FAA do not explain how or whether they have accounted for PM2.5. They also do not explain how or whether they have assessed potential air quality impacts from the proposed rock crushing facility and the construction stockpiles. The rock crushing facility and construction stockpiles may have significant adverse air quality and public health impacts upon residents, schoolchildren, and workers. LAWA and the FAA must clearly describe their efforts to assess PM2.5 emissions from construction activities and they must identify potential air quality impacts from rock crushing and construction stockpiles.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00296-30 regarding how impacts of PM2.5 were addressed in the air quality analysis. Potential particulate emissions, calculated as PM10, during construction from the on-site rock crusher and open storage piles of gravel, sand, dirt, and debris were addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Appendix S-E Section 2.3.2.1 page 39. As an overly conservative estimate, PM2.5 emissions should be less than or equal to PM10 emissions.

SPC00296-33

Comment:

4.6.2.4 Future Background Concentrations

We request that LAWA and the FAA revise Table S4.6-2 to include PM2.5 and an acknowledgement that projected future background concentrations will exceed the California Ambient Air Quality Standards for the average annual mean of PM10 (20 ug/m3) and the 24-hour average of PM10 (50 ug/m3).

Response:

Given the limited regulatory guidance to analyze the air quality impacts of PM2.5 (see Response to Comment SPC00296-30), there is inadequate data available to revise Table S4.6-2 to include PM2.5. Regarding PM10, it is noted that SCAQMD states in the 2003 AQMP (Appendix V Chapter 2) that, even with the implementation of emission controls, neither the PM10 annual average CAAQS nor the PM10 24-hour average CAAQS will be met in either 2006 or 2010 in the South Coast Air Basin (although not necessarily in the vicinity of LAX). LAWA and FAA estimated future PM10 background concentrations for the vicinity of LAX in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.2.4 Table 4.6-2 and in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.2.3 Table S4.6-2.

SPC00296-34

Comment:

4.6.3.1 Federal and State Regulatory Framework

LAWA and the FAA Should Revise Their Discussion of State Air Quality Standards to Reflect Newly Adopted CAAQS

The finalization of California's new PM and sulfates standards has made the information LAWA and the FAA includes in their discussion of the federal and state air quality regulatory framework inaccurate and outdated. (See SDEIR/S, pp. 4-362 to 4-365.) LAWA and the FAA must revise this section of the SDEIR/S accordingly. Specifically, LAWA and the FAA should revise Tables S4.6-3, S4.6-5, and S4.6-12 to include the new CAAQS for PM10 and PM2.5. (SDEIR/S, pp. 4-363, 4-366, and 4-374.)

Under the Newly Adopted CAAQS, LAWA and the FAA Cannot Continue to Use PM10 Compliance as a Surrogate for PM2.5 Compliance

With regard to PM2.5, LAWA and the FAA state, "Until USEPA issues guidance on the implementation of the PM2.5 ambient air quality standards, that agency has recommended that compliance with the PM10 standards be considered a surrogate for compliance with PM2.5 standards, and the analysis in this document follows that guidance." (SDEIR/S, p. 4-363.) LAWA and the FAA can no longer use PM10 compliance as a surrogate for PM2.5 compliance, since this decision rests only upon federal guidance and does not exempt LAWA and the FAA from recognizing and complying with the new PM2.5 standard adopted by the State of California. LAWA and the FAA must assess the potential impacts of PM2.5 emissions and adopt PM2.5 mitigation measures where necessary.¹⁴

¹⁴ Note that regional PM2.5 monitoring data for the South Coast Air Basin average over 20 ug/m3, suggesting that LAX project and cumulative impacts will exceed the newly adopted standard of 12 ug/m3 and represent significant impacts. See ARB, August 2001, 2001 California PM2.5 Monitoring Network Description, Figure 1 at p. 3, at www.arb.ca.gov/aqd/pm25/Final2001PMMonitoringNetworkDescription.pdf.

Response:

New PM10 and PM2.5 California ambient air quality standards have been promulgated. As stated in Section 4.6.3, Affected Environment/Environmental Baseline, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, SCAQMD staff expect that the South Coast Air Basin will be designated in non-attainment of these standards in the near future.

3. Comments and Responses

Since the use of compliance with the PM10 ambient air quality standards as a surrogate for compliance with the PM2.5 ambient air quality standards demonstrated that particulate matter would be significant, a comparison with the new, lower standards would not result in a change of significance determinations. Also, please see Response to Comment SPC00296-30 regarding the PM2.5 analysis.

SPC00296-35

Comment:

4.6.3.2 Air Quality Plans and Policies

LAWA and the FAA Should Revise References to the Air Quality Management Plan

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) finalized and approved its 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) on August 1, 2003.¹⁵ LAWA and the FAA should revise their discussion of air quality plans and policies, including Table S4.6-4, to acknowledge that the draft AQMP has now been made final. These revisions should be made throughout the SDEIR/S where LAWA and the FAA reference the AQMP.

¹⁵ Summary Minutes of the South Coast Air Quality Management District, Friday, August 1, 2003, Agenda Item No. 35, www.agmd.gov/hb/0308min.html.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SAS00003-23 regarding the 2003 AQMP.

SPC00296-36

Comment:

LAWA and the FAA Should Revise the EIR/S to Account for Changes in the State Implementation Plan

The California Air Resources Board (ARB) finalized the new State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the South Coast Air Basin on October 23, 2003.¹⁶ LAWA and the FAA should revise the DEIR/S and SDEIR/S to make these documents consistent with the new air pollution reduction commitments and requirements in the revised SIP.

¹⁶ See ARB Public Meeting Agenda Item August 2, 2003 at www.arb.ca.gov/board/ma/ma102303.htm.

Response:

Comment noted. The analysis in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR comports with all applicable law. The SIP, as distinct from the AQMP, has no force in law until it receives final approval from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Upon EPA approval of the revised SIP, LAWA will comply with all applicable requirements in the revised SIP.

SPC00296-37

Comment:

LAWA and the FAA Should Include Documents Related to the 1994 SIP Consultative Process and Memorandum of Understanding in the Administrative Record

We incorporate by reference into our comments all records related to the 1994 SIP consultative process referenced on SDEIR/S, p. 4-365. We also incorporate by reference into our comments the December 2002 memorandum of understanding identified on SDEIR/S, p. 4-365. LAWA and the FAA should include these documents in the Administrative Record for this project.

Response:

As noted in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.3.2, the consultative process that originated from the 1994 SIP applicable to the South Coast Air Basin culminated in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) executed in December 2002 by CARB and various commercial-service airlines serving the South Coast Air Basin. This MOU was discussed in more detail in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Appendix S-E Section 2.3.1 page 35. While neither LAWA nor FAA are signatories to the MOU, its requirements were integrated into the air quality analyses presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. A copy of the MOU is already included in the Administrative Record for this project.

SPC00296-38

Comment:

4.6.3.3 Environmental Baseline Ambient Air Quality

By Excluding PM2.5 Baseline Data, LAWA and the FAA Provide an Incomplete Description of the Environmental Setting

CEQA requires public agencies to publish Draft EIRs that include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project. (Guidelines §15125, a DEIR "must include a description of the environment in the vicinity of the project, as it exists before the commencement of the project, from both a local and regional perspective.") Without a complete description of the project's environmental setting, the DEIR may never adequately investigate and discuss the environmental consequences of the proposed project. (See San Joaquin Raptor/Wildlife Rescue Center (1994) 27 Cal.App.4th 713, 724-729; see also Environmental Planning and Information Council v. County of El Dorado (1982) 131 Cal.App.3d 350, 354, 357-358.) Contrary to these requirements, LAWA and the FAA fail to identify baseline air pollutant concentration data for PM2.5. (SDEIR/S, Table S4.6-5 at p. 4-366) This incomplete description of the project's environmental setting has caused LAWA and the FAA to fail to consider significant project-related and cumulative impacts. In particular, this incomplete environmental setting description results in the underestimation of air quality impacts. LAWA and the FAA should revise and recirculate the SDEIR/S with an accurately description of the project's environmental setting.

Response:

There are no representative measurements of PM2.5 in the vicinity of LAX, therefore a characterization of baseline for this pollutant for the LAX Master Plan is necessarily lacking. Many of the measured pollutant concentrations presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.6.3.3, Table S4.6-5 were taken from the SCAQMD Southwest Coastal Los Angeles County monitoring site in Hawthorne, however, SCAQMD does not measure PM2.5 at that location. As an overly conservative estimate, PM2.5 concentrations should be less than or equal to PM10 concentrations. It is noted that in the 2003 AQMP (Appendix V Chapter 2), predicted PM2.5 concentrations for Los Angeles suggest that with or without emission controls neither the PM2.5 annual average NAAQS nor CAAQS will be met in 2010 and that only with proposed emission controls will the PM2.5 24-hour average NAAQS be met in 2010.

SPC00296-39

Comment:

4.6.3.4 Environmental Baseline LAX Emissions Inventory

LAWA and the FAA Must Provide Baseline LAX Emissions Data for PM2.5

As with their description of ambient air quality, LAWA and the FAA fail to include PM2.5 data in their description of the LAX emissions inventory. LAWA and the FAA must provide baseline LAX emissions data for PM2.5 to satisfy CEQA requirements for describing the environmental setting in the vicinity of the project.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00296-30 regarding the PM2.5 analysis. As an overly conservative estimate, PM2.5 emissions should be less than or equal to PM10 emissions.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00296-40

Comment:

4.6.8 Mitigation Measures

LAWA and the FAA Should Provide More Specific Information About Their Air Quality Mitigation Measures, Adopt a Set of Mitigation Measure Principles, and Incorporate Additional Mitigation Measures to Reduce or Avoid Significant Adverse Environmental Impacts

CEQA requires a public agency to adopt feasible mitigation measures in order to reduce or eliminate otherwise significant adverse environmental impacts. Cal. Pub. Res. Code §§ 21102, 21081(a.) LAWA and the FAA have identified a long list of significant adverse air quality impacts. (SDEIR/S, pp. 4-370 to 4-387.) Given these significant impacts, LAWA and the FAA must adopt all feasible mitigation measures in order to reduce or eliminate these impacts.

LAWA and the FAA have proposed several air quality mitigation measures. (SDEIR/S, Table S4.6-18 at p. 4-389.)¹⁷ We strongly support these measures and appreciate the efforts of LAWA and the FAA to incorporate proposed mitigation measures suggested by those who commented on the DEIR/S. Many of the proposed mitigation measures, however, could be strengthened. Most lack the specificity necessary to judge their viability and how they will be implemented. We ask that LAWA and the FAA diligently focus on the further specification and development of these mitigation measures so that their mitigation monitoring and reporting plan includes viable and enforceable means of reducing or avoiding the many adverse significant environmental impacts associated with the LAX project.

We request that LAWA and the FAA commit to following a set of mitigation measure principles that include: (1) Setting unambiguous and measurable goals; (2) identifying and meeting deadlines and milestones; (3) enacting mitigation requirements wherever possible and relying upon incentives only when mandates would be illegal or impossible; and (4) establishing an agency accountability program that includes reporting requirements, complaint resolution protocols, and mechanisms for public oversight and enforcement of mitigation commitments. For example, taking the first mitigation measure in Table S4.6-18, LAWA and the FAA should set goals of converting 50% of airport and tenant-owned ground service equipment (GSE) to electric power or extremely low emission technology by 2007 and 100% conversion by 2010. They should also develop reliable ways of measuring progress toward these goals, identify technology milestones, impose airport tenant lease conditions mandating date certain GSE conversion, and provide the public a right to enforce the GSE conversion commitment through a court order, if necessary.

There are many additional feasible mitigation measures available to reduce or eliminate significant air quality impacts. We request that LAWA and the FAA incorporate these additional mitigation measures prior to finalizing the LAX EIR/S:

1. Community Health Needs Assessment Project: The LAX Community Health Needs Assessment Project would be a community-driven process funded by LAWA and the FAA where residents living within the project study area develop, conduct, and participate in a survey of local health needs. A health needs survey would be developed and administered by community members in consultation with independent researchers. The project could be modeled upon the Hispanic Health Needs Assessment conducted by the National Alliance for Hispanic Health. (See www.hispanichealth.org/hhna.lasso.) It should include an environmental health tracking component compatible with the recommendations of the California Department of Health Services (CDHS) SB 702 Environmental Health Tracking Expert Working Group. (See www.catracking.com.)

2. Community Health Services Program: The LAX Community Health Services Program would use research findings from the LAX Community Health Needs Assessment Project to accommodate health care needs of those living and working within the LAX study area. The health services program would include funding from LAWA and the FAA for health clinics within the community and at elementary and secondary schools within the project study area, and the operation of a mobile clinic to diagnose and treat asthma and other diseases associated with exposure to air pollution (e.g., asthma vans).

3. Environmental Indicators Project: The LAX Environmental Indicators Project would be a community-driven process funded by LAWA and the FAA where residents living within the project study area identify environmental indicators they want to track; collect, analyze, and report on those indicators; and support the continuing use of indicator data to advocate for positive change in the vicinity of LAX. (See Hays, J., Landeiro, C., & Rongerude, J., 2002, Neighborhood Knowledge for Change: The West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project.18)

4. Emissions Inventory Validation and Improvement Study: The LAX Emissions Inventory Validation and Improvement Study would include a systematic and detailed analysis of current emissions inventory limitations and assumptions. The study would be funded by LAWA and the FAA and an independent committee of air quality experts and community stakeholders would select independent contractors to carry out inventory validation and improvement tests. Among other things, these contractors would test aircraft engine and auxiliary power unit emissions for toxic air contaminants, test and validate emissions factors relied upon in the LAX emissions inventory, provide independent verification of the accuracy of self-reported emissions data, and measure LAX-related diesel truck fleet emissions. These improvements in the LAX emissions inventory would be consistent with commitments made the South Coast AQMD in its Environmental Justice Workplan for 2003-04. (See www.agmd.gov/hb/030930a.html and www.agmd.gov/hb/0309min.html.)

5. Community Exposure Assessment Program: The LAX Community Exposure Assessment Program would include funding from LAWA and the FAA to measure toxic air pollutant and other environmental chemical exposures among residents, students, and workers in the LAX project study area. This program should be based on priorities and protocols developed by members of the CDHS Biomonitoring Planning Project.19 Program staff should coordinate their efforts with the Southern California Environmental Health Sciences Center (SCEHSC) based at the University of Southern California Keck School of Medicine and researchers with the National Children's Study (<http://nationalchildrensstudy.gov/>). Exposure assessment measurements should include biomonitoring and exposure pathway studies.

6. Air Quality Monitoring Program: The LAX Air Quality Monitoring Program would be a community-driven process funded by LAWA and the FAA where residents living within the project study area work with SCAQMD and ARB staff in designing and conducting air quality studies in the vicinity of the airport. These studies would involve air sampling education and training for community members similar to that conducted by West Harlem Environmental Action (www.weact.org/programs/cbhr/diesel.html), SCEHSC, and the Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security ([www.pacinst.org/online update/oct 2003 online update.htm](http://www.pacinst.org/online%20update/oct%202003%20online%20update.htm)). The program would also include funding by LAWA and the FAA for ARB to conduct a Neighborhood Assessment Project analysis of air pollution around LAX (www.arb.ca.gov/ch/propams/nap/nap.htm) and for SCAQMD to establish a Neighborhood Environmental Justice Council for the LAX project study area.

7. Air Pollution Emissions Reduction Program: The LAX Air Pollution Emissions Reduction Program would incorporate the measures proposed by LAWA and the FAA in the Master Plan and EIR/S. The program would also include other feasible air pollution emissions reduction measures developed and supported by local community members. These include (1) the replacement of all diesel school buses within the LAX study area with alternative fuel buses, (2) the replacement of heavy duty diesel truck fleets and engines within study area with alternative fuel trucks and engines, if feasible, and low-emission diesel trucks and engines where alternative fuel vehicles are shown to be infeasible, (3) the replacement of diesel garbage truck fleets within the LAX study area with alternative fuel trucks, (4) limits on diesel truck idling time in and around LAX, (5) the installation of enhanced vapor recovery technology at all gas stations in the vicinity of LAX, (6) the creation of a distributed generation hydrogen fuel cell infrastructure at LAX, (7) the expansion of the alternative fuel infrastructure in and around LAX, including compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG) and hydrogen fueling stations, (8) the addition of 400-Hertz electrical ground power and preconditioned air systems to all remaining aircraft passenger gates, (9) the extension of electrical power to all hangars in order to eliminate the use of highly polluting aircraft auxiliary engines during maintenance; and (10) a commitment to investigate the feasibility of and develop a pilot for the use of cleaner jet fuel together with AQMD.

8. Contaminated Site Identification and Remediation Project: The LAX Contaminated Site Identification and Remediation Project would be designed to identify and remediate contaminated sites in the LAX project study area. This would include brownfield and other sites regulated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, California Department of Toxic Substances Control, and Los Angeles Regional

3. Comments and Responses

Water Quality Control Board. Project staff would work with community members in advocating for the thorough and timely cleanup of contaminated sites in the vicinity of LAX.

9. LAX Accountability Program: The LAX Accountability Program would provide for a Community Oversight Committee charged with monitoring and enforcing Master Plan commitments and environmental mitigation measures. The Community Oversight Committee would be funded by LAWA and the FAA and include community and labor representatives selected by local residents and workers.

10. Public Participation and Community Advocate Program: The LAX Public Participation and Community Advocate Program would support and encourage public participation in LAX-related decisions. Existing community outreach and public participation efforts need to be improved considerably. LAWA should create an Office of Community Advocate and hire and retain a Director of Community Advocacy and supporting staff charged with protecting community interests and providing community-based perspectives within the agency. LAWA should create a Complaint Resolution Protocol and a Public Participation Guidebook for use by community members and following the examples established by ARB. (See www.arb.ca.gov/ch/ch.htm.) The program would also assure compliance with public records and public notice statutes and develop ways to expand public access to information and participation opportunities. LAWA and the FAA should work with community members to site and establish information clearinghouses. The program should comply with the recommendations of the California Environmental Protection Agency's Advisory Committee on Environmental Justice (www.calepa.ca.gov/EnvJustice/).

11. Community Benefits Grant Program: The LAX Community Benefits Grant Program would provide grants from LAWA and the FAA to organizations working to empower and educate those living and working within the LAX study area. An independent funding board consisting of community members and independent experts would be empowered to make funding decisions. These grants would include funds for capacity-building, public participation, community-based participatory research, special projects, the hiring of consultants to advise community members on LAX-related issues, supporting the development of mitigation measures by community members, and general organizational support.

12. Link Clean Air to Clean Energy: To help reduce LAX reliance on diesel and other less clean forms of energy, LAX should move aggressively toward implementing a "Green Energy" strategy for all its energy needs. Specifically, as part of the development of Alternative D, LAX should rely entirely on renewable sources of energy, such as solar and wind power, for all of its energy needs. In addition, LAWA should use the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) system developed by the U.S. Green Building Council to guide its design and construction practices at LAX. The LEED guidelines encourage use of non-toxic materials, renewable energy and water efficiency. If a building or project meets certain specific criteria under the LEED guidelines, the building or project can seek certification under the program. We encourage LAWA to seek the platinum certification under the LEED guidelines, utilizing the cleanest and most energy efficient building standards. According to the U.S. Green Building Council, such LEED buildings can be built within a mere 2-3% cost increase, and often the energy savings pay back that extra cost in short order.²⁰

All LAX research projects should follow the "Responsible Research Criteria" developed by the CDHS and the National Association of County and City Health Officials' (NACCHO) Protocol for Assessing Community Excellence in Environmental Health.²¹ The research projects should all be based upon a community-based participatory research framework. LAWA and the FAA should commit to following the key principles of community-based participatory research:

1. Recognizing community as an unit of identity;
2. Building on strengths and resources within the community;
3. Facilitating collaborative, equitable involvement of all partners in all phases of the research;
4. Integrating knowledge and intervention for mutual benefit of all partners;
5. Promoting a co-learning and empowering process that attends to social inequalities;
6. Involving a cyclical and iterative process;
7. Addressing health from both positive and ecological perspectives;

8. Disseminating findings and knowledge gained to all partners; and

9. Involving a long-term commitment by all partners.²²

17 In Table S4.6-18 and elsewhere in the SDEIR/S, LAWA and the FAA refer to SULEV/ZEV engines. ARB has adopted updated emissions categories, which now include partial zero emission vehicles (PZEV) and advanced technology PZEV (AT-PZEV). See www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/ccbg/2004pc.htm. LAWA and the FAA should revise the SDEIR/S to be consistent with these new vehicle emission categories.

18 Published in Oakland, CA by Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security at www.pacinst.org/reports/environmental_indicators.htm.

19 California Biomonitoring Needs Assessment, Report to the Advisory Committee (Oct. 28, 2002), Section 5 (<http://dhs.ca.gov/ehlb/BPP/Needs%20Assessment%20Report.pdf>).

20 The U.S. Green Building Council developed and administers the LEED guidelines for commercial buildings. More information can be found at <http://www.usgbc.org/LEED/LEEDmain.asp>.

21 For the CDHS criteria, contact Ms. Lori Copan, CDHS, 510-849-5044, and for the NACCHO protocol see www.naccho.org/GENERAL261.cfm.

22 See "Community-Based Participatory Research: Principles, Rationale and Policy Recommendations," by Barbara A. Israel, Dr. P.H., in *Successful Models of Community-Based Participatory Research*, Final Report, L. R. O'Fallon, et al., eds., published by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, and available at www.niehs.nih.gov/translat/cbr-final.pdf.

Response:

All feasible mitigation measures are included in the Final EIS/EIR and have been considered in the preparation of the air quality mitigation plan. As required by Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the approved project provides the mechanism to ensure the implementation of mitigation measures.

Please see Response to Comment SAL00018-53 regarding mitigation measures. Please note, the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR both properly assumed that mitigation measures specifically identified, adopted, and implemented by FAA and LAWA to reduce or eliminate project-related impacts only apply to the build alternatives. In the absence of a discretionary action by FAA or the City of Los Angeles, such as would occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative, there is no mechanism that would trigger the need to adopt or implement mitigation measures.

SPC00296-41

Comment:

Adverse Impacts Associated With the Rock Crushing Facility Must Be Identified, Analyzed, and Mitigated

If a specific mitigation measure will itself create new significant adverse impacts, these significant impacts must also be described in the Draft EIR. (Guidelines §15126.4(a)(1)(D).) "If a mitigation measure would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the effects of the mitigation measure shall be discussed but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed. (*Stevens v. City of Glendale* (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 986.) As part of their air quality mitigation measures, LAWA and the FAA indicate that construction activities will include the use of an "on-site rock crushing facility to reuse rock/concrete and minimize off-site haul truck trips." (SDEIR/S, p. 4-388.) This on-site rock crushing facility will recycle an enormous amount of material from the demolition of existing airline terminals, parking structures, runways, and roadways. The fugitive dust and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) emissions from this operation will undoubtedly cause significant adverse environmental impacts and must be identified, analyzed, and mitigated in the EIR/S. We are particularly concerned that the on-site rock crushing facility will be co-located with the construction stockpiles adjacent to low-income residents of color in the eastern vicinity of the airport. Stockpiles will be "confined to the eastern area of the airport vicinity" under Alternatives A, B, and C, and "confined to the eastern area of the airport vicinity, to the extent possible" under Alternative D. ("ST-11" and "ST-20" as identified at SDEIR/S, pp. 4-248, 4-249.) The environmental and environmental justice impacts of the rock crushing facility and stockpiles must be discussed in the EIR/S and measures must be taken to minimize their adverse effects upon local community members.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The on-site rock crusher, discussed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Appendix S-E Section 2.3.2.1 Page 39, is one of many on-site sources of fugitive dust during construction. Air quality mitigation measures to address construction-related emission sources are discussed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.8 and Appendix S-E Section 2.3. Several of the air quality mitigation measures listed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.8 Table S4.6-18 will minimize emissions of fugitive dust from these types of sources, including the use of non-toxic soil stabilizers on outdoor storage piles, the use of an on-site inspector to ensure proper implementation of mitigation measures and investigate complaints, a requirement to properly maintain all construction equipment in accordance with manufacturer's specifications and schedules, and a requirement to prohibit tampering with construction equipment to defeat emission control devices. As noted in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.9, the project will be significant for construction emissions of particulate matter and for construction-related concentrations of particulate matter. This conclusion will not change whether or not the emissions from the rock crusher are mitigated. Potential emissions attributable to the rock crusher emanate from an internal combustion engine and from the mechanical grinding action of the equipment. The air quality analysis performed to support the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR assumed that the rock crusher will be housed inside a construction material processing building which will serve to contain most of the emissions. Since ventilation of this building can result in emitting some pollutants to the ambient air, the building exhaust vents will be subject to air permitting requirements of SCAQMD, including the requirement for best available control technology (BACT), most likely a bagfilter. Because the containment provided by the construction material processing building is part of the project design and BACT is a regulatory requirement, neither is considered mitigation. However, emissions to the ambient air from the rock crusher are estimated to be very low.

SPC00296-42

Comment:

4.20 Construction Impacts

The Construction Impacts of Alternative D Must Be Mitigated to Reduce Significant Health and Air Impacts 23

As articulated in the SDEIR/S, significant air impacts will result from construction activities at LAX. The construction schedule for Alternative D is large and ambitious, requiring a total of 34 work crews of different types and sizes, utilizing dozens of pieces of heavy-duty diesel-burning construction equipment for years. (SDEIR/S 4,541-542; Table S4.20-2.) Such a massive undertaking will cause significant negative air pollution. Specifically, "emissions from construction equipment, haul vehicles, earth-moving activities, and employee vehicles... could exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District's construction emissions threshold for carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds (VOC), nitrogen oxides (NOx), and particulate matter (PM10)." (SDEIR/S, ES-47). Even with mitigation measures in place, LAWA acknowledges that "mitigated construction emissions of CO, VOC, NOx, and PM10 would remain significant for Alternative D." (SDEIR/S, 4-569.) These construction impacts will have ongoing negative effects as construction is projected to last at least 10 years. (SDEIR/S, 4-539.)

We have several concerns already articulated in the air quality section of our comments, including the need to include air pollution analysis for PM2.5, which has thus far been missing from LAWA's calculations. The use of construction equipment using "cleaner burning diesel" fuel and exhaust emission controls is referenced in the Recommended Mitigation Measures Components. (SDEIR/S, 5-49.) However, in light of the construction need to use diesel vehicles and equipment over an extended period of time, we believed it essential to directly address our environmental health concerns with the diesel emissions spewing from these vehicles, and recommend several specific mitigation measures to reduce these harmful emissions from affecting our air.

Construction Vehicles Are Generators of Dangerous Particulate Matter

There is an urgent need for heavy-duty diesel vehicles, especially "nonroad" vehicles at the LAX, to take all practical steps to reduce emissions of fine particulates and other damaging airborne contaminants. Vehicles present during construction of the LAX expansion will include backhoes, bulldozers, excavation machines, dump trucks, cranes, diesel generators, and all-terrain vehicles.

Nonroad vehicles pose a special threat to air quality, because they are major contributors of fine particulate matter (also known as PM_{2.5} because the particulates are smaller than 2.5 microns in size) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), a key ingredient in the formation of ground-level ozone. Since nonroad engine standards have lagged considerably behind those for highway diesels, nonroad engines are more polluting than their highway counterparts.

Nationally, nonroad diesel engines emit more fine particles than all the nation's passenger cars and trucks, heavy-duty onroad diesels and electric utilities combined. Diesel particles pose the single greatest source of cancer risk from air pollution. Public health organizations, including the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, the World Health Organization, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California EPA and the Department of Health and Human Service's National Toxicology Program, have associated diesel exhaust or diesel particulates with increased risk of cancer. Epidemiological studies show increased lung cancer risks ranging from 20% to 89%.

In addition, the fine particles from diesel that are breathed deep into the lungs are responsible for thousands of premature deaths from other causes every year. There is a well-researched body of epidemiological studies from around the world that documents the serious effects associated with exposure to particulates. These studies report an association between particulate air pollution and reductions in lung function, respiratory symptoms, school absenteeism, increased use of asthma medications, doctor visits, emergency room visits, hospital admissions, and premature death. In 1997, U.S. EPA established health standards for PM_{2.5} for the first time. In reviewing the basis for EPA's standards the D.C. Circuit Court rejected industry attacks on the underlying science and specifically held that EPA had an ample basis for its action. Since that decision, there have been significant new research findings that powerfully corroborate EPA's findings about the adverse health effects associated with fine particles.

The following discussion, summarizing some of the recent PM_{2.5} health effects studies, is drawn from analysis produced by the American Lung Association. Long-term epidemiological studies indicating that fine particles increase the risk of early death have recently been validated by an independent reanalysis.²⁴ New studies show that chronic exposure to particulate pollution shortens lives by one to three years.²⁵

A study of the 90 largest U.S. cities found strong evidence linking daily increases in particle pollution at contemporary levels to increases in daily death rates, and in hospital admissions of the elderly.²⁶ These results are consistent with a study of 12 European cities. Particulate pollution has been tied to low heart rate variability, a risk factor for heart attacks. A chamber study with human subjects found that concentrated air particles can induce pulmonary inflammation and increase concentrations of fibrinogen in the blood, a risk factor for clotting and heart attacks.²⁷

Particulate pollution worsens bronchitis in asthmatic children. Children experience declines in lung flow and increased symptoms such as cough, phlegm production, and sore throat after particle exposure, but children with asthma are more susceptible to these effects than other children. Children's emergency room visits for asthma increase on high particle pollution days. People most sensitive to fine particle pollution are infants and children, especially those with asthma, the elderly, and people with pre-existing heart and lung conditions.

Studies of particulate matter and mortality have not identified a threshold or "safe" level of exposure. It is therefore crucial to the health of workers and the surrounding communities that nonroad vehicles in the LAX area use state-of-the-art technology to lower emissions of PM_{2.5}.

Nonroad engines also generate a toxic cocktail of other pollutants, ranging from carbon dioxide to nitrogen oxides. For example, as a vehicle class, they emit more than 5 million tons of nitrogen oxides (NO_x) each year - this is more than 20% of the total national NO_x emissions from all sources. Nitrogen oxides are significant contributors to ground-level ozone or smog, acid deposition, eutrophication of coastal bodies of water, fine particulate emissions and haze.

4.20.8 Mitigation Measures Specific to Construction Equipment

There are a number of ways - some of them outlined below - to reduce air pollution at LAX during the years-long construction process. Used in combination, better equipment management, new contractual incentives and effective retrofit technologies can reduce harmful diesel emissions without slowing the pace of construction. Some of these techniques have already been proven effective at other large-scale

3. Comments and Responses

urban construction sites, including, for example, Sydney in preparation for the Olympic Games and at Boston's "Big Dig". Also, there are opportunities for pilot projects using more advanced technologies - pilot projects that could make the LAX expansion contribute to better standards for construction around the country.

Improve equipment management and contractual incentives

Stop engine idling. Users of heavy-duty diesel equipment (both onroad and nonroad) often keep their engines idling when their equipment is not in use. It's against the law for any motor vehicle registered in Massachusetts to idle for more than five minutes. Similarly in Los Angeles, contractors should prevent their employees from idling for more than five minutes when their equipment is not in use.

Ensure appropriate equipment maintenance and inspection. Fleet managers need to keep their equipment in good repair. This is essential not only for the engines to operate efficiently, but also to ensure that emission reduction technologies can be used effectively. As with onroad vehicles, nonroad equipment should have regular, periodic inspections, including smoke testing.

Encourage the use of better equipment through incentives. Construction permits and contract specifications should be structured to give contractors preference if they retire old equipment and purchase new equipment with engines that meet future regulatory requirements. Through contract specifications, equipment owners can also be encouraged to purchase alternative fuel (non-diesel) equipment such as electric or propane forklifts, solar signboards and fuel cell generators. Further, as used in Boston's "Big Dig" project, contract specifications can create incentives for equipment owners to use retrofit technologies to reduce harmful diesel emissions.²⁸

Take advantage of technological solutions

Use low sulfur diesel fuel with after-treatment technologies. Whenever possible, low sulfur fuels should be used in place of regular onroad and nonroad diesel fuels. By itself, low sulfur fuel can lower particulates 10-20% when used to fuel onroad vehicles. But more importantly, low sulfur fuel enables aggressive after-treatment technologies that dramatically reduce particulates, NOx, hydrocarbon (HC) and carbon monoxide (CO) in diesel exhaust. The same is true for construction equipment and other nonroad vehicles: when low sulfur diesel fuel is used with after-treatment technologies, there are immediate and striking reductions in air pollution.

Because of these benefits, low sulfur diesel fuels will be required nationally as part of new regulations promulgated by the federal Environmental Protection Agency for onroad heavy-duty vehicles, to take effect in 2006. This supply should be expanded for use by public and privately owned onroad and nonroad vehicles working on the LAX expansion. There are multiple suppliers who have the capacity to provide low sulfur diesel fuel to LAX. For vehicles fueling at the construction site, low sulfur fuel could be provided through multiple small storage tanks, a large centralized tank or dedicated fuel trucks. With the availability of low sulfur fuel, vehicles at LAX would also have the ability to use important after-treatment devices like particulate filters, oxidation catalysts, selective catalytic reduction and other emerging technologies that are available now (described below). These technologies would immediately and dramatically improve air quality.

Diesel Particulate Filters

Diesel Particulate Filter Schematic

[See original document.]

Source: MECA, Clean Air Facts, Emission Controls for Diesel Engines

Diesel particulate filters can reduce particulates, HC, and CO emissions by 60%, as well as significantly reduce emissions of other toxics including aldehydes.²⁹ Particulate filters can be installed on new or existing equipment, sometimes as muffler replacements, to trap particulate matter in the exhaust.³⁰ Some filters also have a catalyst system, activated by heat from the exhaust, to further combust or oxidize the particulates and exhaust gases. Diesel particulate filters require the use of low sulfur fuels.

Diesel particulate filters have been installed on thousands of onroad vehicles, primarily trucks and buses. They have also been installed and tested on nonroad equipment. The Manufacturers of

Emission Controls Association (MECA) estimate the cost of particulate filters to be \$3,250 to \$5,500 per engine.³¹ Using diesel particulate filters on onroad vehicles and demonstrating the technology on nonroad vehicles used during reconstruction would yield tremendous improvements to air quality in the LAX construction area.

Oxidation catalysts

Diesel Oxidation Catalyst Functional Diagram

[See original document.]

Source: MECA, Clean Air Facts, Emission Controls for Diesel Engines

Similar to catalytic converters on cars, oxidation catalysts for diesel vehicles reduce emissions of particulates by 20%, HC by 50%, and CO by 40%. They also cut down on aldehyde, smoke and odor.³² The catalysts can be added to a vehicle's exhaust system or installed as replacement mufflers. Low sulfur fuel improves the performance of oxidation catalysts. Oxidation catalysts can be installed by themselves on new or existing equipment or with other after-treatment technologies, including particulate filters. Oxidation catalysts have already been installed on millions of onroad and hundreds of thousands of nonroad vehicles. MECA estimates the costs of oxidation catalysts to be between \$975 and \$1,750 per engine.³³

Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR)

SCR systems add a reductant (usually urea) to diesel exhaust. The exhaust and reductant are processed by a catalyst to then reduce particulates, HC and NO_x (the reductant aids in converting nitrogen oxides to nitrogen and oxygen). Initial results from SCR being used in combination with other technologies show a possible 75% reduction of NO_x and a 25% reduction in particulates, as well as a significant HC reduction with the use of low sulfur fuel.³⁴ MECA estimates SCR's cost to be \$10,000 - \$50,000/engine.³⁵ Marine vessels, ferries and trains have successfully installed SCR. Given the great potential to reduce both nitrogen oxides and particulate matter, the demonstration of SCR on generators at LAX would yield important results.

Emerging technologies

Using low sulfur fuel would also enable equipment owners to participate in tests of new technologies like engine gas recirculation (EGR), lean NO_x catalysts, and NO_x absorbers that have potential to drastically reduce emissions. For example, NO_x absorbers have the potential to reduce NO_x emissions by 60-70%.³⁶

Also, it is important to note that these technologies, while highly effective in their own right, may also be used in combination to generate higher reductions in emissions. For example, SCR might be used with a particulate filter and/or EGR system for great reductions in NO_x, particulates, HC and CO.

Also use technologies that can immediately reduce emissions without low sulfur fuel.

With or without low sulfur diesel fuels, several alternative technologies can be used to reduce air pollution at LAX. For example:

Oxidation catalysts and Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR)

Both described in detail above, oxidation catalysts and SCR systems can be installed on new or existing equipment to generate real and immediate reductions in air pollution from diesel exhaust. While aided by the use of low sulfur fuel, both technologies continue to show significant emissions reductions even when they are used with regular onroad and nonroad diesel fuel.

Emulsified fuel

Fuel emulsion is widely available and has been tested for many onroad and nonroad diesel engines. Results show emulsified fuel can be used with any diesel engine including generators, marine vessels, and construction equipment. Emulsified fuel can lower NO_x by 30% and particulates by 50%. Though it lowers fuel economy by 15%, the emissions reductions from emulsified fuel outweigh this increase in fuel consumption. Emulsified fuels can also be used in combination with other after-treatment technologies, such as oxidation catalysts, to further reduce diesel emissions.

3. Comments and Responses

- 23 Significant portions of this analysis are taken from the briefing paper "Rebuilding Lower Manhattan: A Clean Air Initiative," Environmental Defense, January 11, 2002. Primary authors are Jacquelyn Cefola, Janea Scott and Andrew H. Darrell of Environmental Defense.
- 24 Krewski, D., Burnett, R.R., Goldberg, M.S., Hoover, K., Siemiatycki, J., Jerrett, M., Abrahamowicz, M., White, W.H., and Others. Reanalysis of the Harvard Six Cities Study and the American Cancer Society Study of Particulate Air Pollution and Mortality. Health Effects Institute, July, 2000.
- 25 Pope, C.A. III, Epidemiology of Fine Particulate Air Pollution and Human Health: Biological Mechanisms and Who's at Risk? Environ Health Perspect 108 (suppl4):713-723 (2000).
- 26 Samet, J.M., Zeger, S.L., Dominici, F., Curriero, F., Coursac, I., Dockery, D.W., Schwartz, J., and Zanobetti, A. The National Morbidity, Mortality, and Air Pollution Study. Part II: Morbidity, Mortality and Air Pollution in the United States. Health Effects Institute Research Report 94, Part II, June 2000.
- 27 Ghio, A.J., Kim, C., and Devlin, R.B. Concentrated Ambient Air Particles Induce Mild Pulmonary Inflammation in Healthy Human Volunteers. Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med. 2000 162: 981-988.
- 28 For more information about the use of contract specifications see Drew Kodjak, Coralie Cooper, and Ingrid Ulbrich, "Final Report, Development of State Economic Incentives to Promote the Purchase and Use of Low Polluting Heavy-Duty Vehicles," New England States for Coordinated Air Use Management (NESCAUM), November, 1999.
- 29 EPA's verified level of reduction for Johnson Matthey Continuously Regenerating Technology (CRT), as listed at www.epa.gov/otaq/retrofit/retrofitverified list.htm.
- 30 Kodjak et al., Attachment D, "The Clean Air Construction Initiative, Diesel Particulate Filters Technology Description and Overview of Operational Issues."
- 31 Cost estimates dependent on volume of sales of technologies and engine horsepower and are for the mean cost to user for Muffler Replacement. Manufacturers of Emission Controls Association (MECA), Report of Agreed Upon Procedures, November 9, 2000.
- 32 EPA's verified level of reduction for numerous suppliers of catalyst muffler products, as listed at www.epa.gov/otaq/retrofit/retrofitverified list.htm.
- 33 Cost estimates dependent on volume of sales of technologies and engine horsepower and are for the mean cost to user for Muffler Replacement. Manufacturers of Emission Controls Association (MECA), Report of Agreed Upon Procedures, November 9, 2000.
- 34 Emissions reduction with use of 30ppm low sulfur fuel. Khair, Magdi. "Integration of EGR, SCR, DPF, and fuel-borne catalyst for NOx/PM reduction," Oct. 1999.
- 35 Cost estimates dependent on volume of sales of technologies and engine horsepower and are for the mean cost to user for Muffler Replacement. From Manufacturers of Emission Controls Association (MECA), Report of Agreed Upon Procedures, November 9, 2000.
- 36 Hartmut Lueders, Peter Stommel and Sam Geckler. "Diesel Exhaust Treatment-New Approaches to Ultra Low Emission Diesel Vehicles." Society of Automotive Engineers Technical Paper, SAE1999-01-0108, 1999.

Response:

Any and all feasible mitigation measures are being proposed to reduce construction-related emissions. In an effort to quantify a worst-case emission estimate from construction equipment, all equipment is assumed to be idling on-site for approximately 8.5 hours per day. From that emissions baseline, mitigation measures such as the use of emulsified (cleaner burning) diesel fuel, CO catalysts, CARB certified off-road engines and PM filter traps will be employed to reduce emissions to the extent feasible.

Comments noted regarding the health effects of pollution. The following paragraphs highlight each of the commentor's mitigation suggestions along with the rationale for their inclusion or exclusion in the document.

"Stop engine idling." The idling time may be lowered in the future but is currently proposed to remain at 10 minutes. Depending upon the type of equipment, emissions from cold starts can exceed emissions from idling; therefore, mandating a shut down after only five minutes could be environmentally adverse.

"Ensure appropriate equipment maintenance and inspection." LAWA agrees with this suggestion. It can be found on page 41 of the Draft EIS/EIR for the proposed project under "Construction-related Mitigation Measures Not Quantified."

"Encourage the use of better equipment through incentives." There are no monetary incentives currently proposed as mitigation. Construction contracts can mandate the use of cleaner-burning

equipment but there are currently no incentives included in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for the proposed project.

"Use low sulfur diesel fuel with after-treatment technologies." LAWA agrees with the commenter's suggestion. This measure is currently included in Table S23 as mitigation for the proposed project and will include diesel particulate filter traps as well as oxidation catalysts.

"Selective Catalytic Reduction." There are currently no plans to install SCR systems on portable generators at LAX. Rather, the generators will be both electric (33 percent) and use alternative fuels (33 percent).

"Emulsified Fuels." LAWA agrees with the commenter's suggestion. This measure is currently included in Table S23 as mitigation for the proposed project.

SPC00296-43

Comment:

4.24 Human Health and Safety (CEQA)³⁷

4.24.1 Human Health Risk Assessment

LAWA and the FAA Violate the Fundamental Purpose of CEQA by Failing to Develop and Analyze Information About Toxic Air Pollutant Emissions From Aircraft

The basic purposes of CEQA include "[i]nform[ing] governmental decision-makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of proposed activities" and "[i]dentify[ing] the ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced." (Guidelines §15002(a).) "An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences." (Guidelines §15151.) "Direct and indirect significant effects of the project on the environment shall be clearly identified and described, giving due consideration to both the short-term and long-term effects." (Guidelines §15126.2(a).) Thus, if information about the environmental consequences of agency decisions does not exist, CEQA requires the decision-making agency to develop and analyze that information.

Contrary to this requirement, LAWA and the FAA have failed to develop and analyze information about toxic air pollutant (TAP) emissions from aircraft engines. Instead, LAWA and the FAA offer the inadequate excuse that "there is very little current data, research information, and analysis on TAPs resulting from airport operations. This is particularly true relative to TAP emission factors for aircraft." (SDIER/S, p. 4-614.) The absence of accurate TAP emissions data for aircraft results in an inadequate and fatally flawed analysis of human health risk impacts. Ignorance is no defense for failing to comply with CEQA. This lack of testing data does not excuse LAWA and the FAA's failure to conduct an adequate environmental assessment based on an accurate analysis of aircraft engine TAP emissions data. LAWA and the FAA should conduct the necessary studies to identify and analyze aircraft engine TAP emissions and revise the EIR/S accordingly.³⁸

³⁷ Specific issues relating to Human Health and Safety were raised by several commentators on the 2001 Draft EIR/EIS for the LAX Master Plan. We hereby incorporate by reference those comments, including but not limited to the comments submitted by Natural Resources Defense Council on this topic, and request that they be included in the administrative record for this project.

³⁸ A February 2003 study completed by the General Accounting Office (GAO) confirms this assertion. Based on an analysis of aviation-related emissions of nitrogen oxides at 19 airports, the GAO recommends that the FAA "develop a strategic framework that addresses the need for information on the extent and impact of emissions, identifies reduction options, establishes goals and timeframes for achieving needed reductions, and defines the roles of government and industry in developing and implementing reduction programs." (Aviation and the Environment, Strategic Framework Needed to Address Challenges Posed by Aircraft Emissions - A Report to the Chairman, Subcommittee on Aviation, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, GAO, February 2003, found at www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-03-252).

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided the necessary information to describe "direct and indirect significant effects of the project . . . giving due consideration to both the short-term and long-term effects". This information allows both decision-makers and the public to identify "potential significant environmental effects" and to identify "ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced".

The flaw in the logic of the comment is the implication that precise emissions estimates for all jet engines are necessary to provide the type of information required under CEQA. In fact, CEQA allows that "reasonable efforts" be made to obtain basic information for the analysis, and allows for some uncertainty in the analyses performed.

For example, Section 15151 of the State CEQA Guidelines states:

"An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in light of what is reasonably feasible. . . . The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure."

Further, Section 15204(a) states:

". . . the adequacy of an EIR is determined in terms of what is reasonably feasible, . . . CEQA does not require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by commentor's. When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR."

When such reasonable efforts are made, and limitations and uncertainties in any analysis are clearly defined, the analysis meets the requirements of CEQA and provides the information needed for decision-makers and the public to understand possible impacts and the need, if any, for mitigation of these impacts.

Please refer to Section 4.6.2.1 in the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.6 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a description of the sources of aircraft emissions that were incorporated in the analysis. In the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, information on emissions from jet engines was used that was generally obtained from older engines with higher emissions of TAPs. These engines have been and/or are being replaced with newer more efficient engines. Measurements that are available for these latter engines suggest lower TAP emissions than those reported previously. Thus, impacts reported in the Supplement are based on emission rates that are likely to overestimate impacts in the future, when newer engines will make up most or all of the aircraft fleet. Since impacts (cancer risks and non-cancer hazards) are likely to be overestimated, decision-makers are unlikely to underestimate impacts of the LAX Master Plan and the need for mitigation of these impacts. Sources used to develop emissions estimates for TAP released during LAX operations are provided in Attachment B, Screening Level Human Health Risk Assessment of Technical Report 14a Human Health Risk Assessment prepared in support of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please refer to Response to Comment SAL00015-284 regarding the emission factor databases reviewed in developing the TAP emission inventories.

The comment also mentions comments on the Draft EIS/EIR made by the Natural Resources Defense Council on the topic of adequacy of the analysis under CEQA. These comments are addressed in Response to Comment letter PC02585. No other specific comments are mentioned, and the reader is referred to the index to locate responses to other comments on this topic.

Finally, the comment refers to a study of NO_x emissions from the General Accounting Office. Nitrogen oxides are addressed as criteria pollutants in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR not as TAPs. Emission estimates, air quality impacts and uncertainties are discussed in these sections.

SPC00296-44**Comment:**

Request for Notification

Pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21092(b)(3), we request that LAWA please mail any and all public notices or information concerning the SDEIR/S to:

Nancy Cohen
Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy
548 S. Spring Street, Suite 630
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Phone: 213-486-9880, ext. 134
Fax: 213-486-9886

And

Jerilyn Lopez Mendoza
Environmental Justice Project Office
Environmental Defense
3250 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, CA 90010
Phone: 213-386-5501
Fax: 213-386-5577

And

Joel Reynolds
Senior Attorney
Natural Resources Defense Council
1314 Second Street
Santa Monica, CA 90401
Phone: 310-434-2300
Fax: 310-434-2399

Response:

Comment noted. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code 21092(b)(3), LAWA has added the requested parties to the LAX Master Plan Interested Parties Distribution List. Any future, public notices or EIS/EIR - related information, including the Final EIS/EIR will be sent to these parties.

SPC00296-45**Comment:**

Conclusion

In conclusion, we request that LAWA and the FAA include in the administrative record for this project these comments and the exhibits attached hereto. We also request, and CEQA requires, that LAWA and the FAA consider these comments and prepare a written "good faith reasoned analysis" in response to our comments. (Guidelines §15088(b).) This analysis cannot include conclusory statements unsupported by facts. (Ibid.)

Response:

All public hearing testimony and comment letters received on the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, including the subject comments and exhibits, are included in this Final EIS/EIR, which is part of the administrative record for the LAX Master Plan project. FAA and LAWA have considered all comments, and have prepared written responses supported by facts.

3. Comments and Responses

**SPC00297 Voss, Jr., David Westchester LAX Marina del Rey
Chamber of Commerce**

SPC00297-1

Comment:

The Westchester/LAX/Marina del Rey Chamber of Commerce is an organization dedicated to the promotion of business opportunity in our service area which includes Westchester, Playa del Rey, and Marina del Rey. The Chamber has extensively reviewed the proposed plans for expansion of Los Angeles International Airport.

In contrast to our review and conclusions regarding Alternatives A, B and C, we are pleased to find that the adverse and negative impacts on our communities identified in our previously submitted comments are in fact mitigated by Alternative D. As a result, after reviewing the Supplemental EIR/EIS documentation, the Chamber Board of Directors voted overwhelmingly to support the Alternative D.

The Chamber specifically wishes to acknowledge and commend LAWA and in particular Deputy Executive Director Jim Ritchie for their willingness to work with the Chamber to maintain a dialogue regarding the future of LAX modernization and expansion and their willingness to discuss potential ways to accommodate the concerns raised by the Chamber in meetings with LAWA officials - even after the Chamber took its official position in opposition to Alternatives A, B and C. The free access to the design team provided to the Chamber is in contrast to the past experiences we had on this issue and was instrumental in assisting us to develop a thorough understanding of Alternative D.

In addition, we should note for the record that the Chamber not only reviewed every page of the Supplemental EIR/EIS, we interviewed a number of individuals and organizations with critical information necessary to evaluate the proposed plan. Of particular note, we met extensively with both the author of the RAND paper and SAIC officials to focus on security issues which were not the focus of almost anyone's analysis of the prior alternatives which were issued prior to 9/11.

These written comments¹ to the EIR are focused on the impacts of the proposals on the surrounding business and residential communities served by the Chamber.² As a result, our focus in submitting these comments is on those portions of the EIR which impact upon these issues. Our focus has not been on impact on air quality, hydrology and water quality, cultural resources, biotic communities, endangered and threatened species, wetlands, floodplains, coastal zone management, light emissions, solid waste, hazardous materials or any number of other areas required to be included in the EIR.

In our 2001 comments, we specifically identified negative impacts which were not properly mitigated. If the reader of these comments will compare the comments we previously submitted to Alternative D, it becomes plain to see that the issues we identified therein were fully addressed in the planning of Alternative D - almost to the point that one could make the point that the prior comments appear to have been used as a roadmap for designing the present alternative.

We previously wrote:

"From the perspective of legally relevant criticism of an EIR/EIS, the overriding flaw repeated throughout the document is the failure to either disclose known impacts on the community or to provide the legally required alternatives which yield a lesser impact to the preferred alternative. In the present case, there is no alternative for development presented that would mitigate the impacts of development more than preferred Alternative C. These are fatal flaws which should cause the EIR/EIS to be rejected outright.

Compliance with law relating to the EIR mandates that less intrusive alternatives be reviewed - yet, as is often the case with the EIR, although less intrusive alternatives in fact exist, the EIR fails to disclose that there are alternatives that have dramatically reduced impact on surrounding business and residential communities."

By contrast to Alternatives A, B and C, we believe that the Supplemental EIR for Alternative D does adequately address and mitigate our prior concerns. In addition, it meets the requirements of

3. Comments and Responses

NEPA/CEQA in providing a less intrusive proposal by constraining growth to 78.9 MAP and reduces impacts on surrounding communities in comparison to both the prior alternatives and No Action/No Project.

In the comments contained herein, we make reference to those impacts previously identified by our 2001 comments on Alternatives A, B and C and contrast those with the impacts associated with Alternative D to draw the conclusion that we should support the current alternative.

1 For ease of reading, throughout these comments, references made to specific pages and figures in two documents submitted by Los Angeles World Airports ("LAWA"). The LAX Master Plan, Draft, dated November 7, 2000 (released 1/18/01), will be referred to as the "MP"; references made to the EIR/EIS and its Supplement will refer simply to the "EIR". Page numbers (e.g. p.271) refer to the page numbering in the relevant electronic documents of the EIR and MP as distributed in Adobe Acrobat for ease of reference by the reader.

2 These comments are submitted pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"). As an interested party as defined by CEQA §15086(a)(4), the geographic area defining the Chamber's membership is proximate to LAX and is an area which the EIR admits will be significantly impacted by the proposals.

Response:

Comment noted. The Westchester/LAX/Marina del Rey Chamber of Commerce's September 21, 2001 comment letter on the Draft EIS/EIR is identified as comment letter PC02181. For responses to these comments, please see responses to comment letter PC02181. For responses to comments presented in this comment letter, please see Responses to Comments SPC00297-2 through SPC00297-9 below

SPC00297-2

Comment:

Prior Impact #1 - Destruction of the Westchester Business District

The primary reason for the dislocation of businesses in the South Westchester Business District we identified in Alternatives A, B and C was the intrusion of the underpass on Sepulveda where it passes below grade underneath the proposed Ring Road. A number of factors contributed to the problem, but most importantly was the proposal for the relocation of the Northernmost runway further to the North to allow for a taxiway between the North runways. Moving Runway 24R North by 350 feet moves the commencement point for the transition to the underpass ramp that much further North as well. Our prior comments suggested that Option 3 in the MP3 presented a preferable alternative. As we noted:

"Option 3 demonstrated the feasibility of an alternative plan which had in its features neither a ring road, nor a West Terminal.⁴ Option 3 therefore also has the advantage of having the least impact on surrounding communities and has an Intermodal Transfer Center."

Comparison to Alternative D - Note the striking resemblance between Option 3 which we advocated in 2001 and Alternative D! Relocation of the GTC to the East side of the existing CTA obviates the need for the Ring Road and the objectionable undercrossing. Additionally, Alternative does not move Runway 25R 350' to the North, but rather it moves Runway 25L 350' further South. The difference between the plans is clear and unmistakable - Alternative D is the difference between wiping out a vast swath of a revitalized community business district and leaving it intact!

3 Analysis of 2d Iteration Option 2, Unconstrained, Description Summary, MP, Chapter 5, Part 1, p.251, Figure V-2.86.

4 2d Iteration Ground Access Options, MP, Chapter 5, Part 1, p.177, Figure V-2.51

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00297-3

Comment:

Prior Impact #2 - Traffic impact on communities represented by the Chamber.

The plans identified previously were designed specifically to draw traffic through a "backdoor" down Culver Blvd. to Pershing Blvd. in order to create a second gateway for access through the heart of Westchester and Playa del Rey communities

Comparison to Alternative D - Unlike Alternatives A, B and C, Alternative D does away with the ring road and the proposal to draw traffic through to the airport on Culver, Jefferson, Pershing and Lincoln. Instead it more logically moves the GTC and ITC to locations proximate to the freeway rather than bringing traffic through our communities. This is extremely similar to Option 3 which the Chamber previously advocated as a preferred alternative, except that Alternative D also states a preference for a "closed loop" which was expressly requested by our prior comments. In fact Alternative D is a closed loop system in which "Internal vehicle circulation in the GTC would be fully separated from the existing public road system."

The traffic studies contained in the Supplemental EIR are uncontradicted by any information available to the Chamber. They specifically demonstrate that traffic will not come through our neighborhoods as would have been the case with A, B and C. By contrast, community proposals for a "conference center" on the site of the GTC would likely be far more disruptive to the adjacent communities as they would not have a closed loop system as proposed for Alt. D.

Furthermore, unlike Alternatives A, B and C, Alternative D does not disrupt any of the major North/South commuter roads and in fact moves the entry point of the airport away from Century and Sepulveda potentially actually improving the traffic on these congested commuter arteries.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00297-4

Comment:

Additionally, our prior comments criticized LAWA for failing to include an Intermodal Transportation Center in Alternatives A, B or C. As the EIR notes:

"LAX is one of the few major airports in the U.S. that does not have a direct link between its regional roadway system and the airport terminal. The I-105 freeway ends at Sepulveda Boulevard on which vehicles transition to the airport roadways. A large proportion of airport traffic travels on Aviation, Century, Lincoln, and Sepulveda boulevards and other local streets, contributing to congestion, noise, and air pollution in neighboring communities.

The benefits of direct freeway access to LAX would include a segregated flow of traffic from the region to the passenger and cargo terminals. This would reduce the impact of traffic on the airport's local communities by keeping cars bound for the airport out of business districts, which depend on unimpeded access, and out of residential neighborhoods. Direct rapid transit access is one of the best ways to ensure that employment opportunities associated with the airport are available to all of the region's residents. While transit systems can attract a modest amount of airport passenger traffic, other cities have found that the greatest benefits of rapid transit result from increased accessibility by employees and fewer employee vehicle trips to and from the airport area. A transit link would reduce the need for remote employee parking lots and corresponding shuttle bus traffic. The overall need for roadway improvements would be proportionally reduced".⁵

Our fact finding regarding Alternative D has also revealed that as much as 30% of the expected passengers coming to LAX will make use of the ITC. It is well known throughout the community that the prior failure to link the Green Line with LAX is roundly criticized as a blunder of planning. With the ITC as proposed in Alternative D, we will remove vehicle trips to the airport by making mass transit convenient to use and integrated into airport design.

Alternative D follows the logic of this thinking whereas none of the prior Alternatives A, B and C placed LAX access adjacent to the 405, nor did they include an ITC. These design features of Alternative D will reduce traffic impact on our communities.

5 EIR p.2-10.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00297-5

Comment:

Prior Impact #3 - Noise impact on communities represented by the Chamber

Alternatives A, B and C were criticized because they moved Runway 25R 350 feet towards our communities thereby moving the noise envelope represented by the sound contours revealed in the EIR that much further intrusively into our communities. Furthermore, it must be remembered that the Manchester Square area would have been utilized for an expansion of cargo operations. As such, cargo jets would have taxied all the way to Manchester Square, and adjoining residents would literally have had 747's operating directly proximate to their neighborhoods.

Comparison to Alternative D - Instead of moving runways closer to residents, Alternative D moves them further away. Specifically, we believe that the current design proposal to move Runway 25L 350 feet South is a dramatic improvement. Since the inboard runway is used for takeoff procedures, especially at night, this move strikingly moves the noise contours much further away from the community.

Furthermore, although not quantified in the documentation, there can be no question that the absence of cargo jets from the Manchester Square area is by comparison a significant reduction in projected noise for the communities surrounding that area.

Response:

Comment noted. Only Alternative C would relocate runway 6L/24R 350 feet to the north. Alternative A would build a new 6,700-foot runway to be called 6L/24R, and Alternative B would relocate Runway 6L/24R 135 feet north. Runway 7R/25L, depending on the alternative, will be relocated south with distances ranging between 50 and 156 feet for Alternatives A, C and D. An entirely new 6,700-foot runway would be built under Alternative B. Please see Table S3.2, Summary of Facilities by Alternative, of Chapter 3, Alternatives (Including Proposed Action), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts associated with Alternative D in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00297-6

Comment:

It also bears repeating that the Chamber previously requested high-speed runway exits which are facilitated by adding a centerline taxiways as in Alternative D. We noted that the MP stated the following:

"Construction of high-speed exits from arrival runways. This measure is incorporated into the Master Plan configuration to enhance the efficiency of traffic flow, but would also reduce the time an aircraft remains on the runway and require less application of reverse thrust to slow the aircraft. As the aircraft exits the runway toward the interior of the airfield, it would move away from the adjacent residential areas north and south of the complex, thus reducing the noise levels from the arrivals."

In that portion of our prior analysis we also raised our concern over runway incursions and demanded that:

3. Comments and Responses

"This safety issue is not only inadequately addressed by the EIR which is outdated on this topic, it must by necessity cause a complete reconsideration of the proposed runway design and the installation of a taxiway in between runways which is designed to facilitate planes crossing the inner runway to the outer runway both prior to takeoff and following landings. It would be highly imprudent to leave this issue inadequately updated with the latest data and thinking while simultaneously advocating a major runway redesign which appears to run contrary to current thinking on this safety issue."

Subsequently available information from NASA reviewing the South runway complex concluded that centerline taxiways will increase flight safety. NASA concluded that "...the concept of a center taxiway would be effective in reducing runway incursions at LAX." This study⁶ was "an extension of the Phase I and II studies conducted at FFC in February and April, 2001." LAWA has therefore met our prior criticism regarding updating thinking on runway design.

⁶ Study Objective: Los Angeles International Airport has the fourth busiest airfield in the nation. Air traffic has grown rapidly over the past ten years. However, the airfield and airspace have the same capacity and configuration they did ten years ago. Runway incursions have also increased over the past five years. Despite numerous changes to pavement markings, operating procedures, taxiway lighting and air traffic control procedures, the number of incursions continues to be of grave concern. The FAA and the City of Los Angeles Department of Airports (the operator of Los Angeles International Airport) has determined that resolving the runway incursion problem requires a more robust analysis of operations at Los Angeles International Airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00297-7

Comment:

Security as a New Issue:

Touted as a "Safety and Security Plan", we believe that the findings of SAIC are credible. Most importantly, it is impossible to secure a facility and the passengers traveling through it without stopping the flow of unscreened vehicles into the Central Terminal Area.

The SAIC report finds that existing facilities are inadequate to handle screening necessary at heightened threat levels such as orange or red - the times when we would most need to have capacity to handle airport security. By contrast, the RAND paper was based solely on Green level threat condition. At Yellow, Orange or Red congestion creates the additional threat that gridlock will prevent access by emergency response vehicles to the CTA to respond to a crisis.

It should be noted for the record that at one of our meetings, RAND author Dr. Schell publicly stated that he does not disagree with any of the findings in the SAIC analysis.

RAND considered a car or truck bomb not to be a credible threat because history of attacks at airports did not include this type of attack. The RAND author acknowledged that this analysis would not have predicted 9/11 attacks, nor did it include car/truck bomb attacks on other terrorist target including WTC, Beirut, Oklahoma City, etc. as it was confined only to airports. RAND's use of history as a predictor completely ignored that LAX was in fact a terrorist target for a car bombing in December, 1999 and we agree with the concern expressed by SAIC over this threat.

Furthermore, the opportunity to design new passenger handling facilities from scratch will allow items such as reverse airflow HVAC and other technologies to enhance passenger safety where they cannot be retrofitted into existing facilities.

The LA Times even reported that: "LAX Ranks No. 1 on State List of Terrorist Targets: Attorney general names 624 sites thought to be most attractive to terrorists, including ports, the Golden Gate Bridge, bottling plants." As such, it is folly to believe that we will not be attacked again. We must take every precaution to protect this economic asset and the people that pass through it.

3. Comments and Responses

LOS ANGELES AIRLINES AIRPORT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE AND AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC.

The Los Angeles Airlines Airport Affairs Committee (AAAC) represents the more than 80 airlines serving Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) and the Air Transport Association of America, Inc. (ATA) is the primary trade association of the U.S. scheduled airline industry, representing 23 airlines, including all major domestic passenger and cargo air carriers. The Los Angeles AAAC and ATA are jointly submitting these comments regarding the LAX Master Plan Addendum and the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS, which analyze the new project design termed Alternative D.

The airlines strongly believe that LAX needs to be modernized in order to continue to effectively serve the traveling public and to remain the key economic engine for the region. The airlines also share the vision for a safer, more secure and user-friendly LAX, which are the stated objectives of Alternative D. However, Alternative D falls far short of these objectives because it does not appear to enhance security, and it makes it harder for Southern Californians to use LAX by restricting private vehicles from the terminals and funneling passengers through a remote facility. Moreover, it fails to achieve these objectives at the staggering estimated cost of over \$9 billion.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00298-2

Comment:

A. The Airlines Support the Components of Alternative D that Provide for Immediate Safety, Security and Improved Customer Service at LAX.

Several components of Alternative D are needed immediately for improved safety, security and customer convenience. The airlines support the following components of Alternative D, with some recommendations on their phasing.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00298-3 through SPC00298-6 below.

SPC00298-3

Comment:

1. The Airlines Support the South Airfield Improvements Proposed in Alternative D that Address a Critical Airfield Safety Need.

The relocation of Runway 7R/25L to the south by 50 feet and the addition of a new centerline taxiway would improve the safety margins and efficiency of LAX, and help prevent runway incursions, which have become a serious safety issue on the south airfield. The airlines support this component of Alternative D and will continue to work with LAWA in the design of these projects. Any adverse impact to aircraft parking gates in the cargo areas on the south side of the runway would need to be mitigated.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00298-4

Comment:

2. The Airlines Support Measures that will Provide Effective Security Improvements.

The security improvements mandated by the federal government, primarily the \$300 million installation of in-line checked baggage screening systems in the passenger terminals, should begin immediately. In addition, the security checkpoints in the terminals should be expanded to expedite passengers into the

secure areas, and the terminals should be hardened as appropriate to minimize damage and make the terminals less attractive terrorist targets.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00298-5

Comment:

3. The Airlines Support Construction of a Consolidated Rental Car Facility and the Expansion of the Flyaway Bus System to Reduce Traffic Congestion and Provide Improved Customer Service.

The development of a consolidated rental car facility (RAC) would improve traffic flow in the Central Terminal Area (CTA) by greatly reducing the number of buses. The expansion of the flyaway bus system throughout the Los Angeles area reduces single-occupancy traffic in both the CTA and in the adjacent roadways. In addition, fewer vehicles in the CTA should allow better response times by emergency vehicles, thereby improving security and public safety.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00298-6

Comment:

4. The Airlines Support the Renovation of Tom Bradley International Terminal, but it Should Begin Immediately, not Delayed until 2012, as Proposed in Alternative D.

Alternative D includes the addition of gates on the west side of the Tom Bradley International Terminal (TBIT) and the development of related support facilities. Those improvements are scheduled to begin in 2012 and be completed in 2015, at which point TBIT would be capable of accommodating the A380 aircraft.

TBIT is the gateway to Los Angeles for millions of international travelers each year. In order to improve the current passenger service levels, which are substandard, the terminal is in immediate need of the refurbishment currently under design. Further, the airlines support the reconfiguration of TBIT to add gates on the west side of the facility along with related support space. These gates would replace remote gates at the west end of LAX and would provide a significant improvement in customer service by eliminating the current busing operation.

This reconfiguration of TBIT would include A380-compatible gates on the west side of the terminal. To date, seven airlines serving LAX, most of which operate from TBIT, have ordered the A380, with the probability that LAX will be among the first airports served with the new equipment, which is scheduled to be in service by the end of 2006.

If the TBIT refurbishment does not begin immediately, the region risks losing service by the A380, particularly if TBIT is not capable of accommodating the A380 until the time frame proposed in Alternative D, almost 10 years after the A380 is expected to arrive.

To the extent that these TBIT improvements require the relocation of the centerfield taxiways west of TBIT, any resulting impact to the facilities at the central maintenance area would need to be mitigated. This could be accomplished by relocating displaced facilities to another area at the west end of the airfield, without impacting any ongoing environmental remediation activities.

Response:

During the interim period between today and 2015, some modifications would be made to TBIT to allow it to accommodate the Airbus A380 at its northern and southern most gates. The A380 would also be accommodated at the remote gates and at Terminal 2 prior to full implementation of the Master Plan.

3. Comments and Responses

However, major modifications to TBIT including the addition of aircraft gates on its west side, would not be able to begin prior to the relocation of Taxiways S & Q. Figure S3-15 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, 2015 Alternative D Conceptual Summary Schedule, illustrates a conceptual schedule for construction of various components of the Master Plan.

Existing facilities impacted by the construction of new taxiways between the north and south airfield, as well as the construction of the West Satellite Terminal, would be relocated to other areas of the airport. For example, the Master Plan would result in the demolition of the American Airlines maintenance facility west of Taxiways S & Q. However, new airline maintenance facilities would be constructed further west in the airfield as described in Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00298-7

Comment:

B. The Airlines Do Not Support the Components of Alternative D that Do Not Enhance, and May Substantially Reduce, Security and Customer Service at LAX.

1. Security Is of the Utmost Importance, and Certain Components of Alternative D Present Greater Security Risks than Currently Exist at LAX and Should Not Be Pursued.

The airlines strongly support improving airport security. However, Alternative D does not provide any measurable improvement in security, and may, in fact, present greater security risks than that of the existing terminal configuration. Eliminating vehicular traffic in the CTA, as proposed in Alternative D, is being touted as the primary increased security measure; however, eliminating curbside service in the CTA appears to only relocate security issues from the existing terminals to the Ground Transportation Center (GTC) and the Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC). Further, forcing nearly all passenger access to the CTA through two facilities rather than eight terminals may actually increase passenger exposure to terrorist threats.

With the addition of the GTC, ITC and Automated People Mover (APM), Alternative D could actually make LAX less secure by substantially increasing the area that would need to be secured against possible attack. Additionally, consolidating access to the CTA on the APM could turn the APM into a target and potentially bring airport operations to a standstill.

A recent Rand Corporation issue paper analyzed the security implications of Alternative D. It suggested that hardening the existing terminals would be an effective deterrent to damage caused by vehicle bombs, but the report pointed out that Alternative D would not enhance LAX relative to other security threats, some of which have a higher likelihood of occurrence and would cause far greater damage than vehicle bombs. For example, Alternative D has little impact on securing aircraft, which should have the highest priority for security considerations in airport planning because it is the most likely, and most lethal, form of attack. Nor does Alternative D affect the impact of small bombs, the most commonly used weapon against airports. (See Rand study entitled *Designing Airports for Security: An Analysis of Proposed Changes at LAX* Terry L. Schell, Brian G. Chow, Clifford Grammich; Attached as Exhibit A.) Even the study conducted by Science Applications International Corporations (SAIC) to support the conclusion that Alternative D would improve security from vehicle bombs acknowledges that "terrorist shootings, suicide bombings, and armed criminal action could become an increasingly serious concern as more and more U.S. targets harden against vehicle bombs." (Comparative Security Analysis of Alternative D and the No Action/No Project Alternative of the Proposed Master Plan, SAIC (2003).)

Rather than the proposed Alternative D improvements, security could be enhanced in other ways. For example, security for aircraft could be improved by continuing to emphasize the process of properly securing all passengers and baggage. The airlines believe the terminal buildings could be sufficiently hardened to minimize damage in the event of an attack and could be modified to allow the expediting of passengers into the secure areas, thereby limiting their exposure in the non-secure areas and making the terminals less attractive terrorist targets.

Response:

Comment noted. This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1,

which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00298-8

Comment:

Furthermore, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives "which would feasibly attain most of the project objectives." (14 Cal. Code Reg. 15126.6.) The objectives of the original project are three: (1) respond to local and regional demand for air transportation, (2) ensure new investments in air capacity are efficient and cost-effective, and (3) sustain and advance the international trade component of the regional economy and the international gateway role of the City of Los Angeles. (Supp. Draft EIS/EIR, p. ES-1.) Alternative D does not meet any of these project objectives. Rather, Alternative D appears to be a new project designed solely to meet a new objective - that of improved security.

LAWA, as a lead agency decision maker, can decide that it no longer wants to pursue one project - an expansion project to meet capacity demand - and to pursue a different project - a modernization project to enhance security. That, however, is a new project, and CEQA requires that feasible alternatives that would meet the new project's objectives be analyzed to ensure that when a new project is proposed, alternatives that would both meet that project's objectives and minimize the environmental consequences of that new project be studied. As such, an analysis of the alternatives to meet this new project objective has been given short shrift. In this regard, if a proper public scoping of the proposed new project, Alternative D, and the range of alternatives to accomplish Alternative D's objectives had been completed as required by section 21083.9 of the Public Resources Code, the decision makers in Los Angeles and the public would now have better and more complete information as to the various options to achieve better security at LAX.

Response:

As was explained in Chapter 2, Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the project purpose and need, as stated in the Draft EIS/EIR remains valid today. Based on comments submitted on the Draft EIS/EIR and several significant events occurring subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, the Mayor of the City of Los Angeles, LAWA, and many citizens were prompted to reassess the future development of LAX. As was more fully explained in Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the formulation of Alternative D was intended to respond to these events and public input within the overall framework of the purpose and need for the LAX Master Plan, recognizing that the manner and degree to which Alternative D responds to the project purpose and need would differ from those of the other alternatives. As was also indicated in Chapter 2, and further explained in Chapter 3, Alternatives of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D would respond to future demand for air transportation by encouraging, but not requiring, other airports in the Los Angeles area to increase capacity to make up for the limitations of LAX. It would allow airlines to accommodate the demand for international aviation at LAX to the greatest extent possible without otherwise increasing capacity of the airport generally. It would also maintain the return on existing capital investments at LAX. Thus, Alternative D would allow the Los Angeles region to realize some of the important economic benefits outlined in the Draft EIS/EIR, while at the same time enhancing safety and security at the airport and significantly reducing environmental impacts from airport operations to the surrounding communities. It should be noted that Section 15126.6(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR's discussion of alternatives "shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives."

SPC00298-9

Comment:

To that end, with the assistance of Rivers & Christian, a local architectural firm with significant experience at LAX, the airlines have analyzed the feasibility of alternative security improvements in the existing terminals. In particular, both increasing the blast resistance of the CTA and the security checkpoint capacity were studied.

3. Comments and Responses

Prior to undertaking any major security improvements, the desired level of protection for structures, doors and glazing, and personal injury should be assessed. While the airlines are not aware of any such levels being established for LAX, concepts for terminal renovations to increase blast resistance can be developed based on reasonable standards. Specifically, the terminals could be improved, if necessary, to protect from car or small vehicle bombs that would result in some minor injuries and no irreparable structural damage.

This level of protection can be achieved through a combination of structural reinforcement to both the terminals and the upper level roadway and roadway and curbside management procedures. The cost of these improvements would be largely dependent on the level of refinishing desired in conjunction with the structural changes, as well as the timing of the improvements. For example, they would be significantly reduced if these improvements were accomplished at the same time as other terminal building projects, such as the planned renovation of Terminal 3. As stand-alone improvements, the estimated cost of the structural changes is in the one-half billion dollar range, with up to several hundred million more for terminal finishes. While this should be seen as a high-end cost, it is still significantly more economical than the Alternative D improvements, and it retains the current CTA operation.

Besides the structural improvements, blast protection would be enhanced through changes in operational procedures. The curbside lane on both the upper and lower levels would be restricted to pre-cleared or emergency vehicles, precluding non-cleared vehicles from approaching close to the terminal buildings. Access by large vehicles, such as trucks, vans, and the like, would be prevented by placing vehicle height restrictions at the perimeter.

In addition to increased protection from blasts, the expansion of the security checkpoints to expedite passengers into the secure areas of the terminals would significantly limit security risks. The required scope of these checkpoint expansion projects throughout the terminals would vary by terminal, as some terminals may require extensive work while others may require little or no work, and is dependent on several factors, including the passenger screening and carry-on baggage screening processing times, the passenger activity levels, and any terminal functions which must be relocated to provide additional screening areas. LAWA is currently in the process of determining the space requirements for screening in each of the terminals; however, based on a preliminary analysis, it appears that space sufficient to allow expedited processing under virtually any criteria could be accomplished for between \$30 and \$40 million.

The airlines continue to be fully supportive of complying with all security requirements, and work on a daily basis with the Transportation Security Administration and LAWA to address airport security at LAX. For example, the airlines are intimately involved with the \$300 million project currently under design to relocate the checked baggage screening equipment from the terminal lobbies to the bag makeup areas to be integrated into the baggage systems, improving security and reducing passenger congestion in the lobbies. This project is already underway and is separate from the LAX master planning process.

Terrorism is dynamic, as terrorists continually search for more effective methods to carry out their attacks. On the other hand, airport facilities are capital intensive with long useful lives. It is extremely difficult to design facilities around potential terrorism threats 20 years into the future. Thus, the airlines urge LAWA to proceed cautiously, make sure that all parties fully understand the security pros and cons and operational obstacles associated with this plan and ensure that no other solutions exist that could provide the same level of security without permanently degrading customer service and convenience. The threat of terrorism should not dominate a plan; rather, security should complement the improvements planned for more efficient operations and benefits to the region.

Finally, flexibility should be built into any master plan to allow LAWA to take advantage of future advances in technology and airport security, so that LAX is not locked into such a drastic approach as keeping private vehicles out of the CTA if other solutions emerge. For example, it is possible that new technology will be in place within the next few years that would allow vehicles to be screened for explosives while they are in motion. In that scenario, vehicles could be allowed access to the CTA after passing through a checkpoint without any adverse impact on traffic flow or customer convenience, and at the same time greatly reducing the risk of car bombs in the CTA.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues.

SPC00298-10

Comment:

2. The Airlines Believe that Certain Components of Alternative D Will Result in a Significant Reduction in Customer Service and Should Not Be Pursued.

Fundamental to Alternative D are certain projects, including the GTC, the ITC, the RAC, and an APM, which are being planned in part because of a unique airport planning concept that eliminates private vehicle access to the CTA. Instead, all public, commercial and private vehicles (excepting flyaway buses) would go to the GTC and ITC for parking or for curbside drop-off and pick-up of passengers. The APM would then connect these three remotely-located facilities (GTC, ITC and RAC) with the CTA.

While this may be an innovative concept, it unfortunately creates a significant reduction in the level of customer service. Eliminating close-in parking, prohibiting curbside check-in and forcing almost all traffic to the remote GTC or ITC will make it harder for passengers and their families, who, in addition to navigating surface streets to LAX, will have to ride a people mover some two miles to and from their flight. Further, it is likely that departing passengers will have to check their bags in the CTA, as well as claim them in the CTA upon arrival, making their passenger experience even more uncomfortable, as they will have to carry their bags when transiting between the CTA and GTC or ITC. While a few airports consolidate passengers arriving by rental car, shuttles or hotel vans, no airport in the United States prohibits citizens from dropping off passengers in front of the airline terminal. This is a drastic measure that seriously degrades customer service and would discourage travelers from using LAX, resulting in lost economic benefits to the region.

Response:

The additional APM ride from the GTC or ITC should generally be offset by the more efficient drive into the GTC or ITC as compared to the congested airport roadways to the CTA of 2015. In Alternative D, some type of luggage conveyance system will be in place between the GTC and the CTA for those passengers who do not wish to carry their luggage with them in the APM. The details of this system will be developed in the advanced planning stage of this project.

SPC00298-11

Comment:

According to the Master Plan Addendum, baggage may be checked either at the GTC or in the CTA. Baggage must be claimed in the CTA, but may be rechecked and then claimed at the GTC. If these functions are to be accommodated at the GTC, a baggage tunnel and baggage system will likely be required to connect the GTC with the CTA. The airlines understand that such a baggage tunnel may not be feasible and may ultimately not be included as part of Alternative D.

Whether or not there is a baggage tunnel, this would not be an effective use of the GTC. Instead, all passenger processing functions should continue to take place in the CTA. The logistics involved in removing these functions from the CTA would be extremely complicated, as remote processing presents very difficult technical, operational, and passenger service challenges that have not been fully examined by LAWA's master plan consultants, nor have they ever been successful at any airports to date. Additionally, the capital costs of a baggage tunnel and baggage system would be prohibitive, as would the operating costs of such a system; and the airlines would be forced to duplicate personnel and other resources, which would greatly increase the airlines' staffing and facility costs.

Without a baggage tunnel and passenger check-in at the GTC, passengers would be required to carry all their baggage with them on the APM from the GTC or ITC to the CTA on departure, and from the CTA to the GTC or ITC on arrival. This is not satisfactory customer service. Even if a baggage tunnel were feasible and passenger check-in at the GTC were possible, baggage handling would still not be practical. Passengers using the ITC would not have the option of checking their baggage, and they would be forced to carry it on the APM. Passengers using the GTC could check their baggage for departures, but they would have to claim their baggage in the CTA upon arrival, and either carry it with them back to the GTC on the APM, or recheck their baggage in order to claim it at the GTC. Again, this is not satisfactory customer service.

3. Comments and Responses

Alternative D creates a dramatic shift in passenger processing at LAX that is not operationally feasible. Once this major investment is made, it cannot be reversed. The master plan needs to have the flexibility to adapt to improvements in customer service, but not create expensive facilities that will result in severely degraded customer service.

Response:

Comment noted. As described in Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, a tunnel between the GTC and the CTA would be one method of optimizing the movement of oversized passenger baggage between the GTC and CTA as skycap baggage check-in facilities would be a function available at the GTC. All standard passenger processing functions would remain available in the CTA.

Features of Alternative D and of the GTC would improve customer service levels at LAX. The GTC, in concert with the ITC and RAC, would provide efficient processing facilities for LAX passengers. Two convenient APM systems would transport passengers to and from these three facilities and the new CTA, which would feature modern, efficient passenger ticketing, check-in and bag claim facilities. Improved proximity to local roadways and freeways would shorten trip times to and from LAX for future passengers while passenger safety would be protected through the removal of private vehicle access from the CTA. Personal transport of baggage aboard the APM between the ITC, RAC or GTC and the CTA is not considered to be an inconvenience. Today's LAX passengers regularly carry luggage aboard rental car shuttles, remote parking lot shuttles, hotel shuttles and other shuttles each of which are more cumbersome than the APM proposed as part of Alternative D. These features reflect improvements in customer service associated with implementation of Alternative D.

SPC00298-12

Comment:

3. The Airlines Are Concerned that Alternative D Is Too Extreme because it Completely Eliminates Private Vehicles from the CTA; and Certain Components of Alternative D Will Not Reduce (and May Increase) Traffic Congestion at LAX and Should Not Be Pursued.

Alternative D also responds to the need to reduce traffic congestion in the CTA. The carriers support this objective, but Alternative D has gone too far by completely eliminating private vehicles and forcing all passenger access through the GTC or ITC. The carriers believe that implementing some, but not all, of these projects could greatly improve the congestion situation without degrading passenger convenience. For example, the concept of a consolidated rental car facility, proposed as part of Alternative D, has proven to be a viable concept at several airports and could ease the congestion by removing the individual rental car company buses from the terminal roadways even before the people-mover is in place. Also, a proposed people-mover system, if and when proven to be economically and technically feasible, could transport passengers and baggage from various collection points (parking lots and the rental car facility) to the terminals and between terminals instead of buses, alleviating some of the current congestion in the CTA.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00298-13

Comment:

The airlines are further concerned about the volume of traffic that must be carried on the people-mover if all private vehicles are eliminated from the CTA. Given that LAX is the world's largest origin and destination airport, the people-mover operation would necessarily be larger than any current system at any airport in the world. To the extent passengers will have their bags with them, the required size of the system would be that much greater. In the event of a breakdown, the airport would be virtually shut down; so a backup system, which almost certainly would include the use of the existing upper and lower roadway system, would need to be available. However, if, for example, the people-mover system into the CTA were limited to users of rental cars and off-airport parking, the size of the people-mover operation would be on a somewhat smaller scale, and the impact of a breakdown would be mitigated.

Response:

The Automated People Mover will be designed to accommodate airport passengers safely and comfortably, even during peak periods. A back-up system would be designed and provided.

SPC00298-14

Comment:

While traffic congestion in the CTA should be a critical consideration for any Master Plan alternative, the proposed elimination of traffic altogether in Alternative D is too drastic a step that will result in a degradation of customer service. Instead, other options should be considered that could reduce traffic congestion in the CTA to a manageable level, even if private vehicles were to remain.

Response:

Alternatives A, B, and C of the Draft EIS/EIR offer options that preserve vehicular traffic in the CTA. However, those alternatives do not provide the increased level of safety and security to the airport as does Alternative D.

SPC00298-15

Comment:

A proper assessment of any proposed option to mitigate roadway congestion would include the development of baseline traffic data and projected traffic data based on the forecasts of future airport activity. Unfortunately, the baseline data contained in the LAX Master Plan are for 1996, and are only marginally useful, given the time and profound changes in the industry that have occurred since then. It is for this reason that CEQA requires a current baseline be used for the purpose of measuring the potential environmental impacts. (14 Cal. Code Reg §15125.) For example, traffic patterns may have shifted significantly with a smaller proportion of business travelers. Parking lots appear less crowded, indicating travelers are finding other ways to reach the airport. Before making any capital investment in facilities to relieve roadway congestion in the CTA, new traffic counts should be obtained and analyzed to determine the post-9/11 traffic levels. An analysis of these new traffic counts could produce projections of future traffic that will not require the immediate major investment being proposed in Alternative D.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR discusses the baseline update in Appendix S-B, Existing Baseline Comparison Issues - 1996 to 2000. Included in that appendix, on pages 8 through 16, is a discussion of changes in commercial airline aviation activity levels as affected by the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. As described therein, LAX passenger traffic decreased by 25 percent for the fourth quarter of 2001 as compared to the same quarter in 2000; however, it is anticipated that over the long-term, airline traffic can be expected to recover to historical growth trends. As such, the future (2015) activity level projection for LAX used in the planning and analysis of Alternative D has not been reduced from the assumptions that were used previously for the other alternatives and the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00298-16

Comment:

Nevertheless, with the assistance of the Corradino Group, a national firm specializing in traffic studies, the airlines were able to make some general observations and develop some preliminary options. According to the Master Plan, the peak hour of airport traffic activity was shown to be "11:00 a.m. to Noon during the airport's peak month/average weekday, which is a Friday in August." The Corradino Group team visited the airport and toured the upper and lower curbside areas several times during midday on Thursday July 31, 2003 and Friday, August 1, 2003. The primary observation was that during both of those days, the congestion levels were not severe, with an estimation of Level of Service of C or

3. Comments and Responses

better for the terminal loop, with the exception of the Terminal 1 & Terminal 7 bottlenecks, where the level of service was a High D or Low C.

Assuming these service levels are representative of the current levels of service at LAX, it would be unlikely that future year traffic projections would justify the need for undertaking a program as extensive as the GTC. Instead, other options should be considered that would allow the current levels of service to continue, or even be improved, much more economically and without the total disruption of airport operations inherent in the Manchester Square concept. Some of these options that might be considered include:

Response:

The traffic study in the Draft EIS/EIR is based on extensive modeling techniques and analyses using industry-accepted standards. As described on pages 8 through 16 in Appendix S-B, Existing Baseline Comparison Issues - 1996 to 2000, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAX passenger traffic decreased by 25 percent for the fourth quarter of 2001 compared to the same quarter in 2000. This may explain the recent observations of the CTA curbside operation. However, it is anticipated that over the long-term, airline traffic can be expected to recover to historical growth trends. As such, the future (2015) activity level projection for LAX used in the planning and analysis of Alternative D has not been reduced from the assumptions that were used previously for the other alternatives and the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00298-17

Comment:

1. Consolidated Rental Car Facility Construction of a consolidated RAC coupled with a common bus system will reduce congestion considerably. The conversion to common busing will substantially reduce the number of rental car buses, perhaps by as much as two-thirds, and free up valuable substantial roadway capacity in the CTA. This development is consistent with Alternative D, although the RAC would not necessarily need to be in the location identified in Alternative D, and should be pursued as soon as possible.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00298-18

Comment:

2. Flyaway Facilities The addition of flyaway facilities throughout the Los Angeles area could significantly reduce the number of single-occupancy vehicles in the CTA. This concept is also consistent with Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00298-19

Comment:

3. Moving Skyway Drive The congestion observed at Terminal 1 appears to be due primarily to a major access road (Skyway Drive) entering the Terminal loop at a signalized intersection in close proximity to the auto queuing lanes at Terminal 1. Most of the problem results from traffic entering the roadway and weaving in and out of the Terminal 1 lanes in less than 300 feet. This bottleneck could potentially be reduced by relocating the intersection farther to the east to provide a weaving area prior to the traffic reaching Terminal 1.

Response:

Relocation of this intersection further east may improve the traffic problems currently experienced at Terminal 1. However, a detailed traffic study would be required to determine the benefits and

drawbacks of this proposal. For example, the relocation of this intersection would require purchase of property within the Park One parking lot. The relocation of this intersection is not part of any project alternative, including No Action/No Project. Also, this proposal does not address improving the safety and security of the CTA.

SPC00298-20

Comment:

4. Additional Traffic Lanes There is space between the current upper level roadway and the parking structures in the center of the World Way horseshoe for at least another two lanes. The addition of these lanes would greatly enhance capacity and would provide additional weaving lanes as well as a through lane to by-pass terminals. The addition of these lanes would require modifications to the two north-south crossover roads and result in the possible reduction of one lane on the lower level, which would need to be evaluated in more detail.

Response:

This proposal is not part of any project alternative, including No Action/No Project. This proposal would require substantial evaluation, both from a structural and traffic engineering perspective. Adding lanes would exacerbate the weaving of traffic between the terminal curbside to the crossover roadways. In addition, losing a lane on the lower level would cause more congestion on that roadway. Also, this proposal does not address improving the safety and security of the CTA.

SPC00298-21

Comment:

5. Parking Garage Queues Delays due to vehicle queues backing up onto the World Way loop while waiting for cars to get tickets to enter parking structures not only effectively eliminates one lane of traffic on the lower level, but also poses a potential safety problem. Either constructing longer approach lanes to queue up vehicles entering the structures or moving the entrances to the less-traveled crossover roads (with adequate way-finding) would help keep the outer lanes flowing more freely and help vehicles by-pass bottlenecks.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00298-22

Comment:

Other options to be considered to reduce traffic congestion are: (1) the use of the lower level in the parking garages for passenger pick-up/drop-off (which LAWA implemented for a short time after 9/11); (2) the redirection of traffic so that all access to the parking garages is off Center Way; and (3) establishing a holding area for vehicles that are waiting to pick up passengers, in order to reduce the number of cars re-circulating through the CTA.

Response:

It is not believed that these proposals would sufficiently address the anticipated 2015 traffic volumes and parking demands in the CTA. Also, these proposals do not address improving the safety and security of the CTA. Alternative D addresses safety and security through elimination of private vehicles into the CTA.

SPC00298-23

Comment:

4. The Airlines Believe that the Elimination of Parking Garages in the CTA and Conversion to Other Facilities Is Neither Necessary Nor Desirable.

3. Comments and Responses

Under the assumption that private vehicles would no longer have access to the CTA and, therefore, there would no longer need to be parking facilities in the CTA, Alternative D includes the demolition of the CTA parking garages and construction of replacement facilities for ground transportation, passenger processing, and security screening facilities.

The scope of these additional terminal facilities contemplated under Alternative D goes well beyond what is needed to provide additional space for the new processes and requirements by duplicating existing space that is currently used for passenger processing. Reconfiguring all the parking garage space into terminal facilities is not prudent for several reasons. First, with no increase in airport capacity, the proposed amount of support space would be excessive, and unnecessarily increase capital and operating costs. Second, this reconfigured space would not be necessary if, as suggested below by the airlines, the north airfield improvements are eliminated. Third, demolition of the parking garages would eliminate valuable assets that provide a high level of customer service and generate significant revenues for LAWA. Fourth, by maintaining traffic flow throughout the airport to the CTA, the air quality and environmental justice effects caused by Alternative D and its concentration of traffic and air quality impacts on the eastern side of LAX would be ameliorated. Finally, developing the additional terminal facilities to accommodate new security measures would not be timely, as the new security mandates will have to be accommodated into the existing facilities long before any new space could be developed.

This is not to suggest, however, that all of the terminals currently have sufficient space to meet all future operational needs over the term of the master plan. For example, an airline could install self-service kiosks in a garage as a customer service enhancement which would have the added benefit of freeing up terminal space. Depending upon the terminal, utilizing some portion of the parking garages may be a good solution for accommodating additional space needs, such as self-service kiosks.

Response:

One of the primary objectives of Alternative D is to enhance the safety and security of the airport by restricting private vehicle access into the CTA. With no private vehicles allowed in the CTA, there would be no need for the existing parking structures. LAWA does not believe that the facilities which are planned to replace the parking structures would be excessive. The demolition of the parking garages would allow sufficient space for the Automated People Mover stations, security screening facilities, passenger processing facilities, as well as additional area for revenue-generating concession facilities. With the new security measures, current concessions are only accessible by passengers with boarding passes. New concessions would be available to all airport customers.

Located conveniently to the Automated People Mover System, the parking garages proposed at the GTC and ITC will continue to provide high levels of customer service. With direct connections to and from the interstate freeway system, these parking garages would be easily accessible for drivers traveling to the airport. The airport would generate revenue from these proposed parking structures.

Traffic and air quality analyses have been completed which takes into account the revised traffic patterns caused by the elimination of private vehicles into the CTA and the addition of the GTC, ITC, and other Alternative D facilities. A thorough traffic impact study and mitigation plan has been developed and are discussed in Chapter 4.3.2 and Technical Report S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Under the No Action/No Project Alternative, traffic conditions will continue to deteriorate on the roadways to and in the CTA, causing airport users to experience longer and more numerous periods of traffic congestion and delay.

Alternative D includes an environmental justice plan which is discussed in Chapter 4.4.3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

The recent installation of new security equipment within the existing terminals has created a far from ideal situation. The terminals, not designed for this additional equipment, are cramped and inconvenient. Passengers checking in must often queue outside the terminal buildings during peak travel periods. Self-service kiosks in the existing parking structures will do little, if anything to resolve the severe overcrowding within the terminals.

SPC00298-24

Comment:

5. The Airlines Do Not Support the Proposed North Airfield Improvements and the Related Demolition of Terminals 1, 2 and 3 since the Proposed Benefits Do Not Offset the Excessive Costs.

Alternative C to the LAX Master Plan proposed increasing the separation between the two runways on the north airfield by relocating the northern runway (Runway 6L/24R) some 350 feet to the north and constructing a centerline taxiway between the runways. These proposed improvements would have provided the expected separation requirements for A380 aircraft, as well as improved operational flexibility to help reduce aircraft delays. The estimated cost of these proposed improvements was approximately \$350 million.

As a matter of more recent City policy, LAWA no longer supports relocating Runway 6L/24R to the north toward the community of Westchester. Instead, to achieve the separation requirements for the A380 and provide a centerline taxiway for improved operational flexibility, Alternative D proposes relocating Runway 6R/24L 340 feet to the south at a cost of \$2.7 billion. This proposal requires the demolition and reconfiguration of Terminals 1, 2 and 3 and a portion of the TBIT. To make up for a portion of the gates lost by the demolition, it also requires the development of a new west-side satellite for replacement gates. Some of the additional and reconfigured gates would be capable of handling the A380.

The airlines support the dual objectives of accommodating the A380 and improving airfield operational flexibility, but not at the staggering cost contemplated in Alternative D. While the improved operational flexibility gained by adding a centerline taxiway should result in a modest reduction in aircraft delays, the benefits gained would not justify the cost associated with relocating a runway. Potential runway incursions, which occur predominantly on the south airfield, are not a major consideration for the north runways. Furthermore, these projects could actually result in a less efficient airfield, since the proposed reconstructed terminal complex will result in an even higher proportion of gates on the south side.

The airlines believe that relocating Runway 6L/24R to the north is a far superior operational, technical, and economical option to the currently proposed Alternative D improvements. However, the airlines respect the community's concerns about such a runway relocation. Therefore, if the runway is not going to be moved north, then the airlines recommend eliminating all of the north airfield improvements from the Master Plan. By leaving the north airfield intact, there would be no need for the costly demolition and reconfiguration of Terminals 1, 2 and 3 and the northern portion of TBIT.

Response:

Comment noted. The North Airfield improvements depicted in Alternative D were developed based on the comments received on Alternative C in the Draft EIS/EIR. Commentor's living near LAX took exception to the proposed layout of Runway 6L/24R shifting 340 feet north due to the large number of properties required to clear the approach to the proposed runway location and to allow for the interchange improvements that would be required at the intersection of Sepulveda Boulevard and Westchester Parkway/Arbor Vitae. Alternative D provides a comparative analysis of the air traffic, aircraft noise and land use impacts that would arise if it were implemented instead of Alternative C. While the commentor is correct on the approximate relative costs between the two approaches, several other statements made in the comment are not found within the Alternative D technical analysis.

Runway incursions are serious when ever and where ever they happen including those that occur on the North Airfield. While runway incursions have been more frequent on the South Airfield, those on the North Airfield require the same attention and the same type of a physical solution (i.e., constructing a center parallel taxiway). To simply eliminate any fix to the problem or to say that the problem is not as bad would not appropriately address the situation as suggested by the commentor. Alternative D suggests a compromise between the concerns that have been raised and provides the analysis for decision makers to assess the most appropriate way of balancing the two impacts; those to the community versus those to the airport terminal facilities.

While the commentor also correctly identifies a higher proportion of gates on the South Side of the airport versus the North Side of the airport, he does not factor in the increase in the number of north/south taxiways available for aircraft to efficiently depart on the North Airfield. All of the gates

3. Comments and Responses

associated with the North Linear Concourse, the West Satellite Concourse and the new west-side gates on the TBIT would have easy access to the North Airfield. In fact, simulation analysis of the Alternative D airfield layout showed a reduction in departure taxi delay as a result of the additional access to the North Airfield.

The choice between the North Airfield layouts in Alternative C and Alternative D is one between capital costs, operational costs/delay savings and land use impacts. It should not be a choice between whether or not to add a center parallel taxiway as a means of stopping runway incursions.

SPC00298-25

Comment:

6. The Airlines Question the Value and Timing of a \$9 Billion Alternative D Plan.

Alternative D is estimated to cost at least \$9 billion. Airlines and other airport users pay 100% of the costs to operate LAX through landing fees, rent charges, parking and concession revenue and federal ticket taxes. No "local" Los Angeles taxes subsidize LAX. As the primary users of LAX, the airlines would be expected to pay the majority of the costs related to Alternative D.

U.S. airlines lost \$20 billion over the last two years, and continue to suffer substantial losses. Over 100,000 airline workers have lost their jobs, and a large proportion of remaining employees have taken severe reductions in pay. With commercial aviation reeling from war, SARS, and a stagnant economy, it is the wrong time to radically redesign LAX. No one can predict the future of the airline industry or how many passengers will be flying over the next few years. With this uncertainty, it is inappropriate for LAWA to embark on a massive, risky and expensive project with questionable benefits.

The airlines also have very serious concerns about whether or not Alternative D can even be financed. A \$9 billion plan that reduces airport capacity will raise issues with the financial markets. The negative customer service implications of the plan, which threatens to either drive passengers away from LAX and to more user-friendly airports or to not fly at all, only exacerbate the problem. Even if the plan could be financed, it would be unwise for the City to embark on a \$9 billion plan in light of the current dire financial condition of the airline industry. While all of the airlines acknowledge that the industry is cyclical, they also agree that this current downturn is unprecedented and should not be treated as a mere bump in the road that will be corrected in a few years. Until some measure of stability has been achieved, one can only guess how the industry might change, and what implications such changes might have on the financial feasibility of such an extensive and expensive plan.

At \$9 billion, the estimated cost of Alternative D is significantly higher than any other major airport capital program. For example, San Francisco recently completed a \$3 billion program, Dallas and Houston are in the final stages of programs just under \$3 billion, Atlanta is in the initial stages of a \$5 billion program, and Chicago is preparing to start a \$6 billion program. Significantly, these other capital programs all add airport capacity, whereas LAX does not. Thus, not only is Alternative D proposed to be by far the largest airport capital program, it is the only one that does not add capacity, which would result in a disproportionate level of investment for the return.

Additionally, it is not unusual for cost estimates to increase over time as airport capital programs become better defined. Alternative D is a very complicated program still early in the planning process that will almost certainly result in unforeseen costs. As an example, the question of mitigation costs not being included in the current cost estimates has already been raised. Therefore, the airlines expect that the ultimate cost of Alternative D would be far in excess of the \$9 billion estimate.

As a case in point, Alternative D contemplates extensive demolition, excavation and construction activities throughout LAX. These demolition, excavation, and construction activities are likely to exacerbate, disturb or otherwise impact known soil and groundwater contamination at the airport, including interference with significant planned or anticipated environmental remediation projects at the airport. Alternative D calls for the construction of two new aircraft maintenance facilities totaling approximately 300,000 square feet on the west side of the airport, south of World Way West, and just west of the existing Continental aircraft maintenance facility. This area overlays known and suspected jet fuel and halogenated volatile organic compound ("HVOC") plumes in soil and groundwater. The ongoing and planned remediation of such soil and groundwater contamination would be greatly

hindered, and such contamination might be greatly exacerbated, by the construction activities related to Alternative D. The Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS does not adequately analyze these significant adverse environmental impacts, nor the feasible mitigation measures or project alternatives which are available to avoid or significantly lessen these environmental impacts. Not only does this mean that the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS does not meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and CEQA, it calls into question the proposed construction schedule, and suggests that the costs for this project are understated.

Drawing on the experience of other capital programs, and taking into account potential funding sources such as federal grants, passenger facility charges, and increased parking, rental car and concession revenues, the airlines estimate that they would pay well over 50% of the Alternative D costs. The resultant impact on unit costs would be dramatic. Currently, although varying somewhat among airlines, the cost per enplaned passenger at LAX is about \$8, at or above the average cost among U.S. airports. After completion of Alternative D, the cost per enplaned passenger at LAX would increase by an estimated \$25 to \$30, likely making LAX one of the most expensive airports in the country.

As the second-largest metropolitan area in the country, Los Angeles is too important a market for most carriers to abandon. However, with this increased level of costs, airlines will have little choice but to try and pass these costs on to their customers, but they are finding that more and more difficult as all travelers, including business travelers, are becoming increasingly price sensitive. It is entirely possible that carriers would be forced to discontinue marginal routes, and some carriers, particularly low-cost carriers, could leave LAX altogether.

Response:

Alternative D does not reduce the capacity of LAX. The passenger and cargo capacity of LAX under Alternative D is approximately equal to the capacity of the existing facility. The current constraint on LAX passenger capacity fall directly on the passenger due to its congested access system, terminal roadways, curb frontage, and parking facilities, as well as its improperly sized terminal and gate facilities. Without the program improvements, landside access to the airport will be extremely difficult, and during some times, will be in virtual gridlock. Alternative D presents a workable, long-term solution that provides a major benefit to the users by reworking the landside configuration and moving the constraining factor to limited aircraft gates, making the use of LAX an enjoyable experience to its passengers.

The current fiscal problems of the airlines are acknowledged. However, less than three years ago the airline industry was recording record profits. It is anticipated that, with the recovery of the domestic and global economies, demand for air travel will return to pre-2001 levels and profits will improve substantially.

The cost of Alternative D is not strictly comparable to the current development programs at other large airports such as San Francisco, Dallas, Houston, Atlanta, or Chicago O'Hare. Unlike the other airports, there has been no major investment in the facilities at LAX for many years. A benefit of this has been historically low airline operating costs at the airport, a price advantage that cannot continue to be sustained without severely sacrificing the quality of air service to Los Angelinos. The modernization of LAX will improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft and reduce runway incursions, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking.

The cost estimate for Alternative D is an order-of-magnitude cost estimate. Generous contingencies have been included to allow for refinements, mitigation costs, and unforeseen remediation issues.

The cost to operate at congested, constrained airports in an environmentally sensitive state such as California will ultimately be reflected in the airline fees and passenger ticket prices. This is especially true for airports in the large metropolitan areas such as San Francisco and Los Angeles.

SPC00298-26

Comment:

C. Alternative D Does Not Satisfy NEPA and CEQA Requirements.

3. Comments and Responses

Specific comments are provided in the attached Appendix A.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments SPC00298-30 through SPC00298-39 below.

SPC00298-27

Comment:

D. The Airlines Propose a Modified Alternative D to Improve the Security, Safety and Customer Service Level at LAX Faster, Better and Less Expensively.

The airlines understand that Alternative D is being driven by several LAWA policy directives, including a mandate to increase security measures, improve airfield safety, and reduce traffic congestion, and to do so with minimal impact on the neighboring communities, in particular the environmental justice impacts of Alternative D's concentration of traffic on the eastern side of LAX. All these objectives - safety, security, passenger convenience and airport efficiency - can be achieved sooner and at less cost through a plan that essentially modifies Alternative D. While the concept of a Modified Alternative D is still being developed, it is currently envisioned that such a plan would include several key components, which are summarized below:

- Airfield Safety - South airfield improvements contained in Alternative D, including relocation of Runway 7R/25L and addition of a centerline taxiway to prevent runway incursions, would remain in Modified Alternative D.

- Security Improvements - Security improvements mandated by the federal government, primarily the \$300 million installation of in-line checked baggage screening systems in the passenger terminals which is already being addressed by LAWA, would be part of Modified Alternative D. In addition, the security checkpoints in the terminals would be expanded to expedite passengers into the secure areas, and the terminals would be hardened as appropriate to minimize damage and make the terminals far less attractive terrorist targets.

- Traffic Congestion - The development of a consolidated rental car facility would improve traffic flow in the CTA by greatly reducing the number of buses. The expansion of the flyaway bus system throughout the Los Angeles area will reduce single-occupancy traffic in both the CTA and in the adjacent roadways. Security may also be improved as fewer vehicles in the CTA should allow better responses by emergency vehicles.

- Customer Service - Aircraft gates would be added on the west side of the Tom Bradley International Terminal, and the building would be renovated to both replace existing remote gates and accommodate the new A380 aircraft expected in 2007. The CTA and existing parking garages would remain open to private vehicles.

- Timing - With Modified Alternative D, the critical safety, security and passenger service improvements needed at LAX can be constructed much more quickly.

- Cost - The airlines believe that the overall cost would be in the \$2 to \$3 billion range, significantly less than the estimated cost for Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor correctly states several LAWA policy directives such as the desire to increase safety and security at LAX. Central to the theme of increasing safety and security at LAX is the elimination of private vehicle traffic from the CTA. Though the commentor's proposal has several benefits for LAX it does not address the security risk associated with the proximity of the existing terminal roadway to the existing terminal facilities.

The commentor acknowledges the need for the South Airfield improvements to reduce the potential for runway incursions but does not address the same problem for the North Airfield. Alternative D proposes to relocate Runway 24L and its associated parallel taxiways 340 feet south of their current location and construct a new center parallel taxiway between the north runways. This project requires the removal of the pier concourse associated with Terminals 1, 2, 3 and the north concourse of the

Bradley Terminal. Alternative D proposes to reuse these existing terminal buildings by developing an east/west linear concourse with aircraft parking depths suitable for the largest aircraft in the fleet serving LAX.

Related to Security Improvements, the commentor identifies the on-going improvements to the baggage and passenger screening process in the existing terminals. While these are welcomed and desperately needed, these improvements will be sized to handle passenger activity similar to the levels experienced prior to the attacks of September 11, 2001. There is insufficient space in the CTA to size them to handle the passenger activity levels forecasted in 2015. Alternative D is a plan that addresses security and traffic improvements needed for LAX based on the forecast of future activity through 2015. The decision to create the landside access facilities proposed within Alternative D respond to the existing space limitations of the CTA but particularly, it addresses the traffic gridlock that faces both the airport and the impacts of this traffic on the surrounding communities. Further, the ability to harden the existing terminals is severely constrained by the lack of space and structural limitations of the existing terminals, roadways and parking garages.

Related to Traffic Congestion, the commentor identifies the key benefits of consolidated rental car facility and the expanded FlyAway bus system. However, these improvements are insufficient by themselves to solve the traffic problem facing the CTA and its surrounding access roadways. The No Action/No Project Alternative assumes significant operational improvements for traffic like the expanded FlyAway system and consolidated rental car and hotel buses. These improvements would increase average vehicle occupancy of those vehicles that access the CTA. Despite these improvements, analysis shows that the CTA roadway, curbside and access roadways would still be gridlocked. Alternatives A, B, and C solve the CTA traffic problem by adding a West Terminal access point that would work in conjunction with the existing CTA landside access to reduce the traffic load in the CTA back to its original design capacity. Alternative D proposes to disperse traffic among four landside locations (ITC, GTC, RAC, and CTA for FlyAway buses) with the appropriate roadway infrastructure to access these facilities from the freeway and arterial roadway system.

Related to the Bradley Terminal improvements, the commentor again points out the key benefits of this project but fails to identify and acknowledge the additional airfield and facility modifications that this project requires. To add gates to the west side of the Bradley Terminal, Taxiways S and Q must be relocated west of their current location. In order to accommodate this Taxiway project, the American Eagle remote commuter terminal has to be relocated, the American Airlines low bay and North high bay aircraft maintenance facilities have to be relocated and/or modified (the modifications would limit the utility of these facilities). The primary midfield aircraft rescue and firefighting (ARFF) station would have to be relocated along with a number of aircraft and airline servicing buildings and storage facilities. Alternative D provides a logical and sequential plan for these required modifications so that the utility of these facilities is maintained throughout the construction cycle. This sequence of construction necessarily delays the completion of gates on the west side of the Bradley Terminal. In the mean time, a number of aircraft parking positions are being identified for the Airbus A380 in time for its arrival into the fleet serving LAX. As stated previously, gridlock on the CTA roadways would preclude customer access to the CTA and its parking structures as it does today during peak periods. Alternative D provides a complete plan to provide convenient passenger access to the LAX terminal facilities while also dealing with all of the associated impacts and accomplishes the development while LAX remains fully operational during construction.

Related to the timing of improvements, the commentor suggests that the identified projects could be constructed "much more quickly." As stated above, the projects that the commentor identifies have not fully accounted for the on-going operation of the airport during construction or the other airport facilities that would be impacted and that would require relocation. Alternative D includes most of the projects suggested by the commentor in Phase 1 of the plan and thus suggests that these projects are highly beneficial and desirable. However, Alternative D addresses all of the airport facility needs while mitigating for the impacts created by the increasing airport activity.

Finally, the cost of the reduced program suggested by the commentor simply totals the stated Master Plan cost estimates for the individual facilities identified. The commentor does not identify the impacted airport facilities requiring relocation, the associated projects necessary to keep the airport fully functioning during construction or the projects necessary to mitigate the environmental impacts created by the listed improvements. With a full accounting of these costs, the commentor would find that the improvements suggested would rival the costs reported for Phase 1 of Alternative D. Further, the

3. Comments and Responses

customer service benefit of these projects that the commentor desires would be lost to the gridlock condition of the CTA roadway, curbside and access roads

SPC00298-28

Comment:

Conclusion

While the airlines support the objectives of enhanced security, improved airfield safety and efficiency, and less congestion at the CTA, they do not believe that Alternative D is the best way to meet these objectives. The financial costs of the plan, in addition to its detrimental impact on customer service, far outweigh the benefits it offers. The airlines urge LAWA to reconsider Alternative D in an effort to maintain customer convenience, reduce the overall cost of the plan, and more effectively address security concerns. As indicated, the airlines feel that the objectives of Alternative D could be better achieved, and accomplished much more economically in a shorter period of time, through a modification of Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00298-3 through SPC00298-27 above.

SPC00298-29

Comment:

Appendix A

Additional Technical Comments to the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS

In addition to the above comments, the airlines are providing these technical comments on the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS (SEIS), some of which have already been mentioned.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments SPC00298-30 through SPC00298-39 below.

SPC00298-30

Comment:

1. Alternative D is not responsive to the local demand for air transportation services, given the projected growth in that demand through 2015.

While the SEIS reflects that demand will grow to 98 million annual passengers by 2015, SEIS at 3-14, Alternative D does not provide anywhere near the infrastructure improvements required to meet that demand. Quite to the contrary, it explicitly incorporates infrastructure bottlenecks intended to constrain capacity to levels commensurate with the "no-build" alternative. Those constraints will cause capacity to fall short of local demand at LAX by 20 million annual passengers by 2015. As explained further below, not only will other regional airports lack the capacity to make up for this shortfall, but the SEIS proposes to exacerbate the severity of that shortfall at LAX by taking actions that are inconsistent with the practicalities of responding to the public demand for air transportation and incompatible with Congressional policy related thereto.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D is designed to serve approximately 78.9 MAP, the level of passenger activity identified by Southern California Association of Government (SCAG) for LAX in the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Construction of Alternative D at LAX, thus constraining the airport's passenger capacity, would serve to encourage continued development of aviation infrastructure at the other airports that serve aviation demand in the Los Angeles region. The Alternative D Master Plan is designed to provide a restricted number and type of gate facilities thus limiting The Airport's

capacity so that it will comfortably serve approximately the same aviation activity levels identified in the No Action/No Project Alternative.

SPC00298-31

Comment:

2. The assumption in the SEIS that regional airports can be relied upon to meet capacity demands is speculative, beyond the scope of the SEIS analysis, and, as indicated in the SEIS itself, virtually foreclosed by the elimination of El Toro as a regional air transportation alternative.

The SEIS tacitly acknowledges that it does not and cannot explain how regional aviation demands will be met by Alternative D during the subject period 2000 - 2015. SEIS at 1-12. In particular the SEIS fails to explain how, notwithstanding the significant constraints on LAX capacity, the 30 million annual passengers shortfall caused by the loss of the Orange County International Airport can or will be distributed within the region. See SEIS at 1-12. Accordingly, the SEIS and Alternative D cannot be considered to even remotely satisfy the Master Plan project Purpose and Need of responding to the regional demand for air transportation through during the 2000-2015 period.

Response:

Neither NEPA nor CEQA mandate that a project fully meet its stated purpose and need. LAWA and Mayor Hahn developed Alternative D in response to comments by the public that the City of Los Angeles should participate in a regional solution for the fair and reasonable distribution of air service. Alternative D is consistent with the "fair share" that is allocated to LAX by SCAG in its 2001 and Draft 2004 RTPs.

Topical Response TR-RC-4 discusses the elimination of El Toro as a potential commercial service airport.

Officials from Los Angeles joined political leaders from the Inland Empire to form a new coalition in October 2003 to plan as a region for the growth of air traffic in Southern California.

Alternative D emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. LAWA is currently preparing Master Plan updates for both Ontario and Palmdale, in order for them to play their part in addressing the anticipated regional demand.

SPC00298-32

Comment:

3. Alternative D cannot be reconciled with the second enumerated project purpose of ensuring that "new investments in airport capacity are cost effective, maximizing the return on existing infrastructure capital." See SEIS at 2-1.

The cost of Alternative D is in excess of \$9 billion, yet will provide for no increases in passenger capacity beyond the no-build alternative. The project focus is not maximizing the return on existing infrastructure capital, but rather eliminating and then replacing that infrastructure at enormous expense. The investment of such an incredible sum by definition cannot be considered a cost-effective investment in capacity, given the significant projected capacity shortfall under the Alternative D relative to anticipated demand and as compared to the other alternatives.

Response:

Neither NEPA nor CEQA mandate that a project fully meet its stated purpose and need. The current constraint on LAX passenger capacity falls directly on the passenger due to its congested access system, terminal roadways, curb frontage, and parking facilities, as well as its improperly-sized terminal and gate facilities. Alternative D presents a workable, long-term solution that provides a major benefit to the users by reworking the landside configuration and moving the constraining factor to limited aircraft gates, making the use of LAX an enjoyable experience to its passengers.

3. Comments and Responses

There has been no major investment in the facilities at LAX for many years. The modernization of LAX will improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft and reduce runway incursions, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking.

SPC00298-33

Comment:

4. The "alternatives analysis" in the SEIS effectively presents and considers only one alternative. There is no longer a "range of reasonable alternatives" presented by the Draft EIR/EIS (DEIS) and SEIS as required by NEPA.

The SEIS has de facto eliminated any meaningful consideration of Alternatives A-C by recasting the project focus as constraining local capacity. To this end, the SEIS affirmatively incorporates limits on airport infrastructure commensurate with the no-build alternative as a surrogate objective. As noted, this is facially at odds with the Purpose and Need that was set forth in the DEIS and expressly reaffirmed in the SEIS. Moreover, this effectively eliminates any other alternatives from consideration in violation of NEPA,¹ as the other alternatives all provide for increases in LAX capacity responsive to projected local and regional demand.

1 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(c)(iii); 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14; see generally *City of Carmel-by-the-Sea v. United States Department of Transportation*, 123 F.3d 1142 (9th Cir. 1995).

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments SAL00017-70 and SPC00298-8 regarding the fact that Alternative D does not conflict with the basic purpose and need for the LAX Master Plan, and expands the range of reasonable alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. As was discussed in several places in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, including, but not limited to Chapter 3, Alternative D provides for a future (2015) activity level at LAX that is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan, which calls for no expansion of LAX. This design aspect of Alternative D is consistent with SCAG's regional approach in planning for future aviation demand. Please see also Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00298-34

Comment:

5. The SEIS is also inconsistent with NEPA in that it forecloses any Alternative that would meet capacity demand in contravention of FAA policy.

NEPA contemplates that the SEIS must propose within its range of reasonable alternatives an alternative that are consistent with the FAA's basic policy objectives. See *Muckelshoot Indian Tribe v. U.S. Forest Service*, 177 F.3d 800, 813 (9th Cir. 1999). However, as more fully explained below, by effectively foreclosing further consideration of Alternatives A through C (which respond effectively to demand) the SEIS cannot be reconciled with FAA's fundamental policy of ensuring safe and efficient operations within the National Airspace System.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, by definition, simply added to the information and analysis presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, and did not negate or invalidate the Draft EIS/EIR's evaluation of Alternatives A, B, and C. Neither Alternative D or the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR preclude or constrain the FAA's ability to consider any and all of the five alternatives (i.e., the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, C, and D), nor do they conflict with FAA's fundamental policy of ensuring safe and efficient operations within the National Airspace System.

SPC00298-35

Comment:

6. The proposed project is contrary to express Congressional and FAA Policy in the area of air transportation and at odds with the objectives of the Airline Deregulation Act.

In the area of air transportation, Congress has explained that it is the policy of the United States "that airport construction and improvement projects that increase the capacity of facilities to accommodate passenger and cargo traffic be undertaken to the maximum feasible extent so that safety and efficiency increase and delays decrease."²

Congress has determined as a matter of law and national policy that the most effective way to respond to the demand for air transportation services is through market forces. This policy determination was reached as part of the fundamental decision to deregulate air travel and restructure the statutory scheme governing aviation to have public demand set the limits on the scope of air transportation services.³

Consistent with that Congressional policy, the FAA's mission is not to artificially constrain air travel as proposed in the SEIS, but instead to provide the tools for modernization, infrastructure improvements, and enhancements of efficiency that will facilitate the competition and investment necessary to accommodate the public demand without compromising the quality of service.⁴ The essence of the statutory scheme for aviation thus contemplates that the traveling public and cargo customers will decide which airports shall be used and that the airlines that choose to serve those markets will respond accordingly.

Despite this, Alternative D has been fashioned to incorporate infrastructure limitations on aircraft gate frontage and cargo capacity developments that seek to artificially discourage additional passengers by providing for a degraded level of service as demand approaches capacity. See SEIS at 3-27.5

² 49 U.S.C. § 47101(a)(7) (2000).

³ See Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, Pub. L. No. 95-504, 92 Stat. 1705 (1978) (codified at 49 U.S.C. § 1305(b)(1) (1988)).

⁴ 49 U.S.C. § 47101(a)(7). See, also, Seattle Cmty. Council Fed'n v. F.A.A., 961 F.2d 829, 835 (9th Cir. 1992) (FAA's mission is not to control market demand).

⁵ The SEIS indirectly acknowledges that the efforts it has proposed in the Preferred Alternative arbitrarily to limit infrastructure will not keep market forces from fueling demand for additional operations and that "the result [will be] a degraded level of services." SEIS at 3-27.

Response:

Comment noted. The Federal policy to increase capacity is a general directive which does not require any particular airport to increase capacity to any particular level. As described in Section 3.3.2, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the federal government does not determine where and how to serve this demand; this critical element is left up to individual airlines while air transportation is a federal priority. Similarly, the federal government does not determine the need for or location of airport facilities to accommodate projected air traffic demand. Thus, airport facility planning is a local government function. Local government agencies are tasked with planning airport infrastructure improvements and its compatibility with surrounding communities and land uses.

SPC00298-36

Comment:

7. The SEIS cannot be reconciled with the Congressional policy of promoting safe and efficient operations with the National Airspace System.

3. Comments and Responses

Congress and the courts, in interpreting Congressional intent, have made clear that the safe operation of the airport and airway system must be the highest aviation priority. As the Supreme Court has explained, "planes do not wander about the sky like vagrant clouds." *City of Burbank*, 411 U.S. at 633-34 (Quoting *Northwest Airlines, Inc. v. Minnesota*, 322 U.S. 292, 303 (1944)) (Jackson, J., concurring). Instead, they necessarily move within a highly regulated, closely monitored and intricately complex air transportation system. *Id.*

The logical corollary of this situation is that the adequacy and sufficiency of the airport infrastructure necessary to facilitate aircraft operations plays a critical role in the efficiency of the National Airspace System. Constraints on aircraft operations can be expected to result in increased "congestion and a concomitant decrease in safety," see *id.* 639, and local restrictions related to operation can "create critically serious problems to all transportation patterns." *Id.*

This is particularly significant because, with the advent of deregulation, it is the public demand for air transportation that sets the scope and pace of operations necessary to meet that demand. Consistent with that principle, and as reflected in well-established methodology and experience, the FAA has determined that the demand generally will continue to grow as forecast until full utilization of an airport's capacity is reached. See, e.g., FAA Advisory Circular No. 150/5060-5, *Airport Capacity and Delay*.

However, as demand approaches ultimate capacity, delay and congestion are increased and the efficiency of the aviation system is decreased. *Id.*⁶ By incorporating infrastructure bottlenecks designed to limit capacity infrastructure at LAX at a level of 20 million annual passengers below anticipated demand in 2015, the SEIS and Alternative D all but ensure that there will be problematic local and regional issues of delay and congestion and that the efficiency of the National Airspace System will decrease.

⁶ See also note 5 above.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPC00298-35.

SPC00298-37

Comment:

8. Alternative D cannot be said to provide security more consistent with future requirements.

Alternative D is styled as the "Enhanced Safety and Security Plan." SEIS at 3-14. However, the SEIS acknowledges that existing airport security requirements will undergo a variety of changes over the next few years and "[t]he nature, timing and characteristics of such changes cannot be forecasted with any certainty at this time." SEIS at 1-12. As such, the suggestion in the SEIS that the major components of Alternative D will best satisfy future security requirements is speculative and lacking in a reasonable basis. Indeed, as the SEIS acknowledges, the other alternatives (including the "no build" alternative) provide the necessary space requirements for TSA to respond to its mission at immensely less cost. SEIS at 3-13.

Response:

As addressed in Chapter 2, Alternative D Development and Refinement, of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum, the objective of Alternative D is to provide a facility that can continue to operate under the highest security levels with minimal impacts to the passenger processing experience. By creating additional space for passenger terminals, efficient passenger and baggage screening facilities can be implemented at the airport, thereby providing passengers with a higher level of service. Flexibility of the new passenger space created would allow for space to implement evolving changes in airport security technology while also being responsive to the identified security threats.

SPC00298-38

Comment:

9. Alternative D is inconsistent with the third enumerated project purpose of enhancing the regional economy and Los Angeles' role as an international gateway. SEIS at 2-1.

As noted, the SEIS acknowledges that Alternative D cannot be said to ensure that local and regional demand for air transportation services will be met. Indeed, local and regional shortfalls in capacity measured in tens of millions of passengers annually should be expected. A likely outcome of that shortfall is the potential for unmet demand to shift to airports outside Los Angeles and Southern California with an associated loss of jobs and economic benefits. See SEIS at 1-12. As a result, the objective of enhancing the regional economy and promoting Los Angeles as an international gateway will not be met.

Response:

LAWA and Mayor Hahn developed Alternative D in response to the concerns of the public that the City of Los Angeles should participate in a regional solution for the fair and reasonable distribution of air service. Alternative D is consistent with the "fair share" that is allocated to LAX by SCAG in its 2001 and Draft 2004 RTPs. LAWA is currently preparing Master Plan updates for both Ontario and Palmdale, in order for them to play their part in addressing the anticipated regional demand. Officials from Los Angeles joined political leaders from the Inland Empire to form a new coalition in October 2003 to plan as a region for the growth of air traffic in Southern California.

The design of Alternative D would encourage airlines to choose the most efficient use of the gate facilities at LAX and supplement high-frequency domestic service at other airports in the region. High priority would be given by the airlines to accommodating O&D passengers. Alternative D is projected to meet 87 percent of the unconstrained 2015 O&D passenger demand forecast and 82 percent of the 2015 international passenger demand forecast.

Neither NEPA nor CEQA mandate that a project fully meet its stated purpose and need.

SPC00298-39

Comment:

10. Alternative D presents less significant environmental impacts largely by failing to achieve to project purposes and not responding to capacity needs.

The SEIS portrays Alternative D as presenting less significant environmental impacts. However, it does so simply by negating the project's purpose and need. Foreclosing consideration of any infrastructure improvements necessary to meet the significant future increases in passenger demand is not an appropriate strategy for limiting environmental impacts.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00298-8 above.

**SPC00299 Harman, Jane Congresswoman Jane Harman's 8/20/2003
Office**

SPC00299-1

Comment:

In the wake of the horrific events of September 11, 2001, Mayor Hahn called for an overhaul of the proposals for the master plan for Los Angeles International Airport. He claimed that Alternative D would focus primarily on safety, and would effectively address the security needs at LAX.

I remain concerned, however, that the Mayor's proposal ignores important security improvements outlined in a report published by RAND, issued in May. The RAND report found that features of Alternative D create "hard targets" ripe for attacks by terrorists. The report called instead for simpler, cheaper methods of securing the airport, and acknowledged that an important security improvement is to disperse air travelers and cargo into a genuine network of regional airports throughout Southern California.

Specifically, the RAND report found that:

3. Comments and Responses

- The greatest security risks are in high-density areas such as lines for ticketing, baggage claim and security check points. These risks are not likely to be reduced by Alternative D, which simply moves these targets of opportunity to the Ground Transportation Center and the "people mover". Significant reductions in risk could be achieved by increasing the number of screening personnel and machines, and by changing airport procedures to reduce the number of people waiting in line in unsecured areas.

- The effect of attacks on airport operations may be more severe under Alternative D. Reconfiguration would centralize several airport functions, such as transportation and terminal entrances that are currently distributed throughout several terminals. An attack at one centralized location may have a great effect on all operations during cleanup, investigation and repair, while an attack on an existing terminal would affect only operations at that terminal.

- The proposed "people mover" could impede evacuation of terminals in the event of an attack, fire or a natural disaster.

- Alternative D will not bolster security against aircraft - still far more vulnerable than airports - and will not reduce the threat of attack by rocket-propelled grenades or mortars.

- Airport reconfiguration by itself is not likely to affect the number of casualties that result from small bombs, such as those concealed in luggage, or firearm attacks.

- Alternative D would not significantly increase security against attack by chemical, biological or nuclear weapons.

- Alternative D does not address vulnerability from large bombs that could be carried by delivery trucks serving over 200 restaurants and stores requiring daily deliveries.

Ultimately, the RAND report argues that developing a regional aviation plan is the most economical and expeditious way to strengthen security. A firm cap on annual passengers at LAX would shift air travel to other airports, thereby mitigating the effects of a terrorist attack on regional airport operations by dispersing the concentration of travelers and resources.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00299-2

Comment:

Those concerns are echoed by the recent findings of the A.C. Lazzaretto and Associates, the consultant hired by the County of Los Angeles. The Lazaretto study is even more pointed, saying that Alternative D's security proposals are short on detail and often contradictory. This study also raises disturbing issues about environmental justice, noise, and unmitigated traffic impacts.

As ranking member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I know far too well the myriad threats to our national security, both at home and abroad. We must do everything within our power to defend against those threats. I strongly urge additional consideration of and steps to implement the concerns raised by RAND and Lazzaretto and Associates, and pledge to help shape a cost-effective plan that will truly make LAX safe and secure.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPC00299-1 above and Responses to Comments SAL00013-2 through SAL00013-168.

SPC00300

**McCarty, Ph.D.,
John**

None Provided

11/5/2003

SPC00300-1

Comment:

We believe that Mayor James Hahn's master plan for the Los Angeles International Airport is seriously flawed. We also believe that squandering nine billion dollars of tax payers' and air travelers' money on a thinly veiled jobs plan for the building trades is an abomination.

The LAX EIS/EIR is a document which, if followed, would:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00300-2 through SPC00300-4 below.

SPC00300-2

Comment:

- damage the already vulnerable U.S. airlines by increasing their operating costs

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00300-3

Comment:

- harm the citizens of the South Bay by moving runways closer to the adjacent cities

Response:

As analyzed in Chapter 4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, potential impacts associated with the runway realignment under Alternative D would not extend to the South Bay. See also Topical Response TR-N-3.1, Response to Comment SPHF00007-2, and Response to Comment PHM00014-2 regarding aircraft noise impacts resulting from change in flight routes, which would not extend to the South Bay. See also Subtopical Response TR-LU-1 regarding overall quality of life impacts on surrounding communities.

SPC00300-4

Comment:

- inconvenience the flying public and increase their susceptibility to terrorism.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00300-5

Comment:

While individual researchers and organizations have critiqued the Master Plan in terms of security (the Rand Corporation) or curtailing growth (a report prepared by A. C. Lazzaretto & Associates for the Los Angeles County), they have missed the most salient point: The economic foundation of the LAX Master Plan is predicated on three fallacious assumptions.

3. Comments and Responses

- (1) The basic shape of the airline traffic routes will remain relatively constant throughout the planning period (2004 - 2020).
- (2) The passenger mix (first class, business class, economy class) will remain relatively constant.
- (3) The technology of terrestrial transportation will remain relatively constant.

It is our contention that airline traffic routes, passenger mix, and the technology of terrestrial transportation will all change significantly.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00300-6 through SPC00300-13 below.

SPC00300-6

Comment:

AIRLINE TRAFFIC ROUTES

Back in 1996, Jack Driscoll, who was then the executive director of the Los Angeles Department of Airports and who functioned as the guiding light for the initial version of the draft EIS/EIR, was quoted by the Los Angeles Times as saying:

LAX has consistently seen an 8% to 9% increase in aviation activity in recent years, and forecasts show this demand will continue for the next twenty years.

While Mr. Driscoll has long been gone from the management of the LAX, the linear thinking embodied in his statement is very much alive and well and living in the LAX Master Planning Organization. To understand the ramifications of linear thinking, a little history on the development of airline traffic routes is required.

In the early chapters of the U.S. airline industry's history, planners in the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington assigned the major domestic routes. Over two decades ago, the U.S. market was deregulated, and a vicious shakeout ensued. The airlines that remained after the implosion shifted most of their biggest iron birds out to the two coasts where the industry was still tightly controlled by a web of international regulations and agreements. These lumbering airliners would fly from hubs (such as New York) to hubs (such as London). So if a woman wanted to go from Philadelphia to Amsterdam, she would first fly to New York aboard a small plane operated by a regional carrier, then change planes, take a four-engine widebodied Boeing 747 to London, change planes again, and finally fly in a smaller aircraft to Amsterdam. It is important to understand that this multi-connective arrangement was loved by the airlines because it allowed them to fill up their big birds and make a lot of money. And it was an arrangement despised by the traveling public because only the intellectually challenged would like changing planes at a huge hub that is congested with wall-to-wall people.

Subsequently, the Atlantic was deregulated, and the airline executives suddenly developed an input channel and started listening to their customers. As a consequence, they initiated direct routes and began adding nimble airliners with just two engines to their Atlantic runs. Noted the English newsmagazine, *The Economist*:

This taste for smaller international jets reflects the fact that travelers now like to shun big international hubs such as New York or London and fly directly to their destinations. This is changing the international market into a web of direct intercontinental flights rather than one big aerial bridge between London and New York.

In the parlance of the airline industry, this change in airline traffic patterns represents a switch from hub-to-hub routes to point-to-point routes. This change in the basic shape of routes over the Atlantic is reflected in the types of aircraft making the point-to-point hauls. The most common jet found on the Atlantic run is no longer the Boeing 747; instead 8 out of ten birds flying between North America and Europe are two engine planes, such as the Boeing 767 or its younger and bigger sister, the Boeing 777 - the first commercial airliner to be designed on a computer.

Between 1993 and 1995, Boeing and Airbus Industrie (a European airframe consortium) began working together on a large project with an awkward name: The Very Large Commercial Transport. However, as

a result of mutual distrust, this joint venture started to unravel. After the breakup, Airbus commenced work on its own superjumbo jet, a monster machine that would fly hub-to-hub, particularly to the Orient. It was originally called the A3XX, and it is now called the A380.

The top management of Boeing then faced one of those you-bet-your-company kind of questions, the answer to which would affect not only its long-term viability, but also the fortunes of airline companies and airports throughout the world. And that question was: Would air routes throughout the Pacific fragment in the same manner as they did over the Atlantic? After much analyses and hand wringing, the executives at Boeing answered that question with a resounding YES!

Based on this answer, the company cancelled design work on two extended versions of the 747-400. Because they believed that the future of airline traffic over the Pacific would be point-to-point routes, the company then concentrated on producing and selling variations of the 777, a bird designed with point-to-point flights in mind. And they began the preliminary design of other engine and airframe configurations for traffic patterns over the Pacific because the Orient is where the action will be during the next two decades.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00300-7

Comment:

It should come as no great surprise to anyone that there is a direct correlation between increases in Gross Domestic Product and growth in air travel: As a nation becomes more prosperous, its people fly more often and farther for business and for pleasure. It has been estimated that during this first decade of the new century the annual growth in GDP will be about 5% in Southeast Asia and above 7% in China - significantly greater than the 2-3% rate expected during the same period for the mature economies of the world, such as the U.S. and the countries in Western Europe.

Kenneth Leung, managing director of Investment Banking Strategy in the Tokyo office of Deutsche Bank, said: "Asia will be one of the fastest growing areas of the world, if not the fastest growing over the next two decades, and commercial air travel and air cargo will be both a by-product and a staple of that process." Goaded forward by super-strong growth, air traffic in the Middle Kingdom is expected to increase by almost fivefold in the next two decades. Because increases in air travel and air cargo produce surging demand for aircraft, it logically follows that China's fleet of jet liners should grow the fastest of any country on the globe - increasing from 490 birds at the close of 1999 to 1,600 at the end of 2019.

Many of the new aircraft to be purchased by the nations on the Pacific Rim will be long-range airliners destined to fly on point-to-point routes, for Asia is ripe for nonstop travel. It has been estimated that in excess of 85% of the passengers that land at Tokyo's Narita airport (one of Asia's great hubs) are not ultimately bound for Japan, but are heading instead for Singapore, Hong Kong or other far away places in the Orient.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00300-8

Comment:

The main long-range aircraft that is used on point-to-point flights is the Boeing 777. The Triple-7 originally came in two versions. The 777-200 had its first delivery in May of 1995, and the initial models had a range that varied between 4,350 and 5,330 nautical miles. The second version, the 777-300, was first delivered in May of 1998, with a range of 6,550 nautical miles. These are the birds that paved the way for point-to-point routes.

From Day One, the Dash 200 and the Dash 300 had instant sales success, particularly in Asia, where there is usually a long distance between airfields. Japan Airlines, All Nippon Airlines, Thai Airways

3. Comments and Responses

International, Cathay Pacific, China Southern, Japan Air System, Korean Air Lines, Singapore Airlines - all purchased the first two versions of the Triple 7.

In addition to developing extended range versions of the 777, Boeing's aeronautical engineers set about to design a totally new type of airliner - one that was specifically designed for the point-to-point traffic patterns. Called the Sonic Cruiser, this bird would have constituted a major break with Boeing's tradition: Whereas Boeing's 747 - the ultimate hub-to-hub airliner - was big and slow, the Sonic Cruiser - the ultimate point-to-point bird - was being designed to be small and fast. Indeed, in an artist's rendering, it resembles a hot fighter rather than a transcontinental transport.

As its name would suggest, speed would have been the Sonic Cruiser's stock in trade, for it was being designed to fly just below the speed of sound - between Mach .95 and Mach .98 - which means that it would have flown about 20 percent faster than today's fastest jetliners. (Mach number is the ratio of the air speed of an object to the speed of sound in the same region of the atmosphere; Mach 1 is around 740 miles per hour at sea level.) The Sonic Cruiser was specifically fashioned to cater to the carriage trade - those well-heeled tourists and business travelers who would be willing to pay a fair premium to avoid congested hubs and to get where they're going in a hurry. And it was this idea of charging a premium price for tickets that turned out to be the Sonic Cruiser's Achilles' heel. After al-Qaeda's attack on the Twin Towers on 9/11 and the baneful effects of the economic downturn, it became abundantly clear to Boeing's executives that the international traveler would be interested in lower - not higher - airfares in the foreseeable future. So with great reluctance, they shot down the Sonic Cruiser project.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00300-9

Comment:

It was not very long thereafter that Boeing's aero-engineers went back to the drawing board and started to design a new airliner - a bird with low operating costs that was specifically structured for the point-to-point flights over the blue waters of the Pacific Ocean. Initially known as the Boeing 7E7 - and called the Dreamliner in the press - the aircraft is being designed to be a mid-range transport that will be driven forward by the robust engines that were to be used on the Sonic Cruiser. Boeing is banking on production economies - which include both sophisticated production techniques and competitive pressures on suppliers - to drive the per-unit price down. But the main selling point is a 20% fuel-burn improvement vis-a-vis birds such as the Airbus A310, the Boeing 757, and the Boeing 767. In the neighborhood of 9% of that improvement will come from the efficiency of the engines, and some will be as a result of the bird not having to carry so much fuel. Savings from both the use of composite materials and airflow improvements should account for most of the rest.

Boeing has forecast that a market will eventually develop for 2,000 to 3,000 such airliners. Boeing's CEO Philip M. Condit has said: "We believe more passengers are going to want to fly on direct routes on midsize airplanes instead of to hubs on giant-sized airplanes." Boeing expects that the airlines will put the 7E7 in service by 2008.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00300-10

Comment:

The airlines of the world are slowly starting to embrace the point-to-point routes that advances in airframe and engine technology are making possible.

- In March of 2001, Continental Airlines launched a new nonstop air service between New York and Hong Kong. Prior to the advent of Boeing's 777, this flight would have required a connection at LAX. This flight is airborne for 16 hours.

- Also in March of 2001, British Airways began a nonstop service between San Diego and London-Gatwick. The inauguration of this daily flight made history since it was the first nonstop transcontinental service in the history of San Diego. The aircraft of choice: The Boeing 777. This service not only chops a connecting flight from the LAX hub, but it also tears into the regional service (the "spoke" in the hub-and-spoke system) that would have flown from San Diego to LAX.

- In October of 2003, Singapore Airlines announced that it would inaugurate the longest continuous commercial passenger service in the world in the early part of 2004. Using an Airbus A340-500, it will carry passengers nonstop from LAX to Singapore - a distance of 9,412 miles - in 18 hours and 20 minutes. A senior vice president at Singapore Airlines has observed: "When we start our service, it will be history making."

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00300-11

Comment:

It must be understood that not everyone in either the airframe or the airline business believes that midsize airliners flying on point-to-point routes will be the wave of the future. Indeed, the executives at Airbus believe that the future belongs to great behemoths of the sky flying on hub-to-hub routes.

If Airbus's airframe builders stay on schedule, the Europeans will be able to show off the biggest passenger plane ever constructed at the Paris Air Show in 2005. With one wing as long as a nine-story building is high and with a horizontal stabilizer that is as large as the wing of a midrange airliner, the Airbus A380 is supposed to be ready to enter commercial service in 2006. This double-decker is designed to carry 555 passengers when its cavernous capacity is divided into three classes; however, the probability seems high to some analysts that the A380 will be mainly used to carry tourists from the developing countries of Asia who will be attracted by low ticket prices. As a consequence, the airlines using the A380 could configure it in what is irreverently called the "cattle class," to attain economies of scale. In this configuration, the brute-of-the-sky could seat as many as 800 passengers.

The executives at Airbus, who used \$3.5 billion in low-interest loans from European governments to help build the plane, believe that hub-to-hub airline traffic routes will continue to dominate both the passenger and the freight segments of the airline industry. Predicated on this roseate view of the future, they believe that during the next two decades the passenger and freight carriers of the world will require not less than 1,500 airplanes at least as large as the 747. So far, nine companies - all of which are foreign-based except FedEx - have ordered a total of 121 A380's which have a sticker price of \$250 million. (According to people in the industry, the super-jumbos are sold at deep discounts.)

Quite understandably, the executives at Boeing have an entirely different view of the big-bird market. They believe that no more than 320 giant-sized birds will be sold during the next twenty years due to market fragmentation, as the industry makes the transition from hub-to-hub networks to direct flights between smaller airports. And many savants in the industry agree with the Boeing position. Bruce A. Smith wrote in *Aviation Week & Space Technology*: "Many analysts agree Boeing is on the right track in predicting that point-to-point - rather than larger aircraft serving major hubs - is where the bulk of air traffic growth will be in the Asia-Pacific region." Dick Wyatt, head of fleet planning for British Airways, in a speech to aircraft finance bankers in Geneva, said that the Airbus A380, a 555-passenger jetliner, did not make economic sense for the British Airway fleet. According to Wyatt: "There are very few routes that suit large aircraft and we believe markets will continue to fragment." And Gordon Bethune, the CEO of Continental Airlines recently queried the members of the National Business Travel Association: "What's in it for me to sit on an airplane with 500 other people, wait for my bags with 500 other people, check in with 500 other people?"

The writers of this paper, one of whom spent a quarter of a century applying mathematical statistics to production operations problems at airframe manufacturers, believe that Boeing's vision of the future of the market is the one that is on course.

When using passenger data for the year 2000 - so the data are not skewed by al-Qaeda's attack on 9-11, by the downturn in economic activity that has plagued so many of the developed nations, and by the

3. Comments and Responses

SARS epidemic in Asia - it is obvious that growth rates are being lowered in the hubs of the major cities around the globe. In 2000, worldwide growth rate in passenger travel was 8%. If the hubs had received their fair share of this activity, then their increase would closely approximate the worldwide rate. Amsterdam and Frankfurt had a little less than 8%; LAX had about 5%; London (Heathrow) and Tokyo had a bit less than 4%; Atlanta had a tad less than 3%; San Francisco had about 2%; Dallas/Fort Worth had 1%; and Chicago had about minus 1% - "negative growth" as it is known in the popular press. ("Negative growth" is one of the great oxymorons - right up there with "organized anarchy" and "jumbo shrimp.") The only major hub to beat the rate of worldwide growth was Paris - Charles de Gaulle; it had an almost 12% increase. While all roads lead to Rome, many of the air routes over the Atlantic lead to the City of Light. We believe that the inability of the hubs to match the worldwide growth rate in passenger traffic is a harbinger of a change in airline traffic patterns - from hub-to-hub to point-to-point.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00300-12

Comment:

THE PASSENGER MIX

It should come as a surprise to no one that the mix of passengers on airliners is, over the long run, determined by a nation's level of economic activity. When the globalization of business is on a tear, business travelers take to the skies to go abroad and mind their markets; when per capita income is rising and the employment picture looks bright, the middle class embarks on international vacations. The world is presently on the fringe of a major change in economic activity - brought on by a technological transformation - which will significantly change the passenger mix throughout the globe.

The manufacturing sector in the United States has been the first to feel the force of what that great Austrian economist, Joseph A. Schumpeter, called "the gales of creative destruction." In the years following 1979 - when manufacturing employment peaked at 19.6 million - the sector has declined by 25%. Half of that decline took a full twenty years; the second 12.5% (2.5 million jobs) has evaporated since 2001, when President George W. Bush took office. Because California has such an immense economy, its factories bore the brunt of the gale. Since 2001, its factories have had to slough off 298,000 jobs - 16% of the total manufacturing jobs. The smart money is betting that many of these jobs will never return. According to Donald Straszheim, the president of Straszheim Global Advisors, a research firm: "The job loss to China, in particular, is just in its infancy. In the manufacturing sector, there is going to be enormous further erosion of jobs to China."

Some industries have been hit harder than others. For instance, in the automotive industry the United Auto Workers Union (UAW) had 1.5 million members in 1979; that number had plummeted to 638,722 at the end of 2002. Between 1999 and 2003, the UAW lost 50,000 jobs in the auto plants. After a four-year contract was hammered out in the fall of 2003 between the UAW and the Big Three and its two major parts suppliers (Delphi and Visteon) Gary Lapidus, an auto industry analyst at Goldman Sachs, estimated that the UAW's headcount would drop by another 50,000 over the life of the contract. Obviously, not many UAW members will be in the market for international vacation packages in the near future. In 1998, GM, Ford, and Chrysler (which has been peddled to the big German auto company, Daimler-Benz, the maker of the Mercedes) had 58.5% of the auto market in California (the nation's biggest), and the imports had 41.5%. By the fall of 2003, the imports had 53.1% of that market and the Big Three had 46.9%. Jeffery E. Garten, the dean of the Yale School of Management, has come to the conclusion that "Detroit's Big Three are heading for a pileup" by 2010 that will result in either the bankruptcy of Ford and GM or a very costly government bailout. We agree that his gloomy prediction could become a reality.

Those few American politicians who have taken the time to think about the erosion of the nation's manufacturing sector have reassured their constituents that production workers will gravitate to the service sector in much the same manner as agricultural workers once shifted to the manufacturing sector. However, the times are changing in the service sector. Blips of light dancing down skeins of glass are bringing about this change. As a result of fiber optic cable, the cost of making a telephone call between continents will start to approach zero; consequently, any activity that can be converted to a digital format will probably end up being sent to either India or China. It is a phenomenon known as

"The Death of Distance." Near the end of the 1990's Frances Cairncross wrote in *The Economist* as follows:

The death of distance as a determinate of the cost of communications will probably be the single most important economic force shaping society in the first half of the next century. It will alter, in ways that are only dimly imaginable, decisions about where people live and work; concepts of national borders; patterns of international trade. Their effects will be as pervasive as those of the discovery of electricity.

The speed with which America became enmeshed in a web of fiber optic cables boggles the mind. In one very short period (1998-to-2001) the amount of fiber placed in trenches throughout the U.S. increased fivefold. During the same period, a technique known as Ultradense Wavelength Division Multiplexing heightened the carrying capacity of each strand of glass 100-fold; consequently the supply of transmission capacity throughout America increased 500-fold.

As fathom after endless fathom of fiber optic cable was rolled off and laid down on the oceans' floors and as blips of light (photons) replaced surges of electricity (electrons) in international telecommunications, high-paying jobs in America's service sector began to migrate to developing nations on the Pacific rim. According to Forrester Research - the high-tech forecaster - 27,121 positions in computer programming and mathematics left the U.S. in 2000; it estimates that 108,992 jobs will migrate from the U.S. to India and China by 2005 - jobs valued at \$6,549,539,142 - via fiber optic skeins. (We are intimately familiar with these trends. One of the writers spent three decades managing software-engineering organizations in the aerospace industry.) In addition, call-answering and data processing are heading to Bangalor, India, thanks to the efforts of firms such as Electronic Data Systems, which was originally started by a jug-eared little guy with a raucous East-Texas twang named Ross Parot, the lone star from the Lone Star State. Also many of the big eastern banks are now sending financial analyses and accounting work to the Middle Kingdom and the Subcontinent. In a move that is emblematic of the death of distance, radiologists in Beverly Hills will find some of their work going to India, where physicians - many trained in American universities - will decipher x-rays for one-quarter of the U.S. fee. According to a recent study by researchers at the University of California-Berkeley, 14 million U.S. service sector jobs are in danger of being sent overseas.

As America's manufacturing and services flow to the East, American managers will fly in the same direction in droves - to check designs and to monitor quality. And American workers will stay at home in droves and try to stay employed. This switch from tourist class to business class will be a source of unalloyed joy for airline operators, for there is an old adage in the industry that goes: Economy class fills the seats, but business class fills the coffers.

This switch in passenger mix further supports the view that the trend is from big airliners with many seats flying hub-to-hub to smaller airliners with fewer seats flying point-to-point. Thus the Boeing 747, with about 420 seats, is being replaced by the 777, with about 300 seats and by the Airbus 340-500 with about 310 seats. (This substitution is obvious on the Atlantic run: Between 1990 and 2000, the departures of 747s dipped, while flights by the downsized widebodies, such as the Boeing 777 and the Airbus A340, almost tripled.) And, after 2008, many of the smaller widebodied aircraft will be replaced by the Boeing 7E7, with about 200 seats, most of which will be filled by the bottoms of business people, rather than tourists, who will be flying point-to-point to "paired cities." In the world of commerce time is money.

Symbolic of this transformation in passenger mix is the nonstop flight from LAX to Singapore that was previously discussed. Using a new Airbus A340-500 - which normally carries 350 seats divided into first, business, and economy classes - Singapore Airlines is configuring this aircraft with only 181 seats divided into two classes: business and "executive" economy. In executive economy, the seats will be 2 inches wider and have 5 inches more legroom than seats normally found in the economy section. The seating arrangement will be two on each side and three down the middle. (In the economy section of the typical Boeing 777 jet, there are as many as five seats in the middle.) Because this service is structured for the business traveler heading to and from the Orient, Michael Tan, a senior vice president of Singapore Airlines, does not believe that people will have trouble flying nonstop for 18 hours straight. Says he: "People are already flying 20 to 24 hours with stopovers. The majority of the people we fly want to fly nonstop. I think the psychological issue will be easily overcome."

The logical result of the changes in airline traffic patterns and passenger mix is that in the future LAX will experience many more air operations (i.e., takeoffs and landings) for any given number of passengers than it has in the past. And this fact is of pivotal importance in making a long-range plan for

3. Comments and Responses

LAX because it is air operations - not people - that pound the cities of the South Bay with noise and pollution.

Mayor Hahn has promised to hold passenger traffic at LAX to 78 million a year through the year 2020 by restricting the number of passenger gates. Even if this approach succeeds - and it is our opinion that success is impossible - the runways will still be clogged with smaller jets filled with business travelers waiting impatiently to take off for the "long, thin routes" to the Orient. And this will mean that the \$9 billion used to reconfigure and refurbish the airport will have been frittered away.

Response:

LAWA and Mayor Hahn have developed Alternative D in response to the concerns of the public that the City of Los Angeles should participate in a regional solution for the fair and reasonable distribution of air service. Alternative D is consistent with the "fair share" that is allocated to LAX by SCAG in its regional plan.

As noted by the commentor's, Airbus and Boeing do not share the same vision of future ultra long-haul passenger travel. The airlines that have ordered the A380 are the same airlines that currently fly from LAX to the largest cities in Southeast Asia with B747 aircraft: hub-to-hub. That said, many trans-Pacific carriers may choose to serve certain city-pairs with B7E7 aircraft (newly developed Boeing aircraft): point-to-point. The mix of some up-gauging and some down-gauging of aircraft will likely mean that the average international aircraft size remains close to the LAX forecast.

The \$9.6 billion cost of implementing Alternative D will not be wasted. Alternative D will improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking.

SPC00300-13

Comment:

THE TECHNOLOGY OF TERRESTRIAL TRANSPORTATION

Alternative D of the LAX Master Plan advocates a "regional approach" to the growth anticipated at LAX between 2004 and 2020; however, such a plan will not get off the ground unless the airport at Palmdale is connected to LAX with something other than that tortuous and congested trail known as Highway 14. The answer to this problem is a brilliant advance in the technology of terrestrial transportation called magnetic levitation or simply "MagLev."

By the year 2020, the large metropolises of the world will have linked their city centers to their airports via maglev trains. It should be understood that maglev trains - which ride on air rather than rails and which are suspended by one magnetic force and pulled forward by another - represent an entirely new way of moving passengers from Point A to Point B. This wave of the future in terrestrial transportation - the maglev tsunami - is just beginning to gather force.

In October, Shanghai, China opened its maglev link between the city's financial district and its new Pudong International Airport, located nineteen miles away. But before this inauguration, it had already carried 83,000 passengers.

Munich, Germany, is in the advanced planning stage of a maglev line running from its city center to its airport, a distance of 22 miles. The line is expected to be operational in 2008.

Pittsburgh and Baltimore are the final contestants for a grant under the 1998 Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century. If Pittsburgh wins the \$950 million prize, it will build a 47-mile maglev line linking its international airport and two other cities. If Baltimore wins the award, it will build a 40-mile line from the city to the Baltimore-Washington International Airport and then on to Washington, D.C. where it will tie up with Amtrak and the Metro. Both lines plan to be operational in 2012.

Atlanta, Georgia, is planning to link its airport with its northern suburbs by 2010.

Also under study is a maglev line that would link Anaheim to Las Vegas that would have several station-stops along the way. The first phase - from the Las Vegas airport to Primm, Nevada, a distance of 35 miles - would be operational by 2010.

Finally, a maglev line is under study that would link LAX with the Palmdale airport. According to initial estimates, the line would be about 71 miles long and have 5-to-7 stations. It would have an estimated annual ridership of about 30 million, and it could be operational by 2010.

What will make maglev systems so ubiquitous by 2020? One word says it all: speed. For instance, the train built by Shanghai zips along at 268 miles per hour - a full 81 miles per hour faster than Japan's famous bullet train. On trips of less than 621 miles, a maglev train can match air travel time. A maglev line between LAX and Palmdale would cut the travel time to about 30 minutes - or about half the time it takes to go by taxi from the heart of Washington, D.C. to the Dulles Airport.

The answer to the LAX expansion is not Alternative D. The answer is Alternative ML: a maglev line to Palmdale - the terrestrial transportation system for this century.

Response:

The traffic study for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR assumed that an inter-regional Maglev system would not be completed by the 2015 horizon year. If a Maglev facility is implemented by 2015, then the traffic study in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR has taken a conservative approach to the traffic impacts in the vicinity of LAX, since it could be assumed that some passengers and employees would use Maglev over their private vehicles. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan. In particular see Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.1, regarding high-speed rail connections to LAX.

SPC00301 Gubler, Leron Hollywood Chamber of Commerce 11/7/2003

SPC00301-1

Comment:

On behalf of the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, I'd like to express our support for the LAX Master Plan Enhanced Safety and Security Alternative, known as "Alternative D."

We find merit in the Plan's envisioned New Center Taxiway, Central Terminal Area (CTA), Consolidated Rental Car Facility (RAC), Ground Transportation Center (GTC), nearly 40 miles of infrastructure and road improvements, and the People Mover. Our support is contingent upon the People Mover system being completed and operational before vehicle traffic is prohibited within the central airport area and that luggage can be checked in via skycap or underground tunnel.

Response:

Comment noted. The Automated People Mover system will be operational prior to the opening of the GTC and the prohibition of vehicular traffic from the CTA. However, there will be a period during which the APM is under construction but parking will no longer be allowed in the CTA.

The details for the handling of luggage remotely at the CTA will be developed in the advanced planning stages of the project.

SPC00301-2

Comment:

We stress that access to the airport via public transportation should be a focused priority in the years to come, as our region grapples with increased population and traffic. Though "Alternative D" provides a link to the Green Line at the Intermodal Transportation Center, we feel this link is less than optimal because a transfer to the People Mover is still required. Shortsightedness during the rail line's construction, which stopped short of the airport, and incompatible technologies with airport navigation systems have debilitated what could have been a more widely-utilized and efficient system. We urge the

3. Comments and Responses

future planning for LAX to concentrate on providing convenient public transportation access to the airport.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHL00022-2 regarding the most feasible alignment of the Green Line.

Please see Response to Comment SPHL00026-1 regarding the incompatibility of the Green Line with the APM technology.

It is infeasible to connect the Green Line directly to the CTA, as discussed in Response to Comment SPHO00004-6.

LAWA has had several discussions with MTA staff regarding their plans for transit in the LAX vicinity. MTA staff will be invited to participate in the advanced planning of the Ground Transportation Center.

SPC00301-3

Comment:

The Flyaway Bus System is an effective and reliable method of arriving at the airport from the Valley. We understand that an expansion of the Flyaway system to other communities is being considered, but we are dismayed that Hollywood is not included, since we are the tourist hub for the City of Los Angeles. We would be happy to work with you to find a suitable location for a Flyaway program in Hollywood, which receives 10 million visitors a year. For the past couple of years we have been working to create a "parkade," or transit center for tour buses which, located behind the El Capitan and across the street from the subway station at Hollywood & Highland, would serve as an intermodal transportation nucleus.

Response:

LAWA welcomes the opportunity to work with the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce to determine whether a FlyAway in Hollywood is viable.

SPC00301-4

Comment:

Lastly, we feel that by designating the Master Plan Alternative as the Enhanced Safety and Security Alternative, one gets the impression that it will be much less convenient for business travelers and tourists to utilize LAX, due to excessive screenings and delays. We suggest that, as planning moves forward, an effort be made to portray Alternative D as a tourist-friendly enhancement to the existing airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00302 Acherman, Robert None Provided 11/6/2003

SPC00302-1

Comment:

I am writing you in regards to the Draft LAX Master Plan Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (DEIR/DEIS).

As I have stated in previous comments, I am opposed to all of the master plan alternatives presented thus far. I agree and accept that some effort must be made to assure that LAX is a safe and secure airport. Alternative D is a step in the right direction, but it too has its fatal flaws of excessive expense, passenger inconvenience, uncertain traffic mitigation and additional pollution. I have enclosed one of my previous letters.

I agree with the questions and conclusions presented by the Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa del Rey (NCWPDR) and the County of Los Angeles. I do not agree with the county's report suggesting that runway 24R be moved further north closer to the residents of Westchester/Playa del Rey. I have enclosed a copy of the NCWPDR LAX Master Plan Position Paper and Questions on the LAX Master Plan in case you did not receive it.

I have included some of my questions below:

Response:

Comment noted. Mr. Acherman's November 9, 2001 comment letter on the Draft EIS/EIR is identified as comment letter PC02980. The NCWPDR LAX Master Plan Position Paper and Questions on the LAX Master Plan are identified as comment letter SPC00274. For responses to these comments, please see responses to comment letters PC02980 and SPC00274, respectively. For responses to comments made in this letter, please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00302-2

Comment:

1. How will the questions to the Draft EIS/EIR be responded to? Will writers receive an individual response? Will all responses be published in the Final EIS/EIR?
2. On what date do you anticipate to complete answering all of the inquires?

Response:

In accordance with the provisions of NEPA and CEQA, FAA and LAWA have provided written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These responses are provided herein as part of this Final EIS/EIR, which has been made available for public review at FAA and LAX and through distribution to public libraries throughout the area, and is available electronically at www.laxmasterplan.org.

SPC00302-3

Comment:

3. To what depth of analysis and commentary will you provide on the Westchester community designed "Alternative E" and the revised, "Alternative E-1"?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00035-4 regarding a concept proposed by certain residents which they have identified as "Alternative E" and Response to Comment SPC00274-88 regarding a revision to this concept which they have identified as "Alternative E-1".

SPC00302-4

Comment:

4. Should the EIS/EIR be approved, to what extent will there be public input and participation in further defining the project? Will participation be encouraged from areas outside of the surrounding LAX community including outside L.A. City and County limits? Will an advisory committee be established? How will the members of the committee be selected? Will this committee include critics as well as supporters of the selected Alternative?

Response:

As the LAX Master Plan has not been approved, actions following such approval, such as the creation of an advisory committee, have not been defined. However, LAWA has established several methods for encouraging community participation at LAX. The Los Angeles Area Advisory Committee, established in 1975, reviews airport operations issues that affect their communities and makes recommendations to the Board of Airport Commissioners, Mayor's Office, City Council, and other appropriate agencies. The 19-member committee is comprised of representatives appointed by elected

3. Comments and Responses

officials from communities surrounding LAX, including Culver City, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Inglewood, Lennox, Marina del Rey, and Westchester/Playa del Rey. Another important forum is the LAX Community Noise Roundtable, created in September 2000 to reduce and mitigate the adverse noise impacts that the users of LAX create on the surrounding communities and their environs. Membership of the Roundtable consists of local elected officials and staff, representatives of congressional offices, members of recognized community groups, the FAA, the Air Transport Association, and LAWA Management. This forum provides a mechanism that ensures cooperation between the airport and local communities in achieving noise impact reduction to those communities wherever possible.

SPC00302-5

Comment:

5. Will the airlines have any role in shaping the building process should the EIS/EIR be approved?

Response:

As the LAX Master Plan has not been approved, the process following such approval has not been defined. LAWA will coordinate implementation of the Master Plan with resource agencies, members of the public, and other stakeholders, including the airlines.

SPC00302-6

Comment:

6. Will revenue from Airbus A380 pay back the investment being proposed in airfield and terminal improvements to handle this aircraft? Over what time period will the A380 improvements be paid for out of landing and other fees?

Response:

The airfield changes in Master Plan Alternative D are to accommodate not only the New Large Aircraft (NLA) Airbus 380, but also aircraft in the current fleet like the Boeing 747s, Boeing 737-300 and MD-11. Runways that are lengthened to 12,000 feet, for example, are to accommodate departures by the above aircraft at maximum takeoff weight in hot day conditions, reduce airfield congestion and eliminate excessive coordinated crossings in the air, thus reducing departure delays. The center taxiway in the north airfield is being constructed to reduce runway incursions. However, the separation between the center taxiway and the north airfield runways is designed to accommodate the NLA. A total of 6 terminal contact gates will be able to accommodate the A380.

As these improvements are not specifically designed just to accommodate the A380, costs related to alterations needed by the NLA cannot be separately identified. Landing fees paid by the airlines operating NLA equipment will be a function of the certificated landed weight times the then applicable landing fee rate. The landing fees are not a function of a specific set of improvements. Revenues and costs in the airfield cost center are calculated to generate an annual break-even operation, thus no profits are generated.

SPC00302-7

Comment:

7. If the A380 requires 12,000 foot runways, then how will LAX handle a fully loaded long-range A380 on a proposed reconfigured runway 24L that will be less than 12,000 feet?

Response:

A 300 foot clearway would likely be established west of Runway 6R/24L. Application of Declared Distances would provide a Take-Off Distance Allowed (TODA) of 12,000 feet. Additionally, Airbus has stated that the A380 would require approximately 10,000 feet for departure operations at MTOW. The additional runway length is not solely for the benefit of A380 operations but also aircraft in the existing fleet mix that require extraordinary takeoff length such as the Boeing 747-200 and MD-11.

SPC00302-8**Comment:**

8. Can Ontario and Palmdale airports handle the A380? Runways? Taxiways? Ramp area? Gate areas? Parking? Catering? Cleaning? Customs and Immigration (FIS facilities)?

Response:

The A380 aircraft have been ordered and will be put into service by carriers to upgrade their current large aircraft service at constrained airports like LAX. These carriers do not serve Ontario or Palmdale. These aircraft will be used to serve only high density city pairs and depend on the connecting feed provided at major gateway airports. While the improvements needed at Ontario or Palmdale to accommodate the NLA and the cost of those improvements are beyond the scope of the LAX Master Plan and EIS/EIR, LAWA has evaluated the expansion potential at Ontario and concluded that Ontario cannot feasibly accommodate the demand, including the NLA demand, by 2015 that will be accommodated by Alternative D of the LAX Master Plan. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 for more detail.

SPC00302-9**Comment:**

9. How are runway lengths measured? What is the FAA standard for runway length measurements? Are areas for landing lights at the ends of runways calculated into runway length?

Response:

The area defined as the runway is designed to accommodate the weight of aircraft during landings and take-offs. Typically the runway length is measured by the length of its physical pavement. However, the physical pavement of the runway sometimes does not included in the effective runway length for landings or take-offs and the available runway length may be reduced in the instance of displaced runway threshold and declared runway distance.

The area for landing lights at the ends of runways are not included in calculating runway lengths. However, these lights may be imbedded in runway pavement behind a displaced threshold.

SPC00302-10**Comment:**

10. The County of Los Angeles report made reference that a "Supplement" is not the correct format for CEQA purposes. Is the county's assertion correct? If so, would this require a new EIS/EIR to be drawn up using more current data?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SAL00013-31 regarding the use of the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00302-11**Comment:**

11. If the EIS/EIR is deemed inadequate or rejected, will a new EIS/EIR be drafted? Will other concepts be considered? Will new data be gathered? Will the airlines and the public have the ability to submit ideas before a master plan concept has been crystallized and studied? Who will make these decisions?

Response:

NEPA and CEQA require that prior to approval of a proposed project, the approving agency/body must determine whether the necessary environmental document has been completed in fulfillment of the applicable requirements. In the case of the LAX Master Plan, the FAA will have to determine whether the EIS meets the requirements of NEPA prior to approving the project through a Record of Decision,

3. Comments and Responses

and the Los Angeles City Council will have to determine whether the EIR meets the requirements of CEQA prior to approving the project by resolution. Should either or both approving authorities determine that the EIS/EIR does not meet the requirements necessary for the agency to approve the project, the affected lead agency(ies) would need to assess and determine the nature, extent, and process for, providing the necessary information. Such an assessment and determination would depend on the specific facts of, and reasons for, the approval authority's decision.

SPC00302-12

Comment:

12. To what extent does the FAA control, influence or direct planning efforts at LAX and other airports? Can the FAA legally force LAWA to implement certain changes?

Response:

The FAA has approval authority over certain design and operation aspects of the proposed LAX Master Plan. The types of FAA approvals associated with the LAX Master Plan were identified in Section 2.7.1, Requested Federal Actions, of the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00302-13

Comment:

13. When will the ground radar be installed at LAX that was recommended as a result of the 1991 ground collision between a USAir 737 jet and a SkyWest commuter plane?

Response:

The LAX Ground Radar (AMASS) was commissioned in the third quarter of 2001. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding the status of the Airport Movement Area Safety System (AMASS).

SPC00303 Diruillon, Deysi 50th Street Block Club 11/4/2003

SPC00303-1

Comment:

We would like to have Master Plan D. We think this is the best plan we can have.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00304 Brown, Dollie 50th Street Block Club 11/4/2003

SPC00304-1

Comment:

I'm a member of the 50th St. block club. I feel that Master Plan D will be the best plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00305 Cope, Danna

None Provided

11/1/2003

SPC00305-1

Comment:

While Alternative D of the Draft EIS/EIR for LAX Proposed Master Plan Improvements is better than Alternatives A, B, and C, the No Action/No Project is still my preference. Alt. D would delete the ring road, western terminal, and relocation of Runway 24R closer to the Westchester/Playa del Rey community, and it would limit the number of gates; however, it would create new problems that were not adequately studied, nor were there mitigations included for the new impacts. Therefore, Alt. D is not acceptable and is fatally flawed, as are Alternatives A, B, and C.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00305-2

Comment:

Alt. D would cost over \$9 billion to transfer security problems from the CTA out to the community; thereby leaving the residents and traveling public still at risk. Concrete, metal and plastic would be safer; people would not. Safety seems to have been designed for equipment and facilities. People would still be in large, vulnerable groups prior to security screening (at the drop-off point in Manchester Square and at the security processing center), but aircraft/runways/terminals would be protected.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00288-2 which discusses dispersion of people at the GTC.

SPC00305-3

Comment:

Prior to the 2002 mayoralty election, then candidate James Hahn signed the ARSAC pledge that included, in Section 2, a commitment to not increase LAX beyond its existing boundaries. Manchester Square was (and is) not within LAX boundaries.

Response:

The purpose of locating the GTC at Manchester Square is to improve the safety and security of LAX, not increase activity levels beyond the level of activity projected for the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.4 regarding the purpose of the GTC in Manchester Square under Alternative D, and Response to Comment SPHSP00016-2 regarding the level of future airport capacity under Alternative D and Mayor's pledge.

SPC00305-4

Comment:

Placing a new Ground Transportation Center in Manchester Square would shift ground traffic to totally new areas (Inglewood and the Osage neighborhood of Westchester) that are not equipped to handle it.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00305-5

Comment:

It does not appear that adequate security could be provided at this GTC in terms of security from vehicle/luggage/personal bombs or airborne contaminations. The main body of hazardous materials and decontamination staff and equipment would be on the airfield; in the event of a disaster or emergency the staff and equipment would have to travel on city streets (which would, obviously, be heavily impacted) to reach the GTC. There does not seem to be a GTC evacuation plan or place for vehicles or pedestrians to go to.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00305-6

Comment:

Low-frequency noise impacts were not included in Alt. D,

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00274-41 regarding low frequency noise.

SPC00305-7

Comment:

single-event noise impacts were included, but there were no mitigation measures included.

Response:

LAWA, as the lead CEQA agency for the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR, has developed thresholds of significance regarding single event noise effects, based on a comprehensive review of existing studies and research literature pertaining to the issue. It should be noted that the thresholds of significance developed by LAWA are intended solely for use in the CEQA evaluation of the LAX Master Plan, as addressed in this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. There is no Federal threshold of significance for single event noise impacts. Mitigation measures are addressed in 4.2.8 Mitigation Measures of 4.2, Land Use of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, please see Response to Comment SPC00274-47, which elaborates on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR's added analysis of single event noise and their mitigation measures.

SPC00305-8

Comment:

Alt. D sends the message to other, outlying areas, such as Orange, Kern, Santa Barbara, and Riverside Counties that LAWA intends to just keep expanding LAX to handle all the Southern CA traffic - no firm commitment to a plan of action to achieve a regional approach is included.

Response:

Alternative D emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. LAWA only controls the operations and potential improvements at LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Other jurisdictions are responsible for developing the other regional airports. The decision to develop an airport is the responsibility of the local airport proprietor. FAA and LAWA do not have the authority to make and implement development decisions at airports they do not own.

Officials from Los Angeles joined political leaders from the Inland Empire to form a new coalition in October 2003 to plan as a region for the growth of air traffic in Southern California.

3. Comments and Responses

LAWA and Mayor Hahn have developed Alternative D in response to the concerns of the public that the City of Los Angeles should participate in a regional solution for the fair and reasonable distribution of air service. Alternative D is consistent with the "fair share" that is allocated to LAX by SCAG in its 2001 and Draft 2004 RTPs. Under the RTP allocation to LAX, LAX experiences a significant drop in its future share of regional passenger and cargo traffic.

SPC00305-9

Comment:

Mitigation measures, for the most part, in Alt. D rely on other agencies or departments. There should be pro-active, firm actions included for LAWA and/or the City of Los Angeles to take (e.g., the City will formally request and actively lobby for...)

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AR00003-63 and SPC00275-4.

SPC00305-10

Comment:

I support the positions, questions, and comments submitted by the LAX Area Advisory Committee, LAX/Community Noise Roundtable, and the Westchester/Playa del Rey Neighborhood Council. For the sake of brevity (and sanity) I will not iterate those positions in this letter. I do look forward to reviewing the responses to the issues raised by these organizations.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00305-11

The attachment included as part of this comment letter is identical to comment letter SPC00236; please refer to the responses to comment letter SPC00236.

SPC00306 Smith, Robert Westchester Association

The content of this comment letter is identical to SPC00291; please refer to the response to comment letter SPC00291.

SPC00307 Stevens, Mike LAX Expansion No! 11/6/2003

SPC00307-1

Comment:

The following constitute the comments of LAX Expansion No ('L.A.X.E.N.') a community organization comprised of residents living in Inglewood, Lennox, Westchester and El Segundo concerning the Draft ("DEIR") and Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement ("SEIR") for the Los Angeles International Airport ("LAX") Master Plan ("Master Plan") and Master Plan Addendum ("Addendum") (together "Project"), submitted pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000, et seq., ("CEQA"), its implementing Guidelines, 14 Cal. Code Regs. 15000, et seq. ("CEQA Guidelines") and the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. 4321, et seq., ("NEPA"). All of the above listed documents shall be referred to as "The Master Plan" herein.

3. Comments and Responses

Our primary focus of our comments concerning the evaluation of the Draft and Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement, Los Angeles International Airport Proposed Master Plan and Master Plan Addendum will be Alternative D "Mayor Hahn's Plan". Alternatives A, B, and C although presented with Alternative D have already been publicly addressed in our comments, and the community's comments, during the preceding EIR /EIS hearings. We will refine our comments to address specifically Alternative D and the movement and lengthening of the inboard northern and southern complex runways, center taxiways, and environmental justice issues related to Alternative D, baseline analysis, transportation funds, elimination of the existing downwind, base leg, final approach landing pattern, elimination of parking structures inside LAX, loop departures and mitigation remedies.

Response:

Comment noted. The L.A.X.E.N.'s July 24, 2001 comment letter on the Draft EIS/EIR is identified as comment letter PC02391. For responses to these comments, please see responses to comment letter PC02391. For responses to comments made in this comment letter, please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00307-2

Comment:

LAX Expansion NO! (L.A.X.E.N!) believes that an off-site check in facility will never be built in Manchester Square, allowing for the area to be utilized for Cargo facilities development. The main purpose of the Master Plan (Alternative D) is for the movement of the runways creating a center taxiway forcing the removal of the parking structures located inside LAX. The elimination of Parking Lot C and D allowing for rent-a-car facilities further eliminates public parking facilities. This will become a FINANCIAL BONNANZA for Hotel / Parking Structure Owners located nearby just outside of LAX's current check in facility with their number one competitor eliminated and relegated to a relatively obscured location at Aviation and Imperial. The redesign of LAX is to eliminate its parking facilities.

FACT: Hotel Owners on Century blvd. generate more revenue from their Parking Lots than on room rentals. Source: Marriott / Renaissance Hotel and Hyatt Hotel located on Century blvd, accounting divisions.

Alternative D is flawed because it does not address the negative impacts caused by removing LAX's own parking structures from inside LAX and relocating them miles away at Imperial and Aviation blvd. To eliminate parking garages that are currently accessible and convenient to the everyday general flying public at a reasonable cost.

Alternative D fails to address the scenario of not having public parking garages conveniently located near terminal check in facilities forces the flying public to utilize Hotels and Parking Garages closer to LAX especially if the off site check in facility is not developed in Manchester Square or any guarantee that a Behemoths parking garage will be built to replace the parking structures that would be torn down as a result of Alternative D, and if policy decisions are reached allowing hotel buses, limousines and taxi cabs to make drop offs and pick ups inside LAX, the economically disadvantaged flying public will be forced to either use nearby hotels and parking garages, or be forced to travel unnecessarily by either walkway or bus to arrive at the check in terminal.

Response:

The removal of the existing airport parking garages under Alternative D of the LAX Master Plan is a consequence of improved security within the central terminal area. Since private vehicles would no longer be permitted to enter the CTA, there is no longer a need to provide parking. The area currently occupied by the parking garages would be used instead for new passenger facilities.

Alternative D proposes public parking structures at the Ground Transportation Center and the Intermodal Transportation Center. This parking would be located conveniently to the Automated People Mover, which would take passengers to their airline terminal in a matter of minutes. Lower-cost parking would be available in the surface parking lot west of La Cienega Boulevard and north of 111th Street. Passengers parking at this lot would take a shuttle to the people mover station in the Intermodal Transportation Center. In total, the number of airport-operated public parking spaces proposed under Alternative D is nearly the same as the number of parking stalls in the No Action/No Project Alternative.

The traffic study in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR does account for the traffic pattern changes associated with the relocation of the public parking from the CTA to the GTC and ITC.

SPC00307-3

Comment:

Alternative D fails to mention the removal of the ring road inside the check in area. Does it remain or is it destroyed? If it remains are five lanes really needed for emergency vehicles?

Response:

The current CTA roadways would be substantially removed, while accommodations would be made for the continued movement of FlyAway buses, service vehicles, and emergency equipment. The future CTA roadways will be worked out in the advanced planning and design stages of the project.

SPC00307-4

Comment:

CENTER TAXI-WAYS

Alternative D is flawed and creates an artificial need for Center Taxi-ways on both the Northern and Southern Complex's. It is unnecessary to have Center Taxi-ways at LAX to prevent the chance of runway incursions when all that is needed is to return LAX to its original design specifications. Take offs on outboard runways and landings on inboard runways. What is needed is a policy revision restricting landings to only the inboard runways and restricting take-offs exclusively for the out board runways on both the Northern and Southern Complexes.

Alternative D is flawed because it does not identify the construction of the center taxi-way as the driving force for the removal of the parking garages.

Response:

The suggested runway operating procedures by the commentor would substantially reduce runway capacity. Please see Response to Comment PC02204-24 regarding runway operating procedures at LAX.

The commentor incorrectly stated the purpose of constructing the center taxiway on the north airfield complex. The purpose of constructing a center taxiway is to enhance safe aircraft operations and reduce the potential for runway incursions. Moving the inboard runway south 340 feet is to reduce noise impacts on the surrounding communities. Alternative C would move the outboard runway north to gain enough separation and result in higher noise impacts than Alternative D.

SPC00307-5

Comment:

Parking Structures and Parking Lot C and D Removal

Alternative D is flawed and creates an artificial need for the removal of parking structures inside LAX's terminal area and Parking Lot C and D. The main purpose of the Parking Structure Removal according to Alternative D is to provide safety for travelers. The Master Plan does not address the alternative of ceiling the walls of the interior parking garages containing any bomb blast from a car bomb inside the structure.

Response:

Structural enhancements to the existing CTA parking garages do not eliminate the possibility of an explosive device being detonated from a private vehicle in front of the airport terminals. Only the elimination of private vehicles from the CTA would eliminate this threat. Please also see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00307-6

Comment:

Alternative D is flawed because it does not address the possibility of the proposed parking garage becoming a white elephant if the Security Check In facility is not built in Manchester Square forcing passengers to use privately owned parking lots or be inconvenienced to use public transportation to get to and from the airport check in facility located inside LAX.

Response:

The traffic study prepared for Alternative D in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR assumes completion of all components of the proposed plan by 2015. LAWA is not proposing a variation of Alternative D that proposes another use for Manchester Square other than as the site of the GTC; therefore, no analysis is required for the hypothetical scenario presented by the Commentor.

SPC00307-7

Comment:

Alternative D is flawed and does not address the act of removing Parking Garages and its Environmental Justice Component. Such as the removal of the Parking Garages inside LAX check in ring road and Parking Lot C and D will force economically disadvantaged communities to park miles away at the Imperial and Aviation boulevard facility and allow communities that are more affluent willing to pay a premium to park closer to the airport at nearby privately owned hotel parking structures and lots.

Response:

On-airport parking options for the public include the GTC, ITC and the surface lot west of La Cienega Boulevard and north of 111th Street. All of these options will provide adequate capacity and include efficient transportation to and from the lots to the airport terminals.

Although more affluent individuals may be better able to afford to park in privately-owned hotel parking structures and lots, that does not give these individuals an advantage in accessing the airport terminals. People parking in privately owned lots would have to take a shuttle to the GTC and use the automated people mover to access the airport terminals. The surface parking lot west of La Cienega Boulevard and north of 111th Street would be lower in cost than the airport operated parking structures. Passengers choosing to park in this surface lot would ride a free airport-operated shuttle to the people mover at the ITC.

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addresses public parking under Alternative D on page 4-235 of Section 4.3, On-Airport Surface Transportation.

SPC00307-8

Comment:

TRANSPORTATION FUNDS

Alternative D does not address the issue of Transportation Funds being absorbed by the proposed LAX Expansion Project from other areas of Los Angeles and the Southern California region for the building of roads and infrastructure necessary to mitigate traffic concerns in and around Los Angeles International Airport regardless of either Alternative A, B, C, and D.

Response:

A specific funding plan has not yet been prepared for the Master Plan; however, it is anticipated that a joint funding effort will be pursued, involving Federal and State grants and other efforts. Much of the project will likely be funded with airport-generated revenues, such as concession fees, landing fees, revenue bonds, leases, and passenger facility charges (PFCs). It is not anticipated that any local tax revenue would be used for this project.

If funding is unavailable for a proposed transportation mitigation, alternative transportation mitigations will be pursued. These alternative mitigations may require additional environmental review, and will require approval from LADOT. Also, please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding project funding.

SPC00307-9

Comment:

BASELINE ANALYSIS

Alternative D does not address the issue of El Toro International Airport being eliminated as an aviation alternative to help absorb 28 million annual passengers that were designated to be absorbed by the operation of El Toro International Airport.

Response:

Section 1.4, Potential Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Topical Response TR-RC-4 discuss the elimination of El Toro as a potential commercial service airport. Topical Response TR-RC-1 presents the Draft 2004 RTP allocation of projected demand to airports in the region. LAWA and Mayor Hahn have developed Alternative D in response to the concerns of the public that the City of Los Angeles should participate in a regional solution for the fair and reasonable distribution of air service. Alternative D is consistent with the "fair share" that is allocated to LAX by SCAG in its regional plan. The elimination of El Toro as a potential commercial airport does not affect the need to improve the safety and security of LAX.

SPC00307-10

Comment:

Alternative D does not address the issue of why the baseline is computed in terms of million annual passengers and not specified in flights.

Response:

CEQA requires a description of the existing conditions in the vicinity to provide a baseline for environmental impacts analysis. 1996 Baseline and Year 2000 (for informational purposes) conditions are provided for both passenger and aircraft operations.

The nature of demand for air transportation was addressed in Section 1, Regional Context of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, please see Response to Comment TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline conditions.

SPC00307-11

Comment:

Alternative D does not emphasize that 78 million annual passengers is not a preemptive cause of action designed to prevent LAX from exceeding 78 million annual passengers. As stated by Mark Pissano Executive Director of the Southern California Association of Governments, SCAG, on Thursday, November 6, 2003, "There is no guarantee that LAX will not exceed 78 million annual passengers" said Mark Pissano.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D is designed to serve approximately 78.9 million annual passengers. As described in detail in Section 3.3 in the Draft EIS/EIR, it is important to understand that the levels of passengers that each alternative is designed to accommodate are not finite limits where the airport would somehow be closed or where aircraft would be redirected to some other facility when this number is reached. These levels are an indication of the number of passengers that can be accommodated at a reasonable level of service.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00307-12

Comment:

MITIGATION

Neither the Draft nor Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact report, Environmental Impact Statement, Los Angeles International Airport Proposed Master Plan and Master Plan Addendum does not address the option of a voluntary buyout or purchasing of Inglewood residents single family homes and multiple family housing units at a dollar rate comparable to the voluntary home buy out option exercised by the residents of Westchester's subdivision Manchester Square bordered by La Cienega, Century, Airport, and Arbor Vitae Boulevards located in the City of Los Angeles. Los Angeles World Airports used the more affluent Westchester subdivision Osage as a comparable pricing guide for the purchase of single family homes and multi-family housing units in the Manchester Square by Los Angeles World Airports, even though the single family housing units in Manchester Square were inferior to the Westchester subdivision Osage.

This mitigating solution would be to purchase Inglewood residents homes at a rate comparable to the subdivision of Westchester known as Osage and for areas in Inglewood where the housing stock is equal to the area of Westchester's subdivision known as Kentwood, a comparable pricing guide would be used for the purchase of those homes. The purchase of these homes would be a voluntary option exercised by each individual homeowner as an alternative to sound insulation as preceded by residents living in the Westchester subdivision known as Manchester Square.

Specifically Alternative D does not address the above or the issue of LAX reimbursing residents for the dollar depreciation value of their property caused by existing and future LAX operations. It only suggests that placing residents in a comparable bunker (sound proof windows) can mitigation occur.

Response:

The acquisition of Manchester Square residents is a separate program from the LAX Master Plan that is currently being implemented by LAWA. As stated on page 4-96, in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR the Voluntary Residential Acquisition and Relocation Program for the Manchester Square and Belford area was initiated due to a high level of interest from residents and property owners who requested that LAWA purchase their properties in lieu of soundproofing. Comparable pricing for the purchase of homes in Manchester Square was based on providing a replacement unit in a comparable neighborhood unaffected by aircraft noise. See Topical Response TR-MP-3 for an additional discussion of property acquisition within Manchester Square.

Revisions proposed to the ANMP under mitigation measure MM-LU-1 do allow for the conversion of incompatible uses to compatible uses through acquisition as well as sound insulation. Although the preferred method to address noise impacts within the City of Los Angeles is through soundproofing, the decision to pursue noise insulation or acquisition is made by each jurisdiction.

Regarding depreciation of residential property values see Topical Response TR-ES-1.

SPC00307-13

Comment:

Mitigating Solution for movement of runways: There is a better way to solve the problems of Runway Incursions involving arriving and departing flights at LAX. Runway incursions can be easily remedied by simply having all landings take place on inboard runways only. The airport was originally designed with this philosophy being the cornerstone of its design. The original design called for aircraft to turn immediately into the terminal area from the inboard runways only on either the northern or southern complex sides eliminating the possibility of collision with intersecting / departing flights on the outboard runways.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

The EIR lacks a technical understanding for the reader that LAX's original design and existing runway configuration was for aircraft landings to take place on inboard runways on both the northern and southern complexes. The purpose of the design was to prevent a landing plane from turning into the terminal area and before reaching the area intersecting or colliding with departing aircraft which is what can happen today if a pilot fails to stop for departing aircraft taking off on the inboard runways on both the northern and southern complex's to provide noise relief for the residents of Playa Del Rey, Westchester and El Segundo.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE CONTINUED

Alternative D and the Environmental Impact Report lack an explanation for the unofficial noise mitigation measures taken to have planes take off exclusively on the inboard runways today and under the proposed Alternative D. The official explanation for this unofficial noise mitigation measure today is to provide noise relief for El Segundo, Playa Del Rey and Westchester area residents.

The Master Plan fails to address ramifications of providing unofficial noise mitigation measures for Playa Del Rey, Westchester and El Segundo and causing the gated communities of Briarwood, Carlton Square Morningside Park, and Century Heights in Inglewood to have arriving planes fly over their homes on final approach, as oppose to over the parking lot of Hollywood Park, which is clearly designated as an arrival approach path to the inboard runway on the northern complex side by the Gunther Strobe located at 90th and Crenshaw.

The Master Plan fails to address purpose of providing noise relief action for the residents of Playa Del Rey, El Segundo and Westchester when they are eligible for noise mitigation (sound proof windows) by moving take-offs to the inboard runways under Alternative D away from Playa Del Rey, Westchester and El Segundo to the detriment the Communities of Inglewood, and Lennox. This is clearly an issue of Environmental Justice considering the ramifications of this UN official policy over the past decade. Further the ethnic make up of Westchester and its affluent economic base of its residents in comparison to the City of Inglewood self described low income economic base of its residents makes this in our opinion a clear violation of Environmental Justice Laws.

The Master Plan under Alternative D is flawed because for every plane that departs from LAX on the inboard runway will prevent an arriving plane from landing on the inboard runway forcing arriving aircraft to align their arrival glide slope with the outboard runway and negatively impacting homes that would not be affected by LAX and its ill effects of flight paths above upon housing prices and residents' health on the ground below in Inglewood, Lennox, and Los Angeles California.

The Master Plan under Alternative D is flawed and allows the inboard runway on the northern complex side to be moved to the south 300 feet and on the southern complex side the runway is to be moved to the south 50 feet. This will permit visual simultaneous landings on the northern complex side but will require a variance issued by the FAA allowing for the separation of aircraft to be less 4,300 feet that is the normal approved separation of runways for "dual simultaneous instrument approaches" per FAA advisory 150/5300-13, change 5, 2-4-97, "Airport Design", chapter 2, page 11, paragraph 208.a. (1) than what is currently required minimum under FAA rules and regulations.

The Master Plan under Alternative D intention of providing noise relief to residents of El Segundo, Playa Del Rey and Westchester at the expense of the quality of life of Inglewood Residents' is a violation of Environmental Justice.

Response:

An Environmental Justice Program, including relevant mitigation measures and benefits, is proposed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR in order to avoid, reduce or offset the potential disproportionate and adverse environmental effects of the LAX Master Plan on minority and/or low-income populations. Please see Topical Responses TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits and TR-EJ-3 regarding environmental justice and regional context. As illustrated in Table S4.4.3-2 in Chapter 4.4.3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the overall noise exposure in minority and low income areas is less in Alternative D than Alternative C.

3. Comments and Responses

The suggested runway operating procedures by the commentor with arrival aircraft on the inboard runways and departure aircraft on the outboard runways would substantially reduce runway capacity. Please see Response to Comment PC02204-24 regarding runway operating procedures at LAX. The commentor incorrectly stated that the departure operations are exclusively on inboard runways. As described in Section 3.3, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, the primary use of runways is assumed to be arrival operations on the outboard runways and departure operations on the inboard runways. Occasional departures would continue off of the outboard runways. The commentor incorrectly stated the current runway operating procedures at LAX. Simultaneous approaches to the closely spaced runways on the same airfield complex would be conducted under visual approach procedures (similar to the way the airfield is presently used). The move of runways is to construct a center taxiway between the closely spaced parallel runways. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00021-3 for more discussion on simultaneous approaches at LAX.

The intention of the Alternative D design is not an attempt to provide noise relief to residents of El Segundo, Playa Del Rey and Westchester at the expense of the quality of life of Inglewood residents. As stated in Section 3.3.2, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D is a direct response to the strongly expressed desire of many citizens for a regional approach to airport planning in Southern California. Alternative D represents a new design approach to securing airports for the future. By limiting access by private vehicles to the main airport infrastructure, significant threats can be identified and mitigated in new facilities designed for the new security environment. This approach reduces the risk to airport users while also protecting the airport infrastructure and its link to the economy. Enhanced airfield safety is achieved through airfield facility modifications that mitigate the primary causes of runway incursions at LAX. Further airfield safety and improved airfield efficiency are achieved through taxiway development that matches the future fleet of larger aircraft. Alternative D emphasizes encouraging a long-term regional approach to serving air traffic demand in the Los Angeles basin by designing facilities at LAX to accommodate passenger and cargo activity levels as projected in regional plan, such as the SCAG RTP.

SPC00307-14

Comment:

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE CONTINUED

The Master Plan is flawed and fails to address under Alternative D the movement of the northern complex inboard runway 300 feet south and the movement of the southern complex runways 50 feet south and how the movement of these runways will negatively impact Inglewood Residents who live in the Morningside Park Area between Century Blvd. and 90th street forcing planes to fly in airspace that had not been used by jet aircraft and flying directly over residential homes with the possibility of simultaneous landings (two planes abreast) on the northern complex side and one perhaps two planes landing on the southern complex side simultaneously.

Response:

Aircraft noise impacts associated with the relocation of Runway 6R/24L 340 feet to the south and the relocation of Runway 7R/25L 50 feet to the south were addressed as part of the overall changes proposed under Alternative D, as described in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Areas within Morningside Park that would be newly exposed to high noise levels are shown on Figures S4.2-16 and S4.2-18 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As stated under mitigation measures MM-LU-1 and MM-LU-2 residential areas newly exposed to 65 CNEL or 94 dBA SEL noise levels would be eligible for sound insulation under the revised ANMP. See Topical Responses TR-LU-3 for a description of the ANMP and TR-LU-5 regarding noise impacts and mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Regarding simultaneous landings on the north airfield complex and south airfield complex, as stated on page 3-42, in Chapter 3, Alternatives, Section 3.3.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR the primary use of the runways is assumed to be arrival operations on the outboard Runways 6L/24R and 7R/25L and departure operations on the inboard Runways 6R/24L and 7L/25R. Although the use of specific runways for take-offs and landings may vary depending on weather-based operating conditions, only two runways, rather than three or for runways referenced by the commentor, would be used

simultaneously for aircraft landings. Please also see Response to Comment SPC00236-13 for additional discussion of simultaneous landings under Alternative D.

SPC00307-15

Comment:

The Master Plan is flawed and fails to address adequately variances for public participation and the method and procedure that a resident would need to take to participate in any hearing concerning a variance for simultaneous landings or procedure to be placed on the panel discussing what will or may be needed to land jet aircraft / planes two abreast simultaneously on the northern complex side and also two abreast on the southern complex side of LAX.

The Master Plan is flawed and fails to address adequately under Alternative D the possibility for disproportionate share of landings to take place on the northern complex side. Inglewood residents would suffer with more noise while Westchester, Playa Del Rey and El Segundo are provided noise relief with runways being moved further away from Westchester, Playa Del Rey and El Segundo. The movement of the inboard runways on both the northern and southern complex sides of LAX for the purpose to provide noise relief to Playa Del Rey, Westchester, and El Segundo to the detriment of Inglewood is a violation of Environmental Justice.

The Master Plan fails to address Environmental Justice concerning the Lengthening of runways. Alternative D is designed to provide noise relief for Playa Del Rey, Westchester and El Segundo to insure that early turns and fly-overs do not impact their homes but to the detriment of Inglewood and Lennox residents. Inglewood and Lennox residents will be impacted by much larger aircraft and a higher volume of aircraft. Residents who live to the east of the Airport (Inglewood, Lennox, and Los Angeles) will find larger aircraft flying over their homes as a result of longer runways at LAX under Alternative D.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00307-13 regarding environmental justice issues and simultaneous approaches at LAX.

SPC00307-16

Comment:

AIR QUALITY

The Master Plan and Environmental Impact Report concerning air quality studies lack measurements less than Particulate Matter 10 (PM10).

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-329 regarding PM2.5 and PM10 calculations.

SPC00307-17

Comment:

The Master Plan fails to address the over 685 signed health declarations presented to the Air Quality Management District (AQMD) consisting of residents who suffer from cancer, asthma, bronchitis and other respiratory conditions they believe is caused by the aircraft flying over their homes.

Response:

The comment refers to "685 signed health declarations", which were presented to the AQMD. It is not indicated in the comment whether these "health declarations" were submitted as comments to the Draft EIS/EIR. Therefore, the reference to "health declarations" is nonspecific and cannot be addressed. However, to the extent that the commentor is expressing a belief that airport operations have caused certain ailments, please see Topical Responses TR-HRA-2 and TR-HRA-3 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects and human health impacts.

3. Comments and Responses

In response to public comment, additional analyses were presented in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and were summarized in the Executive Summary of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was prepared to integrate a new alternative, Alternative D, into the existing environmental review process and to incorporate supplemental information and analysis for the LAX Master Plan. Such information and analysis were based upon the availability of new or updated information since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR in January 2001.

Please refer to Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment (subsection 4.24.1.6, Environmental Consequences, and Subsection 4.24.1.9, Level of Significance After Mitigation), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for discussions of acute and chronic hazards for all build alternatives and the No Action/No Project Alternative. As described in these sections, health risks (cancer, non-cancer chronic and non-cancer acute) for the majority of nearby residents would be lower for Alternative D than for 1996 baseline, Year 2000 conditions and the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D provides for airfield improvements that would enable aircraft to move more efficiently, thereby reducing air pollutant emissions from aircraft operating in taxi/idle mode. This alternative also provides substantial improvements to the on-airport and off-airport surface transportation systems, thereby reducing air pollutant emissions from motor vehicles. Additionally, Alternative D, unlike the No Action/No Project Alternative, includes Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions.

SPC00307-18

Comment:

AIR QUALITY CONTINUED

The Master Plan and Environmental Impact Report lacks clear and definite language specifically identifying what the negative impacts upon the residents who live in Briarwood, Carlton Square and Morningside Park as it relates to air quality. The EIR does not clearly define what air quality impacts will be inflicted upon these neighborhoods if all arriving flights are designated to land on the out board runway or northern most runway on the northern complex side of LAX under Alternative D.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00018-10 regarding the spatial extent of the air quality analysis. Air pollutant concentrations at all locations in the vicinity of LAX, as a result of any alternative considered under the Master Plan, will be less than or equal to the maximum predicted concentrations summarized in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.8.6.

SPC00307-19

Comment:

LOOP DEPARTURE

The proposed new loop departure procedure will place all Eastern bound aircraft over the communities of Osage, Inglewood and Baldwin Hills. This will remove the aircraft from flying over Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach and Rancho Palos Verdes Peninsula. This will endanger the lives of residents in Inglewood and Baldwin Hills. More aircraft will fly over minority communities to provide noise relief to Manhattan, Hermosa, Redondo Beach and Rancho Palos Verdes.

Response:

The Loop departure will benefit communities east of the airport by allowing aircraft to climb to higher altitude before turning around and crossing the shoreline. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

SPC00307-20

Comment:

CONCLUSION

A New International Airport should be built in the Los Angeles Harbor utilizing soil sentiment and other ecologically safe materials to build an island for runways and the terminal check in facility could be built on land. An airport in this location would not harm or negatively impact any residents utilizing the Alameda Corridor and could serve both Los Angeles and Orange Counties efficiently.

Response:

Numerous concepts were considered during the development of the Master Plan alternatives. Several ocean concepts were considered during concept development phase of the Master Plan, but did not compare favorably to other options being considered. The Port of Los Angeles was not investigated as a potential option in the process. Developing ocean airports or combination ocean/land airports is extremely costly and has numerous operational and environmental issues associated with it. Other international airports built offshore such as Hong Kong China, Kansai Japan, Incheon Korea, were constructed in a site location where the water depth was approximately one quarter to one tenth as deep as the water depth off the coastline of Santa Monica Bay or Long Beach Harbor. Further, building an airport into the Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbor would significantly inhibit cargo and cruise line traffic that use this vital port. The Draft EIS/EIR described the consideration of ocean concepts in Chapter 3, Alternatives, Section 3.1.3, Development Concepts.

SPC00307-21

Comment:

It is necessary to provide a quality of life and environment equal to other communities for the purpose of equality that would benefit residents living to the east of Los Angeles International Airport who are unfairly burdened with the negative environmental impacts of an airport that is too small to carry the aircraft burden for the entire southern region.

Response:

The 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 S-D. Specifically, regarding benefits to residents living to the east of LAX who are disproportionately impacted by the airport see the discussion of benefits beginning on page 4-339. Also note that Alternative D was developed to support a more regional approach to airport planning in Southern California, as further described in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. See Topical Response TR-EJ-3 regarding environmental justice and regional context.

SPC00307-22

Comment:

LAX Expansion NO! also adopts the comments forthcoming from the City of Inglewood, Los Angeles Board of Supervisors and asks that LAX Expansion NO (L.A.X.E.N.) be recognized as having standing to utilize those agencies comments concerning the Draft and Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Report, Environmental Impact Statement, Los Angeles International Airport Proposed Master Plan and Master Plan Addendum.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00308

Parks, Bernard

City of Los Angeles

11/7/2003

SPC00308-1

Comment:

While considering the pros and cons of latest proposed modernization plan for Los Angeles International Airport, the Eighth District Council Office decided to base its position on the opinions of its constituents and the rest of the public. After all, it's the people of the City of Los Angeles and its surrounding areas who will be most affected by any changes at the airport.

To gauge the feelings of the residents, the Eighth District Council Office held a variety of meetings, where experts on the modernization plan were called in to provide details to the public. The public was also allowed to take part in the discussions, so they could voice their concerns.

As one meeting followed the next, time and time again the Eighth District staff heard how residents felt they were being neglected, left out of the process and not taken seriously. Furthermore, they expressed concern at how the plan would negatively affect them. There were concerns about how expanding the airport would leave more schools, churches and hospitals under the noisy glide path and unhealthy exhaust fumes of airplanes. There was dissatisfaction over the traffic problems that would haunt drivers before, during and after the reconstruction with traffic and the extreme exhaust that would come from traffic congestion around the airport. And, there was frustration at how the southern and eastern ends of the area would bare the brunt of the modernization plan, while the people at the wealthier northern end would apparently experience few or none of the consequences.

And, it didn't stop there. the Eighth District Council Office watched that frustration turn into anger, as they learned that with all this disruption; that with all this danger, there would be no guaranteed benefits. Does the Alternative D Modernization Plan make people safer? No one is sure. Does it constrain growth at LAX? No one is sure. Area residents are sure about one thing; the price. At \$9.6 billion, the very least the public deserves is a couple of straight answers.

The attached report is based on information obtained by the Eighth District Council Office.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process and Response to Comment PC00178-2 regarding environmental justice and public participation.

SPC00308-2

Comment:

Community Reaction Report on LAX Modernization Plan
Councilmember Bernard C. Parks

Community Concerns- Most of the reported concerns come from the southern and eastern ends of the area surrounding LAX. People at the eastern end have been experiencing the effects of living under the flight path for several years. They are troubled by the noise, not just for auditory reasons, they are understandably frightened by the structural damage the vibrations can do to their homes. While double-paned windows are a relief to some, countless others remain without that benefit because they are unfortunate enough to live inches outside of the designated areas, where double-paned windows are provided for free. Children hoping to leave the loud rumbles of landing planes behind, simply can't. The overwhelming sound follows them into their classrooms, as many schools are under the flight path as well. Some experts suggest "windowless schools". This may upset parents in the community who feel their children deserve a view from the classroom; just like children who attend school away from the flight path.

Response:

FAA and LAWA acknowledge the concern of the commentor and are working with jurisdictions affected by high noise levels from LAX operations to address noise complaints. The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP and monitoring methods used to validate the current 65 CNEL contour are described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4. The 65 CNEL is the applicable standard for high noise levels as defined by FAR Part 150 and Title 21 (see Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4), of the Draft EIS/EIR). Priority for sound insulation is given to residential properties within the highest noise level band above the 65 CNEL contour.

Regarding existing noise impacts on schools from LAX operations, please see Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14. 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. Note that these mitigation measures do not propose windowless classrooms. Sound insulation is feasible and regularly achieved through use of double pane windows, new doors, and other insulating materials.

Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. See Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. See Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding the difference between single event and CNEL noise levels and Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration effects.

SPC00308-3

Comment:

After the planes land, residents are faced with what they leave behind. A number of people under the flight path have complained about airplane fuel being dumped on their homes. The effects of this are unknown. And, the mystery leads people to make their own conclusions. In one case in the Eighth District, a handful of neighbors claimed that they all acquired cancer because of the exhaust and fuel on their homes.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

SPC00308-4

Comment:

Minority communities near the airport feel abused and neglected. Under Alternative D, their neighborhoods are invaded the most; causing them to make more adjustments than any other communities. Minority and low-income communities would constitute 74% of the area subjected to high noise by 2015. According to "A Preliminary Review of Issues Associated with the LAX Master Plan Supplemental Draft EIS/EIR", the perspectives of minorities who live in the affected areas were not properly taken into account. The review, prepared by A.C. Lazzaretto and Associates states that all federal agencies are required to analyze environmental justice impacts when proposing public projects. The analysis is intended to determine whether minority and low-income communities are unfairly burdened by project impacts. The review goes on to say that the original draft EIS/EIR was found to lack even the most elementary requirements for environmental justice. Even with some later corrections, the deficiencies still remain.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Considerable attention has been paid to the topic of environmental justice. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The analysis provided is extensive, with over 125 pages of narrative along with tabular and graphic environmental data generated by a geographic information system (GIS). The analysis followed relevant guidance for addressing environmental justice and was prepared after a comprehensive review of other analyses prepared for large projects across the country in order to give the issue full and careful consideration. LAWA and the FAA's recognition of the importance of the issue is also demonstrated by their having convened an Environmental Justice Task Force, and by a community outreach program that involved among other efforts, seven workshops in surrounding communities specifically focused on the issue. This program is further described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2. LAWA and the FAA have made a strong effort and believe that the assessment of environmental justice presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and Final EIS/EIR is fair and complete.

SPC00308-5

Comment:

Sloppy und Outdated Reports- The oversight on environmental justice issues is just one of many irresponsible errors made in the EIS/EIR. "A Preliminary Review...", discussion #5 states: "The Original EIS/EIR provided an incomplete discussion of the No Project Alternative by incorporating improvements that were then only in the 'planning stages' and overstating the service levels and capacity of the existing facilities. This approach made it difficult to draw meaningful comparisons with project alternatives. Preliminary review indicates that the Supplemental EIS/EIR may also provide an incomplete picture of impacts associated with the No Project Alternative. Additionally, the No Project Alternative has not represented passenger capacity in a consistent manner. In the original 1997 Notice of Preparation, the No Project Alternative was linked to a range of 68-72 MAP whereas the 2001 and 2003 EIS/EIR documents increased this estimate to 71.2-78.7 MAP, " The review follows this revelation by calling the public review process involved in the original EIS/EIR "confusing and cumbersome".

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-2 regarding No Action/No Project Alternative assumptions. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-42 regarding changes in the projected capacity of the No Action/No Project Alternative between the publication of the original Notice of Preparation in 1997 and the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR in January, 2001. As indicated in that comment, the increase between 1997 and 2001 was based on changes in the rules governing the CEQA definition of the No Project Alternative, not in actual increases in passenger demand during that period.

SPC00308-6

Comment:

What Does the Modernization Plan Really Set Out to Do?

Supporters of the LAX Modernization Plan have a list of reasons why the \$9.6 billion should move ahead. Though their reasons may be well intentioned and may even sound good, there is little to no proof that their any of their predictions are accurate.

Security- When examining the issue of security, "A Preliminary Review... " suggests that the Supplemental EIS/EIR may fall short of an adequate review of airport security issues; calling the information "heavily conceptual", "theoretical" and "significantly short on detail".

The Rand Report shows that Alternative D's modifications could make it difficult to evacuate the central terminal complex quickly, if an emergency took place. Also, the newly-proposed shuttle system may be a target that terrorists can't pass up. Having the ability to disable the shuttle anywhere along the two-mile route give terrorists a dream combination: passengers, a vehicle and fear.

Another security uncertainty stems from the fact that many of the high-tech items requested in Alternative D either do not exist or are unproven. Facial recognition technology and futuristic devices

3. Comments and Responses

that check for weapons and explosives may be in a few movie theaters, but they won't be available in airports for sometime to come.

Alternative D's security measures are designed, primarily, to protect against car bombs. However, Rand Report studied the historic risks that terrorists present to airports and found that small bombs hidden in luggage, shoulder-fired missiles and chemical, biological and nuclear weapons are more likely. Alternative D does not prepare for that fact.

Common Sense and the community tell us that the plan to move passengers out of the terminals and into one single facility, simply, makes it easier for terrorists to get to them. With all the talk of building a 'terrorist-proof' airport, the Rand Report raises the question of whether airports can ever be designed to deter terrorist attacks or to minimize casualties if one occurs. The ability of passengers to successfully adjust to the new seemingly difficult systems would also be a concern.

By dispersing airport operations among numerous new facilities, the plan also would increase the area that needs to be patrolled. This would be difficult to do with the current number of personnel.

The Rand Report offers some less-expensive alternative security solutions, including:

*Reducing the Wait for Baggage Check-In: By cutting the average check-in time from 15 minutes to one minute, the number of potential victims in a bomb attack could be cut by more than 50%.

*Erecting Barriers: Planters and concrete pillars can act as a safeguard between vehicles and pedestrians.

Another thing that could improve security, according to the Rand Report, would be if Alternative D successfully capped the airport at 78 million passengers a year, as promised. But, even the theory of "less people, less worries" is a stretch because there is no way to limit passengers and the airlines maintain the sole responsibility of scheduling flights.

Response:

Comment noted. This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPC00308-7

Comment:

Conflicting goals

Limiting Passengers- One of the keys of Alternative D involves the aforementioned passenger cap. While claiming to set a firm limit for passengers, many aspects of Alternative D do the exact opposite. For instance, the design of the proposed gates is more flexible and has more capacity, which may be more accommodating for the larger 600-passenger airplanes of the future. Also, space in the western portion of the airport will remain available for future consideration of a new west terminal. Meanwhile, some still question the benefits of limiting the number of passengers at the airport. Many believe that setting constraints on Southern California economy boosters, like: tourism, apparel and furniture would cause them to suffer. LAX aviation activity contributes \$61 billion to the regional economy each year, or \$167 million dollars a day. That revenue is too precious to threaten, especially for a plan with so few certainties.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D does not limit the number of passengers at LAX. Facilities that comprise Alternative D are designed to accommodate approximately 78.9 MAP. However, as described in detail in Section 3.3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, it is important to understand that the levels of passengers that each alternative is designed to accommodate are not finite limits where the airport would somehow be closed or where aircraft would be redirected to some other facility when this number is reached. These levels are an indication of the number of passengers that can be accommodated at a reasonable level of service.

3. Comments and Responses

Section 4.4.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.4.1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR describe employment and socio-economic impacts related to the LAX Master Plan.

SPC00308-8

Comment:

Jobs- While the plan is praised for creating 350,000 possible jobs in the region, only about 50,000 construction jobs would noticeably benefit the local economy. And, those benefits would be short term. "A Preliminary Review..." finds that around the same number of jobs would be created if nothing was done at all. The review adds that even fewer jobs could result from Alternative D. In fact, the people pushing this plan acknowledge that there is no expectation for long-term economic growth.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC02204-14 regarding the net change in jobs associated with airport operations under Alternative D. While it is acknowledged that a net job loss would occur due to productivity increases that overwhelm net additional jobs associated with the alternative, it should be noted that a decline in jobs would occur over time in conjunction with such productivity increases (i.e., technological advances), regardless of Master Plan development. New jobs associated with Alternative D actually would reduce the effects of this anticipated loss. Although overall contributions to the regional economy under Alternative D would on balance be modest, cumulative employment effects and associated economic output would be beneficial.

SPC00308-9

Comment:

What Does the Airline Industry Think?

After meeting with airline executives recently, they expressed concerns about the plan because: (1) they were not consulted on the plan, (2) they cannot cover the required costs and find Alternative D financially unfeasible at this time, (3) they have never participated in an airport renovation project that didn't have expansion as its primary purpose, (4) they stated several airlines have come out of bankruptcy recently and are in no position to pay the costs (5) their portion of the costs would have to be paid for by raising passenger prices.

Response:

The airlines were consulted during the design stage of Alternative D. Both formal and informal meetings were held with operational and technical representatives of the airlines. Changes were made to Alternative D as a result of those consultations.

The passenger and cargo capacity of LAX under Alternative D is approximately equal to the capacity of the existing facility. The current constraint on LAX passenger capacity fall directly on the passenger due to its congested access system, terminal roadways, curb frontage, and parking facilities, as well as its improperly sized terminal and gate facilities. Without the program improvements, landside access to the airport will be extremely difficult, and during some times, will be in virtual gridlock. Alternative D presents a workable, long-term solution that provides a major benefit to the users by reworking the landside configuration and moving the constraining factor to limited aircraft gates, making the use of LAX a tolerable experience to its passengers.

The current fiscal problems of the airlines are acknowledged. However, less than three years ago the airline industry was recording record profits. It is anticipated that, with the recovery of the domestic and global economies, demand for air travel will return to pre-2001 levels and profits will improve substantially.

The modernization of LAX will improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft and reduce runway incursions, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking. The cost to operate at congested, constrained airports in an environmentally sensitive state such as California will

ultimately be reflected in the airline fees and passenger ticket prices. This is especially true for airports in the large metropolitan areas such as San Francisco and Los Angeles.

SPC00308-10

Comment:

Listed below are some of the biggest questions, issues and needs raised by Eighth District residents:

Environmental Issues

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPC00308-11

Comment:

*Sound-proofing study update

Response:

It is not clear from the comment what is meant by a "sound-proofing study update," although the comment appears to be in reference to the ANMP and the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour that determines the boundary for soundproofing. An update to the number of units that have received sound insulation or have been acquired within the composite ANMP as of June 2002 was provided on page 4-88 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. According to LAWA's Noise Management Section this is the most recent composite information available. Since preparation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the 2001 ANMP has been released. The 2001 ANMP includes progress in implementing the ANMP through December 2001. However, the information presented in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR still represents the most currently available information about the status of achieving land use compatibility under the ANMP. LAWA's Noise Management Section is currently preparing the 2003 ANMP which is anticipated to be available by June 2004. Monitoring methods used to validate the current 65 CNEL contour are described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4. As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S-1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, areas exposed to 65 CNEL and greater noise levels have decreased in Council District 8 from 1992 conditions, primarily due to the phasing out of noisier (Stage 2) aircraft. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, in particular Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.13 regarding how approval of the LAX Master Plan would revise the current ANMP.

SPC00308-12

Comment:

*Street repair and widening projects

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00308-13

Comment:

*Traffic mitigation & diversion plan for the region

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00308-14

Comment:

*Rapid bus and rail system connections

Response:

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

SPC00308-15

Comment:

*Synchronized signal light system

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00308-16

Comment:

*Various community health issues

Response:

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

In response to public comment, additional analyses were presented in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and were summarized in the Executive Summary of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement was prepared to integrate a new alternative, Alternative D, into the existing environmental review process and to incorporate supplemental information and analysis for the LAX Master Plan. Such information and analysis was based upon the availability of new or updated information since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR in January 2001.

Please refer to Section 4.24.1.6, Environmental Consequences, and Section 4.24.1.9, Level of Significance After Mitigation, in the Human Health Risk Assessment of the LAX Master Plan Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for discussions of acute and chronic hazards for all build alternatives and the No Action/No Project Alternative. As described in these sections, health risks (cancer, non-cancer chronic and non-cancer acute) for the majority of nearby residents would be lower for Alternative D than for 1996 baseline, Year 2000 conditions and the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D provides for airfield improvements that would enable aircraft to move more efficiently, thereby reducing air pollutant emissions from aircraft operating in taxi/idle mode. This alternative also provides substantial improvements to the on-airport and off-airport surface transportation systems, thereby reducing air pollutant emissions from motor vehicles. Additionally, Alternative D, unlike the No Action/No Project Alternative, includes Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions.

SPC00308-17

Comment:

*Consideration of park and ride facilities to the east and south of the City of Inglewood

Response:

A future park-and-ride ("FlyAway") could be located to the east and south of the City of Inglewood if it is shown that the potential ridership by airport passengers and employees would justify such a facility.

SPC00308-18

Comment:

*Interest in moving the airport as far west as possible

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SAL00013-39 regarding moving the proposed airport facilities to the west. As indicated in that response, under Alternative D, the northern runways are extended west to the limits of El Segundo blue butterfly Habitat Restoration Area. While it would be possible to bridge Pershing Drive and grade areas west of the airport for runway safety areas, this improvement would only benefit aircraft landing from the west. The landing thresholds on the east end of the airport would not be extended further west in this case and, as a result, the landing aircraft would not present any less impact on communities east of the airport. To extend these runways further west would have significant impacts on the El Segundo blue butterfly Habitat Restoration Area without providing any environmental improvements to the residents living to the east of the airport.

SPC00308-19

Comment:

*Why are planes permitted to take-off and land between the hours of 11:00 PM and 6:00 AM?

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as Comment SPHE00024-1; please see Response to Comment SPHE00024-1.

SPC00308-20

Comment:

*Why hasn't new criteria been established to account for flight patterns over areas such as Vermont Knolls?

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as Comment SPHE00024-2; please see Response to Comment SPHE00024-2.

SPC00308-21

Comment:

*Why can't jet engines noise be muffled 10 miles before landing?

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as Comment SPHE00024-3; please see Response to Comment SPHE00024-3.

SPC00308-22

Comment:

*Pollution - both noise and aerosol components will increase dramatically, because airline traffic will expand to the level required by the planned MAP goal.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels at LAX.

SPC00308-23

Comment:

*Included in the plan, should be a proposal to provide funds to complete the existing soundproofing contracts and identify the remaining homes that are affected, based on 55 DNL noise levels and above.

Response:

LAWA and the FAA are committed to the on-going funding and completion of the existing ANMP. As stated under mitigation measure MM-LU-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, if the Master Plan were approved LAWA would accelerate the rate of land use mitigation to eliminate noise impact areas through increased annual funding for land use mitigation and LAWA would accelerate the fulfillment of existing commitments to owners wishing to participate within the current ANMP boundaries prior to proceeding with newly eligible properties.

A representative projection of remaining homes that may be affected, in terms of new exposure to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels, and that are located outside the current ANMP boundaries are identified under mitigation measure MM-LU-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Actual adjustments to the ANMP boundary would be based on measured data presented in the quarterly reports prepared by LAWA. As further described in Subtopical Response TR-N-2.3, the 65 CNEL is the established threshold to determine significant noise levels. However, Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified noise-sensitive uses exposed to an increase of 3 CNEL between the 60 and 65 CNEL contour and increases of 5 CNEL below the 60 CNEL under the build alternatives.

See also Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

SPC00308-24

Comment:

*The infrastructure- Century Blvd. from the 110 freeway to La Cienega and other heavily-traveled streets to and from the airport should be resurfaced regularly with funding support from LAWA to eliminate pot holes and other irregularities.

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPHE00034-3. Please see Response to Comment SPHE00034-3.

SPC00308-25

Comment:

*Airplane noises are linked to: stress, hypertension, sleep deprivation and interruptions, work-related performance and learning and academic performance

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise. In addition, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings and school disruption associated with the No Action/No Project

3. Comments and Responses

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.

SPC00308-26

Comment:

New Terminal

*Impact of banning all parking and private vehicles inside the central terminal

*Impact of the prohibition of passenger drop off at the terminal curb

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addresses the full impacts of these elements of Alternative D and how they were analyzed and mitigated in Section 4.3.1, Surface Transportation (subsection 4.3.1 and 4.3.2.) and Technical Report S-2a, Supplemental On-Airport Surface Transportation Technical Report and Technical Report S-2b, Supplemental Off-Airport Surface Transportation Technical Report.

Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

SPC00308-27

Comment:

Cost, Expense and Benefits

*Caps on passengers and cargo load

Response:

Alternative D does not place any caps on passenger and cargo activities. Facilities that comprise Alternative D are designed to accommodate approximately 78.9 million annual passengers and 3.1 million annual tons of air cargo activity. However, as explained in detail in Section 3.3 in the Draft EIS/EIR, "it is important to understand that the levels of passengers that each alternative is designed to accommodate are not finite limits where the airport would somehow be closed or where aircraft would be redirected to some other facility when this number is reached. These levels are an indication of the number of passengers that can be accommodated at a reasonable level of service."

SPC00308-28

Comment:

*12-year hiring plan to redevelop flight schedules, noise and employment

Response:

Comment noted. A hiring plan would be determined during the advanced planning stage as it is project specific. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is a program level document.

SPC00308-29

Comment:

*What methodology has been devised to mass transit passengers to terminals if no curbside drop off is permitted?

Response:

This comment is identical to comment SPHE00024-6. Please see Response to Comment SPHE00024-6.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00308-30

Comment:

*Local residents were told from the start that the general aspects of the plans were not negotiable, if so, then why holding public hearings?

Response:

The goal of the Master Plan process is to produce a plan for modernizing Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) that is appropriate for the City of Los Angeles and the Five-county region. In 2001, the Draft LAX Master Plan and the Draft EIS/EIR were published by LAWA to seek input from the public and to start the agency review and comment process. These documents were produced to describe and analyze four alternatives: the No Action/No Project Alternative (NA/NP), Alternative A, Alternative B, and Alternative C.

Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan alternative, was developed in response to the feedback and public comments received on the other four alternatives. Drafts documents were prepared to describe Alternative D: the Master Plan Addendum, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the Airport Layout Plans (ALP) Package. The government entities, stakeholders and the general public were allowed to formally review and comment on these draft documents. The City of Los Angeles and the FAA will decide which of the Master Plan alternatives best meets the needs of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles region only after input from the public and governmental entities has been received and considered.

SPC00308-31

Comment:

*Of the 49,000 jobs that the airport expansion is projected to create, how many jobs for the residents in those communities that have and will be impacted be made available?

*Though there has been outreach to unions, are there plans to reach out to non-union workers, so they will have an opportunity for employment?

*How will the public be notified of available employment?

Response:

As stated in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice of this Final EIS/EIR, LAWA will set-aside a substantive portion of LAX Master Plan construction-related jobs to qualified disadvantaged business enterprises (DBEs) or minority/low-income individuals with emphasis on those located within the communities surrounding LAX.

Regarding outreach to non-union workers and how the public would be notified of available employment as part of the environmental justice benefit program, see subsection 4.4.3.7 of this Final EIS/EIR.

SPC00309 Schneider, Denny Alliance for Regional Solution to 10/25/2003
Airport Congestion

SPC00309-1

Comment:

Attached to this cover sheet are approximated 300 pages of detailed annotated comments provided in both hard copy and on CD.

Response:

Written responses to the comments contained in the attachment, as related to the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, are provided below in Responses to Comment SPC00309-2 through SPC00309-40.

SPC00309-2**Comment:**

Summary:

Alternatives A, B, and C were demonstrated to be deficient in 2001. Earlier comments to the approximate 12,000 page review materials provided showed that these alternatives have unacceptable impacts on local communities and for Southern California. Although numerous comments were provided in 2001, no responses have been provided to the public. Although the newest alternative, Alternative D, addresses several of the prior fatal flaws and is preferable to the earlier proposed alternatives many issues remain.

Response:

Comment noted. Written responses have been prepared for all of the comments received during the review period for the Draft EIS/EIR, as well as for all comments received during the review period for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Those comments and written responses are provided, in their entirety, as part of the Final EIS/EIR for the LAX Master Plan.

SPC00309-3**Comment:**

LAWA and the City of LA is to be commended for their outreach efforts to verbally present their plans to the many public organizations. Plans such as the "flyaways" should be commended.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00309-4**Comment:**

LAWA outreach for idea exchange, however, has fallen very short. The Osage Neighbors Association, which represents the eastern half of Westchester, is one of the areas most heavily impacted and has many concerns. Yet the Board of Airport Commissioner leadership, LAWA management, and the Mayor's Office have been unable to find an available evening to meet with the ONA Board of directors during the past 14 months despite numerous requests by ONA.

Response:

The comment is very similar to Comment SPHE00004-5; please see Response to Comment SPHE00004-5.

SPC00309-5**Comment:**

Development of the alternatives has been in a restrictive environment. Documents were released in security controlled areas and anyone potentially critical of the plans was prohibited from attending. The same restricted access policy was true of the Mayor's Blue Ribbon Committee on Manchester Square. It was held in a restricted area of LAX with specifically selected individuals. Neither handouts nor recordings were made available to the committee members; the public and press were excluded from these meetings. When an alternative plan was presented by several committee members concerned about the use of Manchester Square it was rebuffed and not seriously considered.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00133-11 and Response to Comment SPC00035-4 regarding an alternative concept ("Alternative E") developed by local residents for improving LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00309-6

Comment:

The approximately 6,500 pages of the Supplemental documents released in July 2003 is very tricky to read and evaluate due to persistent cross referencing between documents released in 2003 and those from 2001. Further, it is very difficult to determine the origin and dates of materials used in exhibits. Numerous times charts dated 2002 or 2003 contained only 1994-96 data without saying so. Many exhibits are sorely deficient in detail on some issues and contain conflicting information for others. The basis assumptions for specific conclusions are difficult to determine from the way in which data is presented. Broadly subjective words like "substantial," or "minimal" are used in place of specifics.

Response:

Comment noted. As was described in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, specifically on page 1-7, the structure and content of the document were designed to be consistent with, and complementary to, the Draft EIS/EIR, and was not intended to repeat or recreate the extensive amount of information presented in the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR contains several tables, charts, and figures that were derived from the Draft EIS/EIR, but were updated, augmented, corrected, or otherwise modified. In such instances, the reference date was updated to 2002 or 2003, depending on when the subject material was modified from its previous form in the Draft EIS/EIR.

The comment is not specific as to which exhibits were felt to be deficient or contain conflicting information. Similarly, the comment does not indicate where or how the use of the words "substantial" or "minimal" was inappropriate or insufficient. Where possible, quantitative data was used in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to provide specific information; however, in some cases, such quantification was not possible and qualitative descriptors, such as "substantial" or "minimal", were used.

SPC00309-7

Comment:

The various alternatives (with several options inside each) are compared to a "No Action/No Project" which is unrealistic and results in a comparison of "apples to vegetables."

Response:

Comparison of the build alternatives to the No Action/No Project Alternative is required by NEPA and, therefore, such comparisons are made throughout the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For purposes of CEQA, the build alternatives are compared to the environmental baseline (or adjusted environmental baseline). Please see the Introduction to Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues.

SPC00309-8

Comment:

Numerous critical issues in Alternative D remain unanswered or unaddressed. On that basis, alone, it should be rejected. Spending more good money just because enormous amounts of money have already been expended is a POOR justification to continue with this EIS/EIR. It should be redone due to the irrecoverable number of errors and omissions.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00309-9**Comment:**

The Supplemental (and original) document reviews are further complicated by the page numbering differences in the electronic versions posted and the hard copy.

Response:

Based on the subject comment, LAWA conducted a comparison between the electronic versions, including the version posted on the LAWA website (www.laxmasterplan.org) as well as the version distributed on compact disk (CD), and the hard-copy version. The comparison included the main text of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and all related appendices and technical reports, and the Draft Master Plan Addendum and related appendices. Over 200 locations (i.e., specific page numbers selected at random) were checked within the different versions, and no differences in page numbering between the different versions were found. Based on the comparison review, it is felt that any page numbering differences that might appear elsewhere within the various documents are likely to be isolated and relatively minor. Such differences, would not preclude or substantially hinder the ability to access and review any and all information contained in the subject documents.

SPC00309-10**Comment:**

This Plan still concentrates over 75% of commerce at LAX resulting in an unwarranted economic risk for Southern California.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00309-11**Comment:**

Below is a representative sample of major impact issues for Alternative D EIS/EIR

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPC00309-12 through SPC00309-40 below for responses to each of the major impact issues referenced in this comment.

SPC00309-12**Comment:**

Noise

- Incomplete review of CNEL impact; changes in patterns depend on which runway configuration is implemented, mix of aircraft that actually occurs, no topology impacts are considered, frequency ranges measured (higher and lower) are not comprehensive.
- Single event (SNL) impacting level criteria are overly generous; impacts understated
- Health impacts-such as respiratory issues, learning issues, autonomic issues such as blood pressure, sleep deprivation and sleep interruptions, and gastrointestinal issues are understated.

Response:

Comment noted. The noise analysis was done in complete compliance with appropriate FAA and scientific principles including FAA Order 1050.1D and Order 5050.4A. Please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.5 regarding the effect of elevation on noise. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 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

3. Comments and Responses

the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please note that there is no federal threshold of significance for single event noise impacts.

SPC00309-13

Comment:

- Air analysis
- Air circulation patterns not adequately considered.
 - Particles less than PM10 (ie PM2.5 studies) not done
 - NOx gases not considered.

Response:

Regarding "air circulation patterns not adequately considered," the dispersion modeling performed for the air quality analyses used actual site-specific meteorological data; these data are discussed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.2.2 and Appendix S-E Section 2.2.1. Regarding "particles less than PM10 (i.e. PM2.5 studies) not done," please see Response to Comment SPC00296-30 regarding the PM2.5 analysis. Regarding "NOx gases not considered," it should be noted that the air quality analyses in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR treat NOx (the total of all oxides of nitrogen) as a precursor to ozone and NO2 (one of the oxides of nitrogen) as a stand-alone criteria pollutant. For purposes of conservatively estimating emissions, NOx and NO2 were considered equivalent. For purposes of modeling ambient concentrations for comparison of NO2 only to applicable ambient air quality standards, the air quality analysis used both the ambient ratio method, ARM (Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.2.3 and Appendix G Section 2.2.5.4), and the ozone limiting method, OLM (Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.2.2 and Appendix S-E Section 2.2.5.3), to express NO2 as a percentage of NOx.

SPC00309-14

Comment:

- Traffic issues
- Mitigations recommended, not fixed - many to be paid by agencies other than LAWA or the city not guaranteed or funded.
 - Cargo not fully controlled yet; needs separate entrance off 105 freeway.
 - Traffic into the community.

Response:

In the Draft EIS/EIR, all identified significantly impacted locations are mitigated where feasible. Cargo trips are considered in this traffic analysis. However, a separate cargo entrance from the I-105 Freeway is not proposed.

If funding is unavailable for a proposed transportation mitigation, alternative transportation mitigations will be pursued. These alternative mitigations may require additional environmental review, and will require approval from LADOT. Also, please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding project funding.

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address neighborhood traffic in Section 5.1 of Technical Report S-2b, Supplemental Surface Transportation, Off-Airport.

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

SPC00309-15

Comment:

- Construction Impacts
- Traffic, noise, pollution
 - Business impacts

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed construction-related traffic, noise, and pollution (in terms of air quality) impacts associated with Alternative D in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; Section 4.1, Noise; Section 4.2, Land Use; Section 4.6, Air Quality; and Section 4.20, Construction Impacts. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Master Plan Commitments and mitigation measures to reduce construction impacts are presented in Sections 4.20.5 and 4.20.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Please see Response to Comment SPC00274-13 regarding potential construction impacts on businesses.

SPC00309-16

Comment:

Safety
Manchester Square separation from the rest of the contiguous airport.
- Ability to evacuate; how to get emergency crews there?
- Community closer to potential attacks.
- LNG facility closer to the community (northern MS area).
- Security is only as good as weakest link which may be other airports.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPC00309-17

Comment:

Substantial difference between Alt D and others that came first makes the CEQA compatibility questionable.
Much of the old data from 1996 was incomplete and evaluations and comparisons with 2000 conditions does not fix the old data flaws.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see TR-ALT-1 regarding the alternatives analyzed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Without reference to specific data, a meaningful response cannot be provided.

SPC00309-18

Comment:

Passenger Inconvenience
- Baggage handling; One stop check in needed
- Lugging baggage on APM? Handicapped, Elderly, Children, bulky items not addressed.
- Delays and transferring is inconvenient.

Response:

Comment noted. The check-in process after implementation of Alternative D would remain largely as it exists today. Primary check-in facilities would be available in the CTA. Skycap baggage check-in as well as E-Kiosk check-in would be available at the GTC for those passengers that would prefer to complete the check-in process at that facility. One stop check-in would remain available if Alternative D were implemented.

The APM, and all public airport structures, would be designed in compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 as required by state and federal law. The APM would be designed to comfortably accommodate passengers with luggage.

3. Comments and Responses

SPC00309-19

Comment:

Consolidated Rental Car facility (RAC) would be better serving near the 105 freeway.

Response:

Comment noted. As described in Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, rental car facilities in Alternative D have the unique ability to meet the entire demand for this use on-airport without the need to acquire a significant amount of additional property. Other build alternatives assumed that substantial portions of the space requirement for automobile storage would be met off airport property due to limited available space near the planned RAC locations. There is no existing site available near I-105 that would be able to accommodate this use better than the Alternative D site.

SPC00309-20

Comment:

Impreciseness of plans; multiple options listed so impact projections can't be traced to the cost impacts on future commerce (increased fees)

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provide a programmatic level of information and analysis for the proposed LAX Master Plan.

SPC00309-21

Comment:

Modes other than cars need consolidation and convenience; i.e. Green Line on MTA route to downtown; major bus center, cabs, level three bus routes.

Response:

Regional transit buses will have convenient access to the ITC. Cabs and shuttle buses will have curbside access to the GTC via the Commercial Vehicle Holding Area. Green Line passengers will have convenient access to the CTA through the Automated People Mover. LAWA-operated FlyAway buses from remote terminal facilities will be allowed curbside directly into the CTA.

SPC00309-22

Comment:

Massive expenditures at LAX detracts from the possibility of the development of a practical regional solution.

Response:

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

SPC00309-23

Comment:

NOISE ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED

Response:

Noise impacts are addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix

D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00309-24

Comment:

NOTE TO READER: The following comments regarding the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR were provided as notes entered directly into a copy of the subject document. In providing a written response to each of the comments on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, each comment presented below is preceded by a brief description of where within the Supplement that particular comment is directed. For example, Comment 1 pertains to the second paragraph of page ES-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR; hence, the statement "[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, page ES-1, paragraph 2]" is provided in front of the comment. A complete copy of the comments on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in their original form is contained in Appendix XX, which is the compilation of original comment letters.

It should be noted that the commentor also provided comments in a similar fashion on the Draft Master Plan Addendum (July 2003). Those comments are specific to the content and technical aspects of the Draft Master Plan Addendum, and are not directed at the Draft EIS/EIR or the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As such, a response to the comments on the Draft Master Plan Addendum are not included with the other comments and responses below. A copy of the comments on the Draft Master Plan Addendum, along with responses to those comments are, however, provided separately within Appendix XX.

The following presents the comments on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in the format described above, and responses to each of those comments.

[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, page ES-1, paragraph 2]

Why were the comments submitted by November 2001 not answered before (or with) the release of the Alt. D Plan in July 2003?

Response:

The comment is essentially the same as Comment SPC00274-68; please see Response to Comment SPC00274-68.

SPC00309-25

Comment:

[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, page ES-1, paragraph 3]

Numerous data issues were identified in 2001. How is the integration of more data into questionable data expected to be satisfactory?

Response:

The comment is essentially the same as Comment SPC00274-69; please see Response to Comment SPC00274-69.

SPC00309-26

Comment:

[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, page ES-1, third bullet]

If " the purpose and need for the LAX Master Plan has not changed since the publication of the Draft EIS/ EIR" and there have been significant political event changes in addition to the Mayor's no expansion pledge, why is one of the three major project objectives to " Ensure that new investments in airport capacity are..." Also, we are told that the major emphasis is for " Security and Safety." Why is this not even mentioned in the list of project purpose and need?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SAL00017-70.

SPC00309-27

Comment:

[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, page ES-2, Table ES-1, Passenger Activity]
Based on 2.8% growth from present we will be at 78 MAP in 2015. Is this a realistic growth rate?

Response:

This comment is essentially the same as comment SPC00274-71; please see Response to Comment SPC00274-71.

SPC00309-28

Comment:

[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, page ES-3, Table ES-2, Alternative D, Runway 6R/24L]
Compare this runway spacing with other statements in the document which appear to differ. This one is 340 ft south of existing centerline.

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to Comment SPC00274-72; please see Response to Comment SPC00274-72.

SPC00309-29

Comment:

[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, page ES-4, Table ES-2, Alternative D, Terminal Building Space]
2.8M sq ft of terminal space added by Alt D without any capacity enhancement? If the capacity is not expanding why are there about 4600 more employee parking spaces?

Response:

The increased terminal square footage proposed in Alternative D would accommodate the massive need for security equipment and space necessitated by the events of September 11, 2001.

The existing employee parking spaces do not meet the existing or forecast demand. Alternative D would provide sufficient employee parking to meet the forecast demand. Additionally, there is not a direct correlation between the number of airport passengers and the amount of employee parking. Additional factors such as amount of concession space influence the demand for employee parking. Alternative D would increase the size and number of concession facilities at LAX thus increasing the number of employees without a directly corresponding growth in passengers. As such, if concession space at LAX today were expanded, the demand for employee parking would increase without affecting passenger capacity.

SPC00309-30

Comment:

[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, page ES-5, Table ES-2, Schools]
How are the schools impacted/ removed related between Alt D and NA/ NP? Alt D shows ab private elementary and a Hollywood CPR(?) not in the NA/ NP.

Response:

In the No Action/No Project Alternative, the 98th Street School is part of the existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program. It is assumed under Alternative D that the 98th Street School is already acquired. LAWA's Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration - Manchester

Square and Airport/Belford Area Voluntary Acquisition Project addressed the impacts on the 98th Street School .

The Westchester Neighborhood School parcel is not being acquired under the No Action/No Project Alternative, but is being acquired under Alternative D. The relocation of this private school can be accommodated in the LAX Northside development.

The private school listed in Table ES-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not be acquired under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D. Only a portion of the parcel would be acquired under Alternative D, but not the school itself.

The Hollywood CPR parcel is not being acquired under the No Action/No Project Alternative, but is being acquired under Alternative D. The relocation of this non-profit vocational school can be accommodated in the surrounding business community within the City of Los Angeles.

Please see Response to Comment PC00267-4 for additional information on the impacts of the various Alternatives on Westchester.

SPC00309-31

Comment:

[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, page ES-5, Table ES-2, Land Acquisition]
What are the values of NA/ NP for Office Use, Retail Use Acquired and Hotel Use that are not shown in the table? How does this compare to Alt D? More or less? Why?

Response:

As was indicated on page 3-26 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the No Action/No Project Alternative accounts for continued implementation and completion of the existing property acquisition program at Belford Avenue and Manchester Square. This program includes the acquisition of the 279 single family dwellings and the 2,285 multiple family dwellings indicated in Table ES-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. There is, however, no acquisition of office use, retail use, or hotel use under that program; hence, no values are shown relative to those uses for the No Action/No Project Alternative in that table.

SPC00309-32

Comment:

[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Page ES-6, Table ES-2, Collateral Development]
This table assumes the higher value of development of LAX Northside in NA/ NP and Alt D but Westchester South (the reduced) for A, B, C. Why? Isn't this assumption different in other areas of the documentation?

Response:

As was explained in Note 6 of the subject table, Alternative D includes a proposed reduction to the existing trip cap for LAX Northside. While LAX Northside has current entitlements for up to 4.5 million square feet of new development, the reduced trip cap would prevent that full amount of development from ever occurring. The exact nature and amount of development that could occur under the reduced trip cap is not known at this time. To provide for a conservative impacts analysis, the evaluation of Alternative D assumed development of the full 4.5 million square feet for all environmental disciplines except traffic and traffic-related air quality and noise.

SPC00309-33

Comment:

[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, page ES-6, Table ES-2, footnote 7]
If LAWA doesn't own Manchester Square, why does it assume airport use in all but Alternative A? How is it going to be procured? Eminent Domain? Why is it in conflict with the W-PdR Community Plan?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00274-77.

SPC00309-34

Comment:

[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, page 4-215, bullet at bottom of page]
Greater outside impacts under Alt D. Why? What specific areas?

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment SPC00274-78; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00274-78.

SPC00309-35

Comment:

[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, page 4-216, bullets 2 and 4, and last paragraph]
What is the threshold of significance for outdoor noise levels? How were they determined and applied?

Response:

The threshold used to identify significant outdoor noise levels is 75 CNEL, as defined by FAR Part 150 and Title 21 (see Section 4.2., Land Use (subsection 4.2.6) of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR). Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-4 for additional description of how significant outdoor noise levels were determined and applied in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPC00309-36

Comment:

[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, page 4-217, bullet 2, paragraph 1]
Alt D more extensive changes than other alternatives. Is it so extensive that a new EIS/ EIR required?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SAL00013-31 regarding the use of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to address the impacts of Alternative D.

SPC00309-37

Comment:

[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, page 4-217, bullet 2, paragraph 1]
Since 2008 is the peak construction period for Alt D and 2004/ 2013 for the others, how does this impact noise distribution due to flight track differences.

Response:

The peak construction periods described on page 4-217 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR pertain to surface transportation. These peak construction traffic periods would not have any effect on aircraft flight tracks. The only construction-related activity under Alternative D that would temporarily affect flight activities would be the reconstruction of runway 7R/25L, which would require closure of the subject runway for approximately one year. During that time, only three serviceable runways would operate. As described in Section 3.1.5 of Appendix S-C1., Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, there would only be a slight shift in the normal noise patterns during that period.

SPC00309-38**Comment:**

[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, page 4-217, bullet 2, last paragraph]
What are the construction model assumptions and where are they delineated?

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addresses the construction model assumptions in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation (subsection 4.3.1.6.2 and 4.3.2.6.2). Also Further details are presented in Technical Report S-2a, Supplemental Surface Transportation Technical Report, On-Airport and S-2b Supplemental Surface Transportation Technical Report, Off-Airport. These assumptions include the construction phasing, the operation of the CTA curbside, and the construction trip generation schedule.

SPC00309-39**Comment:**

[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, page 4-221, Table S4.3.1-1, A.M. Commuter Peak Hour]
Does inbound and outbound counts refer to the upper and lower levels (aircraft arrivals/ departures)? Otherwise they should be equal. Is there an explanation for inbound consistently higher increases?

Response:

Inbound volumes refer to the total number of vehicles going into the CTA, regardless of which roadway level they use to enter. Outbound volumes refer to the total number of vehicles leaving the CTA. There are generally more vehicles entering the CTA in the morning hours than are leaving, as some drivers park in the on-airport lots. In the evening, more vehicles generally leave the CTA than arrive. The peak-hour numbers shown on Table S4.3.1-1 reflect this trend.

SPC00309-40**Comment:**

[Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, page 4-221 Table S4.3.1-1, footnotes]
Why are the peak hours that different? What are the correct ones?

Response:

Traffic impacts are typically addressed relative to a.m. peak hours, normally defined as 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m., and p.m. peak hour, normally defined as 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. However, as was described in Section 4.3.1.2, General Approach and Methodology, of the Draft EIS/EIR, the peak hour traffic associated with LAX operations does not occur during those time periods, but rather occurs between 11:00 a.m. and 12:00 noon. As such, the traffic impacts analysis presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addresses all three peak hour periods.

SPFA00001 Sabroux, Annie**None Provided****8/7/2003****SPFA00001-1****Comment:**

Although, Mayor Hahn's recent proposed LAX Master Plan Alternative was intended to focus on "safety and security" issues, it has become apparent that there are very serious flaws in this proposal.

A recent Rand Corp. study has indicated that congregating all commercial passengers in one location increases the risk and harm to a greater number of people by a terrorist attack.

The added inconvenience of additional time required to be screened and transported to the airline terminals encourages business and wealthy travelers to engage private business jets, charters, and

3. Comments and Responses

fractional share aircraft for transportation. These general aviation options are not regulated as strictly as commercial aircraft nor are the aircraft or their passengers screened for security purposes at LAX or any general aviation airport in the area.

I urge Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) to thoughtfully consider the risks of this proposal and to address the lack of security at the general aviation passenger access to LAX at the Imperial entrance. In addition, encourage the FAA to increase security standards nationwide for access to all general aviation areas and other airports with general aviation traffic.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00028-1.

SPHL00001 Byun, Jack None Provided 8/11/2003

SPHL00001-1

Comment:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Jack Byun. I'm here today to speak in support of Alternative D of the LAX Master Plan. As a business leader in Korean Community, I appreciate Mayor Hahn's efforts to modernize LAX while mitigating the impacts in the surrounding community.

Mayor Hahn has made it his priority to ensure that first and foremost safety and security, as there is traveling convenience in the new design of the Alternative D. The development of the Alternative D will make significant improvements to the airport, will bring state-of-the-art facilities and concessions. The modernization of the airport will be a major business attraction encouraging international tourists.

LAX is the third largest international gateway in the United States, and it's international gateway has reinforced its gross as a passenger and cargo hub. The economy benefits to local and regional business will be multifaceted. The 23 million annual visitors to Los Angeles spends about \$ 10 billion. This translates to 5.4 billion in personal income for the residents of Los Angeles.

We look forward to working closely with Mayor Hahn and supporting his innovative Alternative D that promotes business and travel in Los Angeles.

The LAX Master Plan means improved airport safety. Alternative D modernized the airfields to improve safety for aircraft, traveling passengers and airport workers. Lax Master Plan means improved airport security. Alternative D provided for multiple layers of security protection for the traveling public, airport workers and the surrounding communities.

Also Alternative D permits all observation and assessment of passengers and baggages. LAX Master Plan supports a regional transportation plan.

Alternative D addresses community interest and concern. Also LAX Master Plan means modern airports. Alternative D offers a redeveloped central terminal area that provides for increased security screening and enhanced passenger conveniences. And, also, an automated people mover offers convenient access from the new facilities to the central terminal area every two minutes.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00002 Brown, Piedmont Ironworkers Local 433 8/11/2003

SPHL00002-1

Comment:

My name is Piedmont Brown. I live at 2057 South Atlantic Boulevard in Los Angeles. I represent the Ironworkers of Local 433 and as being a citizen of L. A., I think L. A. sets a trend not only for this country but for the whole entire world.

Alternative D offers a long- awaited, greatly needed modernization, especially in the light rail transportation. As I've flown around through the U. S., I've seen Detroit. Orlando has this. It's very convenient. It helps their elderly people. It gets you to and from the airport in an orderly and conductive manner. It also reduces congestion and pollution. And being a citizen of L. A., this is very important for me as I'm sure the people here amongst us.

And most important, the Alternative D offers aviation safety, safety at the airport and security, the best state- of- the- art that is offered in the world.

With this, I would like to conclude this and thank you for letting me speak here.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00003 Bell, Sam

Los Angeles Business Advisors 8/11/2003

SPHL00003-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Sam Bell. I'm a President of Los Angeles Business Advisors, 333 South Hope Street, Los Angeles, California 90071.

It's a pleasure for me to be here tonight representing our group, which is a group of business executives, which our employers maintained the largest presence of some of the larger companies in Los Angeles. That is my role to representative them.

We want to first congratulate Mayor Hahn, Jim Ritchie, the LAWA staff on the progress today. We think they've done a fine job in addressing a major infrastructure issue that faces the Southern California region.

I think we can all realize but maybe not appreciate the impact of LAX being the huge economic engine that it is for the Southern California area. Sometimes, unfortunately, we don't recognize the need and the role that a huge economic engine like that plays until we're faced with challenges and changes and modifications to that.

The local impact for the Southern California region of LAX is like \$ 26 billion dollars a year, 180,000 jobs. Someone said it's the largest -- it's one of the three gateway airports of the United States. Twelve percent of international passengers across the country flow through LAX.

But there is one problem. LAX is old. It's antiquated. It's unsafe and it's vulnerable. It's really vital that we modernize and make it more safe for our passengers and for the people moving through the airport that work there.

The last modification took place 20 years ago. It's designed for 707 aircraft, an aircraft that is old. We have new generations of aircraft coming on board day to day, and L. A.' s will be coming on board within the next couple of years. Of course, we've got the major challenges faced in the aftermath of 9- 11.

So we've got to do something long- term- wise relative to economic viability to the airport. LAX is the linchpin for the Southern California regional airport transportation system. Obviously, we've got to implement the new safety and security guidelines at the airport that will make it safe.

We feel Alternative D addresses these issues. Public comment period is useful. It's constructive. I'm sure we'll get great comments coming from that that could be built into the final model. But our mission here tonight and what we want to do is to encourage you to keep moving and keep moving rapidly.

The worse thing that could happen to us is to do nothing. It would be a financial disaster for the economy, and it would be totally unsafe for the people working and moving through LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

Again, we congratulate you for the progress, and we encourage you to move forward steadfastly, and thank you for your time.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00004 McDowell, Kelly City of El Segundo 8/11/2003

SPHL00004-1

Comment:

Good evening. I'm Councilmember Kelly McDowell representing the City of El Segundo. Given the length and the complexity of the Master Plan and the environmental documents concerned with it, our full comments on the technical issues presented will not be ready for some time, and my City's comments tonight are preliminary in nature because of that.

We continue to oppose Alternatives A, B and C for the many reasons the City expressed both orally and in writing during the public review and comment period for the Draft EIS/ EIR in the year 2002.

El Segundo has not endorsed Alternative D, but we feel its stated objectives support a regional aviation approach. My City supports an alternative with fewer environmental impacts. We would like to see the adverse impacts of the airport minimized and mitigated to the greatest extent possible.

El Segundo supports enhanced safety and security at LAX, and my City supports an alternative, that by its design, will accommodate passenger and cargo levels no greater than the physical capacity of the airport as it exists today.

Limiting LAX's capacity to its current capacity has always been our number one goal, and we believe that limiting LAX's capacity will allow other airports in the region to develop and handle a fair share of future regional aviation demand, will result in fewer environmental impacts and will improve safety and security at the airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00004-2

Comment:

However, my City is greatly concerned about the impacts of south side airfield changes that would move the southernmost runway 50 feet closer to El Segundo.

LAWA has stated that it believes these changes are necessary to improve runway safety. However, we are currently studying the impacts of the reconfiguration and the options for the southern runway complex.

In particular, we urge full public consideration of the end- around taxiways as an alternative that could provide greater safety at lower cost and with fewer burdens on local communities. Safety at LAX must be a priority for everyone.

The City is prepared to support measures necessary to enhance safety, even if those measures increase our burden, but only if we are assured, through an independent expert, that other alternatives are not equally effective.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00038-3 regarding the potential noise impacts of moving the southernmost runway approximately 55 feet south and discussion on runway incursion at LAX and an analysis conducted by NASA Ames Research Center comparing the costs and benefits of a center parallel taxiway and "end-around" taxiway on the south airfield complex.

3. Comments and Responses

hope the discussion could continue to focus on, because they are elemental to the success of the business I just mentioned.

One is building a safe and secure facility. It goes without saying that that is something fundamental to the success of any such facility. Sadly, it has become absolutely crucial, not only from a practical perspective, but from a perceptual dimension, that is, our customers both in the consumer and in the travel industry will need to know that that is the first priority.

Second strategic perspective is designing an airport that maintains L. A.'s status as an international gateway. There are cities all over the United States building very long runways. Everyone seeks the same customer, the international customer. Either we build a user- friendly facility for this customer, or they will go elsewhere. And they are being given reasons to do that every single day.

And the last part of this strategic perspective, that I hope we can maintain a focus on, is that this plan recognizes a truth. And it's a very controversial one, I know; that demand for air travel cannot be built for Southern California; that demand for air travel cannot be built on the backs of the citizens of a single city.

This plan addresses a truth that there must be a regional solution to what is clearly a regional demand.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00008 Scavo, Michael

None Provided

8/11/2003

SPHL00008-1

Comment:

Michael Scavo. I live at 18355 Figueroa in Gardena. I am a representative for the Steamfitters Union of Los Angeles. But, actually, when I got here, I decided that I was going to speak as a frequent flyer out of LAX, and I am going to speak on what I consider almost an invasion of sensibility and an invasion of my rights as a human to fly anymore, which is why I decided to drive the last time I went to Indianapolis where I'm building a race car for the Indy 500 next year.

The last time I flew, I had to leave very late. I had to fly overnight just to be able to beat the hassle of what the security process is at LAX, which is why I applaud this pamphlet right here that I read. This will bring this airport up to the reason why other people are flying out of Long Beach and flying out of Orange County and smaller airports because it is consumer and customer friendly.

The way that they have the security at LAX, it's almost offensive to fly out of the airport for me. I sometimes want to turn around and walk away and go back. That's not what this city deserves and that's not what the city was planning on.

Due to 9- 11 we had to update it, but it's all in the wrong spots. There is no spot for it. No right spot for it. What this plan will do is it will make a more user- friendly airport. Okay.

The last time this airport was updated was 1984. It was updated for the Olympics. I think it was finished probably in '82. It's 20 years outdated. And I applaud Mayor Hahn for this safety alternative. I thank you very much.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHL00009 Brewer, Gene

Teamsters Local 986

8/11/2003

SPHL00009-1

Comment:

Yes, ma'am, Ms. Smith, Mr. Kessler and Mr. Ritchie, my name is Gene Brewer. I represent the Teamsters Local 986, at 1198 South El Monte, California.

I am a business representative of the Construction Division of the Teamsters, which is the largest Teamsters Local west of the Mississippi river with a membership in our Local of 16,000 members. Not only does our Local represent construction workers, but we represent warehouse members. We represent manufacturing members. We represent retail, food processing members, airline mechanics and pilots, convention industry, plus a wide variety of other types of professions which are affiliated with the L. A. Airport.

We know that this proposal Number D projects benefits that will create nearly 49,000 construction-related jobs in Los Angeles County. We know that its projected that we will result in 350,000 direct jobs in the region at all skill levels in the year 2015. And we know it will generate \$ 63.7 billion annual economic activities for the region by 2015 with \$ 22 billion annually going to the City of Los Angeles.

But to me, the 128,000 Teamsters that are represented here by joint council, 42 in Southern California, the most important point is that the proposal will improve the security and safety of the airport. And believe me, after the unforgivable incident on September the 11th, 2001, we need to have safe airports not only here in Los Angeles but across the entire nation of ours.

Mayor Hahn's Master Plan Proposal D for the LAX is a must, and the Teamsters of Southern California endorse his proposal.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00010 Woo, Peter

None Provided

8/11/2003

SPHL00010-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Peter Woo. I'm the President of Historic Council, Neighborhood Council, an entity funded by the City Charter of 1999, and we are elected by shareholders in our district. The district comprises of Little Tokyo, Chinatown District. I am coming here to testify and to propose to you to accept this Plan D for the modernization of LAX.

We all know the airport was built in 1950. The only time we modernized it was in 1984. It was originally a loop runway with terminals situated on the side. Later, because of the necessity, we double- stacked the roadway and we have two levels.

The problem of that is air travel is a necessity for everyone now. It is no longer a luxury. The way that our present airport is overloaded, the roadway, and creates a traffic jam and deadlock. It creates not only delay but also pollution.

Before the tragedy of 9- 11, it is not unusual for you to get stuck in the roadway for two or three hours before you get on the plane in the summertime. A huge amount of traffic jammed in the airport will really increase our smog emission, which is not good for the environment.

We're moving out of the present terminal to another location is not only -- if security is another tier of protection, it also diverts the traffic so the traffic flow can be much smoother and reduce the emission, and that will be helpful, a lot helpful to our environment.

3. Comments and Responses

I would like also to commend Mayor Hahn for the commitment that he made to hold LAX to 78 million annual passengers. We all know that LAX must be modernized, but it must also meet the needs and concerns of the residents of Los Angeles and the surrounding communities and especially those residents who live near the airport.

This plan addresses traffic, security and noise in its design and regulations. We support the LAX Master Plan, and ask that you give it your approval.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00012 Hilfenhaus, Jim Laborers Local 300 8/11/2003

SPHL00012-1

Comment:

My name is Jim Hilfenhaus. And I'm a representative from Laborers Local 300. We're the largest construction Local in America.

We've had many comments from people up here. We support the jobs issue on there. The one thing people need to recognize about LAX is it doesn't currently work. You've retrofitted security on top of an infrastructure that cannot accept it.

Unfortunately, the tragedy of 9- 11 has reduced passenger traffic, so that the accommodations have not reached crunchtime. Should it come back to 78- million- passenger capacity with the current standards out at the airport, your gridlock is going to destroy the west side of Los Angeles.

As another speaker mentioned, the Green Line will be brought in under this. We have an area transit program to be involved. Visionaries like Hector Delatorre in South Gate want to extend the Green Line to the Metrolink. We have a regional transportation solution potentially in the offing with the modernization of LAX.

The facilities there, as I said, with security, you cannot move around. The modernization is necessary. It needs to incorporate the new security features which will expedite passenger flow. The trucks going in under diesel standards will reduce air pollution. Less traffic idling in the area reduces further the air pollution.

The modern jets, although twice the passenger capacity, are cleaner and quieter which will enhance the environment of the neighborhoods under the flight path, one of the continual complaints that nobody continues to mention.

The job factors is a boost to this economy. Our \$ 38- billion- dollar budget is because personal income tax has been reduced in this state because the millionaires are losing a fortune and the working class is losing their jobs.

Now, we are always hammered as the building trades for fighting for the jobs. We're proud of it. We don't have anything to take back on that. Our workers feed their families, buy houses, buy cars and send their kids to college on the wages that are provided. But in doing that, we've also taken up programs for youth at risk. So there is a social environment to be added to this and it is a component of LAX.

You will see hires from the community around there, and impacted areas that are under- served, with decent well- paying jobs. There will be opportunities for children that are at risk of being involved in gangs to provide careers in the construction industries. And I mean careers, not a job for a week, for a month, but years, lifetimes, including retirement. This is something that needs to be focused on. We can't always be saying no.

Now, does this LAX have to move or does L. A. have to move? It's an airport. It's there. It's a site of transportation. The neighbors are upset. El Segundo may have their reasons. But unfortunately for the safety of the planes, the runways have to go in.

3. Comments and Responses

They must accept the widening and the distances of the runways. We need to have something that fits L. A. And the modernization security plan will give us a 21st Century terminal that everyone in Los Angeles can be proud to travel through speedily, efficiently and safely.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00013 Lee, Henry

None Provided

8/11/2003

SPHL00013-1

Comment:

Thank you. Henry Lee. I'm a Korean- American attorney, 3350 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1110.

I think everybody in this room has read the newspapers and heard the news, and I have, too. Every time you listen to the news, there is something negative about the State of California. There is something negative about our budget. There is something negative about our governor, and there is something negative about the leaders of our state. That's why I feel lucky, and at times very proud to live in the City of Los Angeles because the leaders of our city are promoting growth. The leaders of our city is promoting safety and security, and the leaders of our city are trying to create jobs.

Alternative D to the LAX Master Plan is a perfect example of the positive leadership that our city has. I think everybody here agrees, whether you support it or not, that LAX is the front door to the city of Los Angeles. And through that front door hundreds and thousands of Koreans have come through that front door, and ultimately become Korean- Americans to live in the city of Los Angeles and to do business in the city of Los Angeles just like me and my family.

And just like the front door to our own homes, we should make the front door to our city bigger and better and safer for all the residents who live here. As a Korean- American attorney practicing in the City of Los Angeles, I was recently designated a class- action attorney representing 40,000 Korean- American consumers, most of whom live in the city of Los Angeles.

And I believe I can speak on behalf of those 40,000 Korean- Americans and say thank you, Mayor Hahn, for a plan that will create 350,000 jobs over the course of the next few years. Thank you, Mayor Hahn, for a plan that will improve the safety and security of our front door. Thank you, Mayor Hahn, for Alternative D.

Alternative D has the support of the Korean- American community, and hopefully has yours as well.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00014 Lim, Shawn

**Korean-American Business
Association**

8/11/2003

SPHL00014-1

Comment:

Good evening, everyone. My name is Shawn Lim. I'm President of the Korean- American Business Association.

First of all, I wanted to say is -- this is Korea Town, middle of Korea Town. But, I mean, you're saying that is -- they have Spanish people, Spanish translator, but I see a lot of Korean people. That means Korean people. I'm not saying is not speaking English, but what I'm saying is I see some of these old people. I respect all people. They come in here, show up here every time, long period of time, but they speak Korean language.

3. Comments and Responses

Next time a meeting like this, I want to set it up with a Korean translator, so that way whatever people here, some people I heard about it, they like a speaking issue, but they can't speak. So next time chances are, this is a Korean Town. You see a lot of Korean people. So next time you have got to provide a Korean interpreter, translator. I would appreciate it.

Response:

Comment noted. The Notice of Availability provided the number to call with requests for translators at the public hearings. Translators were provided with advanced notice of the public hearing. FAA and LAVA did not receive any requests for interpreters for the referenced public hearing.

SPHL00014-2

Comment:

Okay. Welcome to Korea town, everyone. I support Mayor Hahn, Alternative D, LAX is a Master Plan. This idea is 100 percent support Mayor Hahn, because that I have a business on Wilshire, 3319 Wilshire Boulevard. We have a lot of Korean- American, then Korean people, all the other nations is a business owners as Korean, you know, Korean Town on Wilshire Boulevard.

It's especially a lot of our people coming from Korea, coming from Japan, coming from China. They are coming here first LAX. LAX is a small. LAX after 9- 11 terrorism everyone, they don't feel comfortable here. There is a safety issue. So we have a Mayor Hahn, is a Master Plan. This is a real good thing working on. We're going to put the safety high- tech everything. So people all over the world is coming into Los Angeles airport is a safety issue.

So that way we have more people coming from foreign people travel here, LAX feel comfortable. We got to modernize everything in a new facilities at LAX. So we have a lot of benefits for business people because of people travel from Korea. My nationality is a Korea background. I have a lot of traveler that don't come in Los Angeles because safety issue.

But our concern is a safety issue. We need to build new airport, put a high- tech safety issue so that way people come here feel real comfortable. Then first impression our airport is kind of old. First impression you're going to make is a brand- new airport. Is a Korean International Airport, move it to new airport about a year ago, international airport. They made a big one, expanded, complete different.

So our wish is Mayor Hahn had good idea. I support him 100 percent. We have to do Master Plan. We have to approve.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00015 Hahn, James City of Los Angeles 8/11/2003

SPHL00015-1

Comment:

LAX also known as Alternative D -- thank you.

I hope they don't take all my time. Thank you all for being here today. I appreciate everybody who is here, and I appreciate the opportunity to talk.

I am here to support the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan for LAX, also known Alternative D.

I believe this alternative breaks new ground in airport design for the 21st Century. We think it can serve as a model for airports around the world.

3. Comments and Responses

My staff and I have brief thousands of stakeholders on this plan, including community residents, airlines, labor, local business leaders. And this plan incorporates many of their suggestions and addresses their concerns, and its concerns that have been expressed previously as to other alternatives.

Alternative D puts safety and security first. It includes modernization of the airfield, including the addition of the center taxiways to improve safety for aircraft, for traveling passengers and airport workers. And it's also going to provide multiple layers of security for passengers, multiple layers of security for airport workers and the surrounding communities as well.

We're dispersing travelers and moving them rapidly through four separate and secure entry points. It also allows security screeners to make assessments of passengers and baggage before they ever get into the central terminal area.

And most importantly, this plan significantly reduces the opportunity for a vehicle with an explosive device to get close to the central terminal area by eliminating private traffic through the area. Security experts believe that the central terminal area and its impact on our economy are the key targets for terrorists.

Alternative D also supports my goal of creating a regional air transportation plan. It designs LAX to accommodate approximately 3 million annual tons of cargo, 78 million annual passengers, consistent with the goals of the Southern California Association of Governments. We're working to promote the use of regional airports to meet increased demand.

Alternative D also means a more modern and convenient LAX for passengers. It includes new passenger terminals with improved ticketing, baggage processing, circulation and concessions. The automated people mover designed to easily accommodate rolling luggage and baggage carts is going to offer very convenient access to the central terminal area.

Alternative D means jobs. It's expected to contribute \$ 64 billion dollars to the regional economy. In addition to connecting the Green Line to the airport, we're going to have direct access from the 405 and the 105 Freeways.

I think as more people learn about Alternative D, they will see that we've addressed a lot of the concerns that people had. They are not for unlimited growth at the airport. They are not for growth that is going to harm the environment at the airport. They are not for growth that will tie up the traffic so that no one will be able to move. They are for a responsible modernization plan, and to make LAX as safe and secure as possible.

I want to especially thank all of our community leaders and representatives who are here today, also my staff, Troy Edwards and Patricia Torres, especially want to thank the Federal Aviation Administration and L. A. World Airports and your staff for the dedication and support of this process.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00016 Walter, Mahala None Provided 8/11/2003

SPHL00016-1

Comment:

Yes. Hi. I'm Mahala Walter; 7015 South Sepulveda, Los Angeles.

Today the Los Angeles World Airports continues to celebrate 75 years of connecting Southern California with the world. Commonly known as LAWA, the Los Angeles World Airports has four airports. Van Nuys is the world's biggest general aviation airport. Ontario International serves the Inland Empire, the fastest growing region in Southern California. And the Palmdale Regional has its 25- year Master Plan for the residents of Antelope and Santa Clara Valleys plus portions of San Bernardino and Inyo Counties.

3. Comments and Responses

And then there is LAX where passengers throughout the world think of LAX not only as an airport, but an entire city, Los Angeles. True, LAX is -- has had a spectacular past, but now we must prepare for a safe future.

Prior to 9-11, LAX contributed \$ 60 billion dollars per year in economic output, contributed 59,000 thousand jobs at or near LAX, plus 408,000 jobs in the Southern California region. LAX security is of major importance to not only our state, but our nation.

California has the fifth largest economy in the world, and we need better security now. So, please, Mayor Hahn, don't wait 15 years for a Master Plan for it will be outdated. The war will be over. The terrorists will have been hunted down, and 15 years is just too long to wait for Alternative D.

With the TSA Home Land Security, the walls came tumbling down in the terminals, moving hundreds of million- dollar explosive scanners with one \$ 100,000- dollar- yearly maintenance fee. Unfortunately, these monsters had far too many false positive readings with only food being the problem.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00090-1.

SPHL00016-2

Comment:

Who pays for Alternative D? We're told a major part is going to be passed on to the airlines via landing fees, et cetera. Now, that sounds just like what the airlines need, especially those that are in or fighting bankruptcy. Besides, the small business and hotels around LAX will have a very difficult time for the next many years, and some may not survive.

This plan has been said to be costing \$ 9.1 billion, then \$ 9.6 billion. Honestly, how many billions more is it going to be?

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00016-3

Comment:

Proponents like to couch this whole scenario about security and cars in LAX don't mix. Well, I ask you, how now are those people going to get to the Ground Transportation Center?

Response:

Comment noted. The access plan for Alternative D is discussed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 and in Technical Report S-2b. Please also see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues.

SPHL00016-4

Comment:

I just have one more. If a terrorist wants to inflict major loss on life and damage, you would have to have a passenger load widely distributed around nine different terminals where everyone and all flights will congregate in only one drop- in and drop- off site.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHL00017 Wayne, Alan

United Airlines

8/11/2003

SPHL00017-1

Comment:

All right. Great. Thank you. Good evening. For the record, my name is Alan Wayne. I am Director of Governmental and Public Affairs for the United Airlines West Region. We're located at 1960 East Grand, Suite 1000, in El Segundo.

I am appearing here tonight on behalf of not only United but also ten other fellow members of the Star Alliance, the largest airline consortium operating at Los Angeles International Airport. In addition to United, which operates a major hub at LAX, the Star members include Air Canada, Air New Zealand, All Nippon, Asiana, Lufthansa, Mexicana, Singapore, Thai, Varig and U. S. Airways.

Those 11 carriers plus United's regional marketing partners Skywest, whose 133 daily departures are the most of any carrier at LAX, wish tonight to underscore our collective support for Mayor Hahn's ongoing effort to craft a Master Plan for LAX, as reflected in Alternative D, that would ultimately improve and modernize this critical but sadly antiquated facility.

United and the Star carriers plus Skywest account for the 30 percent of the flight activity here. We are working with the City to address the airfield safety, airport security, ground access and passenger terminal enhancements that must be achieved if this airport, which is so important to the region's economic competitiveness and the thousands of jobs that depend on it, is to remain in the forefront of commercial aviation.

To do nothing or to not do this project realistically is not acceptable. This project is overdue. It must get underway. Other airports, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Las Vegas, Denver, Phoenix, to name just a few, have modernized or advancing programs to draw business away from LAX.

United and the Star Carriers believe that this plan focuses on the issues and elements that will move LAX forward. And we plan to continue our collaboration with the City and the airport to meet these future requirements.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00018 Kim, Sam

**Korean-American Garment
Industry Association**

8/11/2003

SPHL00018-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Sam Kim. I am here on behalf of Korean- American Garment Industry Associations.

I'd like to thank in advance for having this function here in our Korea Town, and we appreciate it. It's actually an honor to have this great function here in my town.

In our association we have about 600 members. And we employ about 20,000 employees in Los Angeles vicinity. And from our association, we have decided to endorse this project here, and we support Mayor Hahn's project 100 percent. We're behind it.

Instead of going through all the details and the stats, I want to say ditto to all the stuff that was mentioned here, which is the same as mine. And everything that Mr. Mayor said, I agree and I will support that 100 percent as well.

3. Comments and Responses

This project is something that was needed long ago. It is something that needs to be in place on it. I'd like to see it in place as soon as possible. So in closing, I'd like to thank in advance for approving this project.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00019 Leon, Domingo Society of Hispanic Engineers 8/11/2003

SPHL00019-1

Comment:

Hi. My name is Domingo Leon. I am a civil engineer. I am speaking on behalf of the Society of Hispanic Engineers.

Mayor Hahn and also LAWA staff have addressed a problem which is facing a problem in the future to the increasing on the number of passengers at LAX and also the cargo. Passengers will increase from, I think, 59 million to 70 million, so something has to be done.

And as engineers, we like any kind of plans to improve the phases for jobs for construction and also for engineers, also for the Hispanic, you know. I mean, unfortunately, low- paid people at the airport are Hispanic. We do janitorial type of work, but that also we are helping out in the future.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00019-2

Comment:

I think there is room for certain improvements on the Plan D. Currently, what we do is I unload my suitcases. I walk 30 feet to the ticketing. Now, in the future you are going to tear down the parking structure. So I have to go into the terminal, which is like no 30 feet, like probably miles away, and I have to bring my suitcases -- it's a mover; right? You have a mover thing coming. So that is a little, you know, annoying and inconvenient.

So I would like to address the issue, as I have seen airports in Frankfurt and Madrid, you don't bring your suitcases to the ticket office. I mean, you just do it in Downtown or at the terminal.

So I think I would like to address the issue. You can look at that alternative off- ticketing your suitcases at the terminal because there will be no cars once you build the moving train into the terminals for significant reason.

Response:

The existing terminal and roadway facilities at LAX will not efficiently accommodate the forecast volume of passenger traffic at LAX in 2015.

As described in Chapter 2.2 of the Draft Master Plan Addendum the existing CTA would be reconfigured for Alternative D. Four new terminals would be provided within the CTA providing the highest level of passenger security and convenience available. The four new terminals would be constructed where the existing parking structures are located. The new terminal and reconfigured CTA would be connected to the GTC, ITC and RAC via the APM. Trip times between the ITC, GTC, RAC and the CTA would be no more than 9 minutes including the wait time.

E-Kiosk check-in and skycap baggage check-in are functions anticipated to be available at the GTC allowing passengers to travel from the GTC to the CTA without needing to carry their checked baggage if they so wish.

3. Comments and Responses

There is currently no mass transit linking downtown Los Angeles directly to the LAX CTA. However, Alternative D would provide additional Flyaway facilities similar to the Van Nuys facilities, which allow passengers to park at a remote facility and check in for a flight. They would then be transported to LAX via an airport operated shuttle directly to the CTA bypassing the GTC and landside APM.

SPHL00019-3

Comment:

So I would like to -- I applaud, you know, the Plan D, which is I think good for the community.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00020 Cha, Alex

Cha & Park

8/11/2003

SPHL00020-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Alex Cha. I'm an attorney with Cha & Park. My address is 3435 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2600, L. A.

First of all, I want to thank you for having regular citizens like us staying late to hear our concerns. Tonight I'm here to support Mayor Hahn Alternative D for three reasons.

First, in the aftermath of 9- 11, the City's major concerns are the safety and security of the citizens of L. A. and the citizens of the world. And with the modern LAX, there definitely will be an increase in the security and safety for the citizens of L. A. as well as the citizens of the world.

Second, LAX is the largest gateway to the United States from Asia. And as you know, there are state-of-the-art Asian airports such as one in Hong Kong, in South Korea and Japan, which has tremendously increased their reputation as well as the image of those respective cities and countries. And it's about time L. A., as a trend-setter, has a state-of-the-art airport.

And finally economically, I would want to say everybody loves L. A. Everybody wants to visit L. A., and a modernized airport will definitely attract more visitors domestically as well as internationally to this great city of Los Angeles, and a tremendous increase to the businesses as well as the tourism, in the city of L. A. as well Southern California.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00021 Soukiasian, Janine

Cha & Park

8/11/2003

SPHL00021-1

Comment:

Hi. My name is Janine Soukiasian. I work at mid-Wilshire at 3435 Wilshire Boulevard.

I am a born and raised L. A- an, if you will, and I have lived in this community all my life. I support Mayor Hahn's plan. And I'm concerned about the air traffic and safety, LAX and past local businesses as well as international travel.

Because of continual increase of national security, tourism has lessened and has had a negative impact on recent businesses.

3. Comments and Responses

I'm a recent bar applicant, and I want to practice immigration law. As an Armenian- American I don't see how LAX could have more visitors and tourists. And immigration, it does impact. I mean, it might be a selfish reason, but I would like the Armenian community to grow.

Our concerns on both sides of this plan are the same, which includes security of our citizens and safe travel to further interstate commerce, which also eventually affects us locally.

This new plan will further our economy and provide an Alternative D which is attractive, a new and safe mode of travel.

As someone mentioned before, California is the fifth largest economy in the world, and Los Angeles is what you first think of when you think of California. " I am going to Los Angeles, L. A., Hollywood."

Thus, the state- of- the- art facilities and modernization of the airport will play an integral role in encouraging international travel. Other major cities have implemented this type of plan. And when I visit Chicago or New York, I have such an easy to and from the airport. And I do like to mention, San Francisco and Oakland, the use of Bart, the Bart Air that picks you up from the airport. And then you take the Bart, you go under the water and then you're in the city. I mean, that is remarkable.

As a representative of Cha & Park, we are willing to support Mayor Hahn's Alternative D plan. And I will vote and work hard towards the implementation of it.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00022 Alpern, Ken

Friends of the Green Line

8/11/2003

SPHL00022-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Ken Alpern. I'm a board certified dermatologist, drove up from my clinic in Huntington Beach, but I live in West Los Angeles. I am President of the Transit Coalition and Co- chair of one of its most active wings which is Friends of the Green Line.

Friends of the Green Line supports a regional air traffic approach. As a matter of fact, we're not only interested in LAX, but trying to establish other gold line and/ or Metrolink connection with Ontario. We very much want this regional air approach championed by Mayor Hahn become a reality. Frankly, growing up in Long Beach, we all hated going to LAX. And those of us living near LAX hate people coming to LAX. It's sort of a mutual feeling.

Response:

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

SPHL00022-2

Comment:

I need to emphasize that I want to talk about transportation. I've heard both sides of the security issue with regards to the concept of a Ground Transportation Center, and I'm glad we have more time for comments. I think those living next to LAX need to have their time to be heard, and I think there are two sides of the issue. But if you're going to make the decision to go with the Ground Transportation Center, then I think it's very good for transportation and particularly with respect to the Green Line.

Friends of the Green Line is neutral on where the Ground Transportation Center is, but we know that we'd like the Green Line to connect directly to it, whether it's in Eagle Rock, Tombouctou or Newark, New Jersey. The idea is, and we've given you a copy of this brochure, that the Green Line does not hit - does not affect areas north of LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

The people mover is a wonderful concept, but currently it will not benefit those coming distantly from the West Side, the Valley, Downtown. And frankly, the local hotels and businesses won't be benefited by the people mover as much as if you have a proposed Green Line extension to Westchester approved ten years ago in an EIR by the MTA. We need to revisit it. It does not compete with the people mover. We do not want the Green Line to compete with the people mover. The idea is it is to supplement the people mover.

But the question of security comes back as to whether or not you're going to have good security at the Intermodal Transit Center. Are you going to have really good security? Because if you're not, then you really need to shuttle people from the Green Line all directly to the Ground Transportation Center.

The Ground Transportation Center is built next to the MTA Harbor Subdivision rail line. That's one of its most wonderful features. Why not exploit it? Again, L. A. World Airports is not in the business of building regional airport -- regional rail systems, but having a Westchester system that enables northern rail access to LAX, and the people mover is not outside the aegis of this plan.

As forementioned by a colleague earlier, Bart Reed, the Bay area has its own rail airport connection. Orange County, they don't want to repeat the mistake of L. A. It's a new century. Let's do this right. Let's make this LAX reconfiguration plan a good neighbor.

Response:

Comment noted. It is impractical to connect the Green Line directly to the CTA, as discussed in Response to Comment SPHO00004-6. Given this, connecting the Green Line to the ITC generally provides about the same level of service to Green Line users as connecting it to the GTC. However, connecting the Green Line to the ITC as planned in Alternative D is a less costly alternative and is much less complex than designing the GTC around a Green Line extension and connection. Connecting the Green Line to the GTC would require a spur on the Green Line, which would cause the same problems for the Green Line design as extending it into the CTA. It would also require a very complex design at the entrance to the GTC, where many different structures would be constructed at the Aviation/Century intersection location: the at-grade intersection, the above-grade Green Line, the above-grade airport access road, including the Century Boulevard ramp to the access road, the APM from the east above the Green Line, and the APM from the south above that. That location will be very complex even without a Green Line extension. With a Green Line extension, it is infeasible.

Security will be the same at the GTC and ITC.

SPHL00023 Brown, Salvador None Provided 8/11/2003

SPHL00023-1

Comment:

All right. My name is Salvador Brown. My mailing address, PO Box 70312, Los Angeles, California 90070.

It seems to me that too much is being concentrated in one place. This project, as proposed, would increase traffic congestion in one area. There is no room for another freeway, and increasing traffic in the immediate area will overwhelm the surface streets with the people coming off the freeway. I'm trying to bypass the congestion that's on the 405 in that area.

The plan discusses mitigations to meet that possibility, but there have been examples in the past where mitigation plans, like, for example, the expansion of the 405 Freeway didn't pan out. And I think that the same result will happen with this plan here.

We have this great idea, but in the end, increase in populations in the area, increase in traffic, people going to and from the airport will overwhelm the mitigations that's being planned today.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the traffic impacts of Alternative D, and Response to Comment SPC00147-1.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHL00023-2

Comment:

I think that the best solution, in my opinion, would be to spread out that parking. Instead of having it all in one area, that little area there, you should spread the parking out in a more wider area so the people, the traffic would spread out going to those parking areas instead of like one concentrated parking area.

Response:

Comment noted. It is not clear what the commentor means by the description, 'wider area.' The public parking is well-dispersed in Alternative D. The distance between Arbor Vitae Street and Imperial Highway, which form the north and south boundaries of the parking areas, is over 1 1/2 miles long, while Aviation and La Cienega Boulevards, forming the west and east boundaries, are about 1/2 mile apart.

SPHL00023-3

Comment:

And we're all worried about these truck bombs going to the airport and blowing up underneath the concourse area there, but how about a truck bomb blowing up in one of those massive structures for the thousands of people going to and from their cars. Again, that would be another thing to consider, spreading out those parking areas throughout that region and not in one area. That's basically what I was thinking about. I didn't read my speech.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHL00024 Grumet, Michele None Provided 8/11/2003

SPHL00024-1

Comment:

I would just like to raise one issue here. Since the city is spending a huge amount of money on this project, this proposed project, I think there is no reason why the lead agencies or the city cannot afford sending a Draft EIR/ EIS, or whatever, to the people who are very -- who are affected in the areas that don't have access to the internet, that don't -- you know, I know I live not too far from some of the affected areas.

And many of the people are elderly. Some of them live alone. A lot of them do not even know what a CD is or do not have access to that, you know, computers, and do not know how to work on a computer.

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.

SPHL00024-2

Comment:

And I think I've worked on, you know, five other, you know, projects that have had Environmental Impact Reports. And I think people do not -- a lot of people that are very affected by this do not understand even what it is.

3. Comments and Responses

I went to a meeting that my councilman had, and I wasn't even sure what it was about. And I went to it, and they were talking about soundproofing these people's homes, but they didn't even raise at the meeting the whole issue of an Environmental Impact Report. And I think the people, even if they did, they just mentioned it in passing and didn't explain to them, this is the most important document. This is the document that they have a right to challenge or to question. And they should do it in writing or they should do it orally.

So I think people -- a lot of people, and it's not that these people are not intelligent. They've just never participated in anything like this before, and they don't understand it. And, therefore, I think -- I had asked the -- I was kind of hard-nosed about it and angry about it, the Mayor saying, you know, because the Mayor did grow up in my neighborhood where I live, and he does know, and his parents certainly knew that many of the people are elderly and are not into all of this and familiar with this.

So I think if some kind of executive summary of the main issues and maybe just a piece of paper. I mean, we'd be glad, a lot of us, to go and leaflet the area and say "For your comments," and this is where the hearing is, because I know in my own neighborhood, I live on 77th Street, and I'm the only person that got a notice of any of these hearings, and the person that I brought I told him about it.

So I think that, you know, when you talk about environmental justice, I think in a lot of ways it may not be done on purpose, but not everyone is up to speed with the internet. A lot of people aren't. I know my own mother isn't. And, you know, she has a college degree.

So I think that to kind of take it for granted that these people are somehow going to understand what this is, and these are the people that are going to be really affected by this, and I think, I really hope that you think about that.

And I know that many of us there would be glad to go and walk the neighborhoods. I am sure we could get 10 or 15 people. And I know I and the person I am with here would be glad to do that, to explain to people even simply what's in store for them in their alternatives.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00024-3

Comment:

And, also, just one other -- and the thing that kind of upset me was the price, you know, it was quite pricey, \$ 50 for CD and the price there -- and there are only a couple of libraries in the particular area where I am. And if everyone went, they wouldn't be able to look at the documents because there is only one document.

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.

SPHL00025 Hossan, Carole

None Provided

8/11/2003

SPHL00025-1

Comment:

I'm Carole Hossan. I live in Westchester at 7725 Hindry.

And just briefly for the audience, you know, people in Westchester, we'd like a big, beautiful airport in Palmdale where they have room for it, and where they've owned Palmdale for decades. We'd like to see them make use of that property.

3. Comments and Responses

I'm just going to have some brief poetry for you. They are haikus. And the first one is -- they are on the topic of the myth of 78 MAP. Mayor Hahn mentioned 78 MAP. In newspaper articles, I've been seeing 78.9 million annual passengers.

So this poem says, " The promise broken behind that decimal point, 900,000."

Second poem, " Fewer gates limit MAP. Are you so sure? Bigger planes bring more people."

Next one, it's entitled " Weasel Words." " Could, should, may, perhaps mitigate." There's a good one. " My neighborhood chokes."

Second, the last one, " Moving the runways apart. Is it safety or is it increase throughput that is the real goal here?"

And I'm saying this because we're a major city. We need more than one major airport. Other cities have other airports. We shouldn't be putting all of our airplanes into one little, tiny space. And that's considering passengers' safety and security. And Los Angeles has had years to work on this. It's time for them to really get serious.

If Palmdale had some of that billions and billions of dollars put in there, what we would have? We'd have something beautiful and something useful and something that would spread the air traffic around.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level of 78.9 million annual passengers (MAP), which is comparable to the 78.7 MAP projected to occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. As such, Alternative D is not considered to represent an expansion of LAX. The other build alternatives (Alternatives A, B, and C) are designed to serve a future activity level substantially more than the No Action/No Project Alternative, and therefore represent an expansion of LAX. Alternative D is consistent with the Mayor's commitment to no expansion of LAX. Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Chapter 3 of the Draft Master Plan Addendum provide the basis for how Alternative D was designed and determined to serve a future (2015) airport activity level of 78.9 MAP. Please see Topical Responses TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan's role in the regional approach to meeting aviation demand, and TR-RC-5 regarding transferring operations from LAX to Palmdale Airport.

SPHL00026 Ulloth, John

None Provided

8/11/2003

SPHL00026-1

Comment:

Thank you for calling me so quickly. After the Mayor left, it seems a lot of the interest died down perhaps.

Thank you for holding this event. Maybe we should have more than one of two years to see how we're doing.

I signed in and they asked what my address was. I'm not sure because I live all over Los Angeles. We need a transit system, an air system, a highway system that intergrades all of our modes together and spreads all over the region. What's missing in this picture? It's transit. That's what I'm here to talk about today.

Please do nothing to limit the Green Line from entering right inside the airport. Like JFK's people mover, make sure it's the same technology so your people mover can interline with the Green Line.

The reason to do that is, first of all, you don't need to build a new people mover. The Green Line has the capacity. It has the maintenance yard, which I haven't seen identified for a people mover, and it can handle all the traffic in a much faster way in terms of getting it up to speed.

If you'll cooperate with the MTA rather than being hostile to them, it will be much easier for everyone. Make sure we have a one- seat ride from our transit lines inside the airport, as close as you can get,

3. Comments and Responses

And I think this plan certainly addresses a number of the critical issues we have before us; the issue of security, which is first and foremost, the issue of passenger movements and the people mover, transit in and out of the airport, the issue of new terminals or improvements in terminals to be able to accommodate larger jets, and the issue of improved passenger service through facilities which will address the needs to service a type of traffic and passengers in the future that inadequately service today.

So I think all of these points here come through well on the Master Plan. We had an office in El Segundo for a number of years. And every day I drove past the rail just coming to the airport and then taking a quick left and going down Nash Street. All of those things I think are addressed in some form in this Master Plan.

No Master Plan is perfect, but clearly there is a need to act. There is a need to go through these hearings we have today and work through a plan we have out on the table, which I believe is essentially a good plan and should help carry the airport into a future which I think will be bright and will speak to the issues that we have before us today.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00028 Walker, Daniel Friends of the Green Line 8/11/2003

SPHL00028-1

Comment:

Thank you. My name is Daniel Walker. Thanks for this opportunity to come and address you.

Tonight I am speaking as cochair of the Friends of the Green Line. I'm also a local resident. I live at 7416 West 82nd Street, which is about eight or nine blocks north of the airport.

Friends of the Green Line is an all- volunteer group. You may have heard from some of our colleagues earlier. We basically are just users of mass transit that live in the area around LAX and other parts of the city that we simply would like to see improved access to LAX.

We don't have any bone to gripe with the LAWA experts and the fine engineers and planners at LAWA and the city officials. We just think in the past there has been some oversights or some conflicts, or whatever the situation is. Today we don't have very good mass transit access to LAX, and we'd like to see approved access through the Green Line or other mass transit rail services to LAX.

Specifically, we would like to see the airport in their Master Plan address a fast rail service from Downtown along the Harbor Subdivision right- of- way the MTA owns. We would like to see the plans that you have accommodate, not necessarily design the entire rail corridor from LAX to Downtown, but make sure that the plan at least doesn't preclude that from happening. So far I know you have just preliminary plans, but we don't really see much more than just a dotted line.

The people mover, we had some discussions about that in our group, and we're generally supportive of that concept. Using a people mover to get around the airport rather than the current bus system is a step forward if that comes out and meets a fast rail service, either the Green Line or someday also the Harbor Subdivision connection to Downtown. We think that will be an improvement over today's system, which is simply just cars and buses.

So the Friends of the Green Line is definitely supportive of improving access to LAX, getting cars off the roads and the local streets and highways. It seems like you've made a lot of effort to provide direct freeway access to the new facilities, but we don't see that same amount of planning or effort of extending the rail lines as well.

It seems like you've done a great job internally of looking at how you can move people around within the airport, but maybe it's MTA's job or your job to work with MTA to find a line that can make it to LAX and improve access. Not only to LAX, but also a rail system that can access Burbank Airport, which is on

3. Comments and Responses

the Metrolink system. Metrolink also goes out and goes right past the Ontario Airport, and that Master Plan is coming out as well for some study.

So we think that a fast rail network would certainly benefit the local residents of Westchester, and it would also make a better L. A. World Airport.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPHO00004-6 regarding a direct Green Line connection to the CTA, Response to Comment SPHL00022-2 regarding the most feasible alignment of the Green Line, and Response to Comment SPHL00026-1 regarding the Green Line/People Mover interface.

SPHL00029 Clark, Darryl

None Provided

8/11/2003

SPHL00029-1

Comment:

Okay. I'm Darryl Clark. I live at 339 10th Street, Santa Monica. I'm currently chair of the City of Santa Monica Planning Commission. I am also cochair of the Sierra Club Angeles Chapter Transportation Committee, although tonight I'm speaking as an individual.

Two things I would like to focus on. One is that ground connections are critical, as was just commented. I look at in terms of the Green Line definitely needs to access LAX directly. The former Santa Fe now MTA- owned Harbor Subdivision track from Downtown Union Station to Aviation Boulevard in front of LAX could run a very good rail car service in the near term at a rather low cost.

We have to think about the 405 Corridor as more than just high- speed ramps from a freeway that doesn't move into the airport. I drive that freeway every day. Fortunately, I'm going from Santa Monica to Orange County, and the bad traffic is the other way. But to have a fast approach to a non- moving freeway, we've got to do better.

Down the road, I would really like to see the Green Line extended north along the 405 Corridor to the San Fernando Valley, so it would be serving both LAX as well as the whole west side.

And, finally, the Lincoln Corridor. I'm an appointee of the City of Santa Monica on the Lincoln Corridor Task Force Citizen's Advisory Committee. And that's a major challenge because we all know Lincoln Boulevard is just a detour to the 405. We're not going to -- we have no more right- of- way. We're not going to be widening Lincoln Boulevard. We're probably going to be ending up with something like peak hour dedicated bus lines for more rapid bus service at least in the near term on Lincoln Boulevard. That's my personal opinion, but I think that's sort of where we're headed with that. So ground connections are critical.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPHO00004-6 regarding a direct Green Line connection to the CTA, Response to Comment SPHL00022-2 regarding the most feasible alignment of the Green Line, and Response to Comment SPHL00026-1 regarding the Green Line/People Mover interface.

The project would mitigate its impacts on I-405 as presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It cannot mitigate existing traffic congestion.

SPHL00029-2

Comment:

The second point I'd really want to touch on, I find myself favoring a much more modest improvement to the airport than the \$ 10- billion- dollar tearing down three terminals, reconfiguring the whole central terminal area.

3. Comments and Responses

First of all, I have to wonder if it's really necessary to in terms of making it terrorist proof. It just creates a different single point of failure. We have a single point of failure at a remote terminal rather than multiple points of failure at individual terminals, and it would make it less convenient for people like me that typically get dropped off or drive ourselves down to the airport or hopefully someday take the train down there.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHL00029-3

Comment:

And just the enormous cost of such a reconfiguration. I would really say, keep the basic terminal arrangement. Add a people mover to replace the many buses that are jamming all of those roadways today. Add better ground links, but don't do a major reconstruction. I just don't think it is necessary, which leads me to a final recommendation in 17 seconds.

I would suggest another alternative be added. We have the past alternatives from the previous mayor administration. We have this alternative. If we had an alternative of not a no- build, but build less, improve ground connections, improve circulation, but don't do a major reconstruction.

Response:

Comment noted. The mitigation measures and the alternative proposed by the commentor appear to describe Alternative D, which addresses the issues raised by the commentor. To the extent Alternative D deviates from that proposed by the commentor, it is likely because of other goals, such as safety and security, which must be considered as well.

SPHO00001 McDowell, Kelly

City of El Segundo

8/12/2003

SPHO00001-1

Comment:

Good evening. I'm Councilman Kelly McDowell representing the City of El Segundo tonight. Given the length and complexity of the Master Plan and the environmental documents associated with it, my City's full comments on the technical issues will not be ready for some time, and therefore my comments tonight are somewhat preliminary.

My city continues to oppose Alternatives A, B and C for the many reasons the City expressed orally and in writing during the public review and comment period for the initial Draft EIR/ EIS in 2002. El Segundo has not endorsed Alternative D, but we feel its stated objectives support a regional aviation approach.

Specifically, the City of El Segundo supports a regional approach alternative that makes proper use of Inland Empire airports. We support an alternative with fewer environmental impacts. We would like to see the adverse impacts of the airport minimized and mitigated to the greatest extent possible. And we support enhanced safety and security at LAX and we support an alternative that by its design will accommodate passenger and cargo levels no greater than the physical capacity of the airport as it exists today.

Limiting LAX's capacity to its current capacity has always been our number one goal, and we believe that limiting LAX's capacity will allow other airports in the region to develop and handle a fair share of future regional aviation demand, will result in fewer environmental impacts, and will improve safety and security at the airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHO00001-2**Comment:**

However, the City is greatly concerned about the impacts of Southside Airfield changes that would move the southernmost runway 50 feet closer to our city of El Segundo.

LAWA has stated it believes these changes are necessary to improve runway safety. However, we are currently studying the impacts of the re-configuration and the options for the southern runway complex. In particular, we urge full public consideration of end-around taxiways as an alternative that can provide greater safety at lower cost and with fewer new burdens on local nearby communities.

Safety at LAX must be a priority for us all, and El Segundo is prepared to support measures necessary to enhance safety even if those measures increase our burden, but only if we are assured through an independent expert that other alternatives are not equally affected.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00038-3 regarding the potential noise impacts of moving the southernmost runway 50 feet south and discussion on runway incursion at LAX and an analysis conducted by NASA Ames Research Center comparing the costs and benefits of a center parallel taxiway and "end-around" taxiway on the south airfield complex.

SPHO00001-3**Comment:**

In conclusion, we are grateful for Mayor Hahn's responsive leadership and his pledge to constrain growth at LAX and foster a regional approach to meeting future aviation demand in our region. And it is our hope that the ultimate outcome of this Master Plan process will be a regional airport approach that ensures that LAX does not exceed its current capacity.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHO00002 Villar, Max**Los Angeles Convention and
Visitors Bureau****8/12/2003****SPHO00002-1****Comment:**

My name is Max Villar. I live in Los Angeles. My address is 333 South Hope, 18th Floor in the Los Angeles Convention Visitor's Bureau.

My position at the Los Angeles Convention Visitor's Bureau is director of the Americas, and as such, I'm also participant as the marketing arm for Los Angeles World Airports in the international market. Specifically, I'm responsible to develop travel business from Mexico, Latin America and LAX and Ontario Airport. We have a success story to tell.

Aeromexico started service about three years ago with one flight from Guadalajara to Mexico to Ontario Airports and was turned around and turned over to a daily flight. Recently they have added another flight from Ontario to San Jose Los Cabos. We were instrumental to bring another airline to Ontario Airport as well, which is Lineas Ayadas Aztecas with a daily flight from Mexico to Guadalajara.

So what I'm saying -- what I'm trying to say here is that we're here to support the Master Plan as stated to preserve L. A.'s status of the main gateway in the West Coast.

3. Comments and Responses

It is also fitting to mention that we are engaged in an industry that represents, according to your numbers, about 21 billion dollars in direct expenditures and over 328,000 employment.

Approving the plan not only means better service to our great region of Los Angeles, but it also showcases the Ontario Airport as one of the premier international airports in Southern California.

As I will normally promote it while I'm abroad and talking to my Spanish-speaking colleagues, Los Angeles y Ontario (inaudible) perfecto.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHO00003 Olhasso, Mary Jane City of Ontario

8/12/2003

SPHO00003-1

Comment:

Mary Jane Olhasso, city of Ontario, 303 East B Street, Ontario. Olhasso is O- l- h- a- s- s- o.

The Mayor of Ontario, Mr. Gary Ovit, has asked me to read this letter into the record. It is dated today, August 12th, 2003, addressed to President Stein and Commissioners.

"As both the Mayor of Ontario and a member of the Skag Aviation Task Force, I am in support of Alternative D of the LAX Master Plan. Under this plan LAX will accommodate its fair share of passengers and cargo while providing limits which will encourage growth at other Southern California airports. This will create a regional solution to the air transportation issue and preserve our position as global economic leader."

"We look forward to a continued partnership in providing air service to the residents and businesses of Southern California."

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHO00004 Walter, Mahala

None Provided

8/12/2003

SPHO00004-1

Comment:

Mahala Walter, M- a- h- a- l- a, at 7015 South Sepulveda, Westchester.

Proponents like to coach the following scenario about security as cars and LAX facilities How on earth are they going to get to the ground transportation center then?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHA00016-3 regarding the Alternative D access plan.

SPHO00004-2

Comment:

If there were a terrorist waiting to inflict major loss of life and damage, would you rather have the passenger load widely distributed around nine different terminals or where everyone for all flights would be congregated in one security end drop-off center off-site?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00288-2 which discusses dispersion of people at the GTC.

SPHO00004-3

Comment:

There's a definite problem with a check-in drop-off site at Manchester squares. The gridlock on the 405 is totally impossible now. Using Sepulveda, the community surrounding the airport can be at their terminal in just a few minutes.

Alternate D would add at least an hour or two to travel time.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments SPHF00047-3 and SPHSP00006-4, which explain the proposed access system for Alternative D, including the potential I-405 interchange at Lennox Boulevard and the I-105 interchange near Aviation Boulevard.

SPHO00004-4

Comment:

The whole idea of safety is to get the travelers in and out of the airport fast. Why should travelers staying at the Radisson Hotel across the street from LAX have to take the shuttle to the ground transportation center to get on the people-mover to go to the airport?

Response:

The idea of safety is to keep the passengers, employees, and other users of LAX safe. It does not necessarily involve quickness. All hotel shuttles would use the GTC in order to keep the CTA secure.

SPHO00004-5

Comment:

The word from USC students is that if the 105 does not go directly to LAX, they'll fly Jet Blue.

Response:

Alternative D does include a direct, non-stop interchange from I-105 to and from the GTC and ITC.

SPHO00004-6

Comment:

Why now doesn't the green line go directly into LAX, and why not work together with MTA to solve the current and future problems of not only the airport, but the 405 and Sepulveda Boulevard?

Response:

Difficulties with connecting the Green Line into the existing CTA include: 1) The extension would have to be a spur that would extend into the CTA and then back out on the same alignment. Unfortunately, the existing Green Line technology is not conducive to that type of "pinched loop" system. 2) Crossing over/under Sepulveda Boulevard would be difficult. 3) Retrofitting the new rail system to serve the existing CTA terminals would be very difficult and expensive. 4) Operating such a system would be very confusing or inconvenient for Green Line passengers. For example, should everyone -- even those passengers that do not want to go to LAX -- be forced to take the Green Line into the airport, adding as much as 10 to 15 minutes onto their trip? If not, then two separate lines would have to be provided (one to LAX and the other to Redondo Beach), resulting in additional staffing and equipment. LAWA is working directly with the MTA and other transportation agencies on the best solution to the transportation problems as part of the master plan alternatives and will continue to do so as the project continues.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHO00004-7

Comment:

Adding a one or two nonstop lanes for departures coming off of Lincoln to join Skyway Drive into LAX would be a very helpful thing for Westside, Santa Monica, Marina del Rey travelers, relieving Sepulveda traffic during peak and holiday hours.

Response:

The CTA would be closed to all private vehicles in Alternative D, therefore, the commentor's suggestion would not apply to that alternative. Also, CTA traffic in Alternatives A, B, and C would be less than currently exists, due to the off-loading of traffic to the West Terminal. Therefore, the lanes suggested would not be necessary with the project alternatives. The project impacts are summarized in the Draft EIS/EIR (Alternatives A, B, and C) and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR (Alternative D), Section 4.3.1 and 4.3.2.

SPHO00004-8

Comment:

LAX must start the new center runways immediately. However, I wish to see extending the north runway over Pershing Drive. Since we are at war, the butterflies might as well deal with these inconveniences just as the rest of us are having to do.

Response:

New runways are not proposed as part of Alternative D. It is assumed the commentor is referencing the proposed center taxiways. Please see Figure S3-15 in Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR which describes a conceptual summary schedule for completion of construction of components of the Alternative D. Construction of the center taxiway in the south airfield would occur in Phase 1. Construction of a center taxiway in the north airfield would occur in Phase Three.

The runway extension suggested by the commentor would lay cross Pershing Drive to the west into the El Segundo Sand Dunes and the El Segundo Blue Butterfly Habitat Restoration Area to gain the required runway length. Development into the El Segundo Sand Dunes and the El Segundo Blue Butterfly Habitat Restoration Area were evaluated as part of the first and second iteration alternatives in the Draft LAX Master Plan. While developing the airport into the bay would be beneficial from many standpoints including noise and air quality, the high cost (\$30 billion), long-term maintenance risk, and numerous environmental issues make these options infeasible. With extensive feedback from local residents, business owners and oversight agencies through the environmental scoping meetings and formal comment period, a re-weighted set of evaluation criteria and goals places a higher priority on environmental and community objectives over economic and air service objectives. In light of the re-weighted goals, the options of development into the El Segundo Sand Dunes and the El Segundo Blue Butterfly Habitat Restoration Area were removed from further consideration due to the issue of impacting a federally listed Endangered Species. For further discussion of the re-weighted objectives and the development of the alternatives, please see Chapter V, Section 3.1, Planning Objectives, of the Draft LAX Master Plan and Chapter I, Section 1.1, Policy and Planning Objectives, of the Draft Master Plan Addendum.

SPHO00004-9

Comment:

The south runway, I would like to know why is it necessary to move it 50 feet closer to El Segundo and the Hyperion.

Response:

The nature and purpose of the aircraft facilities improvements proposed under Alternative D were described on pages 3-41 and 3-42 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The purpose of moving the south runway approximately 55 feet south is to gain enough separation for constructing a center taxiway

3. Comments and Responses

between the two parallel runways. The purpose of the center taxiway is to enhance safe aircraft operations and reduce the potential for runway incursions. The lack of this center taxiway slows the arrival stream by requiring time-consuming coordination of runway crossings. While these conditions do not create an unsafe environment, they do add to airfield congestion as operations increase. Providing a center taxiway between the two parallel runways allows aircraft to queue and maneuver without blocking runway operations. The center taxiway in south complex is design to accommodate Group V aircraft to provide operational benefit and to minimize noise impacts.

SPHO00004-10

Comment:

Retinal scanning is one of the most important security measures I think we can take at this time for LAWA employees, airlines, TSA, concessionaires, taxis, shuttles, airport drivers plus owners and pilots at the 48 airports that are in our area.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHO00005 Zavala, Frank

Laborers Local 300

8/12/2003

SPHO00005-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Frank Zavala. Location of address is 12635 Franklin Court, Unit 3A in Chino, California. I'm a field representative for the Laborers' Local 300 and an auditor as well, and last name is spelled Z-, as in Zebra, - a- v, as in Victor, a- l- a. I just want to make sure that's clear. She did say that.

Well, I'm here to speak in regards to this plan. Actually, I'm a resident as well as a family member out here. I have three girls out here. And it's plenty of work for our members, for Laborers' speak not only for the laborers, but to -- about all the crafts in the unions. We have plenty of members that live out here from all types of crafts. So this is more beneficial to the residents of, I would say, Ontario and also Chino and various locations, because the unions are represented from different wide world of cities, so - - and the Master Plan that we're supporting, I'm sure you've already heard the comments, and I'm not going to go into length with that, but it is very, very well planned out.

And in the past there's been some questions in regards to it, so I would like to state personally here and as well as a field representative that this plan here is the best plan for everyone in the surrounding communities.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHO00006 Rivera, Jorge

Local Union 250

8/12/2003

SPHO00006-1

Comment:

Jorge Rocky Rivera, Jorge, J- o- r- g- e, Rocky, R- o- c- k- y, Rivera, R- i- v- e- r- a.

As I introduced myself, again, my name is Rocky Rivera. I'm a resident of Riverside, California. I live at 5141 Poinsettia Place. I'm also a member of Local 250. I'm also an individual who helped build the Bradley Terminal when I worked for Sam p. Wallace of Local 250.

I come here in support of Alternative D, and the reason being is that it provides not only safety, but jobs, present and in the future, because we got to take into consideration -- we can be like the crab, walk

3. Comments and Responses

sideways and never go nowhere, or we can take a step forward and face the future head on. Because the only way you're going to do it is by being bold, and that's what our pioneer forefathers did before in the past.

I say for security it is the best because it does give us -- it gives us a way to implement the security in which baggages are checked and individuals are also checked.

I will make my comment short because I'm not a public speaker. From the past, my history, I was a construction worker, and before that I was a boxer.

So anyway, I thank you for your opportunity to give me this chance to speak.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHO00007 Barrera, Peter

Local Union 250

8/12/2003

SPHO00007-1

Comment:

Yes. My name is Peter Barrera B- a- r- e- r- a. I live at 1908 Belmont Lanes, Redondo Beach, California. I'm a fifth-generation Californian.

I've been here -- I mean, my family -- all my life. And when I'm -- I'm a member of the organization of the Local 250. I'm a business organizer for refrigeration and air-conditioning.

The -- one of the reasons that I'm here to speak is I was just talking to a person, Richard Slausson, and it kind of reminds me of the airports that I've been to in the past. I've been to Orlando where they have people-movers, and it was easier for us to get -- I've been into Dulles where there was people-movers. I've been to Denver, Colorado where my son goes to school at. It's people-movers. It's time for (inaudible) people-movers, and for security-wise it would be the best. I mean, I'm for it. Like I said, I live in the area. My family lives in the area, and I want to stay in the area. So I'm for this.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHMP00001 Lau, David

City of Monterey Park

8/13/2003

SPHMP00001-1

Comment:

My name is David Lau, Mayor of the City of Monterey Park; 320 West Newmark Avenue, Monterey Park, California.

The City of Monterey Park is extremely disappointed with the Supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report, LAX Master Plan. This document shares the same deficiencies and problems as the January 18, 2001 Draft EIS/ EIR document that proposed the first three Alternatives, A, B and C. L. A. World Airports and the Aviation Administration once again failed to address impacts to the west San Gabriel Valley community that is currently suffering from severe negative impacts from the LAX operations.

Our citizens submitted comments to the January 18, '01 draft document and voiced our concerns regarding absence of remedy of the impacts to outlying areas.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments AL00051-1 through AL00051-97 regarding comments on the Draft EIS/EIR submitted by the City of Monterey Park.

SPHMP00001-2

Comment:

In regard to Alternative D, Monterey Park is clearly concerned with the proposed changes to the airport that will bring about larger aircraft and a disproportionate increase to the number of approaches to the north runway complex.

The city appreciates LAWA's efforts to reduce a number of aircraft operations by encouraging the use of larger wide body aircraft. However, the louder noise associated with the larger aircraft will not offset the benefit of lesser traffic. Our community cannot tolerate the noise level generated by LAX operation at 81 decibels. How are we expected to live with an estimated 81 decibels or even higher noise levels. Thank you very much for your attention.

Response:

Comment noted. Proposed changes with larger aircraft are anticipated to operate with or without Alternative D. The No Action/No Project Alternative for 2015 forecasts 706 proposed daily heavy aircraft operations. Additionally, all proposed build alternatives for 2015 show an increase in heavy aircraft operations with Alternative D showing the smallest increase with 643 proposed daily heavy aircraft operations when compared to 1996 Baseline (352 operations) and Year 2000 Conditions (353 operations). Table S8, 2015 Runway Utilization Percentages-Alternative D of Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report shows that 40.6 percent of the arrivals are forecast to land on the north complex, whereas, 51.1 percent of the landings are forecast to land on the south runway complex. Thus, the south complex is anticipated to receive more arrivals than the north complex.

In May 1998 LAWA's Noise Management Bureau did perform an aircraft noise impact analysis and it was determined that 10 percent of the noise events collected were greater than 70 dB Lmax and only a few exceeded 80 dB Lmax. The Monterey Park area falls well beyond the location of significant CNEL levels. A grid analysis at the location indicates that the noise levels in the Monterey Park area average approximately 34 CNEL. Additionally, single event impacts are addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Responses to Comments AL00051-3 and AL00051-4 regarding aircraft noise over Monterey Park. Please also see Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2, regarding relationship between traffic levels and noise levels and TR-N-6.3, regarding relationship between aircraft size and noise levels.

SPHMP00002 Eng, Mike

City of Monterey Park

8/13/2003

SPHMP00002-1

Comment:

Yes. My name Mike Eng; 712 Baton Way in Monterey Park. Thank you very much for having your hearing in the beautiful City of Monterey Park. This is a residential community of about 64,000 people.

We have a median age that is higher than the county, which means that we have a lot of seniors that live here. We also have four school districts, which means we also have a lot of young people and a lot of students.

As an elected official I can tell you that Monterey Park was founded about almost 90 years ago by people that came here to escape underground pollution. We're very concerned now by above-ground pollution. And that's why we're here today.

I understand, as an elected official, the difficulty of balancing various economic health and safety factors, but let me tell you where our residents come down on this issue.

3. Comments and Responses

First of all, we are very concerned that Plan D continues the lack of monitoring for the cities east of Vermont. We feel that by not having permanent monitoring instruments in these eastern-most cities, that this deprives us of the right to give you the data that you need to know about the negative impact of noise levels.

Currently noise assessment levels for cities that are east of Vermont Avenue where there is no monitoring equipment is based on radar data that is fed into a computer for purposes of mathematical modeling. The problem is that mathematical modeling, while looking good on paper, does not take into account single effect noise levels that could be as high as 81 decibels, as was caused here in Monterey Park. By not taking into account single effect noise levels that could be caused by aircraft as low -- that are 1,900 feet above our city is similar to saying that Cal Tech should not report to earthquake data because there was only one earthquake that year and they required two to have mathematical modeling.

So what is it that we want? We would like to have a realtime, realistic monitoring system that puts actual monitors in our city. That's number one.

Number two, we would like to have studies of the impact of the noise level in our cities that do not have current access to actual noise monitors more frequently than every five years. The last time that we had sound monitoring equipment here in this city and the surrounding areas was five years ago. We don't feel that the data that's taken every five years and fed into a computer along with modeling gives you the type of data that you need to make the decisions about such issues as threshold levels and frequency of flights and modification of runways.

So in conclusion, we would like to have more representation, not less. It's one thing that noise will make us deaf. But when your procedures make us speechless and muzzle our voices by not having the data, that is not fair.

Response:

Comment noted. The California Airport Noise Regulations require that public airports in California prepare a map each quarter indicating the noise exposure condition for the previous twelve months. LAWA's Noise Management Division relies extensively on the airport's noise monitoring system (26 permanent noise monitoring microphones) and the aircraft operations monitoring system for tracking runway use, flight path utilization, daily distribution of flights, frequency of operations that occur during that calendar year. Extending microphones further east will not result in an extended noise impact area. Please see Topical Responses TR-N-1 Noise Modeling Approach, and TR-N-2, Single Event Noise and CNEL Differences.

The commentor is correct in describing the altitude differences present in Monterey Park. Currently, aircraft directed to land on the north runway complex at LAX fly over the area at 2,500 feet MSL (approximately 1,700 feet above the ground), while those directed to land on the south runways fly over the area at 3,500 feet MSL (approximately 2,700 feet above the ground). Air Traffic Control management has begun to evaluate modifications of the approaches to the north and south runway complexes to increase aircraft altitude over Monterey Park by 2,500 feet for north approaches and 500 feet for south approaches. These actions would result in noise level decreases of between two and eight decibels on the ground. This is a long-term solution and will require a redesign of other terminal airspace and those changes to the airspace structure are beyond the scope of this EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3.5, Effect of elevation on noise contours.

While Monterey Park does experience aircraft overflights and SEL levels can reach 81 decibels, it is located outside the limits of the 65 CNEL contour and therefore any potential noise impacts are considered to be below a level of significance. In May 1998 LAWA's Noise Management Bureau did perform an aircraft noise impact analysis and it was determined that 10 percent of the noise events collected were greater than 70 dB Lmax and only a few exceeded 80 dB Lmax. The area falls well beyond the location of significant CNEL levels. A grid analysis at the location indicates that the noise levels in the Monterey park area average approximately 34 CNEL. Additionally, single event impacts are addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHMP00003 Venti, Benjamin

City of Monterey Park

8/13/2003

SPHMP00003-1

Comment:

Yes. Good evening Mr. Kessler and Mr. Ritchie and facilitator. My name is Benjamin Frank Venti. Benjamin and Frank. Venti is spelled V, as in Victor, e- n- t- i.

First of all, I've lived in Monterey Park for about 40 years. I have seen the impacts and heard the impacts and felt the impacts of these aircrafts that continue to come over.

I'm a little concerned about the fact that we -- one of the things I read outside here on your criterias was criteria number 8, which says "To minimize the environmental impacts of the surrounding communities." I think that's what we're trying to do.

But I also read a letter dated November 8, 2001 that was sent to you in regards to our concerns. And let me just read some of the headings of these concerns. I don't think they've been addressed and we're concerned about that because now what's going to happen with the wide body aircrafts, they are going to actually come further east, but we are east. We are east of LAX. They are going to drop down and come further and it's going to cause some very -- noise concerns to us.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor is partially correct in his reference to criteria number 8 that is listed on Planning and Development Criteria for Alternative D poster board that he saw at the public hearing. Objective number 8 reads as follows: Minimize environmental impacts to surrounding communities. The November 11, 2001, letter to which the commentor is referring came from the City of Monterey Park providing comments on the Draft EIS/EIR. All comments will be addressed as part of the Final EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment SPHMP0001-2 regarding flights over the Monterey Park area. Additionally, noise impacts are addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHMP00003-2

Comment:

The air quality impacts, the noise impacts, the human health impacts, the traffic impacts. That's another thing I don't see you addressing.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHMP00003-3

Comment:

And that is the fact that with all this cargo being brought into LAX, we are going to have an increase of truck traffic coming from the Alameda corridor and that whole area of the airport. I think it's -- it's a big concern for us because most of those freeways come right through Monterey Park. So the actual traffic issues are a real problem.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHSP00017-3 regarding cargo truck traffic. There should not be a notable increase in truck trips from the Alameda Corridor, since the Alameda Corridor primarily accommodates cargo coming out of the Port of Los Angeles via rail. That type of heavy cargo is not the type of cargo generally associated with air travel. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

SPHMP00003-4

Comment:

And the environmental justice. Let me just explain one thing to you. We are basically a minority city. We're adjacent to East Los Angeles, a heavily minority area also. And we just kind of feel that we're being pushed with all this aircraft coming over there as opposed to wanting to deal with Palmdale, wanting to use that more frequently, wanting to get -- to stop the people in Orange County from being -- from stopping the FAA from putting in an airport at the El Toro facility. I think it's very important that this should stop. You're the Federal Government. You should be able to have some impact on these people and not let them push it over here just because we happen to be a more minority area and a impoverished area in this area here.

Response:

Comment noted. Environmental justice was addressed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting data and analyses in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The environmental justice analysis was prepared in compliance with Executive Order 12898 and in general accord with the guidance provided in DOT Order 5610.2. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding a regional approach to meeting demand.

SPHMP00003-5

Comment:

So in conclusion, I would like to say that in reading this, in looking at -- and we haven't really digested the new environmental impact. It doesn't seem like you've had covered the areas that we're greatly concerned with. So we ask that you consider that. And I understand that the Los Angeles World Airports is trying to push the cargo facility -- cargo traffic into the Palmdale/ Ontario and all these other airports. We appreciate that. We would like you to continue pushing for that. We thank you very much. By the way, welcome to the City of Monterey Park.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments above. In addition, please see Response to Comment PC00381-12 and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring cargo operations to Ontario Airport and Palmdale Airport, respectively. LAX Master Plan Alternative D, the LAWA staff-preferred alternative, is designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity, including cargo activity, comparable to the No Action/No Project Alternative.

SPHMP00004 Johnson, Larry

None Provided

8/13/2003

SPHMP00004-1

Comment:

Hi. I'm Larry Johnson, J- o- h- n- s- o- n. I live at 8203 Owens Street, Buena Park, California.

First of all, I would like to say that it is a beautiful presentation out there. That alternative is a beautiful facility to add to our region. One reason I believe that it is important is that people, especially lately, they've been talking about the loss of jobs leaving the area and trying to attract new business to our area. One of the first things anyone interested in starting a business here is going to see is the airport. That is our face to the world. What they've seen for the last five or ten years hasn't been a real pretty face. It's been a lot of confusion, a lot of -- well, you know, it just needs to -- it's a problem that needs to

be alleviated. It's a problem that needs to be addressed. There is a lot of other -- you know, it's just part of the regional planning for our airports.

LAX is just one facility, but it's the main facility we have right now. It's the one with the infrastructure in place. It's the one that can get things going the soonest. What we have here is a very good plan. One thing I've been reading about is people talking about the \$ 9-billion-dollar bid and how that can escalate.

It seems that whenever a construction project comes up, people compare it to the Boston Big Dig Artery. You know, it bloomed from probably four times of what it originally cost. And I say, why compare it to that? Why can't we compare it to the Gold Line, for instance, the project that came in virtually on time and on budget. All that matters is good management and good workforce. We have both available.

In conclusion, you know, the project, it's not like the Boston Project. It's something that's very doable. There is no magic about it. It's something we have the technology to do. We have the manpower. And we just need to get some inertia behind it and get some decisions made. Because to do nothing would be -- that wouldn't be the legacy to leave behind.

Response:

Comment noted.

**SPHMP00005 MacJennett, Patti Los Angeles Convention and 8/13/2003
Visitors Bureau**

SPHMP00005-1

Comment:

Hi. I'm Patti MacJennett. That's M- a- c- J- e- n- n- e- t- t, Senior Vice President of Marketing with the Los Angeles Convention and Visitor's Bureau.

I'm here to speak in support of the LAX Master Plan. Our organization represents the tourism industry in Los Angeles County.

Tourism is the second largest industry. It employs over 240,000 people in L. A. County. Last year the tourism industry, the 23 million visitors that came to Los Angeles injected \$ 11.8 billion dollars into our economy.

L. A. is a strong position as a travel destination, a large measure due to LAX's international gateway status providing visitors direct access from all over the world.

Today airports and cities are fiercely competing for visitors and the lucrative visitor dollar. This is particularly true of the very high-spending international visitor.

And today tour operators and travel agents, as well as today's travelers, have choices. They have lots of choices and they are choosing airports that are safe, modernized and convenient.

We know that the Master Plan Option D has hundreds of pages of details which are going to be greatly discussed. But I'm here to ask you that in all of these discussions the vision of this plan does not get lost and that three important points that we feel this plan addresses do not get lost. And that is that we build a safe and secure facility. That is obviously critical on all dimensions; that we design an airport that maintains L. A.'s status as an international gateway. Either we build a user-friendly facility or our customers, our visitors are going to go elsewhere.

And, lastly, this plan does address the need that there must be a regional solution to Southern California's demand for air travel.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHMP00006 Humber, Daniel

Ironworkers Local 433

8/13/2003

SPHMP00006-1

Comment:

Daniel Humber, H- u- m- b- e- r. That's 2220 Via Corona, Montebello, California.

I've been a resident for California all my life. I grew up with LAX. Since September 11th, you know, picking up friends and family members at the airport with security issues, it was very inconvenient when we had to go to that parking lot and be bussed in because of a high alert status. Now if we get a high alert status, we're going to go back to the bussing and parking lot, outlying parking lots.

The facility is outdated. It was designed for smaller planes originally. They got the big planes in there now that barely fit on the runways. It's not safe for travel. And like a lot of people mentioned, you know, people look at us. Denver put in a beautiful airport.

I'm a member of Ironworkers local 433. A lot of union members went up there and worked on that airport. We have plenty of skilled craftsman here in town that could build a beautiful facility there. It needs to be upgraded. It's outdated. It's not safe. It's not secure for people who want to come to Los Angeles. You could see international -- you know, we have a lot of airports around us. And it's true, they are worried about cargo coming into LAX. Well, the cargo could be diverted to all these other airports, but we've got to focus on bringing people in and out of this airport.

I've traveled a lot. I've been to a lot of different airports. We're just way behind. I don't know how many -- you have A, B, C and D. How far do we have to go down the alphabet before we get going? I've been here two years ago. When are we going to do something about it and quit talking about it? Get something where everybody could agree on and get this airport modernized and safe. Because when I was in CTAG airport, they had the shuttle system that worked fine. I've been in a lot of airports. We're behind. And something has got to be done with that airport. It's outdated. Something needs to be done there.

I just feel that Los Angeles is -- we have lost a lot of industry here. People -- I don't think people really look at Los Angeles. I think San Francisco right now has done a lot of work on their airport. Up in Portland they've done a lot of work. Everybody has been doing work on the airport. What about us? When are we going to get the ball rolling on our airport and make it attractive for businesses, travelers, people who want to come? We have a lot to offer here in California. There is a lot of places people like to come and see.

But in conclusion, I would just hope we could get through all this, what we need to do, and make everybody happy and modernize this airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHMP00007 Dahlem, Walter

UA Local 345

8/13/2003

SPHMP00007-1

Comment:

Yes. My name is Walter Dahlem. Last name is spelled D- a- h- l- e- m. I'm the President of UA Local 345 Landscape & Irrigation Fitters of Southern California, Division of Plumbers and Pipe Fitters of Southern California.

I've attended the last two meetings, Monday night and last night, heard a lot of pros, heard some cons. And all I can say is my Local, and I suppose along with the rest of the Southern California Pipe Trades, would fully endorse Amendment D and the work it brings for the construction trade and also the

infrastructure that goes with it, to bring up the whole entire economy of Southern California, particularly L. A.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHMP00008 Morris, Philip

**Bricklayers, Stonemasons,
Marble Masons Union**

8/13/2003

SPHMP00008-1

Comment:

Hello. My name is Philip Morris. Last name is spelled M- o, double R, i- s. I'm the President, Secretary & Treasurer of the Bricklayers and Stonemasons, Marble Masons Union in Los Angeles.

Some of my brothers and sisters here have already pointed out some -- or I just want to echo their remarks. Patty here -- I guess Patty left -- about the tourism and the Convention Center Downtown. Everybody is worried about bringing conventions. We want to build new hotels around staples arena there and draw big conventions here, like Chicago, New York City and the likes.

If the people can't get here, an antiquated airport like we have here in the City of Los Angeles compared to the rest of them, we're lagging way behind. We've got to get this airport going, not only the construction hours, the man-hours worked, and the economy that the brother said of dollars spent by the workers. We've got to get things rolling and get it going for the whole survival of Los Angeles in itself. The economy is in a bad shape, and this will be a boom to everybody.

I can't believe somebody would oppose this strictly on the noise factor. I never met anybody that went deaf from the noise of an aircraft going overhead. I've lived here 40 years. I've lived with the airplanes -- I live right here down the street in Baldwin Park. Solely for the noise factor I think that's a misnomer there. There is no basis for opposing something just because of the noise.

I say, let's get on with it and get going in the right direction for the City of Los Angeles and all the residents here.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHMP00009 Ferruccio, John

Pipe Trades Local Union 250

8/13/2003

SPHMP00009-1

Comment:

Thank you. Good evening. My name is John Ferruccio. That's F- e- r- r- u- c- c- i- o. And presently I am residing in the City of Gardena. I've been there all my life.

I'd like to go on the record in support of Alternative D this evening. As I've said, my wife and I have been life-long citizens of Los Angeles. And we've seen quite a few changes in the city, most of them very good. And I think we should continue to grow.

Currently I am a member of the Pipe Trades Local Union 250 of the South Bay area. And I worked 22 years in the field. And presently in the last five years I've been a union organizer in my trade. And I feel that this would be -- what a better way to promote my industry to not only the people and the young people that we are encouraging to get into the trade, but also people that are coming from other states getting involved in our trade to get them involved in something. And this would be a great way to start with a big project that the LAX proposal would adopt.

3. Comments and Responses

I believe the long-awaited renovations for LAX are overdue. And once again, I definitely am in favor of Mayor Hahn's proposal.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHMP00010 Hossan, Carole

None Provided

8/13/2003

SPHMP00010-1

Comment:

Carole Hossan, Westchester, right by LAX.

I would like to say, as I said at the other place, I and many other people in Westchester would like to see a beautiful new airport in Palmdale where they have the room for it and where they want it. LAX is surrounded by communities. It's a cramped space. It's at its limit really, although supposedly its capacity is much more even without renovations. But this plan has said that it is going to be limited to 78 million annual passengers. Well, there is no realistic way to do that.

Response:

Comment noted. Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR discusses the future (2015) airport activity levels projected for the No Action/No Project Alternative and for each of the four build alternatives. Described therein is the basis for how the future capacity level was determined for each alternative. Included within the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is a discussion of how Alternative D is designed to serve a future airport activity level of 78.9 million annual passengers (MAP), which is comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

SPHMP00010-2

Comment:

I just wanted to briefly say about the noise. Part of LAX's goal should be being a good neighbor and trying to accommodate people in Monterey Park with their noise concerns. And we, of course, have definite noise concerns living right next to it. And our sound monitors are not close to where we live. In Westchester we would like more sound monitors and more pollution monitors to see exactly what it is we are breathing.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPHMP00001-2 regarding flights over the Monterey Park area. The California Airport Noise Regulations require that public airports in California prepare each quarter a map indicating the noise exposure condition for the previous twelve months. This report relies extensively on the information from the airport's noise monitoring system (25 permanent noise monitoring microphones) and the aircraft operations monitoring system for tracking runway use, flight path utilization, daily distribution of flights, and frequency of operations that occur during that calendar year. Of the 25 monitors there are six noise monitoring sites located in the Westchester area. Mitigation measure MM-LU-5 has been added since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR to enhance the effectiveness of existing monitoring and to reduce the impacts of high noise levels on noise sensitive uses. In the South Coast Air Basin, SCAQMD is responsible for gathering and evaluating data to determine compliance with the ambient air quality standards which have been established to protect the public health and welfare. To achieve this objective, SCAQMD maintains a network of air quality monitoring stations throughout the South Coast Air Basin. These monitoring stations are sited to provide a defined spatial scale of representativeness to achieve specific monitoring goals. The monitoring station which represents the urban spatial scale defined by SCAQMD as the Southwest Coastal portion of Los Angeles County is located in Hawthorne, roughly 2.4 miles southeast of the LAX Theme Building. (The Southwest Coastal air monitoring area comprises that portion of Los Angeles County roughly bounded by Playa Del Rey in the northwest corner, Inglewood in the northeast corner, San Pedro in the southeast corner, and Rancho Palos Verdes in the southwest corner.) As noted in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.3.4 and in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.3.3, data from the Hawthorne monitoring station were used in evaluating the environmental baseline

ambient air quality. The commentor should contact SCAQMD to request air monitoring data representative of a neighborhood or smaller spatial scale (e.g., Westchester) than that provided by the Hawthorne data. Additionally, please see Response to Comment PC01917-9 regarding air quality monitoring.

SPHMP00010-3

Comment:

Now, on another note, I'll read you some poems that I wrote for the occasion. 78.9 million annual passengers, the mayor at his last -- at this hearing even said 78, but we've been seeing newspaper articles, and I believe in the EIS 78.9. Well, that's a lot -- 900,000 extra people than we're promised, which is a lot when you live right next to the airport. So I made that point. So I won't read that one.

But another thing is they were saying about the larger planes, "Fewer gates limit MAP. Are you so sure? Bigger planes bring more people. Fewer gates, it's true, but remaining gates will be changed for larger planes."

So we're not too sure about this 78 MAP. That's why a lot of surrounding cities signed onto regionalism. So we would like you to really be real. You've had Palmdale and Ontario for decades. Let's do some creative building out there and not expand LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPHMP00010-1 regarding the fact that Alternative D is designed to serve a future airport capacity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and Response to Comment SPHF0001-1 regarding the fact that Alternative D is not an expansion plan. Please also see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels, Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, and Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

SPHMP00011 Robles, Luis

Laborers Local 300

8/13/2003

SPHMP00011-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Luis Robles. My address is 117 West Victoria Avenue in Montebello. I'm also a fellow representative and President of Laborers Local 300. We represent approximately 7,000 construction craft laborers in the City of L. A.

I'm here today to voice my support for the LAX upgrade, or Alternative D Plan by Mayor Hahn. By upgrading the existing conditions at LAX, you will not only make flight out of L. A. more secure, you will add millions of dollars to the local economy through the jobs that will be created by this project. You will help -- you will also help business survive by providing income to hard-working families that will also spend that same money in their local area. They will have the ability to visit restaurants, go to shopping centers, go to entertainment, all that money that will go around and still be spent here in the cities.

The people that will be working in the construction phase from all over L. A. County, individuals will take pride in what they do.

The tragic events of 9-11 was a rude awakening for Americans. It is our responsibility to redesign this airport and make it safer for future generations. Alternative D provides multiple layers of security that will make it more difficult for such tragic events to repeat themselves.

By not taking action, roadway congestion will continue to grow increasing the possibilities of explosive vehicles with the ability to reach the airfields. It doesn't take much to realize if we all drive down Sepulveda, that all that stops any explosive vehicle to go down is a sign that says "No Explosive Vehicles Allowed." It will make it a lot safer.

3. Comments and Responses

For those of us who reside in the east side, we have a difficult choice when we fly. Our choices are LAX, Burbank, Long Beach or Ontario. They are all very difficult to get to during rush hour.

The proposal to build more fly-away stations is necessary for the east side. This will make LAX more appealing. For me, personally, the ability to leave my car and take a tram to the airport will give me that extra convenience when flying.

I thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the 7,000 laborers we represent and hope that our support for the Alternative D will help make your decision a little easier.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHSP00001 Mackenbach, Fred City of Palos Verdes Estates 8/14/2003

SPHSP00001-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Fred Mackenbach, 732 Via Somonte, Palos Verdes Estates, California. I'm on the City Council of Palos Verdes Estates.

I have just two points that I would like to make. The figure of 40 million, maybe 42 million sticks in my mind as what the airport was designed to do back in the '80s. If my memory and the figures I was given are correct, we got up to almost 68 million before 9-11. We're told that the capacity of the current airport is roughly 78 or 79 million.

Now, when somebody tells me they are going to basically tear the airport apart and completely reconfigure it and say they are going to hold the passenger count to 78 or 79 million, it is very difficult to believe those figures based on past history. That's point number one.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding past and present activity levels at LAX. Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Chapter 3 of the Draft Master Plan Addendum provide the basis for how Alternative D was designed and determined to serve a future (2015) airport activity level of 78.9 MAP.

SPHSP00001-2

Comment:

Point number two. I've been attending the meetings that were initially at the FAA and now at -- in conjunction with the airport, the noise group, and the noise continues over the peninsula. The noise is not addressed in the proposal. And I am always taken back by the fact that we are positioned uniquely, the airport is positioned uniquely along the ocean.

I was looking at the video earlier. And in the lower right-hand corner it showed this airplane taking off. And here is this wide span of the Pacific. All they've got to do is go out farther and higher before they come back over. And we're just sick and tired of the turboprops. Those things are not being addressed either in the proposal or apart from the proposal.

So it makes it very difficult when somebody comes with a plan and -- that a lot of people feel is disguised as security. And I'm not against security. I'm for security. But the issues that are really driving people crazy and impacting values of homes, being concerned at night, are not being addressed.

I thank you for listening to me very politely. And I tried to be as right to the point as I could.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts are addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are

3. Comments and Responses

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. Additionally, mitigation measures have been developed for all build alternatives to address early turns and nighttime easterly departures. These are identified in Section 4.1.8, Mitigation Measures, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PHM00002-3 regarding why the Palos Verdes Peninsula is not identified in the noise impact area and flights over the South Bay. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1, regarding property value impacts and Response to Comment PHM00014-2 regarding nighttime easterly departures circling over the South Bay area.

SPHSP00002 Molina, Mike

Councilwoman Janice Hahn

8/14/2003

SPHSP00002-1

Comment:

Good evening. I'm Mike Molina, 200 North Spring Street, Los Angeles. I am a Chief of Staff for Councilwoman Janice Hahn.

And I'm here this evening merely just to offer my welcome to the airport staff and Mr. Kessler, yourself as well, to say welcome to San Pedro. And the councilwoman wholeheartedly endorses this public comment period. And, Mr. Kessler, so you know, she also supports the extension of the public hearing process to 120 days because she is a firm believer that the more opportunity we can provide the public to provide public comment and opinions regarding this -- this plan, the more sound and the better the plan will be at the very end.

So I'm just here to offer a welcome from the councilwoman of the district that we're in this evening, and most especially provide a welcome to the many people who have gathered here this evening and encourage all of you to provide comment either through written form or verbal form this evening about this most important project in the life of the city now and in the next decade. So once again, thank you and welcome.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA and FAA extended the public comment period on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to a total of 120 days closing on November 7, 2003. In addition to nine public hearings held in August, three public hearings were held in October, 2003.

SPHSP00003 Abbott, Dwight

City of Palos Verdes Estates

8/14/2003

SPHSP00003-1

Comment:

Thank you. My name is Dwight Abbott; address 1825 Via Estudillo, Palos Verdes Estates, California. Just another quick background before -- well, okay.

I have done a review and I found three important areas. Number one, passenger convenience. Number two, safety and security, and number three, the cost.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments SPHSP00003-2 through SPHSP00003-5 below.

SPHSP00003-2

Comment:

First passenger convenience. I find the Master Plan imposes great inconveniences on the passengers that will use it. The FAA now recognizes passenger convenience as an important airport design factor and defines it in terms of the time to move the passenger from the parking lot of the departure airport to the parking lot of the arrival airport, not simply airline gate to airline gate. That's the old definition. The

3. Comments and Responses

LAX Master Plan will greatly increase the parking lot to parking lot time required over the current LAX configuration.

The proposed Ground Transportation Center and the Intermodal Transportation Center are nearly a mile removed from the terminal area. They are connected via a train called a people mover that passengers must ride to the terminal. Passengers must carry any carry-on baggage and other packages on the train. The current LAX configuration imposes no such inconvenience.

Response:

The content of this comment is very similar to comment SPC00036-2; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00036-2.

SPHSP00003-3

Comment:

Safety and security. Aircraft collisions during taxi take-off and landing can result in more casualties than any terrorist attack. I believe that the proposed reconfigured runways are an improvement. However, I believe that the proposal to move the runway to five left only 50 feet to the south is short-sighted. Moving it farther south would provide greater aircraft separation, less weight turbulence, interference between runways and improved safety.

Response:

Moving Runway 7R25L south 50 feet is to gain enough separation for constructing a Group V center taxiway between the two parallel runways in the south airfield complex. The purpose of the center taxiway is to enhance safe aircraft operations and reduce the potential for runway incursions. The lack of this center taxiway slows the arrival stream by requiring time-consuming coordination of runway crossings. While these conditions do not create an unsafe environment, they do add to airfield congestion as operations increase. Providing a center taxiway between the two parallel runways allows aircraft to queue and maneuver without blocking runway operations. The contributing factors leading to most runway incursions are thereby eliminated. The center taxiway in south complex is designed to accommodate Group V aircraft and to provide operational benefit and to minimize noise impacts. The majority of the aircraft operating at LAX are Group V or smaller and the separation provided in the south airfield complex meets FAA Group V aircraft design standards. With a few New Large Aircraft (NLA) anticipated in the future, the proposed center taxiway in the north airfield complex would be designed to accommodate FAA Design Group VI, also referred to as New Large Aircraft, or NLA.

SPHSP00003-4

Comment:

The location of the new rental car facility very near the end of the newly positioned runway to four left is unsafe. An aircraft landing short of the runway or not successfully taking off when the runways are configured for easterly departure will risk impacting the proposed rental car facility.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00036-4.

SPHSP00003-5

Comment:

The Master Plan puts high importance on security, as it should, but it includes several factors that appear to reduce security. Centralizing passenger check-in at the proposed Ground Transportation Center provides a single location that if incapacitated will shutdown entire airport operations.

Similarly, the train, the people mover, is another single point failure that can shutdown airport operations. A small bomb, a bomb scare, a mechanical failure, even protesters on the track to bring the entire airport operations to a halt.

3. Comments and Responses

An independent RAND Corporation study that you're probably aware of that looked at security afforded by the Master Plan found that the proposed changes would not increase security.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SAR00006-6 regarding concerns related to the GTC and the APM. Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding the RAND Corporation issue paper.

SPHSP00003-6

Comment:

I have additional comments. I have submitted a written report. Those additional comments concerning cost and proposals for a better approach are included in that written comment.

Response:

Comment noted. The referenced submittal by the commentator is SPC00036; please see the responses to comment letter SPC00036.

SPHSP00004 Ackerson, Beverly None Provided 8/14/2003

SPHSP00004-1

Comment:

I'm Beverly Ackerson, 27129 Spring Creek Road, Rancho Palos Verdes. Down a little. I have two items. One is that the residents on the Palos Verdes peninsula are not included in your Master Plan, yet, we are impacted by turboprops and jets that go over us. And the FAA has been to our home. Tracon has been to our homes. And they state, yes, we do have the noise problem. And the recommendation of the South Bay Task Force by Donna Vickers was to move the turboprops off the peninsula and reroute them. They would reroute them around the peninsula out from LAX.

The jets, we recently have a lot more jets going over the top of us. And we are getting calls from across the peninsula. It isn't one isolated area. We do have ravines and canyons that traps the noise and the vibration from that noise.

So we really wonder why we are not included in the Master Plan when you impact -- when LAX impacts us so much and keeps us awake at night with the eastern departures going to the Asian countries.

Response:

Comment noted. As a result of the concerns in the South Bay, two of the twelve, Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Public Hearings were held in the South Bay Area. August 14, 2003, in San Pedro in which the commentator provided her comments and on August 20, 2003, in Manhattan Beach. Additionally, between August 6, 2003, and October 22, 2003, the Review/Consideration and Comment on the Aircraft Noise Elements of the LAX Master Plan Alternative D and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was placed on seven LAX Airport/Community Noise Roundtable Meeting agendas for review and comments. Please see Response to Comment PHM00002-3 regarding why the Palos Verdes Peninsula is not identified in the noise impact area and Response to Comment PHM00014-2 regarding nighttime easterly departures circling over the South Bay area.

SPHSP00004-2

Comment:

And we've heard reasons of being overweight aircraft, the slight incline going to the west that is easier for them to take off to the east. But the pilots themselves at a meeting told us that it is because of curfews that they take off at that time from LAX going to Australia, Japan and the Asian countries. I think the curfew issue needs to be addressed. And I would like to see LAX recommend to Congress that they do look into the curfew issue.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00225-3 regarding easterly nighttime operations by foreign carriers. The commentor is correct in identifying that on occasion takeoffs during over-ocean procedures by heavily loaded cargo aircraft bound to Asian destinations will depart to the east. This is to take advantage of runway slope and length characteristics provided by an easterly takeoff on the south runway complex. This 0.3 percent west to east downward slope accounts for a 27 foot difference on Runway 7L/25R and a 23 foot difference on Runway 7R/25L. 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. These operations were occasioned by specific wind conditions that precipitated pilot requests to deviate from the noise abatement procedures to ensure safe operation of the aircraft. For additional information on the Airport Layout Plan please see the related ALP Appendix of the Final EIS/EIR. The curfew issue has been addressed by Congress with the passage of the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990. Not only did this act phase out the older noisier Stage 2 aircraft over 75,000 lbs., but it also implemented the 14 CFR Part 161 Notice of Approval of Airport Noise and Access Restrictions. LAWA has recently initiated an RFQ to Prepare a FAR Part 161 Study for Los Angeles International Airport. LAWA is seeking to establish a partial curfew at LAX that would prohibit the easterly departure of all aircraft, with certain exemptions, between the hours of 12:00 Midnight to 6:30 a.m. when LAX is in Over-Ocean Operations. For additional information on the use of a Part 161 Study as a mitigation measure, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-4.1-regarding additional mitigation actions suggested for flight activity, TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

SPHSP00004-3

Comment:

The second thing is, when -- I just looked briefly. I haven't looked at all of the total plan yet, but briefly looking at the way the people are moved around the airport, I think is a safety issue. I don't like to see so many people in one spot in the center of the airport that then are going to go like spokes to the airlines. I think that's a set-up that could be a very big problem.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHSP00005 Jones, Lynn

None Provided

8/14/2003

SPHSP00005-1

Comment:

5511 Eau Claire Drive, Rancho Palos Verdes.

Number one, security. From all the indications that I've seen via the internet and also here, the security looks like it only takes place at the CTA. People do not seem to be screened, or their luggages not screened prior to placing it in a plane or moving to the CTA, which is in the middle of the airport. This seems like it is a dangerous place so close to the airplane slots.

Response:

As addressed in Section 2.2.8, Ground Transportation Center (GTC), of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum, passengers would be subjected to a first level security screening process at the GTC. The functions of the GTC can also be found in the same section of the document. In addition, both departing (Skycap checked) and arriving (re-checked from the CTA) baggage would move between the GTC and the CTA via secured baggage tunnels. A common-use outbound baggage sort system is anticipated to be located on the lower level of the new CTA terminals to provide 100 percent EDS baggage screening.

SPHSP00005-2

Comment:

Number two, in the EIR/ EIS Report are they addressing other than noise the following: Pollution from aircraft; two, easterly flights; three, curfews on foreign carriers.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts, including emissions from aircraft in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding easterly operations at nighttime. LAX does not have curfews for foreign or domestic carriers.

SPHSP00005-3

Comment:

Number three, why is Congress not insisting on an EPA and the AQMD be involved in assessing the EIR and the EIS?

Response:

The USEPA and SCAQMD, along with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), have been directly involved in the preparation and evaluation of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR. These agencies have had direct involvement in the preparation of the various protocols used in the air quality analysis, including the general conformity determination. The agencies also commented on the Draft EIS/EIR and/or the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. USEPA's comments are identified as comment letters AF00001 and SAF00005; CARB's comments are identified as comment letter AS00003; SCAQMD's comments are identified as comment letters AR00004 and SAR00004; and SCAG's comments are identified as comment letters AR00001 and SAR00005.

SPHSP00005-4

Comment:

Since the aircraft taking off at LAX or any other airport, a jet, is like setting fire to a gas station. That's the pollution that you're getting in the air. And I think that the pollution should be addressed.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address 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.

SPHSP00005-5

Comment:

Number four, the EIR, the EIS addresses the noise from jets only, not turboprops.

Response:

Turboprops are addressed in Tables 4, 7, 8, 14, 15, 21, 22, 28 and 29 of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Draft EIS/EIR and Tables S4 and S7 of the Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of Appendix S-C1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHSP00006 Visaleya, Joe

None Provided

8/14/2003

SPHSP00006-1

Comment:

Yeah, Joe Visaleya; 1218 Koleeto, Harbor City.

I have several things I want to present. Number one is, it was brought up by Mr. Abbott about access by the people. Presently we have over 12,000 lineal feet of curb available at the airport for picking up and discharging passengers. The new facility doesn't appear to have that.

Response:

The GTC in Alternative D would provide approximately 14,800 linear feet of curbfront, which is less than the existing 24,000 linear feet (on two levels) provided in the Central Terminal Area (CTA). However, it is believed that the Alternative D curb will be sufficient to meet future needs. In Alternative D, passengers can be picked up and dropped off at either the GTC or the ITC. Furthermore, the existing CTA will continue to accommodate the airport's FlyAway buses. In addition, the proposed Automated People Mover and the Consolidated Rental Car Facility will eliminate the need for the car rental courtesy shuttles and LAWA's airport shuttles which currently travel between the CTA terminals and the remote parking lots. Therefore, the GTC does not have to provide all of the existing curbing length now available in the CTA to adequately accommodate pick-ups and drop-offs.

SPHSP00006-2

Comment:

Secondly on the parking. We have 8,000 parking spaces within 600 feet of the terminal. If you use the center -- using the airport's own figures of 8,000 parking spaces in those structures, and those structures are generally within 600 feet of where you'd be entering the terminal, which means it's going to be very inconvenient.

Response:

Together, the GTC and ITC would incorporate over 16,600 close-in parking spaces, which is much more than the existing CTA, which provides over 9,000 spaces. This parking would be conveniently located to the Automated People Mover stations, with handicapped parking stalls located the closest to the APM stations. In addition, unlike the current CTA, passengers at the GTC would cross between the parking lots and the APM platform at a different level from the vehicular roadways. This is designed to make Alternative D safer and more convenient for pedestrians than the existing airport.

SPHSP00006-3

Comment:

And, thirdly, will we have the same amount of counter space when we arrive at the CTA? Presently you have pretty close to 5,000 lineal feet of counter space. And any of us who fly in and out realize that presently we have to wait in line. If that is made smaller, the length of time that we as passengers will have to wait will be increased.

Response:

Comment noted. Although the terminal counter length has not been determined, the counter length will likely be similar to the existing CTA. As more passengers use remote and internet check-in and common use terminal facilities become more prevalent, check-in counters would likely be more efficient, more convenient and less congested.

SPHSP00006-4

Comment:

And, thirdly, the other thing I wanted to bring up is presently we have about four or five accesses to LAX. You have Sepulveda Boulevard north and south. You've got Lincoln. You've got the 405, the 105, as well as Century.

The way this new system is laid out, we have basically one. We have maybe three accesses. You could come across on Century. You might be able to come across Imperial and then up Aviation, which may not be acceptable, and coming off the 405.

There is -- right now we have so many local streets that we can get on that they can manipulate the traffic and the transportation system. The grid permits us to all get into the airport at a much more easily activity than we do when it's going to all be confined to one small location, the intersection of Aviation and Century, or wherever that intersection is. I wasn't able to ascertain the exact location.

Response:

The two primary locations for airport access would be off the I-405 Freeway at Lennox Boulevard and off the westbound I-105 Freeway between La Cienega Boulevard and Aviation Boulevard. These two access points would be designed to provide direct access to and from the freeway and the proposed on-airport roadways, with much more capacity than simple intersections. In addition, other access points would be provided from eastbound Century Boulevard east of Aviation Boulevard, westbound Imperial Highway west of La Cienega Boulevard, northbound Aviation Boulevard north of Imperial Highway, 111th Street between La Cienega Boulevard and Aviation Boulevard, and southbound La Cienega Boulevard opposite Lennox Boulevard. Considering that the existing CTA has access only from Sepulveda Boulevard and westbound Century Boulevard, the proposed Alternative D access system provides a greater number of options in accessing the airport facilities than exists today.

SPHSP00006-5

Comment:

But these are the things that I think need to be addressed. And as Mr. Abbott pointed out, the FAA is concerned about time from your vehicle to the time of your vehicle at your next destination. And this system that we have here is not going to do it.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPHA00016-3 regarding the Alternative D access plan.

SPHSP00006-6

Comment:

And one other thing. On the safety issue, we talked about this thing of safety. I understood that we were going to be checking in at the outer terminal. And seeing the video today, it looks like we're going to be carrying our bags unsecured to the CTA.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHSP00005-1 regarding unsecured bags.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHSP00007 Cvelbar, Katheryn None Provided

8/14/2003

SPHSP00007-1

Comment:

Katheryn Cvelbar, C- v- e- l- b- a- r, 23530 Arlington Avenue, Torrance.

I actually came here tonight to blast you about what I have been reading in the newspapers about the plans, and what the gentleman was just talking about, having your luggage checked at an outer limit. And upon having the plan explained and shown how it actually would work, I actually like it. I think right now I, myself, I always use lot B for my parking anyway. This seems to be -- and use the shuttle to get to the airport. This seems so much more easier.

I just feel that I think it's a good thing that you have expanded the number of meetings and hearings like this so that the more people who are able to see the plans and actually how they are laid out and how they will work, more people will like it a lot more.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 for a listing of the dates and locations of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Public Hearings and Environmental Justice Workshops.

SPHSP00007-2

Comment:

My only question is that, the plan hinges upon the Manchester Square area being a part of airport property. Is it currently still residential or has all of that been purchased by the airport and is vacant?

Response:

The acquisition in the Manchester Square area is currently underway. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.3 regarding the current status of the acquisition in Manchester Square.

SPHSP00008 Barton, Joel

None Provided

8/14/2003

SPHSP00008-1

Comment:

Good evening, Joel Barton, 833 Airport Boulevard in the city of Los Angeles. I was originally just going to show up here to speak about the good aspect of the creation of good construction paying jobs with this project. But after viewing the video and reading all this material here and going and looking at those boards back there, this is amazing how good this project is going to be for LAX.

I'm a Los Angeles native. LAX looks -- I love this city. It's going to put us in the 21st Century. I like that idea. I liked everything I saw about this. You know, you talk about Orange County and all the other airports, but LAX is the airport.

I like the idea of having everybody take the train in because I take a lot of flights out of LAX. I don't like sitting there waiting for someone to pick me up breathing all the fumes coming from all the cars constantly circling the airport. So I do like that aspect of it. I like the added security. So I just wish to speak in favor of this project.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHSP00009 O'Kane, Johnny

None Provided

8/14/2003

SPHSP00009-1

Comment:

Johnny O'Kane, 3158 Almeria Street, San Pedro.

And I'm a union ironworker. So, of course, I'm in favor of construction. And it just seems to me that progress can't always be in someone else's backyard. And the jobs for us as construction workers would be grand at the time, but overall you're going to have jobs that come off of the work that we do, which will be Californians paying tax in a state that could use some tax money right now. I'm in favor of it 100 percent.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHSP00010 Makoni, Pete

None Provided

8/14/2003

SPHSP00010-1

Comment:

Pete Makoni, 4345 East Rosecrans Avenue, Hawthorne, California.

I'm in favor of this project because it helped all of us here. California and L. A. is a multi-cultural people live here. And the people come from all over. You are all aware if you're going to Dallas, anywhere else the airplanes are modernized. Ours have been built in the 1950s and remodified in 1980s. You all hear about that all the time, the near miss in landing and takeoff, the near miss. The airport is not big enough for the airline flying out and coming in.

Also I like the plan to take the people outside. I fly out of LAX about three or four times a year. And you see how many people gridlock. You hear on the news. It takes you three to four hours since 9-11 to wait on the freeway, Century Boulevard, to wait to get in the airport. And, also, you're going to check in, for safety's sake. That's why I like this plan. And it's good for all people.

I'm a construction worker. I'm a pipe fitter by trade. In ten years I'll be retired. But I look forward to my children and my grandchildren to fly out in a safe place like LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHSP00011 Martin, Terry

Local 250

8/14/2003

SPHSP00011-1

Comment:

Good evening. Terry Martin, 18355 South Figueroa, Gardena. 30-year member of United Association, Local 250 steam and refrigeration pipe fitters, currently serving as union representative representing 5,000 members.

I have a list here of 600 of our members that live within a ten-mile radius of this auditorium. That's not including the family and friends. That's just our members.

And I'll tell you, listening to some of our Rancho Palos Verdes audience, I'm going to have to get into contact with nine of my members that live there and tell them to pay attention to that one commercial

3. Comments and Responses

where the father and son are sitting there and that plane flies overhead, and that piece of plane falls off and he says, "You better get yourself a good realtor. Trust me."

Well, I think this airport, in a lot of cases with most people living in Rancho Palos Verdes, unless it's old money, knew about the airport problem if they had any.

Property values, apparently Newport Beach has more money because they got what they wanted. That's where they turn the engines off when it takes off and they don't have that problem.

I'd like to thank Mayor Hahn for all these different alternatives, including the one that he recently tried to get over there at El Toro, another alternative that was turned down by Orange County.

This is going to create a lot of jobs. And being in construction in which it would be nice to finally go to LAX and walk away from their urinal. In case you forgot to flush, it flushes itself. That's some of the work we do. The heating and cooling, the pipeline work, any relocation work we'll be doing it.

Tonight I have 15 of my members that took their time away from their families to be in attendance. These are members that live in San Pedro or in the surrounding area. They are participating in the public hearing, which we encourage all people to do, take part.

It's not easy getting up to speak, but I'm very proud to be a member of a union, very proud of our mayor, very proud of our airport authority for taking time, very proud of the FAA. And I'm very proud of this new Alternative D. Let's get it done.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHSP00012 Humber, Daniel

Ironworkers Local 433

8/14/2003

SPHSP00012-1

Comment:

I'm Daniel Humber. I reside at 2220 Via Corona, Montebello, California. I'm a union ironworker.

I was on the internet this morning with MSN. And I was really surprised at what I'd seen here. It says five airports to avoid. And it says five airports to avoid, if you can.

" LAX is oppressive, says one traveler."

" I dread it, says another traveler."

It also had another article on five airports to layover, you know. They talked about these airports, you know. And they talked about Orlando Airport. It's the best airport in the United States for a layover, bar none. Easy to find parking isn't a problem. And the terminal is easy -- incredibly user-friendly.

And they went down the list and talked about Denver and they talked about Chicago O'Hare and they talked about Atlanta International. They are talking about how great these airports are. So there is -- we've got five airports that have solved the problems that they had to do to make these things modernized.

It also talked about San Francisco. It's being done right now. It's much better today for what work they have done already. You know, we've got -- we can do the work, you know. We've got a lot of people who are in the business here. We do big projects in this town. And we have a lot of skilled labor that can modernize this airport.

You know, I talked last night in Montebello -- up there in another one up -- on the other one we had last night and talked about the safety issues, you know, especially if they have an alert. We had the alert here. And it was -- it was a mess, that we came into the parking lot and being shuttled into the airport. So we need this -- we need this.

And, also, it talked about the five airports to avoid. It said LAX International. "Friends do not let friends fly into LAX." You know, the circular design needs to be redesigned. LAX is oppressive. It's dingy, dilapidated, noisy, overcrowded, unfriendly and with poor facilities.

You know, I'm embarrassed and I'm a native Californian. I was born in Burbank. This has been my city. I want to be proud of my airport. You know, I fly out of LAX a lot. It's a main hub, if we get direct flights to Hawaii, New York and other places, you know. I don't want to have to use these other airports to have to do these transfers and things.

And I like to turn this in for the record, too, so you guys have it for the record and review it.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHSP00013 Johnson, Larry

Ironworkers Local 433

8/14/2003

SPHSP00013-1

Comment:

I'm Larry Johnson, 8203 Owens Street, Buena Park, California.

First I'd like to say, when I saw the presentation tonight and last night of the Plan D, you know how proud I'd be to go to that airport or have my friends or family come in. It's -- you know, it's going to be a good thing for everyone. You know, it's not just -- it's not just the construction jobs. It's business. It's tourism.

The first thing a tourist or someone seeking to relocate a business when he comes to L. A. is the airport. And, you know, sometimes I'm surprised I don't see some -- why some of them don't turn around and go back of what they see when they come.

I flew in and out of Orlando last spring. I am just amazed at how clean, how well laid-out, how good the people mover worked. It was -- we checked our baggages, you know. We didn't walk maybe 200 feet. We're on the people mover. Then we're right at the terminal. All the newer airports seem to be going that route. And I can see why. It's -- you know, it spreads out the people, gets them away from being concentrated in such a big area like they are now.

As a union ironworker, I don't see anything in that proposal that our craftsmen could not handle and build very well.

One thing I've seen in the newspaper, I think it was Monday in the Times, they were talking about comparing this project to other projects with huge cost overruns. And they compared it especially to the Boston Big Dig. And, you know, that's like comparing apples to oranges. The Boston Big Dig is basically trying to put all the downtown freeways underground while they are still running. This is a complicated project, but it's all doable. It's doable now.

Palmdale was a great alternative. I just worked out at Plant 42. I can tell you, they don't have the infrastructure in place out in Palmdale. It would be nice. It would be a nice regional commuter airport, but for now I don't see it happening. I can see this happening now. It should have happened five years ago. And hopefully when all the talk is said and done, it will happen.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHSP00014 Guzman, Arthur

None Provided

8/14/2003

SPHSP00014-1

Comment:

Thank you. Arthur Guzman, 17111 Steven Street in Gardena, which is about approximately a 15-minute drive to LAX.

And I am understanding what the concerns that those who oppose this project have. But in reality, if you were to weigh the total picture, you would see that the positives outweigh the negatives.

We all understand that the State of California, and in particular Los Angeles, is in an economic downturn. And we need -- by these projects, these well-paying projects, these jobs will help stimulate the economy. Not only will it help stimulate the economy, but it will also put to work apprentices, our high school graduates that feel that college education is not their main concern. It's not their forte. How do we give these people the skills, the tools that they need to be a middle-class American? As we all know, it's a strong middle-class America that also secures democracy and freedom for us all. We have to take a look as to Third World countries like Cuba, China, the Middle East. And you will see where there is no strong middle-class America. There is no democracy and freedom.

So this is an opportunity that we all have to help stimulate the economy through good, decent-paying jobs. You do not stimulate the economy by giving tax cuts to a certain segment of society. When this administration in Washington first took office, my wife and I received \$ 600. Did that help stimulate the economy? Obviously not because we're still suffering an economic downturn.

The way we stimulate the economy is to provide good, decent-paying jobs, also, to train people out of high school into decent, good-paying jobs. That helps stimulate the economy. After all, what do we do with these kids who graduate from high school that don't want to go on to college? We have to find a place for them to make a good, decent living. And projects like this will give them the opportunity to do that because this project will employ about 20 percent of apprentices. So it's for us a win-win situation.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHSP00015 Lemmon, Tom

None Provided

8/14/2003

SPHSP00015-1

Comment:

Thank you. Tom Lemmon, 3566 Bayonne Street in San Diego.

As a union asbestos worker, I want to compliment -- oh, I broke the table -- Mayor Hahn and Staff for this visionary LAX plan. I wish the City of Los Angeles and the County's success in approval of this most important project that creates jobs.

My hope is this that project will be approved and move forward. I also hope that my hometown of San Diego will soon follow L. A.'s lead and do something with its unlimbered feild. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHSP00016 Hossan, Carole

None Provided

8/14/2003

SPHSP00016-1

Comment:

I'm Carole Hossan, Westchester. And I know here in San Pedro people are very interested in pollution because they get a lot of pollution from the Port. Well, we have the same situation at LAX, but we don't know what we're -- we don't have the studies. We'd like to see more studies of our air quality monitoring because I believe the closest one we have is at 120 in La Cienega. The other evening I believe I misspoke and said Century, but La Cienega.

Response:

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.

In addition, the FAA is working with the U.S. EPA and others on a Source Apportionment study for LAX. Please see TR-AQ-2 which discusses the LAX Ambient Air Quality and Source Apportionment Study, which is a project separate from the Master Plan.

A number of state and local agencies collect ambient air quality data and report the data to U.S. EPA. Without the exact location of the commentor, identifying the closest monitoring location is difficult. There were 705 air pollutant monitors in use at 230 locations in California in 2003. There are fourteen monitoring locations in Los Angeles County. They are listed below:

803 N. Loren Ave., Azusa

228 W. Palm Ave., Burbank

840 Laurel, Glendora

5234 W. 120th St., Hawthorne

43301 Division St., Lancaster

3648 N. Long Beach Blvd., Long Beach

1630 N Main St, Los Angeles

11220 Long Beach Blvd., Lynwood

752 S. Wilson Ave., Pasadena

3713 San Gabriel River Pkwy., Pico Rivera

924 N. Garey Ave., Pomona

18330 Gault St., Reseda

22224 Placerita Canyon Rd, Santa Clarita

VA Hospital, West Los Angeles

The commentor is referred to the U.S. EPA's AirData website (<http://www.epa.gov/air/data/index.html>) for more detailed information on the ambient air quality monitoring location closest to her home.

Response:

Comment noted. The economic impacts of the LAX Master Plan alternatives were presented 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.

SPHSP00017-2

Comment:

Now, if we look at the EIR and read it in detail, it doesn't necessarily match the renderings that we've seen. And, in fact, it is very difficult to evaluate what Alternative D is because within Alternative D, there are at least 40 different options within it.

As an example, the runway on the north is supposed to be moving some amount toward the Central Terminal Area. One area of the plan says 340 feet. Another says 380. Another says 388. It says that the runway on the northern-most runway would stay at 150 feet. It would be evaluated to be increased to 200 feet. It doesn't say whether it's going to move north, south or whatever. The real issue is costing it, but it's also a matter of what are the impacts going to be on all of the people of Southern California.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was carefully searched for any data inaccuracies. As described in Chapter 3, under the Airfield Facilities heading, Runway 6R/24L would be reconstructed approximately 340 feet south of the existing runway centerline.

Runway 6L/24R (the northernmost runway) would remain 150 feet wide in Alternative D as described in Section 2.1, North Airfield Facilities (subsection 2.1.1), of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum. Runway 6L/24R is shown to remain at 150 feet wide through the 2015 planning horizon of the Master Plan because it is not envisioned to be fully reconstructed in that time. However, a benefit-cost analysis may later determine that this runway should be widened to 200 feet during its life-cycle reconstruction. Widening the runway to 200 feet would have negligible, if any, impacts on neighboring communities because the runway centerline would remain in the same location.

The proposed Master Plan improvements under all of the alternatives would be funded with a combination of FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, airline fees, and other state/federal grants.

SPHSP00017-3

Comment:

The 405 is already like a parking lot. You're going to add more than 20 million cars. You want to add one and a half million annual tons at LAX. It's one of the smallest footprints of any airport in the world of this caliber. One and a half, divide that by ten tons per truck and figure out how many trucks it's going to take. You need a different and more infrastructure. That's why it needs to be spread out. That's why it needs to be developed across all of Southern California.

Response:

Alternative D would not add any more vehicle trips than would occur if the airport did not modernize. Both Alternative D and the No Action/No Project Alternative would have about 28,000 vehicle trips generated during the airport peak hour. In fact, during the morning and evening peak hours, Alternative D would generate less traffic than the No Action/No Project Alternative due to a reduction in trips generated by the LAX Northside property and the removal of the residential trips currently generated within Manchester Square. As a result, very few trucks would be added under Alternative D when compared to doing nothing. However, there are more truck trips under Alternative D as compared to the existing conditions. These trips were analyzed and mitigated as appropriate, as discussed in Chapter 4.3.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-2b.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHSP00018 Rose, Harry

None Provided

8/14/2003

SPHSP00018-1

Comment:

Good evening, gentlemen. My name is Harry Rose. I live at 7725 Hindry Avenue in the lovely community of Westchester. If you don't know where that is, that's eight-tenths-of-a-mile south of the proposed boondoggle of the Ground Transportation Center that LAWA planned on acquiring.

I came here tonight to speak primarily on two issues. The first issue is regionalism of airports. How many airports, how many international airports do we have in Southern California to serve the entire southern half of the state? From my count we have one, to serve all the way down to San Diego. I mean, this is insane. If we want to come here and talk about jobs, let's talk about building a real airport somewhere. I mean, you're not going to do the job on 20 -- or 3,200 acres, give or take a few hundred that you add in land acquisitions. You need room. Denver has 53 square miles for an airport. If you're going to operate a large international airport, you need to operate it away from a community in an area that's not congested so that people can get there. I mean, this is a project to 2015. According to the City of Los Angeles, the population of my community is going to double in 2025. And if that happens in all of the west side communities, you guys are going to have this wonderful modern airport and nobody is going to be able to get there.

Response:

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

SPHSP00018-2

Comment:

The other issue I want to talk about primarily is Manchester Square. The residents of Manchester Square are denied the option for soundproofing and the insulation of jet noise for a noise mitigation project and are forced to indefinitely endure unsafe and unfit environmental conditions perpetuated by LAWA, or conceded to LAWA's voluntary acquisition project, which is wrought with violations of federal law for land acquisitions and relocation of displaced persons, including discrimination, coercion and under-valued purchase offers for property.

Resident appeals to the FAA in Washington, D. C., have resulted in lack of uniform treatment of minority persons and a subjective disregard of FAA guidelines for airport acquisition procedures prescribed in FAA Order 5100 37A.

In essence, this particular land acquisition is being financed by noise mitigation money. That's money that's set aside for soundproofing people's homes. And, yet, when people who live in Manchester Square ask for soundproofing, they are told they don't qualify for soundproofing, but LAWA will buy your house. Personally I would like for the FAA to answer to that.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The focus of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is to analyze the potential environmental impacts that would result from the development of the proposed LAX Master Plan improvements. The acquisition of Manchester Square is a separate Program from the LAX Master Plan that is currently being implemented by LAWA and will continue to be implemented whether or not the LAX Master Plan is approved. As stated on page 4-96, in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR the Voluntary Residential Acquisition and Relocation Program for the Manchester Square and Belford area was established based on interest from homeowners and residents who requested that LAWA purchase their properties in lieu of soundproofing. See Topical Response TR-MP-3 for an additional discussion of property acquisition within Manchester Square. FAA Order 5100 37A provides guidance and procedures to be followed by FAA personnel and airport owners when applying the Uniform Act. A discussion of the Uniform Act, as applied to acquisition proposed under the LAX Master Plan

3. Comments and Responses

alternatives is provided in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The potential for disproportionate and adverse effects on minority persons as a result of Master Plan implementation and mitigation measures and benefits designed to reduce or off-set such effects are presented in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHSP00019 DiMassa, Joe

Yusen Terminals

8/14/2003

SPHSP00019-1

Comment:

Thank you. My name is Joe DiMassa. My address is 3725 Myrtle Avenue in Long Beach. I'm the general manager of Yusen Terminals, a major container terminal at the L. A. complex located at Terminal Island.

And I'm here tonight to express our support for this Master Plan, as provided by the Mayor's office.

This plan will provide needed safety, security, and will allow for a state-of-the-art transportation facility. This is needed for us to maintain our position here in the L. A. basin and the L. A. region as a world leader in transportation logistics. Not only will it help in a regional way, but it will help in a local way and our local economies, which will especially help us maintain and generate more jobs.

I can't emphasize more how important it is for this project to move forward.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHSP00020 Dyer, Dennis

None Provided

8/14/2003

SPHSP00020-1

Comment:

My name is Dennis Dyer. I live at 1102 Paseo del Mar -- excuse me, here in San Pedro.

And first of all I would like to say, my wife loves to travel. And she drags me to the airport about five times a year. So I go through LAX quite often. And in general I think that the plans as presented are -- all of them, really, look very good because I really agree with the idea of dealing with the surface traffic inside the airport. It's just horrendous. And, really, something needs to be done about that.

But in general, the one drawback that I can see with the plan is that I believe that passenger convenience -- I think other people have mentioned this as well. Passenger convenience is really being reduced, reduced substantially. This is because of a couple of things.

One is the people mover, of course, adds an extra step in everybody's trip. That's going to be more time, more effort to have to go through the whole process. Also, I think that the plan is going to refocus surface street traffic and, of course, cause the same sorts of surface street traffic problems that other people have addressed.

Response:

Comment noted. While the APM trip will add another element of the overall trip that some passengers do not currently experience, the added convenience and speed of using the new GTC, ITC, and consolidated RAC will help minimize the overall trip time. Each of these facilities will be designed to allow a high level of service, access and efficiency. This contrasts with the existing CTA which is no longer ideal for meeting today's advanced convenience and safety requirements. Please see Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for additional descriptions of the functions of and connectivity between the GTC, ITC, RAC, APM and CTA.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHSP00020-2

Comment:

One other thing is it looks to me the plan is eliminating the heliport that's currently there. It occurs to me that given the inconvenience of someone deplaning and then getting their luggage and then getting on the people mover and then taking it to where they finally get to surface transportation like a cab, public transportation, so that they can get to their final destination, it occurs to me that given the inconvenience of all of that, that there will be a certain level of people who would love to just be able to get off a plane here, get on a helicopter and go straight to Downtown or the Valley or down here to the Harbor. So I would suggest that the helipad should be back into the plan in some way or another.

Response:

Comment noted. The existing heliport, which is located on top of Parking Garage #4, would be relocated for LAX Master Plan - Alternative D. The location of a new heliport would be determined at a later date. The new facility would be constructed and commissioned prior to the decommissioning of the existing facility.

SPHSP00021 Hunter, Robert

None Provided

8/14/2003

SPHSP00021-1

Comment:

How are you doing? Robert Hunter, 28832 Carnation Court, Castaic.

You know, they call LAX an international airport. Really, it's just a large regional airport that needs adjusted. But those people in California, just like we did the power crisis, we put off building power plants for 35 years until we were in a crisis. It cost us three times the amount of money. It brought the state to almost a halt. If we don't do something about LAX in the very near future, it's going to be the same thing. We're going to end up doing something that we're going to regret in a hurry.

And this has been a well thought-out plan. It's been adjusted to fit a lot of the problems and a lot of the worries of residents and the people of California. It's got everything. It's got mass transport. It helps pollution. And it addresses security. And it does provide jobs for Californians which will boost the economy. But in the long run, all of our children and the people that live here after we're gone will have a facility that they can use rather than at the end of the Century hopefully.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHP00001 Gaddis, Jessie

None Provided

8/18/2003

SPHP00001-1

Comment:

Yes. My name is Jessie Gaddis. But the address is 8838 Haas Avenue, Los Angeles, 90047.

Okay. My presentation here today is I have quite a few questions, but I know time is limited and I really - I'm concerned about the path, which as you see my address I'm concerned about the path that you have to be in the order to qualify for this operation of soundproofing.

Okay. If I'm laying up there and watching my TV and I'm looking at two lights focusing right on me, that's on my pathway. Look to the right, there is another one. Well, okay. I'm getting two or three at the same time. So that is on my pathway. And I want to know what can be done about it. And that's why I'm voicing my opinion, to be heard today. This isn't my first meeting of attending about this matter. And I'm very much concerned and I want improvement done about it. And that's my opinion about it.

When are we going to get to hear from this? So I know it takes time for everything, but, like I say, time is of vital importance. And we want to be heard and we want to be assured that we can get quality in our neighborhood, which I truly know that that is coming over -- that noise is coming over my household. I am a single person, a taxpayer, and I feel I deserve to ask these questions. And I want to be heard. So that's my opinion about the matter.

Response:

FAA and LAWA acknowledge the concern of the commentor and are working to address noise complaints from LAX operations. As shown on Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR the commentor's property is located outside the boundary of residential properties eligible for soundproofing. The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP is based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour. Monitoring methods used to validate the current 65 CNEL contour are described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4. As described in Topical Response TR-LU-4 the 65 CNEL contour has decreased from 1992 conditions. The 65 CNEL is the applicable standard for high noise levels as defined by FAR Part 150 and Title 21 (see Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4) of the Draft EIS/EIR). Priority for sound insulation is given to residential properties within the highest noise level band above the 65 CNEL contour. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts.

See Subtopical Responses TR-LU-3.4 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and TR-LU-14 for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. See Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding the difference between single event and CNEL noise levels.

In accordance with the provisions of NEPA and CEQA, FAA and LAWA have prepared written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These responses are provided herein as part of this Final EIS/EIR.

SPHP00002 Royster, Laura

None Provided

8/18/2003

SPHP00002-1

Comment:

my name is Laura Royster L- a- u- r- a, Royster, R- o- y- s- t- e- r. My address is 8826 Haas, H- a- a- s, Avenue, Los Angeles, California.

Is it three minutes I get?

Because it is on 59 -- 57 now. You didn't reset it. I won't need the complete three minutes, but I would like to have that. Okay.

Since May I have been contacting the residential soundproofing program. I have not received what I would consider a fair letter explaining anything to me. As Ms. Jessie has said, the planes fly directly over our home. I was told it appears they are flying over our home, but they are not, that they are a distance away. But when I can look up at a plane and almost see the writing on it -- at least see the writing on it and the emblem on the plane, for someone to tell me the planes are not flying over my home is not correct information.

I am also concerned -- I'm not that concerned at this present time about whatever you planning on doing. I'm concerned about the noise level that's in our area. Constantly -- and in my letter the only thing I requested was someone do a survey. Constantly the planes are flying over. Sometimes it even appears that they are waiting to land. Sometimes there are four or five planes that are over -- over our area.

3. Comments and Responses

Even this last year, the last ten months they come out and they have six, but they have no Class A incursions. Those are the serious ones. Even on a national basis, that's only six percent.

And what causes the incursions? It's primarily I think 58 percent the FAA says is of pilot error. And then you have another 38 percent, something of that nature, that deals with nothing more than bus lines going ahead and not being where they are supposed to be. But there is a very small percent of incursion.

The thing that disturbs me more than anything else about the relocation of these runways is it's being done for modernization procedures. It's not being done for incursions and for safety. You're simply moving these runways to go ahead and allow a greater number of aircraft to utilize the airfield. And, of course, that means the larger one yet to come, the A380. I'm not going to deal with that issue per se, but I get disturbed when I read EIRs, as the last time and this time, when you go ahead and create a situation that has an impact upon the public, which is a false impact and it should be explained in a more realistic way.

Response:

The downturn in runway incursions during the most recent year is encouraging, however, every runway incursion has the potential to cause enormous loss of life and property. The geometry of the south airfield with several high-speed taxiway exits and minimum distances between the parallel runways has contributed to pilot confusion. LAWA has already implemented improvements to airfield lighting, taxiway marking, runway signage and has sponsored on-going seminars on airfield familiarization with airport users. FAA commissioned Airport Movement Area Safety System (AMASS) in September, 2001. The construction of a center taxiway that will allow aircraft to exit the landing runway and turn onto a taxiway before encountering another runway will provide the flight crew and air traffic control adequate time to carefully plan runway crossings. The FAA has the statutory responsibility to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace in the United States. To that end, FAA is working with airport sponsors such as LAWA to further enhance the level of safety of aircraft operations at all public use airports in the country.

Additionally, the ability to more safely accommodate the Airbus A380 is considered to be a benefit of Alternative D and is consistent with LAWA's stated goal of maintaining LAX's status as a premier international gateway.

SPHP00004-2

Comment:

One last item. I want to know how you're going to build the Ground Transportation Center in Manchester Square when you don't own it yet.

Response:

The acquisition of Manchester Square is independent of the residential acquisition necessary for Master Plan implementation. The Manchester Square area is being acquired through the existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program, in support of LAWA's ANMP. Please see Response to Comment SPC00274-77.

SPHP00005 Norton, Kevin

IBEW Local 11

8/18/2003

SPHP00005-1

Comment:

Kevin Norton, 8833 Airport Boulevard, Los Angeles. My name is Kevin Norton. I'm a business representative with IBEW Local 11. We have over 7,000 members who live and work in Los Angeles. I also represent California State Association of Electrical Workers which represents 90,000 electrical workers in California. We're a community stakeholder with an office over here in Westchester. We've been training and providing quality jobs in this community for over 50 years.

3. Comments and Responses

We're in support of Mayor Hahn's expansion of LAX. We feel that it's hard times for construction workers. And much needed quality, local jobs for local people will be provided by the project. We think that it's wonderful that Mayor Hahn wants to use local people on the project. And so we rise in favor of it.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHP00006 Henderson, Larry IBEW Local 11 8/18/2003

SPHP00006-1

Comment:

Good evening, gentlemen, ladies and gentlemen of the audience. My name is Larry Henderson, 833 Airport Boulevard, IBEW business representative also.

My partner Kevin Norton said almost everything that there is to say about that. We appreciate Mayor Hahn and his expansion project here. Everybody who uses this airport knows that on any given holiday, you can't hardly get in and out of there. This is not only good for labor. This is good for the whole neighborhood, good for people that need to use the LAX. An expansion and a modernization of the way in and out is definitely a need. We no longer have two engine reciprocating aircraft. We've got modern jets coming in, one on top of each other. We need a way to get them in and out, a way to unload the people. And this plan looks very efficient.

I want to thank you for all of your efforts. And that's it for me.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHP00007 Short, Willa None Provided 8/18/2003

SPHP00007-1

Comment:

Thank you. I really didn't intend to speak. My name is Willa Short. I live at 10108 3/4th 8th Avenue, Inglewood. I really didn't intend to speak. So I'll make it short.

I do think that we do need airport expansion. However, it is not too good for the community. There have been cases of cancer in the area where I live. The planes are going over my head actually 2:00 and 3:00 o'clock in the morning. When I go out to hose down, it's dust. It's that black soot. So I don't think it's too feasible. But, however, you know, progress must go on.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. 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, and 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-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 which refers to two LAX-area deposition studies conducted by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (2000a,b: Air Monitoring Study in the Area of Los Angeles International Airport; and Inglewood Particulate Fallout Study Under and Near the Flight Path to Los Angeles International Airport). These studies identified the major components of the deposited material to be rubber dust (from car and truck tires), minerals (such as talc, gypsum and quartz), and biological material (such as pollen, wood, cellulose and plant fibers). Oil soot particles were identified in both studies but "no discernable pattern

3. Comments and Responses

of either carbon mass or total fallout mass under LAX's flight path which would indicate a predominant influence from aircraft fallout" (2000b) was identified.

SPHP00007-2

Comment:

However, I think they should increase a little bit more at some of the other airports. Then we won't have so much traffic over our heads, because in front of us on 8th Avenue we have Smart & Final. They do not listen to us. They honk their horns and they spew their gas, the 18- wheelers. And they say " honk honk" in the morning.

So I thank you for your attention.

Response:

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

SPHP00008 Guzman, Art

None Provided

8/18/2003

SPHP00008-1

Comment:

Art Guzman, G- u- z- m- a- n, 17111 Steven Street in Gardena.

As I hear the speakers speak here this evening, I really sympathize and understand some of their concerns because they are some of my concerns simply coming from the area. But there is no way in the world we're going to stop progress. Right now Los Angeles is in an economic slump. And the only way we will recover from an economic slump is to have good, decent- paying jobs.

My wife and I received \$ 600 when the existing administration in Washington took place. That was supposed to stimulate the economy and we were supposed to have economic development and growth. That never happened because it never increased jobs. By increasing or creating good, decent- paying jobs, that will stimulate the economy. If we do not upgrade LAX, it will become dilapidated. The surrounding areas will become dilapidated. And pretty soon we have a ghetto right here in LAX.

So we have to meet the challenges of technology. And that is to upgrade the airport so that it increases capacity so we can have economic -- stimulate economical growth here in the Los Angeles area.

Another thing. What happens to these students who graduate from high school that do not want to go on to college? What chance do they have to fulfill the American dream? Well, by having good, decent-paying jobs. And this would be one example or one opportunity for those who graduate from high school to go on and get into our apprenticeship programs to get highly skilled where they can get some decent wages and fulfill the American dream.

It's my understanding that this project should it go through will employ something like 20 percent of the labor force, which will be apprentices. This will give them the opportunity to buy nice homes, to move into an area should they decide to stimulate the economy, by buying automobiles, by buying dishwashers, TVs. And it's a snowball effect. You start on the top of the hill with the snowball. You increase momentum and the velocity. Pretty soon by the time it gets down to the end of the hill, you have a big old snowball. So this, even though it has some negative aspects to it, the positive aspects of it outweigh the negatives by a tremendous amount. So we're all for this project.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHP00009 Megoo, Gordon

None Provided

8/18/2003

SPHP00009-1

Comment:

Hi. My name is Gordon Michael Megoo, 4535 West 141st Street in Hawthorne. I'm a native and resident of Hawthorne since October of 1952, former aerospace engineer from the 1970s and '80s, design engineer for various weapon systems, aircraft and so forth.

My father had been a lead and senior mechanic for American Airlines at the airports here back in the 1950s. So I got to see a lot of the different operations behind the scenes and even up until current times and have flown in many different aircraft starting with the Lockheed Constellation, which it was a TWA, that tri-tail, which is a very interesting plane.

So I've seen a lot that has gone on over the years as far as, you know, the operations. I always remember up until the '84 Olympics they have the moving walkways, which I thought was fantastic for those that carried the kind of -- traveled at kind of a slower pace and so forth. But as I look at, you know, the new plan, which is kind of following after, you know, the various alternatives, the Riordon plan, I don't see it as passenger friendly. And the convenience factor will be greatly diminished. The efficiency operations for the airlines and airport is not really greatly enhanced.

And as far as security aspects, you really, essentially, are widening the envelope of the overall airport property of the operations, will extend from the ocean to the 405 Freeway essentially. And as far as the terrorist aspects and all that, you really are increasing that envelope that will be subject to potential strikes and so forth.

As far as people being protected against that really -- the Manchester Square area is definitely not a way to go. You're concentrating too many people in one area.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHP00009-2

Comment:

And, essentially, why is the airport even going ahead with the purchase of the properties when in all reality there has been no contract let off or, you know, the plan that's being proposed, nothing has been approved. So nothing should have been even going forward. Everything should have been stopped in its tracks as far as that goes. And I believe it still should remain a residential area.

Response:

The acquisition of Manchester Square is independent of the residential acquisition necessary for Master Plan implementation. The Manchester Square area is being acquired through the existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program, in support of LAWA's ANMP. This program is voluntary and was initiated by the residents of Manchester Square during the 1997 Public Scoping meetings. Please see Response to Comment SPHP00001-4 regarding the validity of the acquisition of Manchester Square.

SPHP00009-3

Comment:

As far as everything, the terminals, everything should remain as they are with various enhancements to basically the efficiency of the operations of the airport, passenger convenience. And, also, maintaining the inner perimeter roadway is very important for bringing people to and from the airport for unloading --

3. Comments and Responses

-- and so forth, and also bringing in the metro rail Green Line that will stop off at each of the terminals so we have multi-modal system.

Response:

Comment noted. The existing terminals would remain with significant functional modifications while four new terminals would be constructed where the existing parking garages are located. The existing roadway in the CTA would also be maintained. However, access to the terminal roadway by private vehicles would be prohibited. Individuals bringing passengers to LAX or picking passengers up from LAX would be able to use the curbside at the GTC for loading and unloading of passengers and baggage to and from their vehicles. Private vehicles would be prohibited from the perimeter roadway for security reasons as a central component of Alternative D. The GTC would become the landside interface with private vehicles. This facility would not contain large congregations of passengers and visitors that would occur within the redeveloped CTA terminal facilities.

The current regional light rail system in LA County is a non-secure transit system. Extending the Metro Green Line into the CTA would create a security threat. LAX Alternative D would provide a secure APM linking the CTA to the ITC, which would be adjacent to the Metro Green Line Aviation/I-105 station allowing convenient transit from the Metro Green Line to the CTA.

SPHP00010 Moxley, Tom None Provided 8/18/2003

SPHP00010-1

Comment:

My name is Tom Moxley. That's M- o- x- l- e- y. Address is 2057 South Atlantic Avenue, Los Angeles, 90040. I'm here on behalf of 4200 members that I represent, the ironworkers. We applaud Mayor Hahn in his plan D. We support it.

Dealing first with safety, I worked at LAX. I've traveled out of LAX, and my greatest fear is on the ground until I get in the air. The airport was built for 707s. The planes run close to each other. I've worked at every terminal out there over 32 years. And it's time that we not just put Band-Aids on like we have in the past, but we truly modernize that airport for the planes that are built today.

Dealing with security, I think Mayor Hahn's idea of moving the terminal out to Manchester Square is an excellent alternative. All the ticketing, baggage and everything before it gets near the aircraft to have time to disseminate the good and the bad and deal with it appropriately.

I would be remised if I did not say that it's the jobs. I travel a lot throughout this country and I see modern airport and realize that LAX is the hub of the Pacific rim. If we lose that to Vancouver, Denver, Phoenix, we will lose jobs. These are jobs all around the airport where people in the neighborhoods and Inglewood and Westchester, Hawthorne and the other cities travel to their jobs. They are airport-related. They are manufacturing jobs. They are not just construction jobs. The people I represent live in every community here in Southern California and they are all in favor of this.

Thank you for your time and this time to be able to speak.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHP00011 Benson, Virgil None Provided 8/18/2003

SPHP00011-1

Comment:

Thank you. Virgil Benson, B- e- n- s- o- n, 3612 West 116th Street in California.

Basically I'm here to talk about the impact of the noise in the area which I live, and that is the City of Inglewood.

3. Comments and Responses

Impact on the noise, will it affect the land values in the City of Inglewood, that is the commercial and industrial? Primarily I'm concerned about the multi-residential and residential values of the City of Inglewood. If there is a diminution in value, will that be considered a taking? What I'm saying of taking, would that be considered an eminent domain taking such as the First Amendment of the California Constitution requires just compensation for that taking for the land itself? If we are talking about a just compensation for the decrease in value, who is going to be determining what that value is going to be as far as what the diminution in value is going to be on our land and on our homes on the land as a result of the increase in noise over our properties?

Now, we've always seen in other communities where they have complained about the airport noise, whereas what it does, it decreases the value of the residential homes in the area in which the planes fly over. If that in fact happens, who is going to be compensated and who determines what compensation we will be getting? Will it be your appraisers or will it be local appraisers that will make that determination as to the diminution of value on the land that we own? If it's a taking, can we then do an inverse condemnation against you in which to determine what the value of the taking is going to be?

Now, if you're talking about bringing insulated windows and insulating attics for the noise factor, will that then be set against the value of the property itself in which the taking is going to be?

Now, as we know in the past and over the years when planes flew over on the beach community, the airport then utilized the public use of the Eminent Domain law of the State of California in taking those lands, those homes, and they were compensated for those homes. But there were a lot of complaints about the just compensation of the homes were not at market value. So who is going to determine what the market value is going to be as far as the taking of the homes? I'm concerned about my own properties. I'm also concerned about the City of Inglewood because what's it's going to impact are the land values and the commercial and industrial and the residential areas in which I live and in which I've invested in this community over the past 30 years.

So my concerns are basically just this. Who is going to determine what the land values are going to be? And is that taking going to be based on eminent domain? And if so, will we be getting just compensation for the land?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding the effects of LAX on property values. Property acquisitions undertaken by LAWA in order to implement the Master Plan would be subject to the Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan (Proposed Relocation Plan), provided in Appendix P to Chapter V of the Master Plan and updated in Chapters 2.7 and 2.8 of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum. Under Alternative D, LAWA staff's preferred alternative, no residential acquisition is proposed. A description of the method to be used to determine fair market value for properties proposed for acquisition is provided in Topical Response TR-RBR-1. Regarding noise impacted properties, under the ANMP the primary and preferred approach to mitigating high noise levels is through sound insulation; however, individual jurisdictions may in certain instances choose to pursue acquisition and conversion to a more compatible use, as described in Topical Response TR-LU-3. No acquisition of residential properties to address high noise levels is being proposed by LAWA under the LAX Master Plan. The installation of sound insulation would be expected to increase the value of insulated properties. For those residential properties to be acquired, fair market value would be determined irrespective of noise impacts. Separate from the LAX Master Plan, the City of Inglewood has a Redevelopment Plan under which some residential uses considered incompatible with existing zoning and exposed to high noise levels would be acquired and redeveloped with a more compatible commercial or industrial use. The property valuation method used for affected properties would be determined by the City of Inglewood.

SPHP00012 Walter, Mahala

None Provided

8/18/2003

SPHP00012-1

Comment:

Mahala Walter, M- a- h- a- l- a, W- a- l- t- e- r, 7015 Sepulveda Boulevard, Westchester.

3. Comments and Responses

As your former airport commissioner, you told me we need a three- dollar flyaway to LAX just like what the valley has. You also said we don't -- why doesn't the Green Line go to LAX? It would make it easier to get to work.

Now, I can tell you the flyaway is really going to happen, but what about the Green Line? Instead of Alternative D, extend the Green Line north two and a half miles up Aviation turning left on 98th Street. And then you go right to LAX at Sepulveda.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPHO00004-6 regarding a direct Green Line connection to the CTA and Response to Comment SPHL00022-2 regarding the most feasible alignment of the Green Line. Also, please see Response to Comment SPHL00026-1 regarding the Green Line/People Mover interface.

SPHP00012-2

Comment:

Combine this change with a north runway extension over Pershing Drive. Not only will you have more land space available for LAX passenger dissemination, but the two-mile perimeter for shoulder firing missiles is also extended over the ocean for shared protection by the coast guard.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHO00004-8 regarding extending the inboard north Runway 6R/24L over Pershing Drive.

SPHP00012-3

Comment:

Construction on the runways should start now, not 2014. Contrary to Alternative D, the plane and the traffic noise levels and the congestion will be considerably less for the 105, 405 Sepulveda and the Inglewood communities. There will be no need for a people mover nor disruption on Century Boulevard. Manchester Square will become a beautiful park not only for tourists to see and enjoy, but, also, the community.

Seeing that there is a Green Line station plan on Aviation between 98th and Century, one could visualize the retail recreation center at this stop where tourists could enjoy a six hour layover. LAX could become the most tourist- friendly airport in the world, benefiting Angelenos.

Response:

Construction of Runways at LAX can not occur prior to a Record of Decision (ROD). Implementation of the selected Master Plan Alternative would commence after approval of a Record of Decision by FAA. Phase 1 of Alternative D, assuming that Alternative D is chosen, includes the relocation of Runway 7R/25L. Additional phases would need to be completed prior to commencing construction of relocated Runway 6L/24R in 2014.

Noise exposure statistics associated with Alternative D were presented in Table S4.1-24, Noise Exposure Effects - 2015 Alternative D With Comparisons to 1996 Baseline, Year 2000 Conditions, and 2015 No Action/No Project Alternative Conditions of Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. An APM would be needed to safely and efficiently transport passengers between the CTA and the proposed RAC, GTC and ITC facilities. The GTC would be constructed in the existing Manchester Square neighborhood as part of Alternative D. Construction of a Metro Green Line station at 98th Street and Aviation Boulevard is not a part of the Master Plan.

SPHP00012-4**Comment:**

The Green Line has the right- of- way to go north on Sepulveda Boulevard, hooking up with Slauson for a Green Line LAX express to downtown Los Angeles Union Station. However, the community won't like to have the Green Line go through downtown Westchester, and I certainly don't want it going by my house. Then when I focus on the fact that in 20 years I will almost be 90. With a short walk, I could go anywhere. And best of all, our grandchildren will enjoy a positive environmental impact on our city.

Response:

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

SPHP00013 Alpern, Ken Friends of the Green Line 8/18/2003

SPHP00013-1**Comment:**

Good evening. My name is Ken Alpern. I'm co- chair of Friends of the Green Line, which is a very active wing at the Transit Coalition. Good evening and thank you for the opportunity to let myself be heard again.

Last week at the Wilshire District I was able to talk about the overall ideas of the Ground Transportation Center being appropriately utilized wherever it is. We're neutral on the location. But we -- we really feel it's next to a rail line, and that opportunity is not being utilized. And we're not going to be able to achieve the true traffic mitigation, the environmental mitigation that we need to make LAX reconfigured in an environmental and traffic- friendly way. For those of you who have been unable to read our brochure, we're more than happy to forward that. That might take care of a lot of what I'm about to say.

The following are concrete, concrete requests that we're going to ask LAWA to do under the aegis of traffic and environmental mitigation, and we're going to send this to the councilmembers of Los Angeles and to L. A. World Airports.

Specifically, we're asking the L. A. City Council to include in the final EIR that the Green Line extension north along Aviation Boulevard to the Ground Transportation Center be included as an integral part of the locally preferred alternative to rail traffic access to LAX.

Two, the FAA, Caltrans, the LADOT and the MTA should each approve in writing on the Green Line route including the necessary trenching along Aviation Boulevard to avoid potential electromagnetic interference from the light rail wires with the airport radar beacons. This has been done in San Jose. We can do it here. Every airport in the country has been able to do this. Certainly L. A. can do the same.

L. A. World Airports should allocate enough funding to put preliminary design and engineering work on the Green Line alignment to Manchester Square or wherever the Green -- excuse me, wherever the Ground Transportation Center is. For purposes of practicality, I'm mentioning Manchester Square.

We need to have remote airport access anywhere along the Green Line. And, frankly, this would both obviate the need of a Norwalk flyaway service to LAX as well as an Intermodal Transit Center. Frankly, I have very strong concerns that security won't be as good as at the Intermodal Transit Center as it will be at the Ground Transportation Center. I'm very concerned that even though I know you don't want to stop the Green Line cold at Aviation and Imperial, it will have that effect. After all, if we do manage to extend the Green Line north, what are we going to do, deconstruct the Intermodal Transit Center? It's just not something that's good for long- term purposes.

Thank you. Again, we're going to be sending this more in writing in a polished letter to you and to the L. A. City Council.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It is impractical to connect the Green Line directly to the CTA, as discussed in Response to Comment SPHO00004-6. Also, please see Response to Comment SPHL00022-2 regarding the most feasible alignment of the Green Line.

SPHP00014 Jackson Jr, Eric None Provided 8/18/2003

SPHP00014-1

Comment:

Thank you. Eric G. Jackson Junior, 2526 West 18th Street, Los Angeles, 90019.

I used to be a resident of L. A. right over by the airport. I lived on 105th and Wilton for five years. The noise was uncomfortable, but not unbearable. Progress, this is the United States of America.

Now, in the ' 70s you had roll- up windows, 8- tracks. In the ' 80s you came out with cassettes and air conditioner. In the ' 90s you got lasers, CDs, television in the back of cars, television in the visors. We cannot stop the progress of this airport. We have to move forward.

Take the City of Denver. You're 20 miles from the City of Denver with Denver International Airport. Go to Chicago. It's the same thing. Where do you propose that we put this airport? Are butterflies more important than human life? Nobody is talking about let's move the butterflies. Move the butterfly sanctuary. This project has to go.

You've got the youth. You've got jobs and you have opportunity. All of us are not able to send our kids to college. When it costs \$ 500 a unit to go to SC, tell me who could afford it when you make \$ 60,000 and you have a family of four. You will continually eat at McDonald's. You will die of heart failure because you're going to have too much cholesterol. People are tired of working for kibbles and bits. Where is the industry? If construction doesn't move in the United States, the economy stops.

My father is 88 years old, still living and never made over \$ 6.00 an hour in his life. When I got out of the service in 1970, I came to Los Angeles and made a \$ 1.78. Now I make over \$ 35 an hour. This is America. And we must be courageous. And those who cannot afford to go to college has to get a well-paying job. I have a college education, but I make more than an average teacher with a master's. So construction is the way to go. I am for Plan D and we must move forward.

Response:

Comment noted. Please note that the habitat restoration area of the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes supports the largest of four remaining occupied habitats of the El Segundo blue butterfly. The ecological significance of the area is recognized by City ordinance.

SPHP00015 Kenton, Jack None Provided 8/18/2003

SPHP00015-1

Comment:

My name is Jack Kenton. I live at 835 Dune Street in El Segundo.

With all due respect to everyone that wants jobs, I think we all want jobs, but I don't think we should build an airport just for jobs. Let's build light rail. Let's build transportation systems and not necessarily noise here.

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-ST-5 regarding the light rail/transit plan.

SPHP00015-2

Comment:

The runway issue, we have a north complex, south complex. We want to put a taxiway between the pairs of runways. That's supposed to be because we have a safety problem with runway incursions. I don't think that is justified to go through the expense. The millions and billions of dollars of picking up a perfectly good runway and moving it 50 feet. We had an alternative of putting a taxiway out at the back end of the outport runway going around the inboard runway. I think if we have a safety problem, let's go that route.

Response:

LAX ranked first as the airport that had the greatest number of runway incursions for the four-year period according to FAA Runway Safety Report published in July 2003. The purpose of the center taxiway is to enhance safe aircraft operations and reduce the potential for runway incursions. LAWA, in cooperation with NASA Ames Research Center, conducted a study comparing the costs and benefits of a center parallel taxiway and an "end-around" taxiway on the south airfield complex. The study concluded that the end-around taxiway greatly increased taxi time and delays for arriving aircraft and thereby increased the operational costs of this option and did not give any increased safety margin. Air traffic controllers also found the center parallel taxiway which increased their flexibility while controlling arriving aircraft on the south airfield complex. In a separate LAWA study of these two optional taxiway improvements, the "end-around" taxiway was found to increase noise impacts on El Segundo residential land uses from taxiing aircraft. Please also see Response to Comment SPHF00038-3 for more information.

SPHP00015-3

Comment:

On the security issue, we're talking about moving vehicles from the Central Terminal Area and moving them to the proposed Ground Transportation Center. The idea is to get the terrorist attack away from the populated area where the terminals are. However, I can't see that we gain that much by moving the target now to the Ground Transportation Center. I'll be happy if someone could prove it to me that that is what would happen. But it seems to me we still have a large number of people that would be a target at the Ground Transportation Center just as we would have had a large target in the Central Terminal Area.

The move -- the vehicles, the movement, when I looked through the Master Plan, I just cannot see enough of a large change to justify all the expense that we're going to put into it. And I don't think we should be doing it just for jobs. We need jobs. Let's do it at El Toro. Let's do it at Ontario, Palmdale, not just here.

Response:

Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP and Draft 2004 RTP, which call for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

SPHP00015-4

Comment:

And by the way, when you do move that runway 50 feet, it gets 50 feet closer to my house in El Segundo. And even another 50 feet of the noise coming off that south runway is more than I want.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The commentor is correct that the south airfield runway 7R/25L would be relocated 50 feet south of the existing centerline under Alternative D, as described on Table S3-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. However, as analyzed in Section 4.2 (subsection 4.2.6) and summarized on Table S4.2-29 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative D no areas within the City of El Segundo would be newly exposed to high noise levels and there would be a reduction in area and noise-sensitive uses exposed to high noise levels compared to 1996 baseline conditions. See also Responses to Comments PC01377-9 for further discussion of impacts on the City of El Segundo and AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR the commentor's property, located at 835 Dune Street in the City of El Segundo, is within the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL contour and therefore is eligible for residential sound insulation under the ANMP, as described in Topical Response TR-LU-3. As shown on Figure S4.2-16 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR noise levels at the commentor's property and in El Segundo would decrease from 1996 baseline conditions.

SPHP00016 Teeter, Lawrence Coalition Against the Pipeline 8/18/2003

SPHP00016-1

Comment:

Yes, good afternoon. My name is Lawrence Teeter. I'm the attorney for Coalition Against the Pipeline. We oppose this project for a variety of reasons.

First of all, you're in violation of CEQA and NEPA because you haven't considered a genuine no-project alternative. The court says that a no- project alternative is the status quo, the existing situation. That's not what you consider. The existing situation is Manchester Square is a functioning residential community. You've written that out by treating the disappearance of Manchester Square as a noise mitigation measure. So you're not considering a no- project alternative. And that means you're violating the first principle of CEQA. You have to consider a reasonable range of feasible alternatives. And you have to do it in good faith. And you have to consider a true no- project alternative.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-2 regarding No Action/No Project Alternative assumptions. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-3 regarding the use of Manchester Square, and how property acquisition within Manchester Square was initiated, and will continue to occur, separate from the Master Plan.

SPHP00016-2

Comment:

The second problem is that this environmental document is not a good faith document. It's a post hoc rationalization for a preconceived result. Manchester Square's disappearance is foreordained by the fact that the City is telling people who live in the area they are not eligible for noise insulation because the area has been targeted for acquisition. And that news is going out to people before this project is even approved. The California Supreme Court has made it absolutely clear, you can't do that. The environmental process has to run its course. The environmental impact report has to be completed and certified and analyzed in good faith before you can take steps indicating that you've committed to a specific course of action.

When Mayor Hahn told you, " Go ahead and consider Alternative D because that's what I want," that's another indication of a fix of a foreordained result. And no wonder the public gets turned off. What you're going to find if you approve this project, it is that is a violation of state law and it is a violation of federal law and people have remedies.

Response:

As indicated in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the voluntary acquisition program at Manchester Square has been underway for several years and was

initiated as an option requested by property owners in lieu of soundproofing. The program is separate from the Master Plan and will continue on to completion, regardless of whether any of the Master Plan alternatives are approved. Alternative D was added to the range of Master Plan alternatives subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR and has undergone a thorough environmental analysis in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Public review of, and comment on, Alternative D and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR has been afforded through a substantial public review process. No decisions on, or approval of, Alternative D, or any of the Master Plan alternatives has been, or will be, made until the environmental review processes have been completed in full accordance with the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.

SPHP00016-3

Comment:

The second area of major violation is that you could have looked at a whole range of existing alternatives. You could have looked at an expansion of the Green Line. Somebody else already pointed that out. You could have looked at people movers from Lot C or the other lots. I'm not proposing that, but those are some of the other alternatives you should have considered.

Response:

A reasonable range of alternatives have been evaluated in the Final EIS/EIR. Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan alternative, was developed in response to the feedback and public comments received on the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, and C.

Extending the Metro Green Line into the airport has been thoroughly examined. The existing LA County light rail transit system is not a secure system. Extending the Metro Green Line into the CTA at LAX would present an additional security threat to airport passengers. Additionally, the Green Line is owned and operated by MTA not LAWA. Extension of the Metro Green Line would require the authorization of MTA.

The construction of an APM connecting the existing terminals at LAX to long term parking lot C would not be a cost effective measure for improving the level of service to airport passengers. Alternative D would include an APM to provide efficient connections between the GTC, ITC, RAC and the reconfigured CTA. Existing long term Parking Lot C would be reused as a staging area for rental cars.

SPHP00016-4

Comment:

You should have considered if you need more space at Lot C, expanding that upward, not taking that existing residential community of Washington Square. But that was the foreordained result. This is a fix, and you didn't engage in the reasonable analysis of a good faith reasonable analysis of feasible alternatives.

Response:

Lot C is in the Runway Protection Zone for the approach end of both Runway 24R/L. Expanding it upward with structures would interfere with the existing Approach Lighting System and penetrate the FAR Part 77 50:1 approach surface which is not acceptable to the FAA from an airspace utilization standpoint. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00001-4 regarding validity of the acquisition of Manchester Square, and Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.4 regarding good faith reasonable analysis.

SPHP00016-5

Comment:

The other problem is Section 4(f) of the National Transportation Act says you can't go ahead with a project that is going to result in a use of a sensitive resource. And this project, unless there are no feasible alternatives and unless you've considered and rejected all feasible -- all -- unless you have no feasible mitigation measures you can adopt, this project is going to result in increased stress on environmentally sensitive areas including the wetlands area in the Playa Vista.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Section 4.8, Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f) of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address Section 4(f) issues related to each of the five alternatives (i.e., No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A through D). As described in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, implementation of Alternative D, with mitigation, would not result in the constructive use of (i.e., impact) and Section 4(f) resources. Given the nature of the proposed project and its distance from the Ballona wetlands near Playa Vista (i.e., approximately a mile away), it is not expected that implementation of the LAX Master Plan would result in any increased stress on the Ballona wetlands. Additionally, it should be noted that the Section 4(f) Act applies only to publicly-owned property. The Ballona Wetlands property were still privately-owned at the time the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was prepared.

SPHP00017 Jacquet, Joyce

None Provided

8/18/2003

SPHP00017-1

Comment:

My name is Joyce Jacquet. The last name J- a- c- q- u- e- t. And I live at 9431 South Hobart.

And my concern is the noise, because I have gone to the office on Sepulveda to try to get some help because of the noise. If the trees wasn't in front of my house, the airplane lights would shine directly in my living room window. And I can't seem to get any help. Nobody seems to care. So I hope something can be done about it.

Response:

FAA and LAWA acknowledge the concern of the commenter and are working to address complaints from LAX operations. As shown on Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR the commentator's property is located outside the boundary of residential properties eligible for soundproofing and approximately four miles east of the runway. The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP and monitoring methods used to validate the current 65 CNEL contour are described in Topical Response TR-LU-3. The 65 CNEL is the applicable standard for high noise levels as defined by FAR Part 150 and Title 21 (see Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4) of the Draft EIS/EIR). Priority for sound insulation is given to residential properties within the highest noise level band above the 65 CNEL contour.

Regarding concerns about existing airplane lights, the FAA and LAWA staff are not aware of complaints from residents about lights from airplanes shining into homes. It seems unlikely that airplane lights would shine directly into homes while landing at LAX, since the angle of the landing lights, which point forward, and the descent angle and altitude of the airplanes would generally limit any lighting effects to areas and non-sensitive uses in close proximity to the runway (i.e., within hundreds of feet). In addition, aircraft lighting is a necessary safety component and landing lights are required one hour before sunset to one hour after sunrise. Should residents actually experience an adverse lighting effect on their property from airplane lights they can direct their complaints to the FAA Regional Duty Office at (310) 725-3300, who will log and forward such complaints to the FAA Flight Standards District Office for investigation.

See Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. See Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding the difference between single event and CNEL noise levels.

SPHP00018 Giammarco, Giovanni

None Provided

8/18/2003

SPHP00018-1

Comment:

Hi. My name is Giovanni Giammarco, G- i- a- m- m- a- r- c- o, and I live in Marina del Rey. I'm an investor and property owner, which is designated as the Manchester Square area. And beside residential, there are multi- family areas there. This is my first forum. I commend you guys for doing an excellent job on getting the word out and all the information.

What I'd like to find out is in future upcoming forums, if there would be somebody that we could ask questions to in regards to the buy- back program. Nobody seems to have any questions or answers to that particular Westchester -- or the Manchester Square area. All of your plans have somehow designated that particular area to be used either as a park or a runway or something. I'd like to find out what the future holds for several properties I own in the area. That's it.

Response:

Comment noted. No plans have been made for a park or a runway at Manchester Square. As stated in the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, homes in the Manchester Square area are being acquired through the existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program currently underway within the Manchester Square and Airport/Belford areas near the airport, in support of LAWA's ANMP. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.3 regarding the future of the properties in Manchester Square. In addition, the LAWA Residential Acquisition Division can be visited to see where the commentor's properties are in relation to the airport and the proposed development alternatives.

SPHP00019 Hunter, Robert

None Provided

8/18/2003

SPHP00019-1

Comment:

Hello. My name is Robert Hunter. I live at 2057 South Atlantic Boulevard, Los Angeles.

You know, when you look at LAX, it just doesn't work. The pollution there is terrible. The configuration of the airport, it really is a large regional airport. It doesn't serve the purpose. The reconfiguration that Plan D puts with LAX makes it viable. It has got mass transit. It provides jobs for local workers. Not everybody could go to college, and these are good- paying jobs.

You know, California, we have a habit of putting everything off until tomorrow, until it's too late, until we have an emergency, like we did with the power plants and the electricity system with the state. We blocked it for 40 years until it became an emergency and we had to do it. It cost us a lot more and it probably wasn't done the best way. It's better that we can plan things out like we've done with this airport.

We've reconfigured the thing three or four times. And I believe the best plan is the one that we have right now, Plan D. Mass transit, it makes the air cleaner and, hopefully, it will make life better for everybody in Los Angeles for a long time to come.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHP00020 Patterson, Thirkiel None Provided 8/18/2003

SPHP00020-1

Comment:

Yes, good evening. My name is Thirkiel Patterson. I reside at 3634 West 106th Street in Inglewood.

I'm a 30- year resident. I sympathize with most of the resident people who live around here, but progress -- I don't believe they are going to be able to stand in the way of progress because the City of Inglewood pacified me in the property that I own in Inglewood when the noise level became intolerant. And I'm pretty sure this program here would initiate some of the same type of pacification, however you want to see it.

I represent over 6,000 union workers in Southern California. And we're in support of this project.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHP00021 Carpio, Sparky None Provided 8/18/2003

SPHP00021-1

Comment:

Thank you. Sparky, S- p- a- r- k- y, Carpio, C- a- r- p- i- o. I live at 407 E- x- t- o- n, Number 4, Inglewood, California 90302.

I just want to say that I know people need jobs, and Mayor Hahn's plan might be good for the economy, but doesn't people's quality of life matter more? What about the neighboring communities?

Response:

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

SPHP00021-2

Comment:

How can you say that something that has in just months grown from 78 MAP to 78.9 MAP not being an expansion plan? And I guess you don't care what the Southern California Association of Government said about 78 MAP or less, but there is a lot of second guessing. And, oh, Palmdale really needs to be used. And I hope Mayor Hahn stays true to his word of regionalization.

Response:

Comment noted. The capacity of LAX under Alternative D has always been 78.9 MAP. In the RTP, SCAG assumes that the capacity of LAX is 78.0 MAP. Compared to the total regional demand, whether LAX serves 78.0 or 78.9 MAP, millions of passengers will have to be accommodated elsewhere. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. 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 also see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

SPHP00022 Hossan, Carole

None Provided

8/18/2003

SPHP00022-1

Comment:

It's Carol Hossan, like " Ha," 7725 Hindry, Westchester, 90045.

My theme is going to be the stealthiness of all of this. Here is a quote I really like from a comment from a report to the County.

"Because the new larger aircraft require many smaller connecting planes to fill its 600 seats, this improvement will strengthen the confluence of connections that reinforce LAX as the preeminent airport of the Southern California region, and at the same time reduce the incentive for airlines to utilize other regional facilities."

Now, I and many other people have been saying that for months, but it is very reassuring and maybe more convincing to you to have experts say it, too.

This is a poem, " If not now, when? City of L. A. says regionalization. Actions belie words."

Response:

Comment noted. The only markets forecast to use the A380 during the Master Plan planning horizon are in Southeast Asia. These large capacity aircraft will be principally replacing B747-400 equipment on ultra long-haul flights (greater than 6000 miles). Passengers on these flights will be a mixture of local and connecting passengers. That is the nature of an international gateway airport. LAX has been the preeminent airport in Southern California for many years and is expected to remain so under all reasonably considered alternatives. Many businesses in the region that depend on air transportation chose to locate near LAX and made substantial investments in facilities and improvements. Airlines and other service providers have supported LAX by making major commitments to this facility. The level and diversity of service provided at LAX has also created a synergy unmatched by other airports in the Los Angeles region. These facilities cannot easily be replaced at any other airport in the region.

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

SPHP00022-2

Comment:

Now, I'm not going to go into the story of SCRA with you, but those in the know know what that's all about. The death of SCRA caused by the City of Los Angeles, here is the second one.

"The myth of 78 MAP, fewer gates limit MAP. Are you so sure? Bigger planes bring more people."

This is, again, from the County report. " Alternative provides 150 fully functional and high- capacity gates and does not remove the concrete which will remain available for airport parking. The true number of gates is there for over 200." Interesting.

Response:

Comment noted. Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Chapter 3 of the Draft Master Plan Addendum provide the basis for how Alternative D was designed and determined to serve a future (2015) airport activity level of 78.7 MAP. Future operation of LAX under Alternative D would occur through the use of contact gates only, as anticipated in the planning for Alternative D described in the chapters referenced above. Alternative D does not propose, and is not designed for, the use of remote gates. It is important to note that design of Alternative D to accommodate a future (2015) airport activity level of 78.9 MAP took into account the future use of New Large Aircraft (NLA), including as related to the number and types of gates proposed under Alternative D, as well as the ability of NLA to use taxiway/taxilanes to and from those gates. Chapter 3, Alternative D Constrained Activity, of the Draft

3. Comments and Responses

Master Plan Addendum described in greater detail the role of NLA in the future operation of LAX under Alternative D, with supporting documentation and analysis, including the Alternative D Airside Analysis and the Aircraft Operation and Passenger Activity Profiles, provided in Appendices F and G, respectively, of the Draft Master Plan Addendum.

Please also see Response to Comment SAL00010-3 regarding the comment from the County of Los Angeles on the number of gates and associated activity level under Alternative D.

SPHP00022-3

Comment:

Stealth versus security -- or regarding security. This is entitled, " Bull's- eye" and we remember what the RAND study said about the plan.

My poem, " Bull's- eye" " Security, no. All those people in one place, massive target stands."

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHP00022-4

Comment:

And a -- a -- I guess a regular note. I ask if you have the Westchester Streetscape Project mentioned in your plan, if what they are planning is, you know, in your EIS, et cetera. I'm hoping what Westchester is planning is taken into account because the County report says that a lot of current projects are not mentioned in your supplement.

Response:

Comment noted. The Westchester Streetscape Project is accounted for within the planning and design of Alternative D.

SPHP00023 Rose, Harry

None Provided

8/18/2003

SPHP00023-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Harry Rose. I live at 7725 Hindry Avenue, Westchester, California.

I'm here tonight to speak of jobs. By God, there is nothing like a public works boondoggle to get the economy rolling again, isn't it folks?

Something that our union friends are probably not aware of is that the community of Westchester and Playa del Rey have devised an alternative to Alternative D that we like to call Alternative E. And in devising this alternative, we kind of looked at the Alternative D and asked ourselves, what really needs to be done here? From our standpoint, what really needs to be done is we need to move the parking lot. And I think that we can do this for far less than \$ 9.6 billion dollars.

What we propose to do was to move the parking lot to the corner of Aviation and Century Boulevard on airport property and to extend the Green Line into the Ground Transportation Center along a trench on Aviation Boulevard to -- at the Ground Transportation Center provide the passenger with check- in and complete luggage screening so once you arrive at the airport, you're free of your luggage. You can travel on a people mover to the airport.

And we thought that Manchester Square might be a great location for a park, especially since the City Council of Los Angeles promised us that's what it was going to be. But we thought maybe a Convention Center would be nice, too, something close to the hotels, maybe a little larger than what they could accommodate, but smaller -- small enough that it wouldn't compete with downtown.

We propose moving the car rental facility, consolidating it at the corners of Imperial and Aviation so we don't have people driving down our streets asking us, "Gee, how do I get to Hertz from here?"

And looking at the runway complexes, we see an Alternative D essentially building up a flight field that can handle far more capacity than it currently can. And we thought we wouldn't even mess with the north runway complex, but move the inside runway south in the south -- north in the north -- move the inside runway north in the south runway complex to accommodate the larger aircraft. That would also provide them with the 12,500- foot runway and keep them where they belong, away from our community.

We've really gotten no consideration at all from the City of Los Angeles for our proposals. We'll be submitting them in writing. And I'm certain that this proposed alternative of the communities would provide those much- needed construction jobs at a far less -- far more reasonable cost to the airline and air passengers.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPC00035-4 regarding the residents' concept, Alternative E.

SPHP00024 Walker, Daniel Friends of the Green Line 8/18/2003

SPHP00024-1

Comment:

Good evening. I'm Daniel Walker. I live at 7416 West 82nd Street in Los Angeles. That's in Westchester about 10 blocks north of LAX.

In talking to my family and people in my neighborhood, they have -- they use LAX regularly and they'd like to see it improved, but they also have a lot of concerns primarily in terms of traffic congestion, air pollution and noise. Those are the main three things that my family talks about.

Response:

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

SPHP00024-2

Comment:

I'm a Friend of the Green Line, grass roots, all- volunteer group. And we're promoting -- we're promoting the Green Line to go to more places. Just this last month the Green Line set an all time record of over 36,000 rides, probably in conjunction with the opening of the Gold Line. Even though the line really goes from nowhere to Norwalk to nowhere here in the South Bay area, it has so much more potential.

When you go to Europe and you go to the better airports, what you can do is you could get off your airplane and you have access to a rail system that takes you all throughout Europe. You simply don't need to take short -- short hop airline flights throughout the rest of France, for example, when you land at Paris.

There is no reason why in California we can't improve the quality of lives for my friends and neighbors out here by reducing the need for some of those local commuter flights by having a good rail connection. The MTA already owns a line that runs from LAX toward downtown L. A. that could be easily upgraded for quiet, non- polluting light rail transit. The City of Inglewood is very interested in hearing more about that, studying that. That would provide the link from here to Santa Barbara or from

3. Comments and Responses

here to Las Vegas, here to San Diego. It would reduce the need for people to drive to LAX. It would certainly reduce the amount of pollution in the local area.

So there is a lot of reasons why a better mass transit airport access would make things better, not only for the airport, but the communities around the airport.

So the Friends of the Green Line is asking LAWA and the City of L. A. and the City of Inglewood to look a little bit more closely at this former BNSF, now MTA- owned right- of- way that runs from the airport to the rest of downtown Los Angeles and the rest of the County, and see if that can be used as some mitigation for some of the traffic and some of the pollution that are caused by the airport.

So I certainly can sympathize with a lot of my neighbors that are talking today about the problems they face and the concerns they have about more people coming to LAX. And I understand what people are saying about jobs because we certainly need jobs as well. We are here to talk about better access.

No matter what size the airport is, no matter where the ultimate Ground Transportation Center ends up, if it's located near the Harbor Subdivision tracks, we'd like to see a station there that's connected to the rest of the rail network. The people mover is a fine idea, but let's get a real light rail connection as well.

Response:

Comment noted.

Also, please see Response to Comment SPHP00022-2, regarding the most feasible connection to the Green Line.

SPHP00025 Sambrano, Diane None Provided 8/18/2003

SPHP00025-1

Comment:

Okay. My name is Diane Sambrano, 3640 West 111th Place, Inglewood, California 90303.

Good evening, and thank you again for having the public hearing. I unfortunately am disappointed that we did not have any local publicity from our local representatives.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHP00025-2

Comment:

But with regards to the LAX expansion Alternative D, I think that we need to keep in mind, as you heard many people tonight say, that jobs is everything. And progress is everything. And I would encourage you to think that with that concept comes a certain amount of quality of life for those of us who live near the airport that they simply choose to disregard. Our quality of life should not be sacrificed so that someone can have an occasional part- time short- term job. The benefit for those traveling to and from other destinations should not be the sole burden of those of us who live near LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed employment in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics. As indicated on page 4-298 in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, under Alternative D, there would be a decline in direct LAX-related jobs in the Los Angeles Region over the planning period due to productivity increases. However, when the direct employment impact is combined with indirect and induced jobs, the total employment impact on the regional economy by 2015 would equate to about 629,000 jobs. During the initial years of the Master Plan under Alternative D, employment growth similar to that projected for the other alternatives would occur. Refer to Technical Report S-3 for further discussion. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

SPHP00025-3

Comment:

Both the SCAG, the COG and everyone else in this country seems to understand that putting all of your eggs in one basket is not a good idea, but the regionalization should in fact be the plan that we pursue. And by encouraging more and more traffic to come to LAX is a direct decrease of suggesting people to go to other locations, whether it's Ontario, Palmdale or El Toro.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports. The master plans will recommend improvements to meet the projected demand. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County's vote on Measure W, the City of Los Angeles' attempt to gain the ability to operate El Toro as a part of LAWA airport system, and Orange County/Irvine plans for multi-use of the former El Toro property. Also, please see Topical Responses TR-RC-1 and TR-RC-5 regarding other airports in the region generally, and the airports at Ontario and Palmdale specifically.

SPHP00025-4

Comment:

The quality of life for the people that live near this airport should be considered.

As often some people say, " You knew the airport was there." None of us purchased cell phones. And I assure you, very few people in 1950 bought stock in cell phones. And if they did, they are not in this room tonight. They are living somewhere else very far away from any of this discussion.

To say that everything is about progress is tantamount in telling me that greed for some is more important than the need for all. My quality of life and the quality of life due to benzene, carcinogens, traffic congestion, and simple noise pollution should not be the very thing that makes someone else who doesn't endure those things rich. Anyone who wants to get rich off of all those issues should try living in my community.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life and TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

SPHP00025-5

Comment:

Mitigation has not been addressed to a degree that is sufficient for the members of this area of the region. We should not, as I said before, bear the burden so that everyone else has convenience. Those who are elected are elected to serve the people and not simply those who can pay off campaign contributions. We the people of this area deserve equal and appropriate environmental justice.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, with supporting technical data and analysis provided

3. Comments and Responses

Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

SPHP00025-6

Comment:

And it is unfortunate that the entity who put this plan and program together chose to do it on a limited scope and not make the written documents available to the masses who they will affect.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Also, please see Response to Comment PC02236-15 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR in the Spanish language.

SPHP00026 Grumet, Michele None Provided 8/18/2003

SPHP00026-1

Comment:

Okay. Michele Grumet, 2036 West 77th Street, Los Angeles, 90047.

My objection is that many people in the affected communities, and particularly seniors, are not computer literate and cannot afford the high prices of the documents such as \$ 330 for the Supplement EIR, 140 for the appendices, \$ 755 for the technical reports to the Supplement, and the Draft and Master Plan addendum \$ 340, \$ 50 for the disk. You would think that a \$ 9-billion-dollar project could afford to provide the public with free access to those documents.

Now, talking about the cost of the EIR, I feel that the cost of the EIR, which should be free to the public, has impeded the public's ability to participate in the EIR process by limiting access to the EIR and violating CEQA. And I guess that a project of this cost, the lead agencies can just not afford to provide the affected parties with documents for free.

I, myself, have worked on several such documents, EIRs in the past. And always people who requested the documents were given the documents. And I think it's very difficult for many people to go to libraries because there is only, for instance, in South L. A. where I live, that particular area, there are only two public libraries. So people would have to stand in line to wait because you're not allowed to check out the EIR. So I think this violates the CEQA process.

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.

SPHP00027 Carpio, Cecil None Provided 8/18/2003

SPHP00027-1

Comment:

Thank you. Cecil Carpio, 407 Exten Avenue, Inglewood.

This isn't technical at all. I guess it's about as technical as crying for jobs, jobs, jobs. But, you know, LAX Master Planning didn't address terrorism the first time around. Alternatives A, B and C, why?

During the late ' 60s and the early ' 70s high- jacking was in the forefront of international news. Presidential committees studied airport safety and security. Los Angeles Department of Airports has been running an unsecure, unsafe airport all these years. If everyone -- if anyone is serious about

3. Comments and Responses

safety and security, the push would be for decentralization. Los Angeles World Airports would not allow itself to grow. L. A. Mayor James Hahn wants El Toro. Why? To pull another Palmdale. El Toro should be forced to become a part of the Southern California system.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding El Toro.

SPHP00027-2

Comment:

The Manchester Square Voluntary Program is a heartless process of acquiring property for LAX expansion. And it's not voluntary.

Response:

Comment noted. The acquisition of Manchester Square is voluntary and was initiated by the residents of Manchester Square during the 1997 Public Scoping meetings.

SPHP00027-3

Comment:

This hearing must not really be that important either because I'd like to note that at, what, 8: 30 I have not seen the members of Inglewood City Council including Mayor Dorn. I haven't seen the city administrator. I haven't seen members of the Inglewood Aviation Commission, except for me. I haven't seen the board members of the Inglewood Unified School District, you know, not to mention the Planning Commission of the City of Inglewood. So why are we all here?

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHP00028 Sanders, Patt None Provided 8/18/2003

SPHP00028-1

Comment:

Thank you. Good evening. My name is Patt Sanders. I reside at 8716 South 3rd Avenue.

I carry many hats. I'm a library commissioner. And on top of that I'm the elected member of the 51st Assembly District for the Los Angeles County Central Committee.

Previous speaker, the one before me, ditto, I won't go over all of the other comments regarding the EIR not making it available to people.

Response:

Comment noted. For responses to comments made by the previous speaker, please see responses to comment letter SPHP00027. In addition, please see Response to Comment SPHP00026-1 regarding availability of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

SPHP00028-2

Comment:

My parents, my father is 81 years old and lives in Inglewood. There was some other comment made previously of why don't we move. Why should we when we have worked for our homes? I'm a 28-year retiree from the City of Los Angeles. I reside in Inglewood. I cannot hear myself think with all these planes flying over.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation. Please note that LAWA and FAA do not propose that anyone in Inglewood be forced to move away due to the noise.

SPHP00028-3

Comment:

My issue now, I look at this EIR and I'm totally disgusted by this. One of the things, why would you put -- if we're so concerned about terrorism and safety and security, why in the hell do you put it in our neighborhood? You know, I mean, don't we count?

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHP00028-4

Comment:

And the mere fact that, okay, we're having this hearing now when the mayor, Los Angeles mayor is off on vacation, some of our own citizens are off on vacation. I mean, it's like the previous plan. It's like going from bad to worse. That's what it is. There is no consideration about us as citizens.

And I'm a union member. So I'm not going to talk against my union brothers. I was vice president of the Engineers and Architects Association for many years until my retirement, but how many of those union members actually reside in this flight path and are affected by this plan? That's what I want to know. And I'm not mad at them. I know they are looking out for their members and they are looking out for money and everybody wants a piece of the pie. Bottom line is, it's the citizens.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHP00028-5

Comment:

And another thing. Where are the damn -- where the hell are the health declarations? My father lost his hearing and we can look back. My family lives a long time. There is no nobody that has had any hearing problems except when they moved to Inglewood in Carlton Square and have been living there. He's the only one out of ten children that has a hearing problem.

Response:

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

SPHP00028-6

Comment:

We have other health declarations. I saw them when they were submitted. Where are they and why aren't they addressed? What, are you waiting for the people just to die off so you could just go ahead

3. Comments and Responses

with your plan? It's really disgusting that we're really, you know, dealing with this now in this day and time.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor's reference to "other health declarations" is unspecific and cannot be addressed. To the extent that the commentor is expressing a belief that airport operations have caused certain ailments, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding links between airport emissions and adverse health effects and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

SPHP00028-7

Comment:

And then, look, I'm not a mathematical genius, but I can count. On your plan you don't take into account the homes that you're going to have to move. The people, where are they going to go? You're just going to rollover them and that's not counted in the plan? There is no financial planning? The figures don't add up.

Response:

Impacts related to residential acquisition were addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues. The costs associated with the acquisition of existing residences and the relocation of affected occupants are considered construction costs/impacts, discussed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and addressed in more detail in Technical Report 5, Economic Impacts of Los Angeles International Airport and the LAX Master Plan Alternatives on the Los Angeles Regional Economy, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-3, Supplemental Economic Impacts Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHP00028-8

Comment:

So I'm just going to leave you with that. I think it's disgusting that, you know, you're doing this to citizens, to people. My father served this country. He's a declared veteran. I'm a grand-daughter of a Native-American. Why am I being treated like this?

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHA00001 Winger, Shandor None Provided 8/19/2003

SPHA00001-1

Comment:

My name is Shandor Winger. I'm here as a citizen of San Fernando Valley tonight. I'm very pleased to speak before you.

Los Angeles Master Plan is a combination of 11 many years of study in that it's been looked at in every which way you could possibly think of. It has now been fine-tuned to a level that can be readily accepted by many. Readily accepted in the fashion because it now meets the criteria, I think, of satisfying the needs of the citizens and of the community and the security needs.

In that, speaking to the Master Plan, the EIR and the security item, I will address it in a nature of the security in the nature of the Alternative -- I know it's D.

I will firstly say that when it comes to the EIR, which is really a portion of the Master Plan itself, the EIR after reading it now meets the criteria for supporting a full Master Plan.

3. Comments and Responses

The Alternative D is an item that has been brought forth to us and pushed not only by the staff of the Los Angeles World Airport, but pushed by the Mayor himself.

The only thing I will say to that is it's time for everyone to get together and support staff, support the Mayor and push this thing through and get it done,

and get it done as presented tonight with Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHA00002 Rodine, Robert

Polaris Group

8/19/2003

SPHA00002-1

Comment:

Mr. Kessler, Mr. Ritchie, thank you for allowing me to speak here tonight. My name is Robert Rodine. My firm is the Polaris Group, and I live in Sherman Oaks, California.

LAX medium growth demand embodied in the SCAG Regional Transportation fund is driven by fundamental regional demographics at 2020, it's 94.2 million annual passengers and 4.2 million tons of cargo annually.

This is 59.8 percent of the forecasted regional load of 157.4 MAP. Under Alternative D emphasized to be part of a regional plan. The loads planned for LAX are 78.9 MAP and 3.1 million annual tons of cargo. This reduction in the LAX portion of the regional volumes is 15.3 MAP and 1.1 million annual tons of cargo. If this reduction in volume is retained within the region through diversion to other regional airports, there would be no net negative impact. If, however, it is not, the negative impact is the loss of approximately \$ 33 billion dollars of turnover annually and some 220,000 jobs inclusive of the effects of the induced economies.

If we were to avoid the above losses, it seems that specific arrangements for diversion wouldn't necessarily be in place before leaping off on a \$ 9-billion-dollar public works project. However, the EIR seems to be mute on this aspect of the plan.

What, if any, specific arrangements have been made -- have been formalized to ensure that the proposed diversion of traffic does not result in any negative economic impacts of the region?

Absent of pre-arranged plan with specific agreements to accommodate the displaced LAX passengers within the region, I am abjectly opposed to such a plan based on the supposition of such large fantom back-up element.

Response:

LAWA only controls the operations and potential improvements at LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Other jurisdictions are responsible for developing the other regional airports. LAWA estimates that these four facilities will handle approximately 97 MAP in 2015. Regional demand in excess of this amount will have to be met by the other airports in the region or some of the excess demand will be diverted to airports outside of the region and the balance of the demand will go unserved. LAWA has planned Alternative D to be in compliance with SCAG's 2001 and Draft 2004 RTP allocations to LAX. It is up to the other regional airport operators to meet a larger percentage of the regional demand. If the other regional airports do not provide facilities to meet this demand, there will certainly be a negative economic impact to the region.

SPHA00002-2

Comment:

I am also vitally concerned about security of LAX for both passengers and employees. Using a very simple blast radius analysis, it is clear that the proposed CTA has a much higher concentration of

3. Comments and Responses

passengers on an hourly basis than does the current dispersed terminal arrangement. Quantify the current terminal arrangement results in a blast exposure factor of approximately 1,509 passengers per hour while the proposed passenger facility will result in an exposure factor of 7,425 passengers per hour. I think that increase in risk renders the proposed plan unacceptable as defined.

Central Terminal Risk Analysis
Comparison of Numbers of People Exposed to Blasts of Equal Size
Given New Passenger Arrival Center vs. Old CTA

[See original document.]

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHA00003 Leffert, Steven

None Provided

8/19/2003

SPHA00003-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Steven Leffert. I am a citizen, resident of Van Nuys. I live approximately a half a mile of the other side of the airport, of Van Nuys Airport.

I have been a frequent user and strong supporter for the flyaway bus. I notice that that is becoming an integral part of the plan. However, I have not seen anything in the plan which does anything to mitigate what will be the increased normal traffic on the 405 from the San Fernando Valley to the airport.

Traffic gets worse every year. So even if you're riding on a flyaway bus to the airport, it's going to take longer and longer to get there. There needs to be something in the part of the plan that will mitigate some of that traffic on the 405 such as a light-rail line, a monorail or completing the carpool-buspool bus lane. Instead of having it end at Wilshire Boulevard and creating monumental traffic jams that back up into the Valley, complete that at least all the way down to the airport. That's an issue that needs to be addressed.

Response:

Alternative D would give priority use to FlyAway buses by having the FlyAway buses as the only passenger vehicles with direct access to the existing CTA curbside. Although traffic volumes on the I-405 Freeway are increasing, the vast majority of motorists contributing to this increase are not traveling to and from LAX. Any project-generated traffic on the freeway would be fully mitigated, as discussed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.3.2.8.4, CMP Mitigation Analysis (Alternative D). Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the regional traffic impacts.

SPHA00003-2

Comment:

I also noticed in the plan it said something about a clean burning fuel for the flyaway buses for 45 percent approximately. I think they should all be no more diesels and all clean burning fuels for the buses that are going to be used for the flyaway program.

Response:

Clean burning fuels will be used in the Flyaway buses, wherever feasible. The current estimate of clean burning fuel usage is a conservative estimate so as to not overstate the potential emission benefits from this source category. Therefore, there will be no less than 45 percent of the buses using alternative fuels but realistically, this number may be much higher.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHA00003-3

Comment:

Something that I couldn't get a clear answer to here by going through all the charts, and all, had to do with the safety issue and the checking in of the luggage. I heard years ago that they were planning on having the luggage check-in at the flyaway terminals and putting it on secure buses, trucks, or whatever, to take it to the airport, to separate the luggage from the passengers at an earlier point.

That's not in the plan. Apparently what's in the plan is just delivering the flyaway buses into the CTA, or Central Terminal Area, with their suitcases which would not have been screened prior, at least from what I could tell in all the charts and graphs out there.

So for the security issue I would like to see something done with screening and checking the baggage before you get on the bus.

And my other questions were answered by going through the chart.

Response:

The FlyAway buses will have to pass through a security checkpoint prior to entering the CTA. LAWA supports remote luggage check-in at the FlyAway facilities and this service will be pursued to the extent permitted by the FAA and TSA.

SPHA00004 Schultz, Don

**Van Nuys Homeowner's
Association**

8/19/2003

SPHA00004-1

Comment:

Good evening, Don Schultz, S- c- h- u- l- t- z, president of Van Nuys Homeowner's Association, PO Box 3528 Van Nuys, 91407.

I would like to make it clear that I am speaking for myself tonight as a community activist of the San Fernando Valley.

Even though I am not a frequent LAX traveler or visitor, I certainly understand Mayor Hahn's desire to enhance safety and security needs for LAX.

Since 9-11, security for every major airport in the U. S. must be emphasized. The Mayor needs support and constructive input from all of us to ensure that local airports are not easy prey for those cowardly terrorists that are obsessed with destroying us. That's all I have to say.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHA00005 Reed, Bart

Transit Coalition

8/19/2003

SPHA00005-1

Comment:

I'm Bart Reed, Executive Director of the Transit Coalition, San Fernando Valley, Sylmar, California. I'm going to pertain my remarks to traffic and environmental mitigation issues.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPHA00005-2

Comment:

One of the issues I do want to address, of course, is the flyaway bus and the lack of connectivity to public transportation in the San Fernando Valley. Even though the flyaway bus exits the 405 Freeway at Sherman Way, one, for example, from Sylmar would have to take a bus for about two hours and four different buses. However, buses don't run except for during 8: 00 to 5: 00 on the business day on Whitley, so you can't really get there. That doesn't work. We need to do reworking of the flyaway bus there. And in the future if you do any flyaway terminal like in Sylmar, consult with the community before you bring the plans out.

Response:

LAWA's intent is to expand the FlyAway service, not just in Van Nuys but in other areas of Southern California as well. LAWA wants to make it very convenient to take the FlyAway as an alternative to driving, to alleviate traffic congestion not just around LAX, but on the freeways feeding the airport as well. That may include improving service from Sylmar.

SPHA00005-3

Comment:

Also pertaining to the Green Line, I want to suggest that the Green Line extension be north along Aviation Boulevard, that it be included in the Final EIR as an integral part of the locally preferred alternative for real rail and traffic access to LAX.

We need intermodal solutions to traffic, not just more freeway exits, not just more roadways. We need to have a balance. By providing rail, we will provide more of a balance and less of a need for some amount of parking. I believe the airport has somewhere around 58,000 employees that go. We need the mitigation for the employees getting to the airport.

We would like to ask the FAA, Caltrans, the LADOT and MTA to work together to approve in writing and resolve all the issues on the Green Line route past the 18 airport.

We also urge that LAWA allocate enough funding under the mitigation for preliminary design and engineering to work on the Green Line alignment.

We'd also like to recommend that LAWA should construct as part of its mitigation, including FAA approval and oversight, the trench for the future Green Line projected to be dedicated for the future of the Green Line expansion along Aviation.

Response:

LAWA is very supportive of transit alternatives to LAX, including a connection to the Green Line. That is the reason that Alternative D includes as part of the project, a direct covered walkway between the people mover terminus at the ITC and the Green Line Aviation station. This will notably improve the convenience for Green Line users to LAX. A justification for an extension of the Green Line along Aviation Boulevard cannot be made as part of the project alternatives because it is not necessary to provide Green Line access, it would not provide a notable increase in passenger convenience, and it would be cost prohibitive, particularly since the GTC would require a very complex design if it were to incorporate a Green Line station. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

SPHA00005-4

Comment:

Also, while we're not exactly aware of the exact security arrangements of the Intermodal Transportation Center at Aviation and Imperial, if those security arrangements are as good as those at the Ground Transportation Center, we recommend that the Ground Transportation Center be at the site that the

3. Comments and Responses

Green Line be extended to rather than constructing the people mover from the Green Line Terminal to the Ground Transportation Center.

Response:

Comment noted. The purpose of locating the GTC at the proposed site is to provide a conventional airport landside environment for air passengers at a separate location from the CTA, thereby improving 1) safety and security of LAX by eliminating the threat of blast in close proximity to large congregations of queuing passengers at CTA; 2) ground access to and around LAX, as well as 3) the landside system that currently exists in the CTA. The Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum addressed the role of the GTC in Chapter 2, Alternative D Development and Refinement. Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security-related aspect of the comment.

In addition, as indicated in Section 2.4, Automated People Mover - Alternative D, of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum, Alternative D would include two people mover systems (i.e., a Landside APM system and an Airside APM system). The Landside system would become the primary connections between the landside facilities and the terminal facilities at LAX. To balance the passenger loads, two Landside APM routes were designed to operate independently, with one route serving only the CTA and GTC and a second route serving the CTA, RAC, and ITC. Therefore, there would not be a people mover connecting ITC and the GTC. Please see Appendix H of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum for information on decision to locate the GTC at Manchester Square.

SPHA00005-5

Comment:

And just to conclude. For cost-saving purposes and true traffic pollution and environmental mitigation, we recommend the Green Line continue all the way to the Ground Transportation Center, which would obviate the need for a separate and unnecessary Intermodal Transit Center. Certainly a people mover can be maintained on the east side of Aviation Boulevard from the parking lots to the Ground Transportation Center separate from the Green Line, and that we ask that LAWA maintain --

-- well, LAWA may maintain that the people mover could provide round-the-clock connections from the Green Line to the central airport terminals via an Intermodal Transit Center. We also mentioned the rail service is available from 4: 00 a. m. in the morning and it concludes at 2: 00 a. m. So we have a lot of rail service. So we don't necessarily have to do the people mover between the Green Line and the Ground Transportation Center.

Response:

The people mover connects to the GTC and ITC for many reasons other than providing a Green Line connection, such as providing convenient access for motorists parking in GTC and ITC parking facilities. Therefore, the plan will maintain a people mover connection to the ITC regardless of how the Green Line is connected. Please see Response to Comment SPHA0005-3 regarding the Green Line connection.

SPHA00006 Spaulding, John Operating Engineers 8/19/2003

SPHA00006-1

Comment:

My name is John Spaulding. That's S- p- a- u- l- d- i- n- g. And I'm here on behalf of the Operating Engineers. Our address is 150 East Corson, C- o- r- s- o- n, Street, Pasadena, 91103. I'm also a resident of Pasadena. But that's all right. I don't think you need that address.

I'm here representing the Operating Engineers. The Operating Engineers in Southern California represent 23,000 members. We are very supportive of Alternative D. We are very appreciative of Mayor Hahn's position on safety and security issues in Alternative D.

3. Comments and Responses

But, again, I would urge you not to concentrate the people in one place because that is a disaster pending. And I would also urge you, even though it's difficult, to add luggage check-in and security to areas like Van Nuys flyaway and replicate these all over the area. This way it would eliminate the traffic on the freeway. It would eliminate the parking around the airport, and it would substantially eliminate the ability for a terrorist to bring a bomb or a chemical weapon into the facilities that have been through prescreening and check-in at that point.

I'm afraid that Mr. Hahn's idea to get this working by providing this one monstrous place for people to enter a killing field is one of the dumbest ideas I have ever heard.

Response:

LAWA will pursue the installation of additional FlyAways in Los Angeles County. The location of these facilities is based on expected ridership demand, freeway accessibility and size of available property. Alternative D provides an additional incentive for FlyAway passengers since the FlyAway buses would be the only passenger vehicles allowed directly into the CTA. The FlyAway buses will have to pass through a security checkpoint prior to entering the CTA. LAWA supports remote luggage check-in at the FlyAway facilities and this service will be pursued to the extent permitted by the FAA and TSA. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security-related aspect of the comment.

SPHA00009 Ramos, Sergio Laborers Local 300 8/19/2003

SPHA00009-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Sergio Ramos. And I'm a union representative of the laborers. I'm here on behalf of my business manager of Laborer's Local 300. I'm here in support to make LAX safer.

Our 7,000 members that live here in the L. A. area fly in and out of LAX. And it will create jobs for our members and many other construction trade members. And we're in support of the LAX Master Plan project.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHA00010 Stewart, James None Provided 8/19/2003

SPHA00010-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is James Stewart. I live in Panorama City, and I'm vice chair of the Van Nuys Airport Citizen's Advisory Council and speaking only for myself tonight.

I agree with a lot of what is said. I think this plan has some major flaws in the way it sits. The safety issue of concentrating people, the many --

Response:

Comment noted. This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHA00010-2

Comment:

I think the Green Line and also any other future mass transit systems should go directly into the passenger facility if you're going to have one.

Response:

LAWA is very supportive of transit alternatives to LAX, including a connection to the Green Line. Unfortunately, the Commentor does not indicate to which passenger facility he is referring. The Green Line would extend directly to the future West Terminal in Alternatives A, B, and C. However, in Alternative D, the Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC), which is the logical connecting point to the Green Line, is on the opposite side of Imperial Highway, and any extension of the Green Line directly into the ITC would require severe redesign and reconstruction of the Green Line alignment upstream and downstream of the Aviation Station. This is infeasible. An extension of the Green Line along Aviation Boulevard into the GTC would not provide a notable increase in passenger convenience over what is proposed in Alternative D, would require a very complex design, and would be cost prohibitive. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

SPHA00010-3

Comment:

And the passenger facility seems to me to be a maximum inconvenience. You take your luggage out of your car. You take it into the facility, put it on a trolley. You take it on the train, take it off the train, take it to check-in. It is a maximum inconvenience, particularly for those who are elderly or for the infirm, those that can't handle their own luggage very well. This is a ridiculous idea. If we're going to have a central terminal facility for passengers to check in here, why don't we have a true remote check-in at the GTC? So once you get to the GTC, you dump your luggage and you're done with it.

Response:

Comment noted. E-Kiosk check-in, skycap baggage check-in and baggage re-claim (optional for re-checked bags) are listed as major functions anticipated to be included at the GTC allowing passengers to travel to or from the CTA via the APM without having to carry their checked bags. All facilities constructed at LAX would be fully accessible as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

SPHA00010-4

Comment:

The thing I'm most concerned about, however, is the 78.9 annual passengers. This is part of a regional plan. Well, not really because we don't have any regional plan nor do we have any power to enforce a regional plan if we had one. We have no ability to force other airports to take more flights and we have no ability to open new airports either in Orange County or anywhere else around here. And we are going to have some serious economic impact on this lack of activity at LAX.

This facility should be designed for 100 million annual passengers, not 78.9. We should make this a central facility on the West Coast. If that means we have to do a lot more mitigation in the communities, let's do it.

I grew up in Inglewood. I went to Morningside High School. I lived with this airport for the first 23 years of my life. It's a major economic benefit, and we need to maximize it.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHA00011 Ayre, Mike

None Provided

8/19/2003

SPHA00011-1

Comment:

This is going to be short. My name is Mike Ayre spelled A- y- r- e. I'm a resident of Van Nuys.

In short, I'm in full support of the Master Plan Alternative D for the modernization of LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHA00012 O'Sullivan, Dennis None Provided

8/19/2003

SPHA00012-1

Comment:

Good evening. Dennis O'Sullivan, O, apostrophe, S- u, double L, i- v- a- n, Sherman Oaks, California.

I want to speak in support of the Alternative D. I, along with some of the other people here who live in the Valley and have been spoiled by flyaway for years, would suggest on mitigation of the traffic, which we know grows worse daily on the 405, would be to study the regional transportation that goes into LAX, determine what ZIP Codes, what areas could benefit from flyaway and create four or five additional flyaways spread throughout the county. Those of us who use it swear by it. It's the's easiest way to get into the airport. And whether the baggage is scanned at the flyaway or whether it's scanned at the preliminary terminal, I think that we would mitigate some of the safety concerns by doing it that way. Because to get into a terminal where you have everybody coming in from the flyaway from their car drop-offs, from the rental car drop-offs, into one place does create an attractive target.

But 9-11 has forced us to come up with this plan versus A, B and C. And I think plan D meets the needs. We want a world-class city and we're living in an old-world infrastructure.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA will pursue the installation of additional FlyAways in Los Angeles County. The ideal locations for these facilities are based on surveys which provided data regarding the regional origins and destinations of LAX passengers. Freeway accessibility and size of available property are other factors used in planning for future FlyAway locations. Alternative D provides an additional incentive for FlyAway passengers since the FlyAway buses would be the only passenger vehicles allowed directly into the CTA. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security-related aspect of the comment.

SPHA00012-2

Comment:

I fly, and I fly into airports and transportation systems that really make us look like an antique. The people movers work very well in Newark. When you're going into there, it ties directly in with port authority transportation. Yes, there is a lot of people, but they seem to be able to deliver people to the three airports there very effortlessly by tying together the public transportation and the people movers.

So, again, I support Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHA00013 Walter, Mahala None Provided

8/19/2003

SPHA00013-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Mahala Walter, 7015 Sepulveda Boulevard, Westchester.

In reviewing the material for Alternative D, the security improvements aren't nearly as substantial as claimed by the proponents. Basically, it relocates one spot to another.

3. Comments and Responses

If you were a terrorist wanting to shut down Southern California's economy, what better target could you be provided with than to change the airlines passenger load, which is currently distributed around nine different terminals. Change it to one site where everyone for all flights are congregated for checking in and dropping off at Manchester Square located one and a half miles away from LAX, a huge facility called GTC, or the Ground Transportation Center, adjacent to the 405 near the 105 exchange.

Passengers who do not use sky cap services may carry their baggage on the automatic people mover to the CTA, the Central Terminal Area, where screening is done by the appropriate airline. Imagine spending all those billions and have the luggage and the cargo arrive at LAX without screening.

Last year I warned a couple of congressional representatives that our own crazies could put timers on the bombs in the luggage and send them through to the CTA. Now, who would want to work there? This underground luggage tunnel is due to start construction in 2005. But the safety measures recommended by the FAA for the runway and taxiways safety are not scheduled for completion until 2015.

At the CTA the second level passengers' security screening occurs. It is letting not only the travelers, but meeters and greeters through to the CTA without security screening. This is even less secure than at LAX now where the meeters and greeters are not allowed in secured areas.

Sounds like a Disneyland attraction to use the people mover to funnel and increase the amount of people into 200 additional businesses proposed by the Mayor shifting money from existing businesses for the benefit of increasing airport revenues.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHA00014 Brink, Charles

None Provided

8/19/2003

SPHA00014-1

Comment:

Again, I'm still from Northridge. My comments now are relating to cargo jets, particularly all cargo. I think they are an item that should be pulled out of the LAX environment --

Again, what I was saying is to move the all-cargo aircraft operations to an airport like Palmdale, for example. You'll be in Palmdale tomorrow night. I'm sure you'll see lots of people suggesting they could use a lot more traffic, and noise isn't a problem for them.

But the cargo aircraft have no reason to land in Inglewood, no reason to land in the west side because cargo as it comes off the airplanes isn't used in the area. It, for example, would fit better into an airport like Palmdale or even San Bernardino or outlying points. The cargo jets are the late night jets that tend to be the noisiest. By moving that cargo aircraft out to the area would have minimum impact, would still keep the dollars in the L. A. County area and it would allow an area that has an infinite room to expand to use its airport.

Now, it seems the city does not want to expand Palmdale because they claim there is no need for it. But from my house in Northridge, I could get to Palmdale any time of the day faster than I could get to LAX. That's another issue.

I would like to encourage you to think cargo, the big cargo planes, is to take them to Palmdale into an area that they are not bothering the environment. Their trucks aren't producing congestion. Their cargo isn't a risk for, again, passengers because that cargo even next to the cargo areas could contaminate cargo loading into the passenger aircraft. Those are bioterrorism issues.

So separate the cargo by loading it into a safe place like Palmdale. It would be a solution to reduce traffic and reduce terrorism issues, and it would provide increased capacity for LAX because by removing all the cargo-only aircraft from the facility, it could add more traffic to the airport.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Cargo cannot be moved simply to suit the needs of the airport. LAWA is working with the all-cargo airlines and LAX freight forwarders to encourage the use of Palmdale, Ontario, and the other regional airports for cargo destined for or originating near the other airports. LAWA cannot force these companies to use Palmdale. Much of LAX's existing competitive advantage is due to the foresight of the City thirty to forty years ago building sufficient facility capacity to handle long-term growth in aviation demand. As the first jet facility in the region, it was already well established by the time the region had grown enough to support a multiple airport system. Many businesses in the region that depend on air transportation chose to locate near LAX and made substantial investments in facilities and improvements. Airlines and other service providers have supported LAX by making major commitments to this facility. The unamortized investments in facilities at LAX and the cost of relocation will make wholesale movements of cargo flights unlikely in the near-term. 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.

SPHM00001 Aldinger, Jim

City of Manhattan Beach

8/20/2003

SPHM00001-1

Comment:

Yes. Thank you. Welcome to Manhattan Beach. I am the Mayor of Manhattan Beach. Thank you guys for coming down here.

I have several concerns about the plan. The first would be that I don't think there is enough options on the table. I think there needs to be other options. I think security, I think you guys are trying address a security issue, but I don't think there is enough options. I think with the normal EIR process there would be three or four options. And some of those would address security. And some would address other things. But, obviously, security is a big issue.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As indicated in the topical response, the development of Alternative D was an iterative process which included the consideration of many security concepts. The Final EIS/EIR considers five alternatives, including the No Action/No Project Alternative and four build alternatives.

SPHM00001-2

Comment:

My other question is, are other airports -- I know I'm not supposed to ask questions, but are other airports in the country doing this kind of thing, JFK, other airports? Is the Federal Government involved with this? Is the Homeland Security Department involved with this? Have we consulted with them? Is this the right thing to do? I know Harman's people have come out and commissioned the report with RAND. And they've said there was definitely problems with this as far as security goes. So I think that definitely needs to be addressed.

Response:

The federal government is involved in ensuring safety and security at the nation's airports through the FAA and TSA. The enhancement of the security of LAX is being coordinated with TSA.

SPHM00001-3

Comment:

The issue of cost. For me \$ 9 billion dollars and growing is a driver that we need to address. There are a lot of other things we need to do around here as far as with money. I think \$ 9 billion dollars is a significant amount of money to be spending. There are definitely traffic improvements we can do around the airport as far as running the Green Line in there, doing freeway interchanges, those kinds of things.

3. Comments and Responses

I'm not opposed to that kind of thing. I think those are good things that we should be doing. But whether we need to tear down three terminals is a big, big driver to me.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00001-4

Comment:

And then I think as far as the issue of expansion and whether this will be expanding the airport and increasing the capacity, I think ultimately it will expand. I think you're doing some things that make it easier to expand the airport. I think putting in the bigger planes and separating the runways for bigger planes is a concern that I know we have here in Manhattan Beach as far -- because it generates so much traffic and generates such an impact to our community.

Response:

Comment noted. As described in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D is designed to reasonably accommodate 78.9 MAP, which is equivalent to the No Action/No Project Alternative. The purpose of moving the runways further apart is to gain enough separation for constructing a center taxiway between the two closely spaced parallel runways. The purpose of the center taxiway is to enhance safe aircraft operations and reduce the potential for runway incursions. At the same time, the center taxiway would be designed to accommodate New Large Aircraft such as A380. Please see Response to Comment SPHO00004-9 for more information.

SPHM00001-5

Comment:

And I think we had the same issues with the traffic impacts and the fact that you guys didn't go far enough south with your traffic. I mean, you guys have not picked up Rosecrans. You guys have not picked up several streets in our area on the 405 interchanges further to the south that I think a lot of people come up from Orange County. And if the impact -- if the airport expands -- I know the mayor said it won't, but I think we need to continue to look at that.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2, Sub-Topic Responses TR-ST-2.2 and TR-ST-2.3, regarding selection of traffic facilities for analysis.

SPHM00001-6

Comment:

Overall, I think there needs to be more options and more input from other people on security.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPHM00001-1 and SPHM00001-2 above.

SPHM00002 Bonin, Mike

**Congresswoman Jane Harman's 8/20/2003
Office**

SPHM00002-1

Comment:

Good evening. I'm Mike Bonin, B- o- n- i- n. I'm Deputy Chief of Staff to Congresswoman Harman. Do you need her office address? 2321 East Rosecrans, El Segundo, 90245.

3. Comments and Responses

First of all, on behalf of the Congresswoman, welcome the 36th District. We're glad to see you here throughout the district. And congratulations to everyone here from the various communities in the South Bay who turned out tonight to give their voices to the public process. We really appreciate that.

Just to be clear, I want to state from the very beginning that Congresswoman Harman is very much in favor, as many of the T-shirts say here, of fixing Los Angeles International Airport. But she's very determined that it be fixed right. That's as equally important a factor as fixing it now. And Congresswoman Harman applauds Mayor Hahn and applauds Los Angeles World Airports for the intent of Alternative D, which is to make Los Angeles International Airport safer and more secure for the passengers, for the many people that work there and for all the people that live in the South Bay area.

Where she finds fault, however, is with the execution of Alternative D. As most people know, she commissioned the RAND report a few months ago, which raised very serious concerns about the configuration outlined in Alternative D. We'll submit a letter later. And I'm sure you're quite familiar with the RAND report. It's deeply concerned with the centralized features of Alternative D and with what effectively we're afraid puts a big red X on Los Angeles International Airport and says to Al-Qaida, "Attack here."

The RAND study, some of the concerns raised by the RAND study, have been raised again by the concern of the County Board of Supervisors, the study of the County Board of Supervisors had before them earlier this week, which we'll see again on Saturday, the study is by A. C. Lazzaretto and Associates which that the security proposals in Alternative D are short in detail and often contradictory.

And I must say that Congresswoman Harman and many of her constituents were alarmed by some of the reports we saw this week in the press, the Daily News story by Rick Orlove which indicated that many of the security features key to Alternative D aren't in place yet.

Congresswoman Harman is the member of the Select Committee on the Intelligence in the House. As in that capacity, she's very well aware of the various threats to our national security. For her fixing LAX in a way that we are not subject to attacks, and the safety and security and the economic engine of Los Angeles and Southern California are not in constant jeopardy, there has got to be a number one priority. She is committed to working with anybody in working on getting a plan that does that. She's very concerned that so far Alternative D is not that plan.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHM00003 Steiner, Fred

P.I.P.E.

8/20/2003

SPHM00003-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Fred Steiner, S- t- e- i- n- e- r. My address is 9778 Summer Hill Road, Rancho Cucamonga, California. I'm the Assistant Executive Director of P- i- p- e. Pipe is a labor -- Labor Management Cooperative Committee who represents over 14,000 members, union members, and over 600 union contractors in Southern California.

I'm here tonight in support of Alternative D, improvements of LAX. The Pipe Trades of Southern California would enjoy the benefits in taking part of the work in the jobs that are projected with the 49,000 construction jobs for the expansion. But I would like tonight to speak about -- speak from the perspective of a consumer.

My family, my friends and myself and just about everyone I know would rather take a beating right now than to fly out of LAX. I know people, friends of mine that would drive 50 miles plus, do two layovers to fly back east than to fly out of LAX. And I think this is indicative of what's happening right now. The

3. Comments and Responses

major concern of the people that I know are security, especially since 9- 11. I have reviewed the Alternative D proposals, and I believe these issues are driving customers away from LAX. And they would be addressed by the completion of this project.

Also, again, I applaud Mayor Hahn and the people from the World Airports for bringing forth these proposals. And we are in favor of it. Contractors and members of the Southern California Pipe Trade are in favor of Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00004 Kurtz, Barry

County of Los Angeles

8/20/2003

SPHM00004-1

Comment:

Good evening. I'm Barry Kurtz representing the City of Los Angeles tonight. I work for the County Department of Public Works, 900 South Fremont, Alhambra, 91803.

Thank you for the opportunity of providing input into the LAX Master Plan improvements. I've submitted three copies of preliminary comments from A. C. Lazzaretto & Associates. They are the consultant for the County. Attachment I is Mr. Lazzaretto's comments, and Attachment II are comments by the County Department of Public Works.

The Board of Supervisors has approved these comments to be addressed to LAWA and FAA. For brevity, I'll summarize these comments. The first set of these comments are from A. C. Lazzaretto.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. The referenced attachments are identified in the Final EIS/EIR as SPC00063 and SAL00008, respectively. These attachments are also included as part of comment letter SAL00004. Please see Responses to Comments SAL00004-2 through SAL00004-30.

SPHM00004-2

Comment:

First, the proposed Master Plan Alternative D may not constrain growth at LAX.

Response:

The passenger activity that would be expected in 2015 with Alternative D was determined based on the design of the Alternative D gate facilities and the projected airline response to the constrained facilities. As described in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR, these (passenger) levels are an indication of the number of passengers that can be accommodated at a reasonable level of service.

SPHM00004-3

Comment:

The second, airport security may not be fully achieved by Alternative D.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHM00004-4

Comment:

Environmental justice may not be well- served by Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted. The 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 S-D.

SPHM00004-5

Comment:

The baseline year of 1996 is not adequate for 2003 assessment.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SAL00004-6 and Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues and, specifically, the appropriate baseline year. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identifies project impacts compared to Year 2000 conditions, where relevant, although 1996 continues to be used as the baseline for the CEQA analysis.

SPHM00004-6

Comment:

The no-project alternative does not offer a consistent yardstick for measuring project impacts. Traffic, noise and air quality impacts have been shifted eastward. Major changes in the project may call for the preparation of a comprehensive revised EIR/EIS.

Response:

The analysis of impacts associated with Alternative D includes a comparison to the impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative, as required by NEPA (40 CFR § 1502.14) and CEQA (State CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(e)), and an evaluation of impacts as measured from environmental baseline conditions, as required by CEQA (State CEQA Guidelines § 15125(a)). The analysis addresses the nature, intensity, and geographic location of such impacts including those associated with operation of facilities proposed east of the Central Terminal Area, such as the Ground Transportation Center, Automated People Mover system, and the Intermodal Transportation Center. 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. Alternative D has undergone rigorous environmental analysis and extensive public review, comparable to that provided for the other Master Plan alternatives, within the context of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. This approach to, and form of, environmental documentation for Alternative D is in full compliance with the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.

SPHM00004-7

Comment:

And, finally, growth inducing impacts may be significantly greater than stated.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHPD00004-7 regarding the analysis of induced socio-economic impacts associated with Alternative D.

SPHM00004-8**Comment:**

The next two comments came from the County Department of Public Works. First one; a new interchange for the 405 Freeway at Lennox Boulevard is recommended as a mitigation measure if Alternative D is chosen. Additional traffic improvements may be needed to fully mitigate the impact of Alternative D. There may be some intersections that we believe should be covered that weren't.

Response:

Comment noted. A new interchange for the I-405 Freeway at Lennox Boulevard is a major component of the preferred traffic mitigation plan for Alternative D. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 and, in particular, Subtopical Responses TR-ST-2.2 and TR-ST-2.3 regarding the traffic facilities selected for analysis.

SPHM00004-9**Comment:**

The county will formally submit these comments by mail. And that concludes my presentation.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00005 Morris, Steve**None Provided****8/20/2003****SPHM00005-1****Comment:**

Steve Morris, M- o- r- r- i- s, 95 Crest Drive, Manhattan Beach, 90266.

As a resident of South Bay and a frequent user of LAX, I think we all remember pre- 9- 11 and the congestion and the delays in the ability to get home to our family back in the South Bay and also to depart. We want to make sure those things don't happen again. As we take the opportunity now to provide better efficiency in a secured environment as a post 9- 11, I think this is a great opportunity.

I'm in support of the Alternative D. I think it helps provide efficiency in an existing constrained airport. It provides transportation, release for the traffic jams that are now that provide access off the 105 and the 405. It spreads out. The access to the airport through the people mover, which I think every airport in the world has become more modernized with the people mover, and it is time that LAX does that as well.

As well as the Green Line, mass transit, which is a new concept, especially for the west side of L. A. I think the opportunity to get on the Green Line on Rosecrans and be able to get into the airport without getting into a car I think is great for pollution and traffic. I think those are opportunities that we need to take right now.

And as traffic does come back, as post- 9- 11, and the economy recovers, I think it's an opportunity we should take right now to provide those services not only to the South Bay, but to the whole economy of Los Angeles. Again, I support Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHM00006 Wang, E

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPHM00006-1

Comment:

Hi. My name is E. E. Wang. It's spelled W- a- n- g. I live at 1821 Pacific Coast Highway, Number 47, Hermosa Beach, California 90254.

I am not totally in support of Alternative D. I think that it is difficult for me to support it because there is lack of alternatives that are comparable to it at this point. It is basically being compared to proposals that were made several years back. And there has been no -- there has been nothing else that has been put on the board.

Response:

Comment noted. The development of Alternative D was an iterative process which included the consideration of many concepts. Please see Appendix H, Concept Development, of the LAX Master Plan Addendum for a discussion of the different concepts considered during the development of Alternative D and Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHM00006-2

Comment:

I think there are good elements to it, but I am also concerned about several factors that are being proposed. One is the cost. It is going to cost us \$ 9 billion dollars to basically achieve very little capacity gain, I mean, 200,000 more passengers that we will be able to process a year compared to if we did nothing.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D will improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking.

SPHM00006-3

Comment:

The centralized design, which is deemed as enhanced safety and security I think is unproven. As far as I know, there is nothing out there that this has been compared to where we could see there is really some added benefit other than making my commute into the airport probably about 30 minutes longer.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00006-4

Comment:

And, finally, I actually was walking around. In the exhibits you have I noticed you put up a nice board saying how it was going to be funded. I notice one big word that put a red flag up for me was " Bonds." I know that bonds don't come out of the sky. They come from taxpayers voting on them.

Response:

The bonds being used one of the project funding sources are general airport revenue bonds. These bonds are repaid from airport revenues generated from airport users. The bonds that the commentor is

3. Comments and Responses

referring to are general obligation (GO) bonds. GO bonds are issued by a municipality and repaid from taxes and other revenues.

SPHM00006-5

Comment:

I think before we proceed with Alternative D, we need to look at what other options are out there that are comparable to Alternative D and whether they are more cost-effective, especially in an economy where the airline industry is in financial crisis. If we want them to pick up the tab, we better make sure it is affordable for them.

Response:

LAWA believes the airlines will be charged cost-beneficial rates to improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking.

SPHM00007 Hefner, Roy

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPHM00007-1

Comment:

Roy Hefner, H- e- f- n- e- r, 6548 West 80th Place, Los Angeles 90045.

I spoke to the group Monday evening at Inglewood and emphasized at that time the safety aspect of the relocation of the runways. Tonight I have a couple of other items. I'm not dealing with the total picture. I'm dealing with certain individual activities and information that is in the EIR.

Response:

Mr. Hefner's testimony at the Inglewood public hearing is provided in comment letter SPHP00004; please see responses to comment letter SPHP00004. In addition, please see responses to comments below.

SPHM00007-2

Comment:

Number one, I think you're aware for the first time since the Berkeley decision that now we're talking about single event noise as having an impact, and that could also be used for the purpose of noise sound insulation of various areas surrounding LAX even though they may not be in the 65 CNEL contour.

One of the things that disturbs me about the single event noise level is that they are talking about 94 DB as the outside factor that's going to wake somebody up. According to your own particular diagram, a 94 DB would be the same as being three feet away from a gas lawn mower. I think you could indicate or you will indicate that that certainly is going to be less than is necessary to wake somebody up. The interior noise was going to be 81. That's with the -- with the windows open.

I would encourage you whether or not Alternative D is accepted or not accepted you look very seriously into the noise mitigation situation as far as noise insulation is concerned.

Response:

Comment noted. In the Berkeley Jets case, the Court of Appeal ruled that, to provide a more accurate and complete picture of a project's noise impacts and to provide more comprehensive mitigation, a single event noise analysis must supplement an EIR's cumulative noise analysis, including use of appropriate thresholds of significance and mitigation of significant events. It did not specify that sound insulation was to be used to mitigate single-event impacts. However, as a result of the Berkeley Jets case, LAWA has initiated some additional mitigation measures to address those single event impacts and that are outside the 65 dB CNEL area. They can be found in Section 4.1.8, of Noise and Section

3. Comments and Responses

4.2.8 of Land Use of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The commentor is incorrect with his comparison of a 94 dB Lmax lawn mower at three feet to that of an aircraft over flight at 94 SEL. The lawnmower is a peak noise level of 94dB while the aircraft 94 dB SEL is a total noise event (start to finish) crammed into one second, so its peak level is much less than 94dB. This exterior level of noise is then further reduced 13 dB to account for noise level reduction of the house with windows open. If the windows are closed there is a 27.5 dB reduction. The wake-up level is based on an 81 dB SEL and the peak noise level is less than 81 dB. The nighttime awakenings threshold of significance is clearly explained in Section 6.1 of Appendix S-C1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The following mitigation measures incorporate sound insulation for all build project alternatives: MM-LU-1, Implement Revised Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (Alternatives A, B, C, and D). MM-LU-2, Incorporate Residential Dwelling Units Exposed to Single Event Awakenings Threshold into Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), and MM-LU-4. Provide Additional Sound Insulation for Schools Shown by MM-LU 3 to be Significantly Impacted by Aircraft Noise (Alternatives A, B, C, and D). For additional information on the mitigation measures please see Section 4.1.8 of Noise and 4.2.8 Land Use of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHM00007-3

Comment:

Another specific item, it talks about the various improvements that were made in facilities from 1997 to 2000. We happen to know that there were improvements made from 1988 to 1997 because in 1986 that was the end of the first EIR of 40 million annual passengers. And then you started off with the -- with the new EIR process, which took many side roads. But you have seven listed there. I would like for you to include in your EIR all the other improvements that were made at LAX which assisted in allowing LAX to go from 40 million annual passengers to 67 and a half million annual passengers.

Response:

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

SPHM00007-4

Comment:

Very important. We have remote gates set up. This is one of the positive features of Alternative D. You go from 163 to 153 as far as gates are concerned. I'm not going to deal with that as such, but I want to go ahead and point out that we have nothing in there that deals with cargo planes, the elimination of cargo. However, we plan on increasing the amount of cargo over the period of time by 50 percent. So we want to be alert to that.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D cargo facilities would be sized to accommodate approximately 3.1 million annual tons, which is the total cargo volume forecast in the constrained No Action/No Project Alternative. Total cargo building facilities for the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D would increase to approximately 2,342,000 square feet compared to 1,900,000 square feet of cargo building space in the 1996 baseline. Improvements in cargo technologies and building efficiencies would be needed to realize the future utilization rates projected for Alternative D. If regional air cargo demand forecasts are achieved, additional cargo demand pressure would be placed on other regional airports to process a greater proportion of the regional cargo activity closer to the source of the demand. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed Alternative D cargo activity on page 3-30 of Section 3.3.2, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan.

SPHM00007-5

Comment:

I mentioned Monday night at the very end and at the very end now. Phase I of your particular program, you're going to construct the Ground Transportation Center. You don't own it. How are you going to do all of those things without owning and building at Manchester Square?

Response:

The acquisition of Manchester Square is independent of the Master Plan. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.3 regarding current status of the acquisition of Manchester Square.

SPHM00008 Makoni, Pete

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPHM00008-1

Comment:

Pete Makoni. Last name M- a- k- o- n- i, 4345 Rosecrans Avenue, Hawthorne. I live in this community close to the airport.

First security, safety, security and economic for the neighborhood, for L. A. It's not only for construction workers, but for all people. Everybody want to come to L. A. They want to come to the City of Angel. That's why they want to come down. From Japan, Korea, they all want to hit L. A. L. A. is the place where everybody want to come into.

We hear the tragedy, people coming from overseas. They try to get here, you know, on the cargo plane, try to stow away to get here. That's not the point. We need to expand LAX.

The runway is not big enough for all the airplanes to take off and to land in it. Also, LAX we need to expand. People can get a job. All the community have a job for all race. They want to work in there. They have a job. A lot of people, everybody to work in LAX. Also, we need to fix LAX right now.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00009 Scavo, Joe

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPHM00009-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Joe Scavo. The last name is spelled S- c- a- v- o. I'm one of the business reps with the pipe fitters here in Los Angeles. And I'm speaking on behalf of hundreds of pipe fitters who live in and around this community. I'm taking the microphone tonight to speak in favor of the LAX Master Plan Alternative D for several reasons.

Number one, it's needed. I used LAX twice last week. And anything they do to improve it, I'm going to be 100 percent behind, anything. The Alternative D is a vast improvement of what we have there now.

Also, I strolled around outside and read some of the brochures and I read other things before coming here tonight. And I could see that safety and security are one of the number one issues that is repeated time and time again. And I believe it. Due to 9- 11, I think it's a no- brainer. LAX needs to be revised regarding security and safety.

Also, one of the posters outside, a speaker before me mentioned had to do with funding. There is also something else on that poster that I saw that looked promising to me. It said it's going to all be done without general fund money. I think that's an important note. So I support it for that reason, too.

Also, this facility, Alternative D has a lot less congestion in mind. There is a fellow kind of pointing out the charts out there giving an outline of what they have in mind. I really support it. Everything I saw takes what is there now and takes congestion out of it. The idea of putting the parking away from the airport and hooking up these monorails, I think that's fantastic. We need modern things like that in Los Angeles. Like this one gentlemen said, everybody in the world wants to come here. I was in Detroit last week. They've got those monorails in their airport. I think L. A. needs those, too.

3. Comments and Responses

Also, efficiency. I think it's an important point. Alternative D offers a lot more efficiency, a much more efficient facility. Not just congestion for people, cars, but for the smog levels. What I understand, you take Alternative D versus what we have now, the same amount of planes, the same amount of traffic. With Alternative D you're going to end up with less smog. And I support that.

Well, go read the papers that I read, and then whatever you want to get up and say when it's your turn, ma'am.

Lastly, I'm also up here to support Alternative D and this whole LAX Master Plan because of the 49,000 construction jobs that have been reported. Since 9- 11 the economy for pipe fitters in Los Angeles has gone very bad. We need the work. We need the jobs. We live in this community. We pay our taxes in this community. We pay the bonds in this community. We dreadfully need these construction jobs. And I wholeheartedly support this Master Plan, Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00010 Espinoza, Jose

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPHM00010-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Jose Espinoza. I live at 10310 South Grevillea Avenue. My point of view is the reason that I am here. We live close to the airport, about five minutes away. I want to expose my complaint.

I live exactly right on the flight path where the airplanes land. The airplanes make too much noise all day long and part of the evening. My wife is now suffering from insomnia and she can't sleep. I am also a person that works at the airport and I support my family through that work. I am not in favor or against the airport. I'm a neutral person because I work there. The only thing I ask is that you look out for the people that live close to the airport and protect them. And, also, the airplanes leave a real bad odor in the evening. So please do it for the people and the future of all of our children.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, 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 D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addresses 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-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life, and Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors.

SPHM00011 Correa, Freddy

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPHM00011-1

Comment:

Freddy Correa, 1840 west Pacific Coast Highway, Long Beach California 90810. I'm speaking on behalf of -- I'm a member of the Local 250, Pipe Fitters Union.

I'm for the project. I think it would be good for the economy. It is critical time that we are facing in the region. And I am just talking on behalf of my union. It would put L. A. on the world map.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00012 Miller, Chris

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPHM00012-1

Comment:

That's okay. My name is -- Miller is M- i- l- l- e- r. And I am an El Segundo resident, and I live somewhat off the flight path of the runway.

My concern as a resident is by moving the runway 50 feet closer to my house, that I have some reassurances that the planes will actually stay on course. Routinely, daily, sometimes hourly at 3: 00 in the morning these planes take off and take off directly over my house. And that's not the course that they are supposed to stay on. And I understand that by relocating the runway 50 feet and doing all this will actually make it a safer runway. They won't have to take measures to fly over my house.

Response:

The commentor is partially correct in identifying that Runway 7R/25L would be relocated 50 feet to the south. This will happen under Alternatives C & D. Whereas, under Alternative A, Runway 7R/25L would be relocated 156 feet south. Mitigation Measure MM-N-4, has been added to address the relocation of the Runway 7R/25L. This mitigation measure states that: When existing runways are relocated or reconstructed as part of the Master Plan, the aircraft noise abatement actions associated with those runways shall be modified and re-established as appropriate to assure continuation of the intent of the existing program.

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 (as defined in Section 1, Operational Procedures and Section 4, Traffic and Flight Procedures of LAWA's Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures and Restrictions), but occasional deviations from the procedure continue to occur. Aircraft operate in a complex environment and are regulated by a series of rules and regulations and weather conditions of which LAWA has no control over. The pilot is in command of the aircraft. And that aircraft is under the control of the FAA. As stated in LAWA's Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures and Restrictions; It is not intended that any of the traffic or flight procedures contained herein shall, in any manner, abrogate the authority and responsibility of the pilot in command to assure the safe operation of the aircraft.

A part of the reason is the alignment of the runways relative to the community. The west end of the runways nearest El Segundo are closer to the community than the east ends (the runways are aimed more toward the community's west end), while the north runways are both farther away (except in Alternative A) and aimed away from the community. The 747 is the largest US built aircraft and due to its size gives the impression of being much closer to the observer than it is. For further information regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2. Additionally, noise abatement measures associated with early turns are addressed in Section 4.1.5, Master Plan Commitments and Section 4.1.8, Mitigation Measures, of Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

For a detailed explanation on sleep disturbance please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use with supporting technical data and analyses in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. There is no curfew at LAX, however, LAWA has recently initiated an RFQ to Prepare a 14 CFR Part 161 Study for Los Angeles International Airport. LAWA is seeking to establish a partial curfew at LAX that would prohibit the easterly departure of all aircraft, with certain exemptions, between the hours of 12:00 Midnight to 6:30 a.m. when LAX is in Over-Ocean Operations. Over-Ocean procedures have been in place since the 1970's and they require that under appropriate weather conditions (as defined in Section 4, of LAWA's Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Restrictions), arrivals and departures will occur over-ocean on the inboard (6R/24L and 7L/25R) runways between the hours of 12:00 Midnight and 6:30 a.m. For additional information on the use of a Part 161 Study as a mitigation measure, please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation, Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHM00012-2

Comment:

I'm also concerned that the future of Los Angeles is dependent on an interconnected transportation system, not just at the airport without an outreaching -- no one is going to utilize these things. They are still going to be in their cars. They are still going to try to get on the 405 to get to the airport, and that doesn't change anything.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00012-3

Comment:

Another thing that seems to have gotten pushed way way back. If you're going to spend \$ 9 billion dollars, I would like to see Palmdale put back on the map because I don't understand. I know this isn't about Palmdale, but somewhere out there in our past we created this alternative. If we're spending this much money, I would like to see that as an alternative and see what that would cost and where we might be able to create a high- speed rail from Palmdale to downtown.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding LAWA's efforts to encourage operations at Palmdale, planned improvements at the airport and nearby roadways by LAWA and Caltrans, and the master plan update that is currently underway. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding planned high-speed rail in the region.

SPHM00012-4

Comment:

The other concern I have is the cost of paying for this. And I know that one of the people paying for this would be the airlines. The last time I checked the financial conditions of the airlines, they are asking us for that money. When it comes down to it, \$ 9 billion dollars is a lot of money.

Response:

The proposed Master Plan improvements would be funded with a combination of FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, and other state/federal grants. No general tax dollars will be used to pay for any of the proposed on-airport improvements.

Alternative D will improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking.

SPHM00012-5

Comment:

If the consideration of impacting our community, our neighborhoods continually -- you know, that was another concern I had.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00013 Ruiz, John

TWU Local 564

8/20/2003

SPHM00013-1

Comment:

Hi. My name is John Ruiz. I'm a Redondo Beach resident and I'm an American Airlines aircraft maintenance technician based in Los Angeles.

Before you begin the timer, I think we have a solution to the individuals' problems here. We could put a hush kit on the engines. The problem with the airline industry today is there is no money to purchase that, but that's something to consider.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor is not clear as to whether he is referencing hush kits for Stage 2 aircraft or Stage 3 aircraft. Stage 2 aircraft over 75,000 pounds were phased out of service in the continental United States on December 31, 1999, as a result of Congress passing the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990. These aircraft are not allowed to fly any longer unless they meet Stage 3 requirements. Some airlines are still operating Stage 2 aircraft that have engines that were retro-fitted with noise-reduction apparatus (i.e., installation of a "hush kit") to meet Stage 3 noise compliance. 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-C1 and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-7.6 regarding ANCA phase-out of Stage 2 aircraft.

SPHM00013-2

Comment:

I'm also here in the capacity as a union officer. I'm a vice chairman representing TW Local 564.

My concerns regarding what I've seen out there is, American Airlines currently has three maintenance hangars. And in the plan to expand, and I don't know if it is economic reasons or what have you, but to expand the International Airport runs directly in line of where these three hangars are. I don't see anywhere in there where these hangars existed.

American Airlines currently employs in those hangars in excess of 600 people. And I'm glad to see that there are other trade unions here that are -- that may benefit from this. But as far as American Airlines, I don't even need to mention the effects 9- 11 has had. I think this is more of an issue of trying to maintain employment.

We have 400 people that are out on the street trying to get back in. That's just in aircraft maintenance. We're also dealing with pay cuts. I'm making 30 percent less and I'm not any less a person. I'm working just as hard. But I think these factors need to be taken.

There are people that live away from the airport for the sole fact they can't afford to live around the South Bay cities. And anything we can do to accommodate that, I would definitely like to see -- I hear acronyms every day. I'm not sure -- you did mention the EIS/ EIR. I'm not sure. If this is about the environment, we do have existing hangars that can be refurbished and possibly look into that as opposed to demolishing them and possibly relocating work and moving work. I've heard everything from moving work to maintenance work up to Palmdale, which would require ferrying aircraft, which would require city taxes and landing fees. We do have the facilities there to accommodate the work.

And as American Airlines is trying to get back on their feet, we're not in the capacity right now to go out and demolish hangars and come up with money to refurbish them. I would hope that -- I know I can't get answers today, but I would hope that consideration would be given to look into that matter.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to comment SPC00044-1. Please refer to Response to Comment SPC00044-1.

SPHM00014 Barriage, John California Ground Passenger 8/20/2003
Carrier's Association

SPHM00014-1

Comment:

The French pronunciation. You could do it by " Barrage."

John Barriage, attorney at law, San Diego, California. I'm general counsel for the California Ground Passenger Carrier's Association, which is a new association of members consisting of shuttle and livery carriers operating from Southern California airports.

The membership of the organization supports the proposed reduction of gates from 163 to 153. The association agrees with the assessment that the reduction of aircraft gates will divert passenger traffic to other Southern California airports. And we believe there would be a substantial benefit to both the shuttle and livery operator companies as well as their passengers by reducing congestion, which is obvious at LAX, as well as reducing unnecessary travel time.

So we would support the reduction of the gates from 163 to 153.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00015 Brown, Cleveland None Provided 8/20/2003

SPHM00015-1

Comment:

Yes. My name is Cleveland Brown. And I live in the city of Inglewood.

As I have sat here this evening and listened to my coworkers, I am a union man also and I'm a bit concerned about the flight -- I mean, about this job situation we are concerned about. But most of my friends live in Orange County.

So my concern is that I live in the flight path. And these planes fly overnight. They are flying day and night, morning. It doesn't matter. They are even taking off going east, which is directly over my house. Now, I'm real concerned about that.

Response:

Comment noted. A partial curfew is initiated through the mechanism of an FAR Part 161 study. For additional information on the use of a Part 161 Study as a mitigation measure, please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation, Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. For a detailed explanation on sleep disturbance please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use with supporting technical data and analyses in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHM00015-2

Comment:

I know we need jobs. I know the airport needs expansion. But we were turned down in Orange County by John Wayne Airport, El Toro. And, yet, the voters out there told them if they did, they would not be

3. Comments and Responses

elected again. We come here and we want to force this on the City of Inglewood -- not only Inglewood, but L. A., which is adjacent to Inglewood. And we are talking about more cargo, more flights. And, yet, we don't have a solution to the problem. So I'm real concerned.

Response:

Comment noted. Impacts on the cities of Inglewood and Los Angeles were analyzed throughout Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Regarding the statement of concern about more cargo and more flights, it is important to note that cargo and passenger activity levels at LAX under Alternative D, LAWA Staff's preferred alternative, would be similar to what would occur if the LAX Master Plan were not approved, as reflected under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D was proposed to encourage other airports to accommodate future air travel demand.

Please see Topical Responses TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits. Also see Chapter 2, Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.4.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a discussion of economic benefits that would occur from development of the LAX Master Plan alternatives.

SPHM00015-3

Comment:

They said they will soundproof our homes. You know, they told me my home, it would probably be 2020 before they could get to it. You know I'm concerned. They would do one home within an X- amount of square miles per you might say six months to a year. That's a real concern of mine. I'm not just here to say that the job market is what we're looking for. We need the work, but we do not need to exploit the citizens that live there.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. As indicated in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.8, according to the 2001 ANMP the estimated timeframe for completion of acoustical treatment of residential units within the ANMP boundaries is by 2015.

As indicated on page 4-88, in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Inglewood has made significant progress in mitigating residential properties that have been exposed to high noise levels. As of June 2002, in the City of Inglewood 577 units have received sound insulation and 1,591 units have been acquired under the ANMP. However, the following obstacles have slowed completion of mitigation under the ANMP in the City of Inglewood: a preference of acquisition rather than soundproofing residential units (which is a longer process), substandard or non-code compliant housing stock, and residential properties located in areas zoned for non-residential use (inconsistency zoning). Concerns about the progress of the ANMP in Inglewood should be directed to the City of Inglewood, Residential Sound Insulation Program (310/ 412-5289).

As stated under Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA would accelerate fulfillment of existing commitments to owners wishing to participate within the current ANMP boundaries prior to proceeding with newly eligible properties and would provide additional technical assistance to local jurisdictions to support more rapid and efficient implementation of their respective ANMPs.

SPHM00015-4

Comment:

Now, I'm really disappointed in the union. We're concerned of public safety, which is the airline situation, yet, we're not concerned about the health of the citizens living in that area.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The objective of the Human Health Risk Assessment was to determine the increased incremental health risk, if any, associated with the implementation of Master Plan alternatives for people working at the airport, and for people living, working, or attending school in communities near 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 and TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

SPHM00015-5

Comment:

Also, we're concerned about where they come from as far as Japan, wherever they come from. We are not saying that they shouldn't arrive here in California, but they can do it somewhere else with less cargo and less traffic. I'm really concerned about that.

Response:

LAX is a public facility and is supported by grants from the FAA. LAWA has no authority to restrict domestic carriers based on their origin of flights and thus discriminate among carriers. Individual air carriers determine which markets to serve. In the case of international flights, 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. LAX is a named gateway in the bilateral agreement between the United States and Japan, for example. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

SPHM00016 Carpio, Cecil

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPHM00016-1

Comment:

Well, I'm glad you're going to call Mike Gordon again. I didn't hear him the first time. I'd like to hear what he has to say.

But in the meantime, yes, you know, LAX needs to be revised as someone said. It needs to respect the surrounding communities. It needs to enforce penalties for overflights and nighttime operations. LAX needs to follow procedures and agreements that it has agreed to perform for the Noise Variance Contract with the Department of Transportation.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA has recently initiated an RFQ to Prepare a 14 CFR Part 161 Study for Los Angeles International Airport. LAWA is seeking to establish a partial curfew at LAX that would prohibit the easterly departure of all discretionary aircraft, with certain exemptions, between the hours of 12:00 Midnight to 6:30 a.m. when LAX is in Over-Ocean Operations. Over-Ocean procedures have been in place since the 1970's and under appropriate weather conditions arrivals and departures will occur over-ocean on the inboard (6R/24L and 7L/25R) runways between the hours of 12:00 Midnight and 6:30 a.m. During a recent 18 month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. When over-ocean procedures are not practicable for reasons of adverse weather or winds (as defined in Section 4, of LAWA's Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Restrictions), aircraft will continue to depart to the east between 12:00 Midnight and 6:30.

For a detailed explanation on sleep disturbance please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use with supporting technical data and analyses in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Aircraft operate in a complex environment and are regulated by a series of rules and regulations and weather conditions of which LAWA has no control over. The pilot is in command of the aircraft. And that aircraft is under the control of the FAA. As stated in LAWA's Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Procedures and Restrictions; It is not intended that any of the traffic or flight procedures contained herein shall, in any manner, abrogate the authority and responsibility of the pilot in command to assure the safe operation of the aircraft. Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement and in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-7.2, regarding responsibility for enforcement of noise abatement rules.

One of the terms and conditions that was assigned to LAWA in the March 21, 2001, Noise Variance, LAX is required to include a brief report regarding the implementation of each of the conditions in its variance decision on a periodic basis. For a specific listing of variance conditions assigned by most recent variance please see section 2.3.1, 2001 Noise Variance, in S-1, Supplemental Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHM00016-2

Comment:

It's telling the union members to not -- don't support those speakers who speak about quality of life. Where is the applause there? We're supposed to be addressing the environmental reports tonight. Do these union workers understand that homes, businesses and schools will be adversely affected by expanded operations? We lose our sleep. We breathe toxic fumes from the jets. Why aren't they supporting Mayor Hahn's plan for El Toro? I haven't heard one of them speak about that tonight.

Response:

Comment noted. Impacts on homes, businesses, and schools that would result from implementation of Alternative D are described in Section 4.1, Noise; Section 4.2, Land Use; Section 4.4, Social Impacts; and Section 4.27, Schools of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality and noise impacts associated with Alternative D in Section 4.6, Air Quality; Section 4.1, Noise; and Section 4.2, Land Use, respectively. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Mayor Hahn's plan for El Toro is not a comment on the contents of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR; however please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding the MCAS El Toro facility.

SPHM00016-3

Comment:

The other thing just for fun. I think it is reprehensible that the elderly in Manchester Square, that transportation center, that -- that processing center are being terrorized into giving up their homes. And, you know, I'm even further disgusted that the City of L. A. decided they are going to place the name Manchester Square on a community south of Inglewood -- excuse me, east of Inglewood. That's ridiculous.

Response:

Comment noted. The acquisition of Manchester Square is independent of the residential acquisition necessary for Master Plan implementation. The Manchester Square area is being acquired through the existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program, in support of LAWA's ANMP. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00001-4 regarding the validity of the acquisition of Manchester Square and relocation of homes in Manchester Square. In addition, the area the commentator is referring to as another Manchester Square in east of Inglewood was a proposed development by Vidal Sasson in South L.A. There is no official designation of a community, district or neighborhood entitled Manchester Square in that location. The neighborhood designation for that general area is Vermont Knolls.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHM00016-4

Comment:

According to a memorandum from the Association of Governments of Southern California, is the proposed project, Alternative D, consistent with facility capacity constraints adopted for LAX in our 2001 RTP Aviation Plan which limits its service to 78 million annual passengers and 3 million tons of cargo?

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA has planned Alternative D to be in compliance with SCAG's 2001 and Draft 2004 RTP allocations to LAX. The capacity of LAX under Alternative D is 78.9 MAP and 3.1 MAT. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

SPHM00016-5

Comment:

From a system- wide standpoint, does the proposed project promote a decentralized aviation system? And may I say decentralized is the only way to go. This expansion stuff is ridiculous. Anybody who would think it through with terrorism in their mind would know you do not expand an airport to have safety and security. Please. Get a job at El Toro.

Does the proposed project have action steps designed to promote the use of other LAWA- owned airports as part of the decentralized aviation strategy including the support of stakeholders from the aviation community? Oh, yes, perhaps it does, but there is no support from the City of Los Angeles to do that very thing.

There was a SCRA, for the people who understand that little whatever it is, SCRA -- ha ha ha. It's about the regional airports getting together and talking about, okay, we're going to put this together and we're going to have a regional system of airports. The only problem was L. A. City never showed up at that. So the sucker probably -- just basically dies.

Does the proposed project discuss potential relationships with non LAWA- owned airports designed to encourage decentralization? Well, maybe it does, but the fact L. A. City doesn't show up at the Aviation Task Force to discuss this stuff. So what happens, all of this decentralization stuff is a bunch of BS.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports.

The Southern California Regional Airport Authority (SCRAA) is a joint powers agreement among the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino, and the City of Los Angeles. The Authority was formed to develop and implement a regional approach of providing airport capacity. After being dormant for many years, the SCRAA was reactivated in March 2001 to deal principally with two issues: the proposed expansion of LAX and the proposed conversion of El Toro to a civilian airport. The decline in air travel demand due to the economic recession, the events of September 11th, the war in Iraq, and SARS has largely driven the Authority back to inactivity. Riverside County voted in July 2002 to withdraw from SCRAA.

LAWA has planned Alternative D to be in compliance with SCAG's 2001 and Draft 2004 RTP allocations to LAX. LAWA only controls the operations and potential improvements at LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Other jurisdictions are responsible for developing the other regional airports. It is up to the other regional airport operators to meet a larger percentage of the projected regional demand. For further information regarding the role of the LAX Master Plan in a regional approach to meeting demand, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1.

SPHM00017 Gordon, Mike

City of El Segundo

8/20/2003

SPHM00017-1

Comment:

Gosh, usually I'm the guy that's the most worked up at these meetings. So it's great to always follow Cecil.

Good evening. I am Mayor Mike Gordon representing the City of El Segundo. Given the length and complexity of the Master Plan and environmental documents, our full comments on technical issues will not be ready for some time, therefore, the City's comments tonight are preliminary.

The City of El Segundo continues to oppose the LAX Master Plan Alternatives A, B and C for the many reasons the City expressed orally and in writing during the public review and comment period for the initial Draft EIS/ EIR in 2002.

While we feel the stated objectives of the new plan supports a regional aviation approach -- an issue Mayor Hahn and I continue to work side by side on -- the City of El Segundo has not yet taken the official position on Alternative D, nor have I.

Specifically the City supports a regional approach alternative that makes proper use of Inland Empire airports.

The City supports an alternative with fewer environmental impacts. We would like to see the adverse impacts of the airport minimized and mitigated to the greatest extent feasible. The City of El Segundo supports enhanced safety and security at LAX.

And the City supports an alternative that by design will accommodate passenger and cargo levels no greater than the physical capacity of the airport as it exists today, approximately 78 million annual passengers.

Limiting LAX capacity to its current capacity has always been our number one goal. We believe limiting LAX's capacity will allow other airports in the region to develop and handle a fair share of future regional aviation demand. This approach will result in fewer environmental impacts and will improve safety and security at the airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00017-2

Comment:

However, the City is greatly concerned about the impacts of the proposed south side airfield changes that moves the southernmost runway 50 feet closer to El Segundo. LAWA has stated that it believes these changes are necessary to improve runway safety.

However, we are currently studying the impacts of a reconfiguration and other options for the southern runway complex. In particular, we urge a full public consideration of end- around taxiways as an alternative that could provide greater safety sooner, at lower cost and with fewer new burdens on local communities.

Safety at LAX must be a priority for all of us. The city is prepared to support measures necessary to enhance safety, even if those measures increase our burden, but only if we are assured through an independent expert that our other alternatives are not equally effective.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00038-3 regarding the potential noise impacts of moving the southernmost runway approximately 55 feet south and discussion on runway incursion at LAX and an analysis conducted by NASA Ames Research Center comparing the costs and benefits of a center parallel taxiway and "end-around" taxiway on the south airfield complex.

SPHM00017-3

Comment:

In conclusion, we are grateful for Mayor Hahn's responsive leadership and his pledge to constrain growth at LAX and foster the regional approach to meeting future aviation demand. It is our hope that the ultimate outcome of this Master Plan will be a regional airport approach that ensures that LAX does not exceed its current capacity.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00018 Slawson, Richard Los Angeles Building & 8/20/2003
Construction Trades Council

SPHM00018-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Richard Slawson. I'm the Executive Secretary of the Los Angeles and Orange County Building and Construction Trades Council. I've given testimony at the other hearings, but I wanted to comment on some of the things that we've seen and reviewed in the Environmental Impact Reports as well as some of the commentary that we've heard at the various hearings that have been held throughout the greater Los Angeles area.

I might add that the people that are here tonight also attended the hearings in Ontario, downtown Los Angeles and all of the other areas where they've had an opportunity to speak as well as many others.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPHM00018-2

Comment:

The members that are here tonight of the various unions also live in each community. We have members that live in every community along the beach and surrounding LAX. We have members in Inglewood, El Segundo, Westchester, all of those areas that are impacted.

My home address, by the way, is 4634 Deelane Street in Torrance. I am not affected by the noise there. But as many in the South Bay, we perceive that part of the problem of LAX has been traffic.

I know what the reports say and I know that a very minimal amount of the impact of traffic comes from the airport in most of the South Bay cities. For sure in El Segundo, Westchester and Inglewood there is some impact from airport traffic arriving and leaving.

But we believe that can be mitigated by the design of Alternative D. We have an alternative that includes a stop at the airport for the Green Line, which people from all over the region will be able to utilize and should assist in reducing overall traffic impacts on all of our cities and especially in those cities surrounding the airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00018-3**Comment:**

Also I wanted to address the issue of the regional plan. From the onset, and it's been going on for over four years now, we have been studying, discussing and reviewing all of the alternatives that have been offered at the airport. We always supported a regional plan. We believe in the trades that El Toro should have taken its load.

In fact, our members that live in Orange County and many from Los Angeles County participated in the debate in Orange County, supported the issue wholeheartedly. And I'm sorry to say, many in Orange County, as many that live around this airport, do not want to see any airport in their area. I also believe that many of the speakers would like to see LAX leave and go to some other area totally. They forget about not only the construction jobs, but the permanent jobs and how these cities were built up over the years.

In fact, one of the supervisors in Orange County lost their job as a supervisor by supporting the El Toro idea of building an airport at El Toro Air Base.

So these are very concerned people that are here tonight. We've been involved in all of the issues. We do support a regional plan. We want to see Palmdale eventually built. It is going to take some time for the powers that be in this area, SCAG and the cities in the area to come up with a final plan for that as well. Meanwhile, LAX does need to be fixed. Without a plan, we will continue to grow here with all of the problems that we see now. And we want it fixed now. We want Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00019 Spilman, Bill**None Provided****8/20/2003****SPHM00019-1****Comment:**

Good evening. My name is Bill Spilman. I live in Manhattan Beach. I'm a businessman, a frequent traveler. And like thousands in the Los Angeles area, I depend on affordable and convenient travel to do my -- to conduct my business.

First, I support the modernization of LAX, however, I oppose this specific plan. My first point is I think the economic forecasts in here are not realistic. I believe there will be a negative L. A. economy due to reduced air capacity and higher fares. This will occur by reduced tourism. It will occur by reduction in businesses both that are located here and that are not located here, but try to operate here. And it will occur by the inability to grow our economy with the growth of both the country and the world economy.

Response:

Comment noted. The economic impacts of the LAX Master Plan alternatives were presented 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.

SPHM00019-2**Comment:**

Thirdly, I think that the fare and capacities, the fare will increase and the capacity will not be able to meet demand because of a couple of reasons. One is, you're putting the financial burden of the project on the airlines. The airlines cannot afford this any way you put it. This burden will be placed on the traveling consumer or the airlines will simply choose they cannot operate certain markets at that expense. So what that will do is it will decrease capacity, and that will increase fares. All of the people understand the

3. Comments and Responses

I'd like to lay this aside and talk to you as a private citizen, which I am, and I live over the airport, which is in Long Beach. I live right over the flight pattern. And I understand what these people are talking about, but it was my choice to live there. I liked it. I put up with the noise. The planes come over my house. That was my choice to live there.

The other issues are, we have serious issues and we need serious people to take care of these issues. We need to stop talking about them and we need to move forward and pursue these issues before something does happen like 9- 11. And then everybody goes, " What happened? We didn't do anything. We just sat in these rooms and we talked about it."

The other issue I want to talk to you about is family. My family is back east. I've been here since 1979. My parents are elderly. They can't drive now and they are afraid to fly. So I look at my parent's situation, and I'm sure there hundreds and thousands of parents the same way that their children have relocated and want to fly here, which would boost our economy.

The other issue I want to talk about is location. Who wants to fly to Palmdale? I worked out there years ago. I don't choose to live there. I choose to live over here. LAX is where I choose to fly in and out of, not Long Beach, but LAX because it has more frequent flyers out there and more flight times that fit my schedule and the people that I need to fly here to see me.

The fifth thing I would like to talk about is they say that LAX is going to grow. Well, if the economy of Los Angeles needs to grow, it is going grow. The airport needs to grow, and we need this growth and expansion.

And the last thing I would like to talk about is talk about the cost. The cost in our life to live for the freedom that we freely use comes with a price. And everyone in this room understands it. And this is the price that we have to pay to be the great nation we are. And with that I would like to close my statement.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00021 Ferguson, Jim

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPHM00021-1

Comment:

My name is Jim Ferguson. I live at 770 West Imperial. I live in a 100- unit complex there, Pacific Sands.

Now, you don't know me and you don't care, but we have put up with 30 years of being modified. I am 82 years old. You come up now and offer a plan which, as far as I can find out, if we talk only about Alternative D, since I assume even though these other gentlemen talked about B, have taken precedent because of your great sales job on safety. It was marvelous. Whoever brings all that really should get a raise.

Now, as far as that goes, if you look at the problem we're talking about now is 18 years worth of work, more or less, to do this. With people saying no cost to the government, to county, federal. Baloney. All the traffic modifications ought to be paid for, not from airport funds. Look it up. That is true.

Number two. I don't know how you're going to sell this to the legal beavers. In fact, you probably tried it 12 years ago when the airport had a surplus of funds. And some brilliant politician in the L. A. City said, " Oh, we'll just transfer that to the government general fund." And, of course, I understand it was stopped. But this program shines brightly as to what the same thing is happening.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHM00021-2

Comment:

The other point is, I went to the reading room over at the airport, Imperial Airport. I asked, " How do I get answers to a question?" Well, I'd like anybody to answer that.

Response:

Comment noted. In accordance with NEPA and CEQA, FAA and LAWA have provided written responses to all public comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR in this Final EIS/EIR. Moreover, FAA and LAWA held 12 public hearings in August and October, 2003, including the public hearing at which the commentor provided oral testimony. Each public hearing was preceded by a public workshop at which members of the public could ask questions of LAWA staff and consultants.

SPHM00021-3

Comment:

I've asked people, " How do you get answers to the present traffic and the expected 2008 traffic?" There isn't any. There is none. It is separated. It is in 14 different places. There is no comparison a lay person can go to.

Response:

Comment noted. The year 2008 conditions are analyzed as part of the construction impact analysis, summarized in Technical Report S-2b, Section 7.6, Assessment of Construction Impacts.

SPHM00021-4

Comment:

You get the problems of noise. They talk about average noise. Who cares about average noise. If I'm kept awake at 2: 00 a. m. by a cargo plane landing, I don't want it. I'm sorry.

Response:

Comment noted. The CNEL contour discloses the areas of significant noise exposure, as defined by federal and state standards. For a detailed explanation on single event noise analysis on nighttime awakenings please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use with supporting technical data and analyses in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information about the relationship between CNEL and single event noise levels, please see Topical Response TR-N-2, Single Event Noise and CNEL Differences, and in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-2.1, CNEL characterization of noise events.

There is no curfew at LAX, however, LAWA has recently initiated an RFQ to Prepare a FAR Part 161 Study for Los Angeles International Airport. LAWA is seeking to establish a partial curfew at LAX that would prohibit the easterly departure of all aircraft, with certain exemptions, between the hours of 12:00 Midnight to 6:30 a.m. when LAX is in Over-Ocean Operations. For additional information on the use of a Part 161 Study as a mitigation measure, please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation, Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

SPHM00022 Hartman, Randall

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPHM00022-1

Comment:

Yeah, I'm Randall Hartman. I live in Torrance, California. I work at LAX. I'm a quality assurance inspector for American Airlines, and I've worked at LAX for the last 20 years.

I looked at Hahn's plan. When I looked at it, I thought this is utter lunacy. I can't believe they are even considering this. The only thing that makes sense is for construction workers on this job. That is the only thing that can possibly make sense.

They talk about safety. How is this going to improve safety? Just go out there at the ocean and watch. Every 20 seconds a plane takes off. That's where the safety problem is. There is too much traffic. This is not going to do anything to relieve traffic. They are not adding a runway. They are separating the runways. That has nothing to do with traffic. The only way to make this place safer is to put more of the traffic at the regional airports.

Most of the people I work with live out at these areas. Some people drive two hours to work. They would love to have jobs out there. Construction workers would love to have jobs out there. I mean, it just doesn't make sense. First they want to put all the -- just imagine all the people at LAX checking in at one location and being transported to the terminal. I mean, this is a terrorist's dream to put everybody in one place where they could just easily do a terrorist attack. I just -- and it's just going to cause a nightmare.

Response:

Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

In addition, please refer to Appendix I of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum for a detailed assessment of the security and safety features of Alternative D. Please see Section 2.1, Airside Facilities - Alternative, of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum regarding separation of the runways. In addition, please see Response to Comment SPC00288-2, which discusses dispersion of people at the GTC.

SPHM00022-2

Comment:

How many years of it, 11 years of construction. What are they going to do in the meantime when they are doing all this? They are going to have half of the terminal just moved, all the gates moved over. It's just going to be utter chaos for the next ten years. It's going to hurt the airlines. It's going to cost the airlines.

I work for American. We were, you know, the number one airline in the world. Now we're on the verge of bankruptcy. Now they are going to hit it with this.

Response:

Comment noted. As described in Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, construction on LAX Master Plan - Alternative D would commence in the fourth quarter of 2004 and conclude in the fourth quarter of 2014 if approval is granted.

The phasing of construction of various components of the LAX Master Plan would minimize impacts to airport users. The phasing program would be designed to prevent the net reduction in aircraft gates and other facility capacity at any time. For example, the construction of the West Satellite terminal

3. Comments and Responses

could conclude prior to the commencing of demolition of Terminals 1, 2, and 3 allowing the new gates to become operational prior to the decommissioning of the existing gates.

Construction phasing would be designed not to hurt the airlines. LAX Airlines would bear a portion of the cost of the Master Plan.

SPHM00022-3

Comment:

This whole plan is utter lunacy. We should just -- how come we don't hear anything about San Bernardino Airport? It's an international airport. It's not even mentioned. We should open up Ontario. There is plenty of other places. We don't have to go to Palmdale. I mean, just common sense.

Response:

Comment noted. San Bernardino International Airport has no scheduled passenger service to any destinations. It is international in name only. San Bernardino International Airport is 23 air miles east of Ontario International Airport. The close proximity of these two airports and the fact that Ontario has established air service with additional unused capacity makes the establishment of passenger service at San Bernardino International more difficult. Terminal facilities have been improved and the airport is attempting to attract passenger service. Currently it serves only as an aircraft maintenance facility. Its potential to attract air service is dependent on its ability to compete with well-established service at other airports. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports. The master plans will recommend improvements to meet the projected demand. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX.

For further information regarding the role of the LAX Master Plan in a regional approach to meeting demand, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1. Also, please see Topical Responses TR-RC-1 and TR-RC-5 regarding other airports in the region generally, and the airports at Ontario and Palmdale specifically.

SPHM00022-4

Comment:

I've been going to these hearings on all kinds of things. It's just a charade. I mean, 90 percent of the people will be against the project, and you'll still put it through because of politics. I mean, come on. Get a clue people.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00023 Martin, Terry

Local Union 250

8/20/2003

SPHM00023-1

Comment:

Terry Martin. I'm one of those individuals from Orange County. I live in Anaheim, M- a- r- t- i- n. I'm a union representative Local 250 Steamfitters.

I know it seems like with all the fitters speaking in attendance at all the meetings, we would have so much work. But we have a small percentage of the work. I know this isn't a question- and- answer session either, but the lady who is so concerned, and rightfully so, I respect that. I respect everybody's opinion. And you have to respect -- and I respect you probably won't clap for me.

But living in Orange County and sitting on the Orange County Central Labor Council as Vice President, we did all we could to get El Toro going. And if you're familiar with Measure V or Measure W, the great park, which we called the great plank -- or prank, it turns out the great park is really a bunch of homes

3. Comments and Responses

being developed by developers, you know. It's a lot of work like that. I don't see a lot of -- there is a golf course that's already existing that they'll update.

But I'd like to compliment Mayor Hahn on this Alternative D. I'm in full support of it. I know he made every attempt to agree to expand and, of course, to register. And, well, the developers made sure that that didn't happen.

I will again support Alternative D. I do support unions. Unions do care about the community. We do so much to help. It's not just work. It's not just about jobs. We give back. We've got Harbor Interface Shelter. We've got Children's Institute International over here, the Eli home. We do our fair share in helping, which we need to do. We've been doing that since 1947.

Again, I'm in support. I live in Orange County, but we have 5,000 members. 600 of them live within a ten-mile radius of this building here. And I do respect your concerns. I got a little troubled there at San Pedro.

I did apologize to the Palos Verdes Estate residents who had the same problem you had. And I brought up that commercial. And I didn't mean to be smart-alec about it, but it's true. That guy, the father and son sitting on the porch saying, "You make sure you get a good real estate agent." About that time the plane flies over and that piece of the plane falls off. And he says, "Trust me." Well, I didn't get any claps for that neither, but I did talk to them afterwards. And believe me, we're on good terms. And I do, again, want to say I respect you, and you don't have to clap for me.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00024 Kunkee, Elizabeth None Provided 8/20/2003

SPHM00024-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Elizabeth Kunkee. And I'm a resident of Manhattan Beach. I appreciate the opportunity to come talk. I'm also here with my son John and daughter Lea.

I'm simply an interested citizen. And I'd like to tell you my impressions of what I've been reading in the newspaper and hearing about.

What I see is that a very expensive -- a very expensive plan is being put before the citizenship. And I see very little of value that we're going to get from it. I don't believe that it's going to be any safer. RAND Corporation has said they don't think it's going to be safer. I haven't seen airline security experts consulted.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been developed in consultation with airport security experts. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding the RAND Corporation issue paper.

SPHM00024-2

Comment:

I don't believe it's going to be any more convenient.

I was back in the -- in the room talking with an engineer. And ground transportation when I added up, well, it would probably take at least 20 minutes longer than it currently does to drop someone off and pick someone up. Remember when it used to be 60 minutes before your flight left when you checked in? Do you remember that? Wouldn't it be nice to get to that. Could we get to that with this airport renovation instead of moving to 90 or 120 minutes?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Although Alternative D does add an automated people mover trip for passengers going to the airport, it is expected that the overall time to travel to/from the GTC or ITC to the CTA will be similar to driving directly to/from the CTA. The road system planned for the GTC and ITC is designed for non-stop access with adequate capacity to get to and from the curbs with little delay. This contrasts with the existing experience on the CTA roadways, in which a driver must traverse several traffic signals in order to reach terminal curbs that are often highly congested. Also, with 16,600 spaces planned in total for the GTC and ITC, parking should be more convenient and easier to find in Alternative D than in the existing CTA.

SPHM00024-3

Comment:

I believe I would like to see the money that's saved by not pouring it into LAX, putting it to our other regional airports. I think there is a better solution. I'm not opposed to expansion of the Los Angeles International, but I'd like part of the burden and the pride of our air travel to be spread around.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Responses TR-RC-1 and TR-RC-5 regarding other airports as a regional solution.

SPHM00025 Walright, Jonathan None Provided 8/20/2003

SPHM00025-1

Comment:

Good evening. Jonathan Walright, American citizen. Nobody cares where I live. Suddenly LAX doesn't. Los Angeles International Airport directors, officials, have engaged in domestic, emotional terrorism. They have turned a deaf ear to the complaints, to the prayers and to the petitions of the citizens of Inglewood to have a peaceful and quiet night of sleep and rest. I have three minutes. That's a limited amount of time.

The airlines were grounded for three days and three nights. The airlines have demonstrated that they have no moral courage to do what is right for the people of Inglewood. It is morally wrong to build and expand an airport inside the boundaries of any American city. The evidence is clear that it pollutes the air, it has an adverse impact upon the learning of children. Studies conducted at Cornell University and in Germany verifies that conclusion. Whatever is morally right should be politically right.

It is morally wrong to expand an airport inside the boundaries of a heavily populated residential community. Since it is morally wrong, it should be politically wrong. Repeat those words, will you please, often. The American Airlines, the industry as a whole was pushed on September 11th. Many families suffered great loss. I only have 18 more seconds. I can't say everything that I want to say here, but I would encourage those who have any faith to make decisions to protect the water, the air and the people on the ground.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed water quality in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G, and Technical Reports 4, 6, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-4, S-6, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIS addresses 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, with supporting technical data and analyses provided Appendix S-C1.

In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-4 regarding human health mitigation strategies.

SPHM00026 Kropp, Bob

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPHM00026-1

Comment:

Good evening. I'm Bob Kropp and I've been a resident of Manhattan Beach since 1956. I also was an airline employee for 36 years. The airline is no longer in business, but one of the airlines took us over. So I guess it's okay.

I would like to comment on one thing about that with the present check- in system, which everyone likes to believe it's a big, safe situation. I can fly free. And I refuse to go out to the airport and fly anywhere because of the hassle. It is a big hassle. Now, if the people here or in your travels believe that it isn't, wait until the day that they get the entry built over two miles away and you have to go through your check- in there, get on a tram, go over to the airport, check in. It's going to take two, two and a half, three hours to board an airplane.

Also, there will be parking problems. And with that situation going on, you're chasing the traveler who would fly between here and a short distance, Phoenix, San Diego, San Francisco, Seattle, are going to get in their car and they are going to drive rather than to fly. The airlines can't afford to go to outlying airports if they can't fill the airplane. The thought that we can force people to go out there, people will travel by another mode. And what you're doing is penalizing an industry known as the airline industry.

Response:

Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, would improve the safety and security of LAX. As described in the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum, the GTC is designed to address a variety of safety and security issues as well as improve the landside system that currently exists in the CTA. Alternative D would separate the commercial and private vehicle landside components from the passenger terminal facilities and gates in the CTA. This would eliminate the threat of blast in close proximity to large congregations of queuing passenger at functions such as ticketing and baggage claim. Though the primary concern in constructing the GTC is providing passengers with a safe and secure airport environment, passenger convenience is also addressed. The existing CTA would not efficiently accommodate the forecast volume of passenger traffic in 2015. Construction of the GTC, ITC and RAC would address this issue by improving the landside facilities available to LAX airport users in the future, as discussed in chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Travel times to the airport would be reduced due to improved access to the ITC and GTC from roadways in the airport vicinity, such as the 405 and 105 freeways, versus access to the existing CTA. Upon arrival at the GTC, passengers would find both E-Kiosk check-in facilities as well as Skycap baggage check facilities. The ITC and GTC would be separated from the CTA for safety reasons. However, the APM connecting the GTC to the CTA would be able to deliver passengers in six minutes or less while the APM connecting the ITC to the CTA would be able to deliver passengers in 9 minutes or less. Improved airport access and enhanced safety and security would provide improved levels of customer service for airport users.

SPHM00026-2

Comment:

The airport, the airport at the present time, I could have drawn the picture six years ago when they decided to build a bigger airplane than the Boeing 747. The truth being is that they are tearing the runways up, moving them, spreading them further apart because you can't land the airplane being built by the French on this airport and get it into position and park it at a gate. So, therefore, we are going to tear down three buildings so we can make room to put in these airplanes that fly non- stop from Singapore, Australia, from London, from Paris and the likes. We're going to make room for that. So what we're going to have is basically strictly an international airport.

Response:

The airfield modifications proposed in Alternative D would not prevent LAX from accommodating domestic air traffic. As described in the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum, Appendix F, Aircraft

3. Comments and Responses

Operations and Passenger Activity Profiles, approximately two thirds of LAX passengers would be arriving or departing on domestic flights.

SPHM00026-3

Comment:

The people who live here will hear the noise.

I don't complain about the noise. I don't hear the noise. And I'm not deaf. But I would like to say that I've got friends here who complain about the noise and the same noise I don't hear. I guess I've gotten used to it and I accept it. Back in the prop days we had the same noise over the top of Manhattan Beach.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00026-4

Comment:

The building of the new airport, I'm for advancement. I think it's a great idea. I think having the method that they are going to use two miles away to get people to the airport is ridiculous. The reason we don't have the Green Line going to the airport today is because they envisioned putting this thing out at the end of the runway and having to transport the people in. That's why they never finished the Green Line. Okay.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00027 Sambrano, Diane None Provided 8/20/2003

SPHM00027-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Diane Sambrano. I'm one of those pesky people who lives in Inglewood. I see LAWA made that wonderful agreement with my community for, what was it, sound insulation that was suspended.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor appears to be referring to the suspension of the requirement for an avigation easement in exchange for residential sound insulation. An avigation easement transfers certain property rights from the owner of an underlying property to the owner of an airport. See Topical Response TR-LU-3 for additional information about avigation easements. As described on pages 10 and 11 of the Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR under a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the City of Los Angeles and City of Inglewood LAWA has suspended the requirement for an avigation easement for Inglewood residents receiving residential sound insulation under the ANMP as long as there is continued cooperation between the City of Los Angeles and Inglewood in studying, designing, and implementing mitigation measures that are mutually beneficial to Inglewood and LAWA.

SPHM00027-2

Comment:

So we have that understanding that safety and security really means expansion. We've been there, done that before, misrepresentational terms. But to us safety and security by any other name is simply expansion, not only in the amount of land which is acquired, meaning, what was it, 2,568 homes. We

call them homes. I think you all call them dwelling units. We actually have families that live there as opposed to simply entities that dwell. You've already wiped out several of our schools.

Response:

Comment noted. For the purpose of clarification, as was indicated in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, no acquisition of residential properties is proposed under Alternative D. If the commentor is referring to acquisition of residential properties within Manchester Square, the voluntary acquisition program currently underway for Manchester Square is separate from the Master Plan and will continue on to completion regardless of which Master Plan alternative is approved. Please also see Topical Response TR-MP-3 regarding the acquisition of residential properties at Manchester Square, and the fact that such property acquisition was initiated at the request of property owners in Manchester Square, as a preference to having their homes sound-insulated.

SPHM00027-3

Comment:

Our children tolerate pollution, the planes fly over their heads.

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, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHM00027-4

Comment:

Now, I know one of the greatest supporters earlier this evening was one of the pipe fitters who said everyone would rather drive farther than to have to wait in those lines. And you know what, I support that concept. If he really believes it, let's leave the airport just as it is, and we'll have our regional solution, won't we. No one will want to, as he says, wait in line.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00027-5

Comment:

But if in fact we believe that we are about a regional solution, then we have to take into account the concept of air quality. It isn't just employees who are entitled to breathe comfortably and safely and have long lives. Homeowners and children should have that opportunity as well.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The objective of the Human Health Risk Assessment was to determine the increased incremental health risk, if any, associated with the implementation of Master Plan alternatives for people working at the airport, and for people living, working, or attending school in communities near the airport. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHM00027-6

Comment:

As I looked at many of the documents, and of course 8,000 pages is a little tough to read in 45 days,

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA and FAA extended the public comment period on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to a total of 120 days closing on November 7, 2003. In addition to nine public hearings held in August, three public hearings were held in October, 2003.

SPHM00027-7

Comment:

it seems the only concern we had was about that auto bomb, explosives loaded into a car. And that's the only thing we seem to be addressing. And I'll bet you there is a terrorist out there who could think of two or three other ways. Gosh, that you all had to move that little sign that said, " You can't go under Sepulveda" because some of us brought that up at a public hearing. By the way, it's still not far enough away. You can't really do that if you're in the wrong lane.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHM00027-8

Comment:

Someone said we want LAX to leave. No, we didn't, but we certainly should not bear all of the burdens so that a few people could have some benefits of having quiet time.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00027-9

Comment:

There was a comment made about that commercial. And I bet people thought it was funny. But in my neighborhood, all kinds of stuff spills out of the air. And it usually is not from flying birds. They are engine parts, wing parts, not to mention that unmentionable liquid.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot and fuel dumping. Please note, spills from aircraft occur infrequently, if at all. In 2003, only two incidents of spills occurred while aircraft were located at the gates. Aircraft lavatories are cleaned while at the LAX gates and should not be dumping lavatory waste while in the air.

SPHM00027-10

Comment:

It seems some people want to say I want what I want now. Anything worth having is worth studying and waiting for. And we'd like to have a quality of life. Ours has been destroyed for many years by LAWA.

Response:

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

Jackson, Eric

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPHM00028-1

Comment:

Good evening. Eric Jackson of Los Angeles/ Orange County, and most of all an American citizen. This is America. We have to continue to move forward. We have to stop the corporate greed.

And I wasn't going to speak on this matter tonight because I spoke earlier -- earlier this week. But the previous speaker mentioned the French aircraft. That's why we have to increase the airport runways. This is necessary to increase the airport runways if we continue to buy these French aircrafts. And that's the price you pay when you don't want to put Americans to work. I never believed NAFTA. I believe in used to. The United States of America and our citizens need to be put to work. When you pay \$ 45 for a shirt, if you wear it between medium, large and extra large, if you wear 2X, 3X and have to go to Rochester and pay \$ 90 for a shirt that's made in Indonesia, something is wrong.

There is no way possible somebody can tell me they are going to drive six hours to San Francisco, Phoenix, Oakland, 17 hours to Seattle or more and they can fly for \$ 39. That's ludicrous.

I am in favor of proposition D, plan D, not because I'm a pipe fitter, because I'm an American citizen. We can't afford to stop the progress. The environment is important. If we could afford to stop progress, why are our boys in Iraq today?

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00029 Kenton, Jack

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPHM00029-1

Comment:

Yes. It's K- e- n- t- o- n. I'm at 835 Dune Street in El Segundo.

I've commented previously about the idea of having a midway -- midfield taxiway between runways on the north and south sides of the runway. And I still would like to make my point that I feel that the expense of creating extra runways and taxiways is not necessary based on the safety issue, that the safety issue can be handled by having a taxiway off the ends of the runway going around the inboard runway should that truly be such a problem. And I also disagree with it because I feel it facilitates movement of a greater number of aircraft in and out of LAX, and the frequency that the noise goes over the houses are part of the things that makes it hard to live close to the airport.

Response:

Alternative D does not propose any new or extra runways. From the following content of the comment we have guessed that the midfield taxiway the commentator mentioned may refer to the center taxiway between the closely spaced parallel runways. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00038-3 regarding runway incursion at LAX and an analysis conducted by NASA Ames Research Center comparing the costs and benefits of a center parallel taxiway and "end-around" taxiway on the south airfield complex. Also please see Response to Comment SPHF00021-3 regarding aircraft runway operations at LAX under Alternative D.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHM00029-2

Comment:

Also, I would like to have someone convince me that moving all the check-in points away from the airport is truly beneficial simply because the idea is that we're going to eliminate the terrorist threat at the Central Terminal Area by moving all the vehicles away. However, there will still be vehicles at the other check-in points, which to me could be just as much a hazard. It won't be a hazard to the terminal and the aircraft parked at the terminal, but it would still be a hazard to the people. And it's -- you start just looking at it and wondering whether there is really cost-effectiveness in producing all this extra construction.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHM00029-3

Comment:

Now, I like the idea of having a link to the Green Line to facilitate people getting into the airport. That alone is a point that's well worth constructing, but I'm not sure about all these other items that we've planned to build.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments above.

SPHM00030 Hefner, Roy

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPHM00030-1

Comment:

Roy Hefner, H-e-f-n-e-r, 6548 West 80th Place, L. A., 90045.

I just hated to see you people close up without somebody going ahead and talking. So I thought I would come up for a second round. What I'm attempting to do is I'm not dealing with the overall Alternative D plus or minus. I'm trying to take certain things in that alternative and bring it to your attention.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPHM00030-2

Comment:

Number one, I talked earlier tonight about the single event noise and how one of the mitigation measures that they plan to incorporate as far as schools were concerned is they wanted to conduct a survey and a test to go ahead and determine whether or not noise does have an impact upon the education program. And they are referring primarily to the area of Lennox.

And my question is, how are you going to have a test of the students in Lennox about noise and no noise when they always have airplanes flying over? There is never a time that they don't. So you cannot make a comparison on that particular basis.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA has initiated a study regarding the relationship, if any, between aircraft noise disruption and learning. This is explained in Mitigation Measure MM-LU-3 Conduct Study of the Relationship Between Aircraft Noise Levels and the Ability of Children to Learn (Alternatives A, B, C, and D). Additionally, schools that are exposed to high single event noise levels are not limited to Lennox. These schools are identified in Table S9 of Section S1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

As part of the Master Plan process LAWA has committed to a series of mitigation measures including Mitigation Measure MM-LU-3, Conduct Study of the Relationship Between Aircraft Noise Levels and the Ability of Children to Learn (Alternatives A, B, C, and D) that will determine what, if any, measurable relationship may be present between learning and the disruptions caused by aircraft noise at various levels. Schools significantly impacted by single event noise impacts will receive sound insulation to reduce interior noise levels to the applicable threshold noise level, unless the school is subject to an existing aviation easement. .

SPHM00030-3

Comment:

Another thing is in the EIR itself on the -- on the summary comparisons, you make excellent summary comparisons of Alternative A, B, C and D, but you do not make the comparisons on those charts in the executive summary of the no- action, no- project. However, during the -- in the written aspect of your particular report, while you do go ahead and invariably, so far what I've read, without exception the Alternative D in your unbiased opinion is always superior to the no- action, no- project, which leads me to believe that there is something that is lacking there.

Response:

The Executive Summary in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR includes many instances where the impacts of each build alternative (Alternatives A through D) are compared to those of the No Action/No Project Alternatives (i.e., see Impact Comparison tables/charts ES-1 through ES-19 in the Executive Summary). Table ES-3 in the Executive Summary of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR does not include a comparison of each build alternative to the No Action/No Project Alternative because, as indicated in its title, it is for CEQA purposes. Unlike NEPA, the primary basis of comparison under CEQA is between the proposed project and the existing environmental conditions, not the No Action/No Project Alternative. It is true that Alternative D is superior to the No Action/No Project Alternative in several respects. Alternative D provides for a variety of improvements to LAX facilities that would not otherwise occur under No Action/No Project. Improvements such as those proposed for the airfield and for the local roadway systems enable aircraft and motor vehicles to operate more efficiently, resulting in reduced impacts to the environment. The supporting analysis and documentation for these conclusions are provided throughout Chapter 4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the associated appendices and technical reports.

SPHM00030-4

Comment:

You also include in Phase I the building of a tunnel, but yet all -- for baggage, for luggage. But in all of your other aspects, that building of a tunnel is not included and I think probably has been eliminated as a possibility. And the only place I know of that you might be tunneling is from Bradley to the new west terminal.

Response:

As described in Chapter 3, Alternatives of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR a baggage tunnel connecting the GTC to the CTA is one option for the secure transport of baggage to and from the GTC. Construction of such a tunnel is anticipated to be carried out in conjunction with the construction of the APM linking the GTC and CTA. However, other alternatives such as a dedicated car within the APM system for the transportation of the baggage were investigated. Final determination of the mode of transport for the baggage would be identified during the preliminary design process.

3. Comments and Responses

There would be a tunnel, which would link the proposed West Satellite Concourse with TBIT and the CTA. This tunnel would carry both the airside APM and baggage.

SPHM00030-5

Comment:

The disruption that will take place with the development of the runways. As you know, there will be three runways eventually developed in one way or another either by moving and/ or by extending, both to the east and/ or to the west. I don't think there is adequate coverage left in the EIR to express the amount of disruption and the shifting of noise during that particular process. When you have to close down a runway, that means that there is three runways that are going to handle what normally four runways are going to do. So we have to be concerned about that.

Response:

As described in Section 3.1.5, Alternative D, Aircraft Noise Pattern During Reconstruction of Runway 7R/25L, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, reconstruction of the north airfield proposed by Alternative D would be accomplished without substantive effect on the operation of the airport. Relocated Runway 24L would be constructed prior to the closing of current Runway 24L, and any construction activity that may affect the utility of Runway 24R will be accomplished during the night hours when that runway is not used as part of the noise abatement program of the airport. In contrast, the reconstruction of Runway 25L, planned for the 2005 time frame, will require substantial changes to the way the airport is operated. It is anticipated that Runway 25L will be closed for a period of approximately one year while it is being shifted 50 feet to the south to accommodate a center taxiway between the two runways in the south airfield complex. Please refer to Figure S-5, Aircraft Noise Contours During Reconstruction of Runway 25L - Alternative D, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for more information.

LAX would continue to operate in a safe manner during the various airfield construction phases. Construction would be concentrated during daily, seasonally and annually low traffic periods to minimize disruption to LAX operations.

SPHM00030-6

Comment:

As far as the Green Line is concerned, I remember when the Green Line before it was ever constructed, it was really going to be a big boon for carrying people to the airport. It has carried a lot of employees to the airport, but very few travelers utilize the Green Line as such. And maybe they will go ahead and expand that.

One point, though. The Green Line must provide some type of space for luggage to be transported.

Response:

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

SPHM00031 Blanks, Bobby

**Congressmember Maxine
Waters' Office**

8/20/2003

SPHM00031-1

Comment:

First of all, let me say good evening to everyone. My name is Bobby Blanks, field representative to Congressmember Maxine Waters. And I have a statement she'd like me to read this evening.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak and submit a statement regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report for Alternative D Enhanced Safety and Security.

3. Comments and Responses

"As a member of Congress for the 35th Congressional District, I represent over 638,000 constituents who live in the cities and communities of Inglewood, Westchester, Playa del Rey, Gardena, Hawthorne, Lawndale and portions of South Los Angeles. Since the release of the prior Master Plan in January 2001 and the release of the new Supplement to the Master Plan, Alternative D, the views and concerns of my constituents have not changed.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00031-2

Comment:

Thousands of residents are still heavily impacted by airplane noise on a constant basis. Thousands of residents are still impacted by pollutants and toxins from aircraft emissions that fly overhead. Thousands of residents have suffered the consequences of increased traffic congestion in their neighborhoods. Thousands of residents are still suffering from hearing loss, sleep deprivation, hypertension, respiratory ailments, anxiety and stress. Residents should not have to live under such conditions.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, human health in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, and 14a of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, and S-9a of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addresses 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 Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding the fact that existing and future noise levels at and around LAX are projected to be well below OSHA and CalOSHA standards that serve to protect against hearing loss, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life.

SPHM00031-3

Comment:

With the release of Alternative D, new issues of concern have arisen. I have talked to many residents and elected officials regarding Alternative D. The primary focus of the plan is enhanced safety and security imposed as a result of the possible threat of terrorism in the aftermath of the September 11th attacks.

Although I am highly in favor of ensuring all passengers and employees at LAX and other airports are as safe as possible, there are evident flaws in Alternative D. Specifically my objections to the proposed plan hinge on the following:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPHM00031-4

Comment:

One, the new alternative increases the passenger cap from 78 million annual passengers to 78.9 MAP, as illustrated in the Table ES- 1 of the Executive Summary, Supplement to the Draft EIS/ EIR Volume 1. This is a clear deviation and violation of the Mayor's promise and pledge to constrain passenger capacity within LAX to the existing facilities which he signed on March 26, 2001.

3. Comments and Responses

On July 16, 2002, I introduced The Careful Airport Planning for Southern California Act, H. R. 5144. This legislation would cap LAX traffic at 78 million annual passengers a year and prevent LAX from expanding beyond its current capacity. The County Board of Supervisors and the Los Angeles City Council has supported this legislation which is currently pending.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level of 78.9 million annual passengers (MAP), which is comparable to the 78.7 MAP projected to occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. As such, Alternative D is not considered to represent an expansion of LAX. The other build alternatives (Alternatives A, B, and C) are designed to serve a future activity level substantially more than the No Action/No Project Alternative, and therefore represent an expansion of LAX. Alternative D is consistent with the Mayor's commitment to no expansion of LAX.

SPHM00031-5

Comment:

Two, Alternative D sounds more like expansion than safety and security given the fact that part of the plan is to utilize Manchester Square as the Ground Transportation Center. If LAWA is relocating residents out of the Manchester Square area and clearing the land over 568 properties to build this new center, I would definitely call that expansion. This site has been opposed by the community, elected officials. And there is no substantive proof that it will make the airport more secure.

Response:

The acquisition of Manchester Square is independent of the residential acquisition necessary for Master Plan implementation. The Manchester Square area is being acquired through the existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program, in support of LAWA's ANMP. 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 and Draft 2004 RTP, which call for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

Historically, the acreage of the airport has increased. The airport acreage of the 1996 Baseline was 3,641 which increased to 3,685 in Year 2000. Each Master Plan alternative has different project components, and therefore, requires different acreage of land. The acreages of the Master Plan alternatives are 3,778 for No Action/No Project Alternative, 4,116 for Alternative A, 4,195 for Alternative B, 4,056 for Alternative C, and 3,883 for Alternative D. Thus, Alternative D is most comparable to No Action/No Project Alternative in terms of acreage, as well. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.4 regarding purpose of the Ground Transportation Center at Manchester Square, and Topical Response TR-SEC-1 and Appendix I of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum regarding security.

SPHM00031-6

Comment:

Three, based on a recent analysis completed earlier this year by the RAND Corporation, to simply reconfigure the airport does not mean the airport is safer than before. It would actually make the airport less safe in certain instances. The RAND analysis states that, "The great risks are in high density areas such as lines for ticketing, baggage claim and the security check points. These risks are not likely to be reduced by Alternative D, which simply moves these targets of opportunity to the Ground Transportation Center and the people mover."

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHM00031-7**Comment:**

Four, during tough economic times, it is not prudent to increase passenger facilities charges and to use any surplus funds on untested ideas. We must take a lesson from the State of California not to allow ourselves to create a deficit in the billions of dollars on plans and ideas of uncertainty.

There are major airlines who are also opposing Alternative D due to the current decline in air travel and the increased costs that will be incurred such as landing fees to pay for much of the project.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment SPC00040-7; please see Response to Comment SPC00040-7.

SPHM00031-8**Comment:**

Alternative D is simply a ploy and a continuation of former Mayor Richard Riordan's plan to expand the airport in the name of safety and security.

Response:

The content of this comment is the same as Comment SPHM00031-8; please refer to the Response to Comment SPHM00031-8.

SPHM00031-9**Comment:**

In addition, Alternative D provides Los Angeles World Airport Commission President Ted Stein and Mayor Hahn an opportunity to assist their fat cat developer friends in securing large city contracts in return for re- election campaign contributions. I am opposed to Alternative D. I believe that now is the time to seriously look at --

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHM00032 Blanks, Bobby**Congressmember Maxine
Waters' Office****8/20/2003****SPHM00032-1****Comment:**

The last thing I would just like to mention in the congressman's statement, it goes on to say that I am opposed to Alternative D. I believe that now is the time to seriously look at developing a more regional approach to air travel so that airports such as Ontario International and Palmdale Regional can begin to accept their fair share of air traffic.

I am asking all constituents of the 35th Congressional District and the South Bay communities to oppose Alternative D.

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

SPHM00033 Weis, Brian

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPHM00033-1

Comment:

Brian, B- r- i- a- n, last name Weis, W- e- i- s. And I live at 8836 Croydon Avenue in Westchester, California.

It seems that the major focus recently has been on converting the expansion plan to now a need for better security at LAX. And oftentimes when there is projects that are being planned or developed, the planners try to take advantage of possible angles to help sell their ideas. And the 9- 11 tragedy has really served the purpose for LAX to really try to make that their cornerstone with Mayor Hahn's new plan.

Unfortunately, LAX has some very interesting security problems that no other airports in the world seem to have. One is the fact that it's -- it's so geographically limited in all the -- all the traffic and planes, and access is just jammed in on top of each other. There is very little security that is afforded by geographic space.

Security, by definition, comes from having limited access. I mean, it's just -- it's -- it's kind of inconceivable to -- to considering you have a secure area and then you have access that anybody can get to, as in the case of the runways in the Sepulveda tunnel. Basically, anybody that gets in this concrete can be within 15 feet of the runway by virtually driving down the state highway, or whatever that is, Sepulveda Boulevard.

I understand this is a long- standing, you know, problem that LAX has always had this tunnel since the last big remodel job, but it doesn't -- it doesn't really -- just because somebody, you know, made the tunnel a project before doesn't mean that it shouldn't be addressed in a security environment that we have today.

If you -- if you want to take all the airport designers of the world or maybe the top 100 and said to them, " Here is my blank sheet of paper, LAX 3,500 acres, or whatever it is, " design me an airport," there isn't a one of them that would advocate running a highway under the middle of those runways.

Now, I know that people think that just because that concrete is thick and there is a lot of steel in it, that it could possibly withstand a large -- a large truck- type bomb like was used by either in the Oklahoma City Bombing or in the World Trade Center back in ' 92. But both of those truck bombs, I don't think they were all that large from what I heard on the news, not in comparison to what could potentially happen. And I just don't see -- I don't see any point in trying to build a \$ 12- billion- dollar remodel job when it doesn't address the very biggest security problem that LAX could possibly have.

You know, there isn't -- virtually every airport in the world has the same sort of layout as LAX. You've got roads that run around, and people get out of the cars and they walk into the terminal with their bags. I don't see that every other airport in the world is jumping to do some remodel job to make it some remote check- in facility. I think the real issue ought to be addressed so that we don't spend ten years and \$ 10 billion dollars or \$ 12 billion dollars, or however many billion dollars, only to end up with the potential of still having a major terrorist problem that blows up the tunnel, and then you lose half of your runway capacity and 85 percent roughly, according to my rough guesstimate of where all the cargo facilities are located. Pretty much everybody seems to be east of the tunnel. And, you know, all that will be cut off. There won't be an avenue for these people to -- all these businesses to be able to operate cargo, and half the runways will be gone.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHM00034 Weis, Brian

None Provided

8/20/2003

SPHM00034-1

Comment:

One of the questions I have is how the funding would be guaranteed to not get tied into the city as revenue. I mean, we've got a \$ 38- billion- dollar deficit in the State of California. And people think that's a huge burden, but it's spread out over 35 million people. It's a big problem. What's going to happen with a 12 billion or 10 billion dollar project that's going to be funded by partially, I guess, bondholders? And if there is some sort of a disaster, either some air- type disaster like 9- 11, that will have a bad fallout on airline traffic, or if there is, God forbid, some terrible disaster at LAX and we're in a middle of a 12 billion dollar program, the airlines can hardly afford to fund it now. How is that going to get -- how is that going to get paid for?

Myself, as a taxpayer, I hope somehow it's not going to backfire so I have to pay for this. How is this project going to be guaranteed to be paid for out of somebody else's money other than my tax money.

And if it is like service by bonds, how is that going to be guaranteed that that's not going to come back to get LAWA or the City of Los Angeles. I understand that United Airlines is having problems where they are not making payments on their bonds to the bondholders right now at either LAX or San Francisco because of the Chapter 11 situation. And it seems to me that the City of Los Angeles should be guaranteed that no matter what, it's not going to be a problem that the bondholders -- or that the city taxpayers are going to have to pay. Orange County had a project where they built the massive freeway and it was going to be paid by bondholders who are going to be paid back by tolls on the toll road. That project went belly- up and Caltrans is bailing them out. How is it that the people that live in Los Angeles are going to be protected from having to foot the bill from this if there is some sort of a problem?

Response:

The proposed Master Plan improvements would be funded with a combination of FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, and other state/federal grants. No general tax dollars will be used to pay for any of the proposed on-airport improvements.

The bonds being used one of the project funding sources are general airport revenue bonds. These bonds are repaid from airport revenues generated from airport users. The bonds are guaranteed only by the revenues from the airport. They are not backed by the City of Los Angeles or the State of California.

SPHM00034-2

Comment:

The other comment I have relates to just having all the eggs in one basket at LAX. I mean, it's unfortunate that there hasn't been better utilization of regional airlines. But, you know, I think that the overwhelming security problem with trying to fix the tunnel, which I see is a real security problem just because of the nature of how it is constructed and how there is no prevention of large truck bombs or whatever from going into there.

The utilization of the other airports, there just isn't -- there isn't any way they could immediately take up the capacity that would be reduced by something that happened to that tunnel. And it seems to me that it's LAWA's responsibility to help ensure that there is a safe operating airport system for people of the greater Los Angeles and Southern California area and to not have provisions for that and to continually put all the eggs in one basket when there is a real weak spot, in my opinion, in the bottom corner of that basket. It's a gross negligence on the part of LAWA.

Response:

Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer

3. Comments and Responses

and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP and Draft 2004 RTP, which call for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

SPHPD00001 Baumann, Allen

None Provided

8/21/2003

SPHPD00001-1

Comment:

Oh, yeah, you're right. Allen A. Baumann, B- a- u- m- a- n- n, 36435 Ironhorse Drive, Palmdale, 93550.

Regarding Alternative D, it seems to me that a better approach than the approach, which is being envisioned at this time, would be a diffusion of the density of the population for security reasons.

The 405 and the 105 are easy targets for terrorist activities. And we all know the glut of activity of passengers that are transporting themselves down to LAX.

LAX itself sees or understands the problem of a lot of people being in one area at one time. That's why the security, if I'm correct, is envisioned to be offset and then brought to the various terminals.

The airlines, I'm reading in current doctrine, are looking at regional airport concepts. They no longer are looking at the large aircraft carrying 300, 400 people. They are now looking at what they call the regional airplane itself. The 7E7 is being specifically built for that.

The airlines doubled the number of smaller aircraft that they put in their fleet last year. This year they are planning to triple it. That gives us, at least in my opinion, the impression that the airlines are planning not to have all this going into one large area, but a diffusion across the countryside.

It would seem to me that a better plan, a better alternative would be to look at utilizing three regional area concepts, LAX, Ontario and Palmdale. That would diffuse not only the people, but it would diffuse the cargo and it would also give us the opportunity to provide better security. That's the essence of what I have to say about Alternative D.

Response:

LAWA is developing plans for all three airports. Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX and necessary improvements to safety and security. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the role of the LAX Master Plan in a regional approach to meeting demand.

SPHPD00001-2

Comment:

I would like to make a comment that I'm on the Palmdale Aviation Aerospace Commission. We meet the first and third Tuesdays of every month. We very much would like to see the public at these meetings because currently it is five of us trying to drive forward conceptually what is going to be given to the City Council. We would appreciate very much the public coming to our meetings and giving us the opportunity to hear their input and give us a better perspective.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHPD00002 Schack, Bob

None Provided

8/21/2003

SPHPD00002-1

Comment:

Good evening, Bob Schack, S- c- h- a- c- k, 38647 25th Street East, Apartment Number 2, Palmdale, California.

I've been a resident of the Palmdale area since 1965. I've served on many committees in support of the Palmdale Airport. I was interested in what the gentleman had to say about coming to Palmdale in the near future to talk about our Palmdale Airport here; is that correct?

So we are looking forward to that meeting. I'll keep my remarks very short, then, because we'll be looking forward to talking to you again soon.

We would like to see that some of the air travel and some of the luggage and some of the cargo being shipped to Palmdale -- or transferred up to Palmdale and also transferred to Ontario and taking the pressure off of LAX. Relieving the pressure that's being put on the folks down there, you need this \$ 9 billion dollars to expand the airport. And through that, even through the construction, you're going to do your remodeling down there, through the construction period transferring some of that up here to Palmdale and to Ontario. And that would relieve a lot.

Thank you very much for your time. And, again, we will look forward to talking to you.

Response:

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

SPHPD00003 Burr, Kathleen

**Los Angeles County Farm
Bureau**

8/21/2003

SPHPD00003-1

Comment:

My name is Kathleen Burr. I'm the Executive Director of the Los Angeles County Farm Bureau, 1006 West Lancaster Boulevard, Lancaster.

Mr. Ritchie and staff, thank you for the opportunity to again stand here. It's been a couple of years. And I realize that agriculture is not a top priority of the LAWA, but as an interim land use here up in Palmdale, I think it should be one of the top priorities.

Currently I've identified 2,080 acres that has the potential of being an ag-land. This is located between 40th and east of 80th. When we get closer to 90th, we're encroaching on the SCA that has been designated for the LAWA property.

The revenue for the first year on this 2,080 acres at \$ 25 an acre would be about \$ 52,000. That's for soil preparation and everything. Currently after that if we're leasing this land to the vegetable growers, we're looking at approximately \$ 250,000 in income per year. That's not including the sod which generates \$ 200 an acre. Both of our large carrot groves up here are each looking for an additional 5,000 acres each to put into carrot-potato production.

At that land, that would be an additional 1.2 million in revenue for the airport with that 10,000 acres. That's not even including DM Camp from Bakersfield and the current lessees on the airport property.

3. Comments and Responses

We're going to take all this and we're going to add the Mohave Desert ground squirrel to this issue. And currently the Sanitation District has finished their EIR of their section. I believe it was 15, no ground squirrels were found. This is going to be put into alfalfa production.

What's going to happen if the Mohave Desert ground squirrel gets federally listed? LAWA is going to be up a creek without a paddle. And now we're going to throw Fish and Game into this, which I know Fish and Game is already on the scene. One other way to remedy this is to do the EIR and let ag come in as an interim use.

Mitigation, what is that going to be from Fish and Game, two to one or seven to one? Seven to one dollars is going to run in the billions to LAWA. And I don't think that's going to be a sound science in business.

Adjudication of water rights, there is another issue we have out here. If you have ag come in, they are going to pump a lot more ground water out. It is going to be re-used. They can recharge the ground water with some of it, but adjudication rights on the airport and the water rights are going to increase.

So with the added issue of the Mohave Desert ground squirrel and Fish and Game, I would like to talk to someone and find out why there has been a large holdup in using this land as interim lease for ag.

We're looking over the next 10 to 15 years with this additional ag land leases, \$ 12 million dollars in revenue. And I'm not sure why LAWA is turning down \$ 12 million dollars in revenue from our farmers.

Response:

During a recent meeting between LAWA staff, the commentor, and another Los Angeles County Farm Bureau Official, LAWA staff concurred with the need to expand agricultural leasing at Palmdale Regional Airport (PMD) and indicated that more than 2,000 acres at PMD may be available for agricultural lease. LAWA staff will continue to discuss this issue with the Los Angeles County Farm Bureau.

SPHPD00004 Hickling, Norm

**Supervisor Mike Antonovich's
Office**

8/21/2003

SPHPD00004-1

Comment:

Norm Hickling. It's H- i- c- k- l- i- n- g. Address is 1113 M-4, Palmdale, California. And it's a pleasure to be here on behalf of Supervisor Mike Antonovich.

And Supervisor Antonovich has a great deal of concern with this current plan. He finds fault in the current LAX Master Plan for its failure to adequately address Southern California's future air transit needs.

Supervisor Antonovich feels it is vital for the future of air transit needs of our County that we adopt a regional approach that includes the full utilization of both Palmdale and Ontario Airports.

Response:

LAWA is developing plans for all three airports. Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX and necessary improvements to safety and security. It is beyond the scope of the LAX Master Plan and associated EIS/EIR to develop projections of which regional airports, if any, would handle the unmet regional demand. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the role of the LAX Master Plan in a regional approach to meeting demand.

SPHPD00004-2**Comment:**

Additionally, he is concerned that the proposed Master Plan does not really limit the growth of LAX to 78 million annual passengers,

Response:

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

SPHPD00004-3**Comment:**

nor does it provide adequate security in light of all the recent events after 9-11,

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHPD00004-4**Comment:**

nor does it adequately address environmental concerns or of the shifting traffic, noise and air quality impacts that will go eastward, especially affecting the communities of Lennox and the City of Inglewood,

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-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities, including the communities of Lennox and the City of Inglewood, and Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice related mitigation and benefits.

SPHPD00004-5**Comment:**

does not use up-to-date data for the Supplemental EIS or EIR. The data is from 1996.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a description of the most current environmental conditions that are meaningful and relevant to the analysis of the LAX Master Plan. In instances where these conditions are materially different from those of the 1996 baseline conditions, such differences were described in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, as were any material differences in the impacts that would result by using Year 2000 conditions instead of 1996 baseline conditions. Please also see Response to Comment AL00022-12 and Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues.

SPHPD00004-6**Comment:**

Nor does it include a rail component on how to move passengers between regional airports.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

SPHPD00004-7

Comment:

Also, it doesn't deal with the fact that growth-inducing impacts may be significantly greater than stated in the current plan.

Response:

The growth inducing impacts associated with Master Plan Alternative D were addressed in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The analysis provided therein was based upon the same general approach and methodology utilized for the other build alternatives and described in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement), of the Draft EIS/EIR. Socio-economic growth was estimated based on projections of total economic output from the econometric forecasting model of the Los Angeles region developed by Regional Econometric Models, Inc. (REMI). Methodologies for determining employment, population, and housing numbers are presented fully in Technical Report 5, Economic Impacts Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR. In comparing the growth inducement analysis for Alternative D with the analyses of the other build alternatives, it should be noted that all estimates of population and housing were considered to be high, as it was assumed that all new employees would move into newly constructed housing rather than existing housing, and that new jobs would not be filled by individuals who already live in the area.

As was discussed in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D would involve a net decrease of 57,113 jobs compared to baseline conditions, resulting from productivity increases over time. Therefore, induced growth associated with increased employment levels would not occur. Furthermore, based on the projected decrease in LAX-related jobs under Alternative D, associated growth induced by an increase in population and households would not occur. Consequently, Alternative D would not generate net new indirect demand for housing resources, public utilities, or services. Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR also addressed the potential for growth-inducing effects near LAX due to the projected increase in cargo levels over baseline conditions expected under Alternative D. Such impacts were determined to be less than significant.

SPHPD00004-8

Comment:

As we all know, LAX currently serves about 56 million annual passengers and about 2 million annual tons of cargo. The region, as it's been purported to say, it will need to accommodate up to 98 million annual passengers and 4.2 million annual tons of cargo by the year 2015. We can do that if we start utilizing Palmdale today.

LAX annual economic impact to the region is estimated at \$ 60 billion dollars. An estimate of 59,000 jobs are directly attributed to LAX at or near the airport with 408,000 jobs throughout -- 408,000 jobs spread throughout Southern California.

40 years ago Los Angeles City fathers envisioned the regional airport system instead of reliance on one single airport. The City of Los Angeles bought more than 17,000 acres here in Palmdale and still sits here empty today. This could alleviate the future overcrowding of LAX.

We have a current contract with the air force at Plant 42 to use the terminal and use the runways. And today we could take up to 50 flights starting right away. And Supervisor urges the regional transport method is the solution to the problems and not the plan that we have before us.

Response:

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.

SPHPD00005 Snyder, D

None Provided

8/21/2003

SPHPD00005-1

Comment:

Thank you. D. C. Snyder, D, period, C, period, S- n- y- d- e- r, 3125 Lantana Court, Palmdale, 93551.

I've been a resident since 1981. I'm in favor of the regional plan for airports. I'm against the development of LAX and all the resources thereof.

Ever since I've moved to this region, there has been continual talk and meetings and on and on about the development and possibility of the Palmdale Regional Airport. And it basically has been just that, talk. I'm here in support of a regional plan.

Response:

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.

SPHPD00006 Cope, Garry

**Oldtown Homeowners Group,
Inc.**

8/21/2003

SPHPD00006-1

Comment:

My name is Garry Cope, C- o- p- e. My legal name is George, but I go by Garry. I am representing Old Town Homeowner's Group.

I also favor the regional approach, but I'm glad somebody mentioned that you have the U. S. Transportation Department in on this, that we need to work with them and the state. If you come out to Palmdale to widen the 14 Freeway, you're going to strangle any efforts of using a regional concept out here by the couple of few lanes that we have for the 14 Freeway to accommodate traffic coming into the area from outside to relieve LAX and the San Fernando Valley areas of -- for making use of an airport.

We need the jobs. We need the industries that such a regional airport would bring to Palmdale,

Response:

The commentor's statements about I-14 are unclear. 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.

SPHPD00006-2

Comment:

but we also need to be cautionary on the environmental impacts it will have. One of the community -- local community environmentalists in the community is worried that with 50 flights a day might fill up the valley with a lot of pollution. And even though we do get a lot of wind not only from our politicians, but from nature, we may not be able to fully be blown out when the airplanes start flying here in Palmdale.

So that is a major concern that I have myself because -- especially with my concern of being on the Environmental Restoration Advisory Board of Plant 42, we're worried that you will really need -- and the

3. Comments and Responses

part we don't have any control of are looking into, there are still sites of contamination that may be out there that nobody is aware of yet that will need to be cleaned up so the people using this airport will not be getting sick just coming to Palmdale.

We don't want that on our heads, "Come to Palmdale and get sick." We want it to be a place to call home and we need the industry also.

Response:

Comment noted. The comment, submitted at the Public Hearing on the LAX Master Plan Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR held in Palmdale, describes conditions local to Palmdale Airport. The comment does not pertain to the content of the LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHPD00007 Williams, Doug

Ironworkers Local 433

8/21/2003

SPHPD00007-1

Comment:

My name is Doug Williams, W- i- l- l- i- a- m- s. I live at 42437 West 56th Street in Lancaster.

I'm a business agent for Ironworkers Local 433. And we represent 4,200 union members in the general area.

We would love to see Plan D go through, me personally because I'm a frequent flyer and I fly overseas. That airport, LAX, is not rated for the big jumbo jets. And they are only going to get bigger for the oversea traffic.

We also support the security plan. I think it is masterfully done. Unfortunately, with our current world structure of our politics, we need it. I do think it is the thing to do. As ironworkers, we would benefit naturally from jobs. That is a hell of an engine for the L. A. area. A lot of our people up here work down in that area. It would need -- it would be the boost that California needs right now in the work picture. We also support this being a regional airport as soon as we could get that. We would like to see that.

I miss the old terminal. I used to use it quite a bit. With that I'll end my speech.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHPD00008 Valdovinos, Paul

Laborers Local 300

8/21/2003

SPHPD00008-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Paul Valdovinos. It's V- a- l- d- o- v- i- n- o- s. I'm a resident 1210 East Avenue Q-10. I'm a member of our Laborer's Local 300. We're here to support the Master Plan Alternative Plan D. We're also here to support the proposed expansion of the Palmdale Regional Airport. And, also, we represent our Laborer's Local 300.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHPD00009 Hawkins, Sam

Ironworkers Local 433

8/21/2003

SPHPD00009-1

Comment:

Hi. My name is Sam Hawkins, H- a- w- k- i- n- s. I live at 37744 Birch Tree Lane. That's Palmdale.

I'm a member of Ironworkers Local 433. I'm here in support of Plan D and also of the security plan. As also someone that has lived here for 20-plus years, I support the Palmdale Regional Airport also. And that's it.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHPD00010 Norris, Rick

City of Palmdale

8/21/2003

SPHPD00010-1

Comment:

Rick Norris, Palmdale City Councilmember, 383 100 Sierra Highway, Palmdale, 93550.

First thing I want to do is, Mr. Ritchie is well aware of my efforts to bring an airline to Palmdale. And the message that we want to send is the Council is together.

Palmdale is the regional solution to the L. A. congestion. In fact, we're part of the congestion that you're suffering at L. A., at Burbank and Ontario in that we have to travel the freeway in our efforts to get to the other places and utilize those airlines that we so desperately need here in the City of Palmdale.

Also, a part of the regional solution for homeland security, in the event there is an event in Southern California, LAX will be shutdown. Ontario will be shutdown. Burbank will be shutdown. And we have a mountain range that separates us from it. And we become the metropolitan and bypass for all of Southern California. That's critical in our future needs of this country, the future needs of Palmdale and the future needs in the event there is an event.

We feel and felt relatively secure that had 9-11 not occurred, that we were getting close to getting an airline. It was financially devastating to the airlines. And as a result, many of those airliners that we could be using are parked at Mohave in dry storage.

The other thing that I wanted to point out is if something happens in Southern California, we have been to Long Beach. Long Beach cannot have any additional flights. American was there. American left there. JetBlue became very successful. Now American is suing to get back into Long Beach. And I went to the City Council in Long Beach. And they voted nine to zero to support Palmdale Regional Airport.

So what we are is the true regional solution, the economic engine of an airline operating out of Palmdale in addition to the numbers that Norm indicated from Supervisor Antonovich's office is that it means about \$ 70 million dollars to us. It means thousands of jobs. And we're sitting here in one of the few communities in the United States that is saying, "Bring us an airline." We are ready, willing and able. We have a terminal in place, and we're in a position to be able to start flights tomorrow with the assistance of LAWA and the assistance of not having additional gates at LAX and Ontario. If there is no additional gates down at those airports, they will come to Palmdale because we are the only viable alternative.

So I just wanted to make a couple of points. Then what I want to also point out is that LAWA controls thousands of acres out here. Thousands of acres close to this airport with an airline, there will be industrial development just outside the borders of this airport. We need those additional jobs. So we're going to continue to fight for it and deliver an airline to the City of Palmdale.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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.

SPHPD00011 Gomez, Ramon

Laborers Local 300

8/21/2003

SPHPD00011-1

Comment:

Yes, good evening. My name is Ramon Gomez of Laborer's Local 300. I'm the union rep and I am also a resident of Palmdale. I would like to ask the membership of this area to stand up at this moment.

Okay. Also, we as union members and as residents, we also are in support of Alternative D. We would like this to happen. We believe not only for national security but also for job and creation in this area that we also need this, not only in L. A. but in Palmdale. So hopefully this passes, and thank you.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHPD00012 Schaefer, Jeff

None Provided

8/21/2003

SPHPD00012-1

Comment:

Thank you. I'm Jeff Schaefer, S- c- h- a- e- f- e- r, 40653 158th Street East, Lancaster, 95395.

I just want to state as a resident out here, I have previously commuted to Van Nuys and recently began working here at Plant 42. I do want to say that the regional solution is that, a solution. The residents up here, the economics up here need to have this solution in place. The LAX area is too congested to allow the new generation of long hull aircraft. And by developing this site in a master-planned environment, we can provide that solution for all of Southern California.

And I just want to say that I'm in support of the regional plan and that maybe that money from Plan D or any of those other efforts should concentrate up here in Palmdale rather than in L. A. They've had the funds down there. They've had the opportunities down there long enough. And the people here in Palmdale are tired of commuting and tired of taxing the state funds to improve that freeway. It's time to have it here.

Response:

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

SPHPD00013 Blanco, Juan

None Provided

8/21/2003

SPHPD00013-1

Comment:

Good evening my name is Juan Blanco. I'm a resident of Palmdale, 38256 Hillcrest Drive.

I just viewed the video a few moments ago. The terminal looks really nice, but I'm kind of wondering and reading the statement about the security checks. Apparently that video doesn't deal with rush hour traffic. So it's kind of light traffic, and I don't see how the relevance is at 8: 00 a. m. being a traveler and all.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts are addressed in 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 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-SEC-1 regarding security-related aspect of the comment.

SPHPD00013-2

Comment:

But I'm just kind wondering, the funding for that terminal, is it developed out of any of county moneys? Can some of this money be diverted to a rail connection from Palmdale Regional and LAX to lighten that burden because it doesn't seem that we're taking into consideration the alternatives? I appreciate security. But building this massive transportation center or modal center at LAX doesn't seem to be the answer to the solution, or the solution to the answer I should say. We really need to build out towards Palmdale Regional.

Now, funding seems to be quite important. And there is going to be a lot of money spent on this new improvement, and a lot of relocation of people's homes and of people. I appreciate the fact that work will be developed from this, but can we share this fountain of wealth with Palmdale and the Antelope Valley?

Response:

No county or taxpayer monies will be used for on-airport improvements. Off-airport improvements such as a rail line from LAX to Palmdale would have to be funded with non-airline monies. Until Palmdale area demand increases, the most likely result of such a rail line would be for Palmdale residents to take the train to LAX, rather than LAX passengers riding to Palmdale Regional Airport for their flights. 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 roadways by LAWA and Caltrans, and the master plan update that is currently underway. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding planned high speed rail in the region.

SPHPD00014 Hill, Raymond

None Provided

8/21/2003

SPHPD00014-1

Comment:

My name is Raymond Hill. My address is 38539 36th Street East, City of Palmdale.

My question is, I have heard in the past that Palmdale was trying to get an airport up here in the area. And a few years back I'm quite sure we all know that the economy kind of fell down. Everybody was kind of anticipating on that, the Palmdale Airport would come into existence.

My question is this. How positive at this point in time is -- you know, is all this going to occur or is it still under negotiation? I'm kind of foggy in that area.

Also, like I said, I'm new in the area. I just purchased a home here in the Palmdale area, and I'm kind of close to it. So I'm kind of concerned about the neighborhood that I just bought a home in and how it's going to affect me as far as a new homeowner. That's the only question I wanted to ask.

Response:

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.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHPD00015 Blanco, Juan

None Provided

8/21/2003

SPHPD00015-1

Comment:

Good evening. Again, Juan Blanco, 38256 Hillcrest Drive. I would like to just add to my earlier comment concerning the project on Item D.

As speaking earlier this evening, I mentioned that I'm a New York City -- ex New York City commuter. So I have some personal experience with crowd and traffic and people controlling people movement. And looking at the video again, I see the design is a beautiful design, but it doesn't seem to be -- I guess this comment is directly to Mayor Hahn because this project is not focused on moving people as it is. It is going to congest. It is going to bottleneck. It is going to create more of a havoc than it will eliminate havoc.

All we're doing is replacing the bus system with the rail system. If the rail system is automated, what security do we have on the automation? So are we really moving in a positive fashion or are we taking a step backwards for the sake of spending cash on, I guess, an attractive proposal.

Moving people, especially on rush hour in LAX is problematic, to say the least. That proposal -- or according to that film if this is what it is intending to do, take people out of their vehicles what used to be parking lot C, shuttle them into a people moving rail system whereas they have to now go through security check. You have a bottleneck number one.

Number two, in any given day between Monday through Friday between 6: 00 a. m. and 9: 00 a. m. you have hundreds and thousands of people, commuters, business people who are in a rush trying to get to their destinations. This I do not see as extra added. What they probably would want to do then is push the Southern California Regional Rail System for a bullet train because it will have less security.

But in looking at this I don't see that it's going to aid the commuter. I don't see it aiding in security because you're going to bottleneck through these points. You put them on a rail that if automated, can be subject to electrical problems, mechanical problems. And then you still have a bulk of travelers that you may think that you're eliminating, but you really are not. They are still going to be there. You have to move them to that terminal in and out.

To eliminate the vehicle, that will work if you don't want vehicles within the terminal. As far as moving people, I don't see this as a viable solution. It doesn't look like it is a viable solution and it was designed according to the video to handle traffic between midnight and 4: 00 a. m. That's what I see the video portraying. I do not see it portraying the actual traffic from 6: 00 a. m. to 9: 00 a. m. or from 2: 00 p. m. to 7: 00 p. m. when traffic is heavy, especially during the holidays.

Response:

The Automated People Mover will be designed to safely and comfortably handle the volume of passengers expected during peak hours. A back-up system will be designed and provided as well. As stated in Section 6.6, Automated People Mover Alternative D Concept, of the Appendix I of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum, each supporting LAX remote transportation facility (GTC, ITC, and RAC) will accomplish Level 1 screening of passengers prior to boarding the APM. In addition, as addressed in Section 6.1, Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA) Green Line Connection, of the Appendix I of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum, under today's system, there are no known airport security measures other than organic security (deputy sheriffs riding the light rail cars, Closed Circuit Television (CCTV), and other proprietary security systems) inherent to general MTA operations. As such, there are no identified or proposed passenger or airport employee inspection processes in place between the MTA Green Line and the CTA. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 for a more detailed discussion on security under Alternative D.

SPHPD00016 Trout, Lewis

**Palmdale Regional Airport
Advisory Council**

8/21/2003

SPHPD00016-1

Comment:

I live at my name is Lewis L- e- w- i- s, Trout, T- r- o- u- t. I live at 930 Crescent Drive in the City of Barstow.

On behalf of the employees of Palmdale Regional Airport, I would like to say, we greatly appreciate the opportunity you've extended to the citizens of Palmdale and the Antelope Valley to provide input into the process. And we appreciate you having stayed here until 9: 00 o'clock this evening to provide that opportunity to the community.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00001 Waters, Maxine

U.S. House of Representatives

8/23/2003

SPHF00001-1

Comment:

Thank you very much and good morning to everyone. Welcome to the 35th Congressional District. I'm delighted you're here, and I'm delighted that I have the opportunity this morning to testify before you. I'm going to try and do this in three minutes.

Let me just say that I thought this was an issue that we had put behind us, expansion of LAX. When the mayor was running to be elected mayor of this city, he signed an agreement that said we would seek a regional solution, that we would indeed not try and expand to LAX. Little did we know that there would be an attempt to expand to LAX under another name and under another banner. And I think this is what this is all about.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level of 78.9 million annual passengers (MAP), which is comparable to the 78.7 MAP projected to occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. As such, Alternative D is not considered to represent an expansion of LAX relative to increased activity levels. While implementation of Alternative D would expand the overall development "footprint" of LAX through establishment of the Ground Transportation Center (GTC) at Manchester Square, that component of the project is an integral part of the overall enhanced security design of Alternative D. The other build alternatives (Alternatives A, B, and C) are designed to serve a future activity level substantially more than that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and therefore represent an expansion of LAX. Alternatives B and C proposed airport uses at Manchester Square, and the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative A assume Manchester Square to be vacant. It is important to note that none of the alternatives assume the continued presence of existing residential uses at Manchester Square, since the acquisition of the existing residential properties was initiated separate from the LAX Master Plan and would be completed regardless of which alternative is selected, even the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D is consistent with the Mayor's commitment to no expansion of LAX, and to his promise of improved safety and security at LAX. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the role of LAX in the regional approach to meeting future aviation demands.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHF00001-2

Comment:

I'm opposed to Alternative D because I do not think it is needed. It is costly. It is unnecessary and it is disruptive. I represent an area that's had to suffer the noise and pollution of these flights over the homes of this community for many years.

In this community, we have the cities of Inglewood and Hawthorne and Gardena, and we have Westchester and we have Lawndale. And we have many people who have not only suffered noise, pollution and congestion, we have promises that have not been kept.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding past and present activity levels at LAX.

SPHF00001-3

Comment:

We have had retrofitting that was promised to be done, people's homes have cracks in their windows. Their doors are not fitting. They have walls that are cracked. This retrofitting that has been promised has not been carried through. We've been through enough here. We don't need this additional disruption.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In an effort to mitigate current noise impacts from LAX operations on adjacent jurisdictions affected by high noise levels, the City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, Inglewood, and El Segundo prepare and administer their respective ANMPs. The ANMP identifies areas eligible for residential sound insulation (defined by the 1992 65 CNEL). The 65 CNEL is the applicable standard for high noise levels as defined by FAR Part 150 and Title 21 (see Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4) of the Draft EIS/EIR). Implementation of the ANMP by other jurisdictions is outside the direct control of LAWA; however, LAWA is working with other jurisdictions to improve and accelerate their soundproofing efforts. Concerns about the progress of the ANMP in Inglewood and Los Angeles County should also be directed to these jurisdictions. Please refer to Subtopical Responses TR-LU-3.11 regarding contact information for questions and concerns about the ANMP; TR-LU-3.10 regarding progress in implementing the ANMP as of June 2002; and TR-LU-3.14 for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels and Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding the potential for property damage from noise-based vibration. As stated under Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA would accelerate fulfillment of existing commitments to owners wishing to participate within the current ANMP boundaries prior to proceeding with newly eligible properties and provide additional technical assistance to local jurisdictions to support more rapid and efficient implementation of their respective ANMPs.

SPHF00001-4

Comment:

To remove all of these homes in Manchester Square is a sin and a shame when we have a housing crisis. We need the housing.

Response:

As stated in the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, homes in the Manchester Square area are being acquired through the existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program currently underway within the Manchester Square and Airport/Belford areas near the airport, in support of LAWA's ANMP. The program was instituted after LAWA received a high level of interest from those who reside in the area which is subject to high noise levels. The program was instituted independent of the LAX Master Plan and has separate utility. This program is proceeding and will be completed with or without approval of the LAX Master Plan. The effects of this acquisition are assessed under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Furthermore, as noted in the Draft EIS/EIR, a Mitigated Negative Declaration was approved by the City of Los Angeles for the Manchester Square and Airport/Belford Voluntary Acquisition Program. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.1.2 regarding legality of the acquisition of Manchester Square, Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.2 regarding relocation of homes in Manchester Square, and Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.5 regarding housing needs.

SPHF00001-5

Comment:

I'm absolutely concerned about this 9-billion-dollar expenditure. We have a 38-billion-dollar deficit in the State of California. We need to save money for a rainy day. The airport is not secured. We have not secured it yet. There are many things that we should be doing now.

I was just there in the cargo sections, and I have a whole list of things that should be done and they don't cost 9 billion dollars, and you don't have to clean out Manchester Square to do it.

Response:

The proposed master plan improvements would be funded with a combination of FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, and other state/federal grants. No general tax dollars will be used to pay for any of the proposed on-airport improvements. The content of this comment is similar to comments SPC00099-6 and SPC00162-5; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00099-6 and Response to Comment SPC00162-5.

SPHF00001-6

Comment:

We do not want this plan. We do not want this congestion. We're asking that consideration be given to the residents of the area. All of the elected officials of the area are opposed to this plan. We believe, again, it's too costly. It's too disruptive. It's unneeded. Let's do the things that can be done now to help make the airport more secure, not launch into a plan where we think only the fat cat developers and contractors are going to benefit from.

For those people who are here today, all my friends in labor, I respect you. I've worked with you for many years. I've given you much support. We have got a lot that we need to be doing about compensation and benefits and better working conditions. Let's concentrate on that. Let's not get tricked into fattening the pockets of the big developers in the name of elected Hahn again.

Response:

Comment noted. Please note that LAX is not run as a for-profit organization. It is a public service and the fees collected are used to pay for the maintenance and upkeep. As required by Federal law, any funds generated at the airport must be expended at the airport.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHF00002 Miscikowski, Cindy City of Los Angeles

8/23/2003

SPHF00002-1

Comment:

Cindy Miscikowski, 200 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, City Hall. And I am the councilmember for this area and pleased to represent this -- pleased to represent this community.

Although the statement was that there is no decision that could be made today, there can be a conclusion reached that additional environmental analysis and an alternative draft with a real cap of 78 million airline passengers needs to be done. I have turned into LAWA a multi-page letter critiquing the EIR, which is what this hearing is about. I will try to summarize very quickly the details of that letter which goes into detailed analysis.

There are six major things that are flawed, I believe, in the EIR.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see below for responses to comments on the six specific areas of concern raised by the commentor.

SPHF00002-2

Comment:

First, the issue dealing with transportation. The mitigation measures that are proposed in the EIR are unfunded, uncertain and under-evaluated. The whole thrust of this plan is that traffic is going to be reduced as a consequence of focusing it all in one area, in one area that is going to be dealt with by one access to the 405.

Today we know there are three access points to LAX, at least, from the 405. To say you're going to concentrate it on one and deal with the traffic is not adequate, particularly when that is put forward as a mitigation measure and, yet, acknowledge that the full funding is not available.

So the whole environmental analysis is based on the fact that a traffic system can work, but it's a traffic system that the project itself cannot support, cannot pay for and is going to be dependent on state and federal funds. And we all know what the situation the State and the Federal Government are in today. So the whole process of the transportation is flawed.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments PC02220-6 and SPC00064-2 regarding funding. If a lack of funding affected the airport plan, the plan would have to be amended to reflect alternative mitigation, for which there was funding available. Any major plan revisions would have to have environmental approval, including public input.

SPHF00002-3

Comment:

The issue of security is the second issue that I've addressed, particularly since this is called the "Enhanced Safety and Security Analysis." It is also based on technologies that don't exist, on processes that are not clear and, in fact, are going to be duplicative and problematic for people going through the systems. In fact, it may make, as we've learned from RAND, easier target of a mass of people at one location, and is something I think has not been addressed fairly and frankly.

It is also further noted that the current environmental documents which put forward these suggestions do not fully elaborate that the technology and construction are not yet available. They are dependent on future technology that don't exist today.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHF00002-4

Comment:

My third concern, as itemized in detail, is the concern over the growth potential. This has been put forward as a Master Plan that has a cap. But, in fact, if you look at the Ground Transportation Center, the corps of this, the capacity of that Ground Transportation Center is huge, is huge, over 78 million airline passengers. That growth could occur afterwards and be seriously problematic and not a growth plan at all.

Response:

The commentor incorrectly stated that there is a cap in the Master Plan to prevent growth potential. The passenger activity that would be expected in 2015 with Alternative D was determined based on the design of the Alternative D gate facilities and the projected airline response to the constrained facilities. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00027-3. A separate environmental process would be required if there are new facilities or runways being proposed at LAX.

SPHF00002-5

Comment:

I will skip to the end of this since my time is running out, and just say that the Supplemental Draft EIR is fatally flawed in that it does not offer a true mitigation plan for a 78-million-airline-passenger alternative within the existing LAX framework. We need to see an environmentally sound, economically viable and current security capability alternative in this environmental process. Without that alternative, this environmental document is -- is, as I say, fatally flawed, and I think would be challengeable. So we need to really come up with a new alternative that works within the existing system, that can deal with some of these measures and not disrupt the community.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00003 Burke, Yvonne County of Los Angeles 8/23/2003

SPHF00003-1

Comment:

I'm Yvonne Burke, Chair of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. My position is one that is the official position of the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors. We have serious concerns about this plan as it is presented, and the proposed Master Plan has inadequacies in the Supplement to the Draft. We recognize everyone has worked hard, but there is some specific things.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPHF00003-2

Comment:

Number one, traffic, noise and air quality impacts have been shifted eastward. What has happened is that the unincorporated communities Lennox, the City of Inglewood will now bear the brunt of additional

3. Comments and Responses

traffic. The community adjacent to Manchester will now face a host of impacts as a result of the new passenger processing facility.

Compared with the Alternative C, this places a heavier burden on the communities to the north and the east. The City of Inglewood and incorporated communities of Lennox will continue to be the most impacted.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPC00065-2 regarding traffic, noise, and air quality impacts that would occur to the unincorporated community of Lennox and City of Inglewood under Alternative D, and how these compare to impacts under Alternative C. Please also see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-impact and minority communities and TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

SPHF00003-3

Comment:

We understood that this was going to be an attempt to constrain passenger growth to 78.9 million. The proposal sets up a possibility in Alternative D with a footprint larger than the prior alternatives. This footprint, along with the new air terminal layout, provides the opportunity for future expansion beyond the 78.9.

The residents of these communities are already impacted, and as a result, we're going to see intolerable air quality, noise, traffic and safety impacts.

Response:

Alternative D does not cap passenger activity. Facilities that comprise Alternative D are designed to serve approximately 78.9 MAP. As described on page 3-25, Section 3.3.2, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D encourages a long-term regional approach to serving air traffic demand in the Los Angeles basin by designing facilities at LAX to accommodate passenger activity level as projected in regional plans, such as the SCAG RTP. LAWA determined that constraining the aircraft gate frontage at the terminals is a component of the airport system that is fully within its control. LAWA can constrain the development of this frontage and believes that this will, in turn, place an effective constraint on total passenger activity at LAX. However, as explained in detail in Section 3.3 in the Draft EIS/EIR, it is important to understand that the levels of passengers that each alternative is designed to accommodate are not finite limits where the airport would somehow be closed or where aircraft would be redirected to some other facility when this number is reached. These levels are an indication of the number of passengers that can be accommodated at a reasonable level of service. Federal law does not permit FAA or LAWA to prohibit the use of a public airport. LAWA is interested in providing safe, secure and efficient aviation facilities for airlines to operate passenger and cargo flights to and from. However, LAX does not exist in a vacuum. Thus, Alternative D is designed to provide facilities that are safe, secure, efficient and environmentally sensitive. The constrained aircraft gates proposed in Alternative D would serve to encourage other airports in the Los Angeles region to continue to improve infrastructure to meet the forecast demand in 2015 that LAX would be unable to comfortably accommodate.

The environmental analyses in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, including noise and air quality, have addressed the potential impacts under the most practical and most likely activity level for each alternative including Alternative D. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

SPHF00003-4

Comment:

I would like to say that our position is for regional airports. We thought that was going to be the emphasis in this new plan. Rather it's minimized. We wanted to see Ontario and Palmdale as the alternatives to increase their use within the entire regional plan.

Response:

Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports. The master plans will recommend improvements to meet the projected demand. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX and necessary improvements to safety and security.

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

SPHF00003-5

Comment:

One of the things, though, of greatest concern to me, environmental justice may not be well served by this EIS/ EIR evaluation. This is a requirement that's been in the law for ten years. Signed in 1994, the original draft, which was in 2001 seven years later, lacked an elementary analysis of environmental justice.

Alternative D appears to shift the burden of improvement away from wealthier communities toward the most economically disadvantaged communities east and northwest of LAX.

I believe that the EIS/ EIR will not be adequate until it provides an honest assessment of the trade-offs. Now, they say they'll make the environmental justice assessments later. This should be part of the present EIR.

I'm a real environmentalist. But I have to tell you, in designing runway extensions and facilities to the east, this appears to protect biological resources, the El Segundo blue butterfly at the expense of residents, children and families in the communities Lennox, Inglewood and Manchester.

Can you justify such an assessment? What we have to do is to have an analysis of environmental justice prior to the time that this is presented. We want to know what's actually going to be done. We want to be sure that this processing facility compared with the previous Alternative C does not impact those communities to the north and the east.

Response:

LAWA and the FAA have paid considerable attention to the topic of environmental justice. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The analysis provided is extensive, with over 125 pages of narrative, maps and tabular data. The analysis followed relevant guidance for addressing environmental justice and was prepared after a comprehensive review of other analyses prepared for large projects across the country in order to give the issue full and careful consideration. LAWA and the FAA's recognition of the importance of the issue is also demonstrated by their having convened an Environmental Justice Task Force, and by a community outreach program that involved among other efforts, seven workshops in surrounding communities specifically focused on the issue. This program is further described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2. LAWA and the FAA have made a strong effort and believe that the assessment of environmental justice presented in the Draft EIS/EIR, Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and Final EIS/EIR is fair and complete.

Regarding the comment that Alternative D appears to shift the burden of airport improvements away from wealthier communities on the north and south toward the more disadvantaged communities to the east, physical improvements to the airport are generally concentrated along its existing boundaries in areas to the west of the I-405 in predominately non-minority/low-income communities. These communities would be most effected by construction impacts and operational impacts associated with traffic. It is true that Alternative D would have a disproportionate and adverse effect on minority and low-income communities due to aircraft noise, similar to the other build alternatives. Under Alternative D, 87 to 93 percent of the population newly exposed to high noise levels would be located in

3. Comments and Responses

disadvantaged communities to the east, based on the 1990 and 2000 Census, respectively. However, Alternative D would result in the fewest minority and low-income residents being newly exposed to high noise levels of the build alternatives. Furthermore, compared to Year 2000 conditions, implementation of Alternative D would result in a greater reduction in the overall population exposed to high noise levels than if the project were not approved, as represented under the No Action/No Project Alternative.

Regarding run-way extensions to the east favoring biological resources over residents, all of the build alternatives have set a priority to avoid the El Segundo Blue Butterfly Habitat Reserve. As further described in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR, several alternatives were considered and rejected during the process that led to selection of the current set of alternatives. Concepts that involved runways further to the west were rejected due to environmental concerns and objections voiced by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in order to protect habitat for the El Segundo blue butterfly, a federally listed endangered species. This area is formally recognized and designated by both the City and County of Los Angeles for preservation in recognition of its importance as unique habitat for an endangered species. While the loss of habitat for an endangered species would be permanent, the shifting of runways to the west would result in negligible benefits in noise reduction to communities to the east, since the basic approach and departure patterns to the east would not substantially change and there would be other physical constraints that would substantially restrict the extent of a runways shift to the west. In addition, improvements in technology over time would continue to reduce the noise generating characteristics of aircraft. It is also important to note that the general western limit of the runways and avoidance of the dunes is consistent with existing airport conditions and is not a unique feature of Alternative D. As previously noted, the overall population in minority and low-income areas to the east that would be exposed to high noise levels with implementation of Alternative D would be reduced compared to conditions without approval of the project as represented under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Also please see Response to Comment SAL0004-9.

SPHF00003-6

Comment:

It is important to us that there be additional hearings here in this community. These are the communities that will suffer. And these are the communities that must be considered in terms of enhanced mitigation.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits. Please also see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

SPHF00003-7

Comment:

Noise has not been mitigated. Today the airport is providing more noise on those communities than it did before. What this plan will propose is beyond any level, the amount of noise and impact and traffic that may result.

Response:

The FAA and LAWA acknowledge the concern of the commentor and are working with jurisdictions affected by high noise levels from LAX operations to address noise complaints. In an effort to mitigate current noise impacts from LAX operations on adjacent communities, LAWA and other jurisdictions affected by high noise levels (defined under FAR Part 150 and Title 21 as the 65 CNEL) prepare and administer their respective ANMPs. Residential properties within the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL are eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP as described in Topical Response TR-LU-3. Priority for sound insulation is given to residential properties within the highest noise level band above the 65 CNEL. As further described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3, page 4-88) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, as of June 2002 it is estimated that of the 33,099 residential units within the current ANMP boundaries, 6,685 previously incompatible dwelling units are now compatible with approximately 3,845 residential units having become compatible since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR in January 2001. However the following obstacles have slowed implementation of the ANMP over time: a preference by some jurisdictions of acquisition rather soundproofing residential units (which is a longer process), substandard or non-code compliant housing stock, and residential properties located in

areas zoned for non-residential use (inconsistency zoning). Please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 for a description of current efforts underway by LAWA to address existing high noise levels. With implementation of the Master Plan, and as stated under Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA would accelerate fulfillment of existing commitments to owners wishing to participate within the current ANMP boundaries prior to proceeding with newly eligible properties and provide additional technical assistance to local jurisdictions to support more rapid and efficient implementation of their respective ANMPs. See also Topical Response TR-LU-5 for a summary of mitigation measures presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR that would reduce aircraft noise impacts.

Regarding an increase in noise from airport operations, areas exposed to 65 CNEL noise levels have decreased from the 1992 conditions, primarily due to the phasing out of noisier (stage 2) aircraft. This decrease is depicted on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, as shown in Table 1 of Topical Response TR-LU-4, under LAWA Staff's preferred Alternative D the overall area and residential area within surrounding communities that would be exposed to the 65 CNEL would be less than under 1996 baseline conditions, Year 2000 conditions, and the No Action/No Project Alternative. This information is also presented in Tables 12, 13, 16, and 17 in Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Tables S2, S3, S48, and S49 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise and traffic impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, respectively. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHF00004 Knabe, Don

County of Los Angeles

8/23/2003

SPHF00004-1

Comment:

Good morning. I'm Don Knabe, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration.

I appreciate Supervisor Burke's comments and support her concerns about the environmental justice issues. I'd like to begin by saying that I agree with Mayor Hahn that something must be done to make LAX more secure, more efficient in handling passengers while balancing the concerns of the local community and obviously the need to create additional jobs.

Alternative D indicates it is designed to accommodate a passenger activity level of 78.9 million by reducing the number of existing gates and by foregoing the creation of new terminal facilities and runway extensions.

I support the Mayor's stated goal of providing for more manageable limits on the passenger volumes at LAX given the well-documented impacts that the airport has had on surrounding communities and the surrounding infrastructure.

The County of Los Angeles is in the process of ongoing review of the LAX Master Plan and your new ideas, and just how the Mayor intends to assure the region that the 78.9 MAP will not be exceeded once Alternative D is implemented.

In May of this year, our County Council provided us with their opinion that the City and Los Angeles World Airports could legally place deed restrictions on the LAX property restricting the future development of the airport in order to benefit nearby properties owned by the public near public entities and private parties.

I believe limiting development is a way to keep a passenger cap in place. I have submitted a motion yesterday for consideration by my colleagues to call on the City of Los Angeles and LAWA to deed restrict the land until 2020 to ensure LAX does not exceed the 78.9 MAP.

3. Comments and Responses

I encourage Mayor Hahn and LAWA to follow through on the efforts to limit the growth to a manageable level to the greatest extent possible through a commitment to place deed restrictions on certain portions of LAX property, to prevent those portions from being used to expand facilities to serve passenger volumes beyond the 78.9.

Specifically, it would be appropriate for LAWA and the City to commit that portion of LAX generally located on the west side of the airport easterly of Pershing Drive, between the north and south pairs of runways, and westerly of the proposed redevelopment Central Terminal Area, Area 1, and the portion generally located on the northeast corner quadrant of the LAX property currently used for parking lot and rental car purposes, and depicted as the site of the proposed consolidated rental car facility in the Area 2. Those two areas would be deed restricted through 2020.

These deed restrictions should provide that those two areas will not be developed with airport passenger terminal, airport runways, or other improvements intended to increase airport passenger capacities beyond the Mayor Hahn's 78.9 million target levels.

Such a firm commitment may be crucial in obtaining the support of Mayor Hahn's Alternative D from at least some of the significant interested agencies and groups who will be so directly affected by the development of LAX.

Response:

This comment is essentially the same as Comment SPC00066-1; please see Response to Comment SPC00066-1.

SPHF00004-2

Comment:

And while I have spoken this morning about limiting growth, I do want to say that the security aspect of this plan, it continues to be a major concern of mine. While the County is reviewing the security aspects of this plan -- and we will comment in written form as part of your official record -- I still have very strong security concerns with the Manchester Square passenger check-in facility. I want to make sure that we give the same safety concerns to the passengers and consideration to the passengers as we do the infrastructure of the airport.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00066-2.

SPHF00004-3

Comment:

Again, thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today, and I hope that we could move forward in a very productive way at achieving our common goals for the redevelopment of LAX; limiting growth and protecting people through viable safety enhancements.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments above.

SPHF00005 Contreras, Miguel AFLCIO 8/23/2003

SPHF00005-1

Comment:

Miguel Contreras at 2130 James Woods Boulevard, Los Angeles, California.

I wear a series of hats today. One is I sit as the airport commissioner for LAWA, but also serve as -- I'm here in the capacity of the executive secretary of treasurer of the Los Angeles County Federation Laborer, AFLCIO, that we're here today.

3. Comments and Responses

I want to start off thanking the hundreds of men and women here from the trade union movement to show their concern and the interest in this Master Plan, who gave up their Saturday morning to be here and have their comments heard by the hearing panel.

I'm pleased today that Mayor Hahn has announced over the last few weeks that he will pledge to do everything in his power to move forward the Master Plan and begin construction at LAX utilizing the existing project labor agreement between LAWA and the various labor unions, some of who are represented in this room, including the AFLCIO, the building and construction trades, the -- the Building Trades Council of California and the -- and the L. A. Orange County Building Construction Trades Council here in L. A.

The purpose of the project labor agreement at LAX is to establish labor practices and standards for modernization for years to come at LAX. It's been near 20 years -- it's been nearly 20 years since the last measure construction program was completed here at LAX. We are very well aware that LAX needs modernization immediately for safety reasons, for security reasons and for economic reasons.

On economic reasons, the idea of having 40,000 new jobs that will be involved in the building of the improvements at LAX over 11 years is quite significant for the economy here in this region. 49,000 jobs provides billions of dollars into the economy here in Southern California. It will generate many economic activities for the L. A. County alone.

But not just on the building construction jobs, we're also -- we also have a big interest in the service jobs that will come after this is built, thousands of new service jobs for workers in the service industry, many of them who live in Inglewood and Lennox and the surrounding communities. You know, so we want to make sure that those jobs are good jobs, make sure that those jobs are living wage jobs and people can afford to raise a family on them.

While the jobs and economic benefits are important, it's just as important to the labor union movement to take care of the affected communities adjacent to the airports. These benefits should include environmental mitigation, education improvements and enhancements to local schools such as Inglewood and Lennox, service improvements to the noise and traffic pollution in the area and do serious community development to the impacted areas.

So these community benefits coupled with the large scale job creations make this plan the right approach for Los Angeles and the region.

Our City and the entire Southern California should get behind this Master Plan. And our last words is, let's get to work.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

SPHF00006

McDowell, Kelly

City of El Segundo

8/23/2003

SPHF00006-1

Comment:

Good morning. I'm Councilman Kelly McDowell representing the City of El Segundo, 350 Main Street, El Segundo.

Given the length and complexity of the Master Plan and its environmental documents, our full comments on technical issues won't be ready for some time and my city's comments today are preliminary.

El Segundo continues to oppose Alternatives A, - B and C for the many reasons we expressed during the review process in 2002.

3. Comments and Responses

El Segundo has not endorsed Alternative D, but we feel that its stated objectives are consistent with a regional aviation approach.

Specifically, we support a regional approach alternative that makes proper use of Inland Empire airports.

We support an alternative with fewer environmental impacts, and we'd like to see the adverse impacts of the airport minimized and mitigated to the greatest extent possible.

El Segundo supports enhanced safety and security at LAX. But limiting LAX to its current capacity has always been our number one goal, and we believe that limiting LAX's capacity will allow other airports in the region to develop and handle a fair share of future regional aviation demands, result in fewer environmental impacts and improve safety and security at the airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00006-2

Comment:

But my city is greatly concerned about the impacts of proposed south side airfield changes that would move the southernmost runway 50 feet closer to El Segundo.

LAWA has stated that it believes these changes are necessary to improve runway safety. However, we are currently studying the impacts of the proposed reconfiguration and the options for the southern runway-complex.

In particular, we urge full public consideration of end-around taxiways as an alternative that could provide greater safety at lower cost and with fewer added burdens on nearby communities such as mine.

Clearly, safety at LAX must be a priority for all of us. El Segundo is prepared to support measures necessary to enhance safety, even if those measures increase our burden, but only if we are assured by an independent expert that other alternatives would not be equally effective.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00038-3 regarding the potential noise impacts of moving the southernmost runway approximately 55 feet south and discussion on runway incursion at LAX and an analysis conducted by NASA Ames Research Center comparing the costs and benefits of a center parallel taxiway and "end-around" taxiway on the south airfield complex. The NASA study concluded that the end-around taxiway greatly increased taxi time and delays for arriving aircraft and thereby increased the operational costs of this option and did not give any increased safety margin. Air traffic controllers also found the center parallel taxiway which increased their flexibility while controlling arriving aircraft on the south airfield complex. In a separate LAWA study of these two optional taxiway improvements, the "end-around" taxiway was found to increase noise impacts on El Segundo residential land uses from taxiing aircraft.

SPHF00006-3

Comment:

In conclusion, we're grateful for Mayor Hahn's responsive leadership and continuing pledge to constrain growth at LAX and to foster a regional approach to meet future aviation demand.

And it is our hope that the ultimate outcome of this Master Plan process will be a truly regional airport approach that ensures that LAX does not exceed its current capacity.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00007 McTaggart, John

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00007-1

Comment:

Thank you for holding this hearing. I do have -- my name is John McTaggart, M- c, capital T, a- g- g- a- r- t. And I'm here not representing the South Bay coop where I'm the aviation subcommittee chair or the LAX roundtable on noise. I'm here representing myself as a person in the trenches that was set on the FAA Task Force --

Okay. My address I don't have to give. I gave it on the sheet. Rancho Palos Verdes.

First, I'd like to say that parking at this facility is totally inadequate, although I'm happy you're having the hearing.

Response:

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

SPHF00007-2

Comment:

My comments are based on what's not in this -- in this document and what is in this document. And I think our comments today are supposed to be to the document. I'm not going to make a political speech. I'm here to say that the peninsula in the South Bay was left out of this supplement. Any changes in routing are going to affect us. And we'd like to know what they might be. They are not addressed in this document.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addresses impacts associated with Alternative D in Chapter 4 and provides supporting technical data and analyses in the Appendices and Technical Reports of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As more fully analyzed therein, potential impacts associated with Alternative D would not extent to the South Bay peninsula. See Topical Response TR-LU-1 for a general discussion of impacts on quality of life under Alternative D, as presented in Chapter 4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Changes in flight routes under Alternative D were developed based on project flight tracks as described in Section 3.1.3 of Appendix SC-1 Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As shown on Figures S4.2-16 and S4.2-18 respectfully, high noise levels (defined by the 65 CNEL contour) and high single event noise levels (defined by the 94 dBA SEL) would not extend into the South Bay peninsula. As described in Topical Response TR-N-3.1, new routes over the South Bay would occur under a separate action which is outside the scope of the LAX Master Plan. However, significant noise increases, as defined in Section 4.1.4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR would not occur over the South Bay peninsula as a result of implementation of Alternative D. Additionally, see Response to Comment PHM00014-2 regarding nighttime easterly departures circling over the South Bay area.

SPHF00007-3

Comment:

I'd like to also speak to gates and how they constrain 78.9 MAP, million annual passengers. Freight does not need gates. So what we're talking about is how much more than 78 million point 9 would generate with all the freight traffic.

Response:

Freight operations need aircraft parking positions and cargo building space for sorting and processing. The Alternative D cargo plan would provide approximately 2,342,000 square feet of cargo building

3. Comments and Responses

space. Please see Section 2.5, Cargo Facilities - Alternative D, of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum for more information. The Alternative D cargo activity is determined by the amount of cargo sort space available to process cargo tonnage. The Alternative D cargo facilities would be sized to accommodate approximately 3.1 MAT, which is the total cargo volume forecast in the constrained No Action/No Project Alternative. Please also see Section 3.3, Cargo Activity (subsection 3.3.4), of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum for more information.

SPHF00007-4

Comment:

I have long supported the regional solution as previous speakers have mentioned. I think it's the answer. I think it would create more jobs than this thing.

Response:

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

SPHF00007-5

Comment:

The threshold of significance in this document need to be defined to a single event noise level that is meaningful. It's set way too high. We're happy it's in there, but it's not where it ought to be.

The people who live under the flight paths -- and I mean all the flight paths, when the heavy laden jets take off after midnight and fly to the east, they wake up thousands and thousands of people, and -- and this has not been addressed. We're hopeful that Part 161 will have some affect on that. You know, that's still a figment.

Response:

Comment noted. There are no federal thresholds of significance for single event noise analysis. The basis for determining the threshold of significance for nighttime awakenings is explained in detail in Section 4.1.2.1, Aircraft Noise Methodology of Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 6.1 of Appendix SC-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC00225-3 regarding easterly nighttime operations by foreign carriers. LAWA has recently initiated an RFQ to Prepare a 14 CFR Part 161 Study for LAX. LAWA is seeking to establish a partial curfew at LAX that would prohibit the easterly departure of all aircraft, with certain exemptions, between the hours of 12:00 Midnight to 6:30 a.m. when LAX is in Over-Ocean Operations. For additional information on the use of a Part 161 Study as a mitigation measure, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-4.1, regarding additional mitigation actions suggested for flight activity.

SPHF00007-6

Comment:

At no place can we find in this document the term "will" or "shall." It says "should." And that doesn't mean that it will. So we'd like to have the document say meaningful things that mean something to the people who have to live with this airport.

Response:

Comment noted. Potential impacts from the proposed Master Plan to the communities surround LAX are addressed throughout Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures to avoid or reduce impacts are presented in Chapter 5 of those documents. In conjunction with approval of the Master Plan, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will be adopted to provide mechanisms for ensuring implementation of the commitments and measures for the selected build alternative.

SPHF00007-7**Comment:**

Traffic is another thing that I won't get into. I will make extended comments at a later time. I don't want to take your time. But, frankly, I think that we do need to improve the security of the airport, and we can do that on site without all the changes that are being proposed.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHF00008 Miller, John City of Los Angeles 8/23/2003

SPHF00008-1**Comment:**

Thank you, Mr. Kessler, Mr. Ritchie. I appreciate your having me here and giving me this time.

I'm John Miller, Chief of the Counter Terrorism Bureau of the Los Angeles Police Department. At the request of -- that would be 150 North Los Angeles Street, Los Angeles, California.

At the request of Councilman Smith and the Mayor's office and Commissioner Ted Stein of the airport, we were asked to review Alternative Plan D for a security consideration.

So I want to preface my comment by saying, the Los Angeles Police Department takes no position on the expansion, its costs or any other aspect of this plan pro or con in any way, other than to discuss our review of this particular plan, vis-a-vis, its enhancement of airport security against potential acts of terrorism.

What we found in reviewing Alternate Plan D was that in four major ways, and a large number of smaller ways, it improves security vastly over the current plan at LAX. It increases screening by 100 percent by adding a passenger and luggage screening area that screens people before they get to the people movers that take them into the terminal areas on the interior of the airport.

What we know is screening works. There have been critics who have talked about the lack of ability to pick up the possible chemical or biological agents that could be introduced by using this type of screening. But what we found worldwide, particularly in the recent incidents in Gatwick Airport where explosives were found hidden inside an electronic back massager, looking where they are supposed to be looking at can be very effective, doubling that from one screening area before the boarding area to two screening areas. One before you actually enter the airport complex is significant because currently screening is now constituted in most airports. And LAX as it is now is designed to prevent people with dangerous items or weapons from getting onto aircraft as opposed to getting into the airport complex itself.

We know since 1980 there have been approximately 75 attacks on airports worldwide that involved guns and explosives in the prescreening areas.

The second part of the plan we find attractive from a security standpoint is that it introduces a plan that makes LAX essentially a careless airport, meaning that cars are parked at a central facility, rent-a-cars are taken to another central facility, and people are moved through the airport by the people mover and other modes of public transportation. That gives us two things in terms of security.

One, it removes the random introduction by any vehicle allowed into the airport of explosives contained in a vehicle-borne bomb, a large vehicle bomb. Trucks -- and this is the third point -- are screened before they come into the airport. This would be trucks making deliveries and servicing the commercial entities

3. Comments and Responses

there. We have suggested that they add to that, a screening of the actual truck drivers. So there will be a series of drivers who are actually airport certified to make those deliveries.

I do not at this time, although, I would be happy to prepare some if you thought it would be helpful.

But those are eventually the four points we found that are an improvement on this particular plan. We have not seen any other plan or reviewed any other plan, but we are in favor of these improvements.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00009 Aldinger, Jim

City of Manhattan Beach

8/23/2003

SPHF00009-1

Comment:

Yes. Thank you. Again, my name is Jim Aldinger. I'm the mayor of Manhattan Beach. And I have a few comments here.

First, I'd like to say that I think this EIR is fatally flawed from the beginning. I think the number of options we have here, trying to add one more option on top of three other options that we've looked at before and had many problems with before is not a good path to go down.

And the main reason for that is because of the security issues. I think what I would like to see is three -- if we're going to do options, let's do three options. Let's look at the options on security. Let's look at three options and see what those three options are as far as security goes.

Response:

Comment noted. The development of Alternative D was an iterative process which included the consideration of many concepts, including an existing CTA security modification analysis. Please see Appendix H, Concept Development, of the LAX Master Plan Addendum for a discussion of the different concepts considered during the development of Alternative and Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHF00009-2

Comment:

And, you know, having cars in the Central Terminal Area, is that a big deal? There is many, many other airports in this country that have the same situation. We are talking about spending \$ 10 billion dollars to do this. I think a lot more time and effort needs to be put into it.

Jane Harman with her RAND study basically said the same thing. And I think we need to take a step back, look at the -- we all think that security is a big issue, obviously, at LAX. But how we go about solving that problem is something that I think needs a lot more input.

Response:

Alternative D is designed to accomplish many more objectives than just moving the passenger vehicles out of the terminal core. Alternative D will improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking. The design of the improvements incorporated in Alternative D was given much thought and review.

SPHF00009-3

Comment:

As far as the cost goes, \$ 10 billion dollars is a lot of money to spend, and there are so many other things that need to be done in this town and around here. I'm not opposed. If we could find the \$ 10

3. Comments and Responses

billion dollars, that's a big question for me as well. But I'm not opposed to spending \$ 10 billion dollars on infrastructure needs. We have a lot of infrastructure needs, and those should be spent.

All the people from labor that are here, you know, if we could expand Palmdale, do the work at other places, that seems to be -- it seems to be a much better way to spend our money than it does to spend it here on LAX.

Response:

There has been no major investment in the facilities at LAX for many years. The modernization of LAX will improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft and reduce runway incursions, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking.

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 that discusses 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 underway.

SPHF00009-4

Comment:

The improvements, traffic improvements in the area and the impacts in the area are huge, too. Doing something like this, the neighborhoods around Manchester Square, they definitely need to be listened to. I don't think they are being listened to with this report.

Response:

Alternative D was developed in response to concerns from the surrounding communities regarding Alternatives A, B, and C, as published in the Draft EIS/EIR. LAWA will continue to meet with and listen to surrounding residents as the process continues.

SPHF00009-5

Comment:

And as far as Manhattan Beach goes further south, there are impacts on the 405. The impacts in the original EIR and this EIR stop, do not include Rosecrans, do not include other intersections on the 405 further south. And the number of people that come up from Orange County will continue to grow.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 and, in particular, Subtopical Responses TR-ST-2.1, TR-ST-2.2, and TR-ST-2.3, regarding the study areas selected for analysis.

SPHF00009-6

Comment:

And I'll say -- and the last thing, you know, tying the 78 MAP, which I think is a great idea. I think if we can do that, that's great. But something needs to be done to come up with a way to tie it to the deeds. But I think it needs to be tied to expansion at Palmdale.

I think, you know, 78 MAP is great, but they need to expand Palmdale, and they need to expand other airports, Orange County especially as well.

Response:

The comment regarding tying the LAX's passenger capacity to the deed is noted. LAWA only controls the operations and potential improvements at LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Other jurisdictions are responsible for developing the other regional airports. Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather

3. Comments and Responses

than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports. The master plans will recommend improvements to meet the projected demand. The decision to further develop an airport is the responsibility of local government. Any decisions to further develop John Wayne Airport - Orange County is the responsibility of the County of Orange.

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

SPHF00010 Bauer, Sandra

County of Los Angeles

8/23/2003

SPHF00010-1

Comment:

Sandra Bauer. And I am here in Association with A. C. Lazzarretto and speaking on behalf of Los Angeles County. I wanted to speak briefly about the use of a supplement, the baseline data and the security analysis.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPHF00010-2

Comment:

A CEQA guideline states that a supplement is the appropriate type of document where you have a project that does not have significant changes, where major revisions occur in a project. The proper type of CEQA document is a subsequent EIR that presents all the information in new, not just the changed information.

Both types of review, by the way, are typically used in conjunction with certified or approved documents. In the present case, there is no certified or approved EIR and, in fact, we do have major changes. We have an entirely new alternative that's being presented as the preferred project.

Even an adaptation of CEQA to include a document that has not yet been certified would suggest that we should have, in fact, a document that is providing a comprehensive revised Draft EIR.

We have a second serious concern with respect to the process used. In 2001, the County of Los Angeles devoted a great deal of time and effort to the preparation of detailed comments on the Draft EIR that was released. I'm sure that that statement would apply to many people who are here in this room today.

There is no question that if you had prepared responses to those comments, to all of the comments received, it would have advanced the public discourse, it would have facilitated the current review that we're preparing. It would have strengthened the environmental protection, and it would have also provided us with important insight into the thinking of decision makers with respect to key issues.

So we do ask why you didn't take the opportunity to present or even summarize the comments that had been presented back in 2001.

Response:

The comment is essentially the same as Comment SAL00013-31; please see Response to Comment SAL00013-31.

SPHF00010-3

Comment:

With respect to the baseline data, the 2003 Supplement makes widespread use of 1996 baseline data. That was also the case in the 2001 document. And the data was outdated even then in 2001. And, yet, what we don't see in the current document is an analysis of the significant baseline shift that occurred following 9-11, and how that shift changed the operations at the airport and the benchmark for understanding project impacts.

Given that conditions at LAX have changed so dramatically since 2000 and given that LAWA developed an entirely new Alternative D, why did LAWA not consider it worthwhile to provide the public and its own decision makers with a baseline reflecting conditions at LAX as it exists today.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment SPC00068-3; please see Response to Comment SPC00068-3.

SPHF00010-4

Comment:

Finally, with respect to security, we do have significant concerns. I can see that my time is out. I'll just point out that we believe that the security plan is emphasizing the Gateway elements at the expense of some of the backside elements, and we do look forward to providing more detailed review of that as the review goes forward.

I thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00011 Voss, David

**Westchester LAX Marina del Rey 8/23/2003
Chamber of Commerce**

SPHF00011-1

Comment:

Good morning. My name is David Voss. I'm the President of the Westchester/ LAX Marina del Rey Chamber of Commerce. I'm a resident here and live in this community in Playa Del Rey.

Our Chamber of Commerce represents the communities both greatly impacted both positively and negatively by Los Angeles International Airport. On Thursday the Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce voted to support Mayor Hahn's Alternative D.

The significance -- the significance of this vote is that, unlike any other group that will probably come before you through this process, our chamber is on record in opposition the last time around. We opposed Alternatives A, B and C that were previously submitted by Mayor Riordon.

And I hear today a comparison to Alternative C suggesting that we should maybe still be looking at that and remind everyone that that amounted to growth to 89 million annual passengers at the same time as saying that we want to have less growth that the chamber is in favor of.

It is not acceptable to grow without planning and mitigation of impacts. We have to do something or gridlock will be the constraint. Alternative D presents a framework for modernization that moves us in the right direction, that balances modernization with community concerns and it provides jobs.

3. Comments and Responses

The chamber did not take lightly its reversal of position. Prior to reaching our conclusions, we participated in the Blue Ribbon Commission, Councilwoman Miscikowski's workshops. We have read the over 5,000 pages of new information. We have met both of the authors of the RAND study and the SAIC study and had them at chamber meetings at the same time to confront each other.

It's important to remember that the comments here are on the Draft EIR/ EIS, yet few of the people that are actually making comments have so thoroughly studied the proposal and actually read the document they are commenting on. These plans, the Riordon plans would have brought the wrecking ball to the Westchester business district and driven traffic through Westchester and Playa del Rey.

The plan that the Mayor now presents by contrast solves those problems and constrains growth permanently by moving that north runway further south and using up real estate that would otherwise be occupied by gates in the future.

It's a question of where you want the bottleneck. Do you want it on the airfield or do you want it in your communities with traffic?

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00011-2

Comment:

On security, and hearing from RAND and SAIC, and we did have them in the room at the same time, the bottom line is that we heard the RAND author state unequivocally that he did not disagree with any of the conclusions in the SAIC study.

Those studies show that a simple car bomb in the current Central Terminal Area would shut down LAX. And I asked Jack Kaiser the other day, an economist that would know what the cost of that would be. The cost would be over a billion dollars a day. If you don't spend \$ 9 billion and it happens, heaven forbid, a billion dollars a day is the cost.

The Mayor's office should be commended for listening and adapting his design to our concerns and to remember that Alternative D is the only plan that can handle security when we're at a red level condition when we most need it.

The RAND study was based on a green level condition. Remember, LAX has never been at red level, and only Alternative D can solve those problems.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00012 Bass, Eric

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00012-1

Comment:

My name is Eric Bass, 4840 York Boulevard in Los Angeles.

We're a certified small business here in the City of Los Angeles. We work with the Mayor's office of small business. We work -- we're working with the Department of Water and Power and the L. A. Housing Authority.

What our company does is we specialize in green buildings sustainable fixtures. One of our products is called chroma, which originated in Australia. It is a dual flush technology for water closets and urinals. It utilizes 50 percent less water than what the conventional water fixtures use.

So we're in favor of the airport. We feel that it would be good for local business. We also want to minimize the traffic flow. That is a challenge now for us, and it appears that in the overall overview that I just got, that the plan would facilitate that.

So as a small local business, it certainly would facilitate more work for us, and we could contribute also to the diminishing of the use of water, which is not a renewable resource. And that's something we specialize in is ecological-type fixtures for these kinds of facilities.

I just want to say, I appreciate the opportunity, and I know it's an area where many people are impacted. I live in Burbank. And so I'm not in favor of the expansion that's been going on there. But it appears that we're -- L. A. is growing, and it's going to continue to grow. And if we don't make any plans to accommodate the continued growth, then the traffic levels within our city are going to get worse than they already are.

So I feel we need to do something to address that. And I'm sensitive to the people that live in the area, but we have to do something to accommodate the growth that's coming into our county.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00013 Stolper, Sid Southern California Pipe Trades 8/23/2003

SPHF00013-1

Comment:

Good morning. My name is Sid Stolper. I live at 7822 Stewart Street, about six blocks from here.

Actually, I have been a long-term resident of the area. I went to El Segundo High School. For most of my adult life I have lived on one side or the other side of the airport.

I am the business manager financial secretary and treasurer of the Southern California Pipe Trades here representing about 15,000 members in Southern California. We rise to support the plan for Alternative D. We believe that the Mayor has done a great job in putting together a plan that's long overdue in being executed.

I am also a very frequent flyer. Last year I logged 132,000 miles on three different carriers, all originating out of LAX. I chose the proximity of my base to be able to make frequent airport trips. As a resident and as a frequent flyer, I think the first thing we need to think about here is the need for national security.

I was unfortunately last week a part of a blackout. I was in Detroit when the lights went down. And I will tell you, I don't know if anyone else in the room was affected by that. But these are real things, people. These are not things that just pass by and we can sweep under the carpet as being things we don't need to pay attention to.

The upgrade modernization of this airport is way overdue. I have hundreds and hundreds of tickets that I paid a surcharge on to look for a modernization of the LAX to execute better passenger participation and free flow of the traffic to be able to come in and out of the airport. It's important that we look at this with the safeguards to all of our community and all of the passengers, and what it would do economically to this area if this airport is down.

For the 29 hours that the airport was out of commission in the east coast last week of which I was a part of, it actually cost about 7 billion dollars for 28 hours of being down. Now, that's a reality. Now, we heard that from a previous speaker here today. I lived it last week, unfortunately.

We in -- one part of that airport where I was at in Detroit, half the airport is renewed, the north west terminal is renewed. Unfortunately, I don't frequent that particular airline.

But in the other half, it is an old airport. It's antiquated, just like this is. While we keep putting facelifts on this airport, we have done little or nothing to really increase the ability to contend with -- first of all, any

3. Comments and Responses

kind of problems as far as terrorist problems, ingress and egress to the airport or the problem with smog and air mitigation measures.

And right now, today, security is probably the most important thing that we ought to be all looking at. If we delay this any longer, we are number one on the list of being the most probable site for the next strike if it's possible for them to attack us. Los Angeles cannot afford to sit here and not be prepared.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00014 Woo, Shu

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00014-1

Comment:

Hi. Good morning. My name is Shu Kwan Woo. I'm a resident of Mar Vista neighborhood and the adjacent area for the past 30 years. My son Christopher Woo, he went to Westchester neighborhood school right here for the past nine years since kindergarten. So between the two airports, I know how it is to live around airports.

I'm speaking here today in support of it. As far as I can see, the Mayor's plan, Alternative D is the most neighborhood-friendly plan I have seen so far for the following reason.

That -- that is a safety, security and efficiency plan, other than an expansion plan. The airport the way it is now with different terminals, with duplicated functions, some of them are very crowded. And when one of them is crowded, it create a bottleneck and just jam up the whole airport in the surrounding area. The new plan will spread things out.

People say it will concentrate some operation, but actually it's quite opposite. It does centralize some area. But since it's spread over a wider area, things flow through. Now, the problem we have now is congestion. The solution is to make it not congested. But when you do that, you increase efficiency. And that is a good solution to the problem, but then some people accuse that of being -- when you find solution, you're being accused of creating a problem, but it's not.

So since you spread things out so not one single area is crowded at certain times, things keep on flowing through even though you can handle the same amount of passengers, but it's less of a target for any terrorist activities.

The whole plan, the whole idea is to keep passenger moving, keep planes moving. You don't want to wait a whole hour when you arrive -- when you are approaching L. A., you don't want to spend a whole hour cueing up in the sky or taxiing on the runway before you can get out of the airport. And you don't want to spend two hours just trying to get through the airport.

If that is the case, passenger or visitor in the future might skip L. A. and go to Las Vegas and go to San Diego or San Francisco, and Los Angeles will miss greatly.

So for this reason, I strongly support the expansion plan, and I think it is very important for the future of Los Angeles, particularly for all the different diverse multicultural groups and the residents because we are connected to the world. And the airport is a very important infrastructure to do that.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00015 Stefanski, Andrew None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00015-1

Comment:

Andrew Stefanski, 7296 West 85th Street, 90045, Westchester.

The State of California does not have a comprehensive air transportation master plan that would reach for some 30 or 50 years ahead. The volume of passengers is projected to 150 million passengers, annual passengers by year 2025. And, also, we're going to have substantial increase in the cargo.

Where do they go? Nobody knows. Some people say put as much as possible into this airport. Some people say cap it, put it somewhere else. But we don't know where and what.

I am opposing to the present plan as written. I realize that the airport needs modernization, needs security, needs everything, but the present plan is too expensive and provides too little of the increased capacity. It is not cost-effective. Two of the prominent members of the L. A. City Council made the same points that they would spend too many money for increasing the capacity of the airport just little.

Consider building -- consider taking a little lot with a little house and making a little addition to it at a tremendous cost of \$ 1,000, \$ 2,000 per square foot. It would not be cost-effective. It would provide job, it would provide expenditure, but it would not be cost-effective and should be avoided.

Trying to expand the present airport is a bad deal because it provides hardly any extra passenger capacity at a tremendous cost. Common sense says we should modernize the present airport, but the bulk of the money in the area where you can get big increase in the passengers, that's the Palmdale, the \$ 9-billion-dollar expenditure.

Well, whoever is familiar with the government project realizes this is not the final figure. Probably is the down payment because the cost go up and up and up.

If you want to spend the money, spend it wisely because you will end up where California is in a big deficit. And, finally, all the costs are coming from the taxpayer's pocket no matter what the name of the source is.

So my final recommendation is, yes, modernize this airport, restrict the cost and put all the labor and all the money into Palmdale when you could have a big increase in the capacity of the passengers and the cargo at this small cost. That's what the reasonable thing is.

Response:

Decisions to develop an airport are the responsibility of local government. As a responsible public agency, LAWA will only develop Palmdale when sufficient local 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. No county monies will be used for on-airport improvements.

SPHF00016 Bowdre, Erney None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00016-1

Comment:

My name is Erney Bowdre. I live at 627 West Acacia in El Segundo. I have been at that address for 50 years. I have seen Los Angeles Airport from when it was mines field.

3. Comments and Responses

I live one block off of Imperial Avenue. I have a very, very close unhappy physical relationship with LAX. These people are getting ready to put the runway, which is closest to El Segundo, 50 feet closer to El Segundo.

Now, I'm not going to say that the guys who fly the airplanes don't know how to fly. I'm sure they do or they wouldn't be up there, but they sure don't know how to steer them. If they did, they wouldn't be flying over El Segundo all the time. I could spend two hours a day talking to the line at LAWA about flight incursions over El Segundo, but it really doesn't do any good because it still keeps happening.

I have a stack of probably 150 squawks that I have made over the past three to four years, and it doesn't make any difference. It just keeps happening. I don't know if that's LAWA or if that's FAA or both. But for God's sake, let's do something. We're going to have an accident one day. And I'm going to tell you, if you think it's going to be very, very nice to see a 747 pancake over an area which is increasing in population all the time, and I don't think for once that we should be making corrections after we have a tragedy like we're trying to do after 9-11. Let's get it right beforehand.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor is partially correct in identifying that Runway 7R/25L would be relocated 50 feet to the south. This will happen under Alternatives C & D. Whereas, under Alternative A, Runway 7R/25L would be relocated 156 feet south.

Early turns over El Segundo have been a focus of public complaint for years. The airport has attempted to deal with the issue for years through the posting of signs at the end of each runway calling for flight to the coastline prior to turns, but occasional deviations from the procedure continue to occur. A part of the reason is the alignment of the runways relative to the community. The west end of the runways nearest El Segundo, are closer to the community than the east ends (the runways are aimed more toward the community's west end), while the north runways are both farther away (except in Alternative A) and aimed away from the community. The 747 is the largest US built aircraft and due to its size gives the impression of being much closer to the observer than it is. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-3.2, regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX.

LAWA staff does have concern for the surrounding community and has taken steps (LAX Community Roundtable, Noise abatement rules, etc.) to reduce overall noise impacts where they have control as the airport operator. However, aircraft operate in a complex environment and are regulated by a series of rules and regulations of which some that LAWA has no control over. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1, concerning aviation safety regarding runway incursions and aviation incidents and accidents.

SPHF00016-2

Comment:

A couple of little things that I noticed on your plan here, you're going to have -- there is an employee parking lot which is planned on the back end on the southwest corner of the airport. You've got 12,400 spaces. That's an awful lot of people. I don't see any increases in the size of the highways that are going to get those employees there either on the north side or on the south side. I think it's something that should probably be looked at.

Response:

The number of employee parking spaces required for Alternative D (12,400) is the same as for Alternatives A, B, and C. The number of spaces actually provided (13,600 in Alternative D) is more than is provided in Alternative A (12,000) but less than Alternatives B (13,748) and C (14,265). The number of airport employees is not expected to increase under Alternative D from the No Action/No Project Alternative. The impact of employee trips was fully analyzed and mitigated where appropriate. There are proposed traffic mitigations related to the construction of the West Employee Parking Garage in Alternative D. These improvements largely involve intersection enhancements along Imperial Highway and Lincoln Boulevard. The complete mitigation list is located in Table S4.3.2-13 of Chapter 4.3.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The other alternatives are analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHF00016-3**Comment:**

And I do have to scratch my head about the fact that the so-called the Environmental Report is nothing more than just a continuation of what happened when we first started this thing, and times have changed. Things have changed. And I would certainly strongly recommend that the FAA look very, very hard at making sure that that Environmental Report still is as it should be.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00017 Woo, Charley**None Provided****8/23/2003****SPHF00017-1****Comment:**

Good morning. My name is Charley Woo. I'm a business owner in Los Angeles for the last 35 years and resident and business together. I love this city because of its opportunity provides for citizen. I think of all the positive thing you could say about a city because it is really the hub of the Pacific rim.

It's a very important capital of the -- of the future global economy. And the reason it has that advantage is because of access such as the airport. And if you ask traveler of the world one of the most recognizable symbol of Los Angeles, they are probably going to tell you the circular building with arches supporting it. I think that's more recognizable as anything else.

The reason it is important is because we pride ourself on diversity, a place where east meets the west, north meets the south. A place like the airport is important. It really represents a city, and is something that is well worth investment.

Of course, it's important for the local economy because of the goods flowing through. I'm not talking about just any goods. This is goods that require expensive transportation. Timing is important, which means it create high-paying jobs, high value goods, and is very important to our economy.

And we need an airport that is efficient, that is friendly, that give people a positive impression when they use it, and most important of all in this era, people have a sense of safe and security. I think that's is very, very important.

And when you talk about the money invested, the amount of money invested, yes, it is a lot of money. But this is money that is not wasted. It is going to the economy. It create jobs. It creates work. It has indirect impacts to people's income, to the tax revenue of the region.

And then if you divide the number of people flowing through the next 20, 30 years by the amount of money we invest, we are talking about a few dollar a passenger. And I think when you look at that and when we look at the plan, that it include all the other considerations and balance of all the interest, I think it's well worth to spend a few dollar per passenger.

I think as a use of the airport, I'm glad its willing to spend that because it gave me a sense of efficiency, again, security and safe and friendly. And for that reason, I think it's important for the City. It's important for our rich culture, our diverse culture as well as the economy that I think not doing something, not supporting the Master Plan would be a really big mistake. For that reason I wholeheartedly support it.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHF00018 Guzman, Art

United Association

8/23/2003

SPHF00018-1

Comment:

Art Guzman, 17111 Steven Street, S- t- e- v- e- n, in Gardena, California 90247.

I'm a member and a business rep out of Local 250. It's an air conditioning and refrigeration pipe fitters local and we're approximately 5,000 strong. We have many of our members who live in the impacted areas.

But I'm not going to speak to you as a union rep. I'm going to speak to you as a concerned citizen, and as a concerned father who lives in the impacted communities and is happily married with three children.

These concerns that have been voiced here this morning are also my concerns, traffic congestion, air pollution and excessive noise. But isn't that why technology is a wonderful and beautiful thing, because it enhances the quality of life for all of us, be it through communication, be it through education, be it through creating a cleaner environment, and even through the progress as in the advancements in medicine which prolongs the life of all of us.

The new technology will meet the challenges of traffic congestion, air pollution and excessive noise. That being said, let me make a statement as I stand before you here and now. If LAX does not go through with this project and does not incorporate the advances of the new technology into its operation, then within ten years, LAX and the surrounding communities will become our next ghettos.

There will be an increase in crime, an increase in welfare lines, an increase in illegal drug sales, and those things that come with property; therefore, LAX must approve this project.

In addition, we must stimulate the economy because in Los Angeles the state of the economy is in a downward slump. You don't do it by giving tax relief to a few people or a few groups that don't need it. You do it by giving it to organizations that are going to stimulate economic development and growth; therefore, we must proceed forward with this project. If not, we are going to suffer all the negative consequences because of it.

Response:

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

SPHF00019 Correa, Freddy

United Association

8/23/2003

SPHF00019-1

Comment:

Good morning. Thank you for letting me speak.

My name is Freddy Correa, spelled C- o- r- r- e- a, 1840 West Pacific Coast Highway, Long Beach, California 90810.

I'm a mechanical engineer, and I'm also a member of the Local 250, the Steamfitters Local. My point of view is I approve Alternative D. I feel that it's imperative that LAX be renovated due to all the gridlock and congestion and unnecessary problems that this airport is affected.

Also, it would stimulate these stagnant local economy, and it will put -- it will put LAX on the top airport in the world.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00020 Barrera, Peter

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00020-1

Comment:

Good morning. My name is Peter Barrera. Know you had Correa cards. Just put a B. It's Barrera.

No problem. I live in the city of Redondo Beach at 1908 Belmont Lanes. ZIP Code is 90278. I lived in the South Bay all my life. As a matter of fact, my family has been in California for over 150 years.

We had discussed the new airport design and listened to area residents complaints for over six years. I want to see the LAX Master Plan move ahead. The reassignment of the entire airport has addressed the security and needs of the airline passengers and the general public and the area residents and the design to include the ground transportation system and the people movers and trans, like most of new airports around the world, around the country, too.

The LAX Alternate D design will do that, bring the ground transportation system of LAX into the 21st Century. Every major airport in the world has rail access, lines with trans and people mover.

I heard people talking about Palmdale and Ontario. I've been hearing that since 1970. People around here are not going to travel right now to Palmdale or Ontario. They are going to LAX. It's close. Let's make it security safe.

But as the population of L. A. grows, I mean, I've been here all my life and I see it growing more and more. I saw the smog come and now it's going away, like you see the mountains in the morning when I was a kid. We got to approve the Alternative D plan to see LAX move into the 21st Century.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00021 Moret, Jerry

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00021-1

Comment:

Good morning. My name is Jerry Moret, and I just thank you for the time to speak. I only have a few points I would like to make.

Number one, I support very much the idea of regional airports, which in Southern California already have the ability and the capacity to support heavy jet traffic, and those would be Palmdale, Ontario, Long Beach, San Bernardino International, Oxnard, Camarillo, El Toro, Point Magoo, Burbank, Van Nuys. There are other airports that could handle smaller regional aircraft.

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

SPHF00021-2

Comment:

I think the idea of putting large crowds of people into one small location is not in our best interest. I think we're looking for safety. I think that is what makes the perfect opportunity for terrorists that we're trying to protect ourselves from.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00021-3

Comment:

Also the idea of moving runways to separate them a little bit, all this really does is allow air traffic controllers to authorize more approaches at the same time, simultaneous approaches, which in effect could increase the number of aircraft landing as much as double.

Response:

As described in Appendix E, Alternative D Airside Analysis, Section 1.4, Runway Operating Configurations, of the Draft Master Plan Addendum, the runways would operate similar to the existing airfield with arrival operations primarily on the outboard runways and departures primarily on the inboard runways. Simultaneous approaches to the outboard and inboard runways on the same runway complex are conducted only under visual approach procedures. The centerline separation between the parallel runways in Alternative D would be 1,040 feet on the north airfield complex and 800 feet in the south airfield complex. The centerline separation required for simultaneous independent approaches during instrument weather conditions is 4,300 feet. With the installation of Precision Runway Monitor (PRM) and Final Monitor Aid (FMA) equipment, this distance may be lowered to 3,400 feet. Dependent parallel ILS approaches may be conducted with centerline distance of 2,500 feet as delineated in Federal Aviation Administration Order 7110.65. Therefore, neither the north nor south runway complex meet the centerline separation requirements to conduct parallel approaches during non-visual weather conditions and would operate the same as the No Project/No Action Alternative.

SPHF00021-4

Comment:

From my own point of view, from my own personal feeling, the things that have affected me, Plan D has not yet been approved, but it has begun implementation.

In the guise of security and safety, my rental car company, which operates a seven-passenger minivan, is denied access to the airport because of safety, denied access to the airport because of traffic. My one seven-passenger minivan that has served this airport since 1963.

Response:

Comment noted. This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHF00022 Donaldson, James None Provided 8/23/2003

SPHF00022-1

Comment:

My name is James Donaldson. I would like to say that I go along with what Jerry said just before me. I live in the approach to Santa Monica Airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00022-2

Comment:

When I first came to these meetings, I think four years ago, the people sitting up here that said that they were going to do everything in their power to discourage the small business jets from coming to LAX. They would have them circle around and around so they could make way for the big cargo jets. That's what they wanted to get here.

Now, since Mayor Hahn took office, he stopped that plan. And one of the things that I see -- I saw today in the rooms over there is that currently it had one fixed based operator, which is Garrett Corporation over here that worked on your small business jets. One of the things I saw in the plan over there is you're going to add a brand-new fixed based operator, which is going to have 121,000 square feet, which is good.

What I would hope that maybe you could do is either add a third fixed based operator to handle these small business jets. You've got a lot of these fractional jets so they could come to the airport.

What happens is if you get some of these smaller jets to come in here, that's going to take the time slot up from the big jet. If you don't have any small business jets coming in here, what's going to happen is you're going to have all of the large jets coming into LAX.

What I would like to see is if you could maybe increase the footage from 121,000, if you can't put any more fixed based operators to increase it a little bit bigger from 121,000.

Also at the same time, I don't know about Garrett Corporation if you've talked to them about letting them enlarge their -- where they are currently at, in other words, enlarge the areas so where they could service some more business jets.

And let me see. I've got a couple of other things. Here is, from what I could see from Mayor Hahn's plan is that you're not going to push any jets off to the surrounding communities. I know you tried to put jets over -- not you guys, but originally they were going to put them in Hawthorne. They told the mayor they were going to put them in here. He stopped them from doing that.

So what I like to see is -- is if you can continue not to push any of the jets off to the surrounding airports.

Response:

The commentor's comment in support of general aviation activity at LAX is noted. It is the decision of individual FBO companies to initiate service at LAX. It is LAWA's intention to provide sufficient GA facilities to meet the demand. All GA traffic desiring to use LAX, including business jets and other aircraft, is being accommodated. Please see Response to Comment PC01496-1 regarding general aviation activity and facilities at LAX.

Alternative D, as analyzed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, is designed to accommodate commercial passenger and aircraft operations at LAX to levels similar to what would occur with existing facilities if the LAX Master Plan were not approved. Unmet demand will have to be accommodated at other regional airports or will be lost to the region. The constraints on commercial operations should not impact GA traffic.

SPHF00022-3

Comment:

If you do, then I would like to see you do an impact of what that would be to the Santa Monica, City of Santa Monica and its residents and the residents that I represent in West Los Angeles. I'm with the North Westdale Neighborhood Association.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-4 regarding potential environmental impacts at surrounding other airports as a result of the LAX Master Plan.

SPHF00022-4

Comment:

I go along with the safety. I think that's a good idea to have an area off of the airport. But then at the same time, I've heard some people come up here and they've said some things, like Cindy Miscikowski. So I go along with that. So you've got to kind of listen to the -- what these people have to say because they live over here. I live further north.

So I think that's about it.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00023 Moxley, Tom

Ironworkers Local 433

8/23/2003

SPHF00023-1

Comment:

Thank you. Tom Moxley, M- o- x- l- e- y, 2057 South Atlantic Avenue, Los Angeles, 90040.

I'm a business agent for Ironworkers Local 433 who represents -- and I represent over 4,000 members. That does not include their families, their wives and children and significant others. They live in every community in the L. A. basin, every city, every community. And I'm here to represent them in favor of Plan D, Mayor Hahn's insight to modernizing LAX.

LAX was designed and built for 707s. It was ahead of its time at that time and it has degenerated backwards. We have consistently put band-aids on it, and now is the time to bring it back in ahead of its time to show the world what kind of place L. A. is.

Safety is a concern in the construction industry. It's job one. It doesn't stop when we leave the construction site. We implement it in our daily lives. Safety is needed and moving of the runway and making the bigger jets being able to negotiate around the airport and come in and out.

Security goes with safety. Security is an issue that all of us after 9-11 became very aware of. I applaud the LAPD in their terrorism task force for looking at this and seeing what the needs are and reporting back to the Mayor.

And then jobs. This is not just jobs for construction. Those are short-term. These are good paying jobs for L. A. citizens around the community here in manufacturing, hotel workers, employees, the janitor and all those others.

I heard the comment about technology that wasn't developed. And I remember when I was a young man, or a young boy actually, President John F. Kennedy said, "We're going to put a man on the moon." That technology was not there. I remember in 1969, sitting at home and watching that man step on the moon.

I'm disappointed that our representatives did not stay around to listen to the public comment session. And I applaud them and would encourage them to use Ontario and Palmdale every time they travel because they are frequent flyers, and see what it takes to get there. They use LAX as a convenience. I use LAX as a convenience for where I live. If I live next to Palmdale or Ontario, I would use it. I can guarantee I wouldn't drive there.

Don Knabe lives right by me. He comes to LAX. When I see him in the neighborhood, I'm going to ask him to go to Ontario when he flies out.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00024 Curtis, DA Curt None Provided 8/23/2003

SPHF00024-1

Comment:

My name is D. A. Curt Curtis. I reside at 7880 Vicksburg Avenue. I've lived there for 49 years. I'm a former airport commissioner.

When I was on the commission, we had an absolute limit of 40 million annual passengers. As far as I know, that limit has never been changed. We still have a limit of 40 million annual passengers. And so much for what that 78 million annual passengers limit means. I do not think that the Draft EIR adequately addresses the capacity, the air capacity or the ground capacity for aircraft movements.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding past and present activity levels at LAX.

SPHF00024-2

Comment:

Enhanced safety and security, what a misnomer. There is neither enhanced security nor enhanced safety. RAND's think tank study is far more believable than a self-styled expert from Canada or the Mayor Hahn's police department.

Common sense dictates that one huge target, Manchester Square, is far more vulnerable for attack than eight different terminals in the current central terminal area.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHF00024-3

Comment:

Runway incursions are practically nonexistent this past year. There is really about two things for this expansion.

One, so that the -- so the European Airbus, a larger aircraft, can land. What is stated is for the modern aircraft. It doesn't mention that it's the European Airbus. That's why you have to move the runways apart. If you didn't move them apart, you wouldn't be able to have the same capacity on your runways.

Response:

The commentor states that runway incursions were - practically - non-existent this past year. During fiscal year 2002 there were seven runway incursions at LAX. Considering the potential for enormous loss of life present with each runway incursion LAWA feels that the only acceptable number of annual runway incursions is zero.

Alternative D serves to supplement the various other methods of reducing the risk of runway incursions through modifications to the airfield that will provide a safer air operations area at LAX, namely the elimination of high-speed runway exits directly linking the outboard runways with the inboard runways.

3. Comments and Responses

The manufacturing origin of the Airbus A380 is irrelevant. Six airlines that operate at LAX have signed letters of intent to purchase the A380 from Airbus and have expressed interest in operating said aircraft to and from LAX. Alternative D includes several airfield improvements intended to allow the A380 to safely operate at LAX. These improvements will provide a safer LAX for each and every LAX passenger.

SPHF00024-4

Comment:

The second reason is \$ 10-billion-dollars worth of jobs. And you can see the yellow shirts and blue shirts out here. As the Chamber of Commerce made their remarks, what is their name? Westchester, LAX, Marina del Rey Chamber of Commerce. Is Mayor Hahn paying off his fund raising obligations?

Response:

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

SPHF00024-5

Comment:

A million -- a million --

A million people living in San Fernando Valley can get to Palmdale a lot easier than they could get to LAX. Ditto for the Inland Empire, that they can reach Ontario far easier than they could drive into LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00025 Porras, Carlos

**Communities for a Better
Environment**

8/23/2003

SPHF00025-1

Comment:

My name is Carlos Porras. I am executive director of a non-profit organization in the State of California, communities for a better environment. My office is based in Huntington Park, California, 5610 Pacific Boulevard, 90255.

I am here to speak on the issue of the environmental justice, the mission and purpose and goal of my organization, and to talk a little bit about the history.

The patterns and the trends in Southern California, in particular in the Los Angeles region, a pattern of racism and a pattern of disproportionately burdening people of color, working class people, low income people with the health burdens of progress.

Working class people who are struggling and fighting for a right to collective bargaining, low income people who are struggling and fighting for the decency of a living wage, people of color struggling and fighting for equal opportunity.

While progress, development and projects quickly quantify benefits. The burdens and the costs are those that are not so readily quantifiable in EIR and EIS. This is a pattern of impacts that must be taken into consideration.

I want to note that while the EIR/ EIS and the supplemental point to incremental increases of the baseline, the baseline is unjust. The cancer burden is unjust. The cancer, respiratory, asthma, all of

3. Comments and Responses

these health effects, at the baseline is unjust. The marginalized education of our people and the developmental problems at the baseline is unjust. And, yes, the baseline is racist.

People who live in the impacted community demand a voice. We demand equal access, full disclosure and a full and meaningful decision-making role. Environmental justice is for all. Where we play, where we go to school, where we worship. I implore that this agency include the voice of the people who will live with the project.

Response:

Comment noted. The focus of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is not on quantifying benefits, rather it focuses on the potential future impacts associated with implementation of the LAX Master Plan alternatives. The commentor's concerns regarding baseline conditions is noted and it is correct that a primary focus of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is on incremental changes over an environmental baseline. However, the analysis of environmental justice provided in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR does acknowledge pre-existing conditions and the potential for minority and or low-income populations to be more susceptible to impacts, such as those relating to health effects, due to heightened vulnerability, inadequate access to health care, and synergistic effects of multiple environmental hazards. The document also acknowledges that progress toward sound insulation has been slower in minority and low-income communities despite a greater share of available funding.

Although the reference to racism is not a comment on the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, it should be noted, as stated on page 4-405 and 4-411, in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice of the Draft EIS/EIR, that effects from LAX on minority and low-income populations to the east are due to a combination of long-standing runway orientation and more recent changes in demographics in these communities that were predominantly white heading into the 1970's.

Regarding equal access, full disclosure, and a meaningful decision-making role, please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits and note the extensive good faith outreach effort that has been undertaken by LAWA and the FAA to assure an effective dialogue with minority and low-income communities affected by LAX and, to best respond to the needs of these communities.

SPHF00026 Moore, Walter None Provided 8/23/2003

SPHF00026-1

Comment:

Thank you. My name is Walter Moore. I live and work in Westchester. My mailing address is Post Office Box 45705.

I studied public policy at Princeton, and this proposal is such bad public policy. I'm not just going to talk out against it today. I'm going to replace the Mayor who is pushing for it. I filed the papers with the City Ethics Commission to run for mayor. I've set up a committee, and I've formed a website, mayorforyou.com.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00026-2

Comment:

Let me tell you why this proposal is the worst idea in security since the French built the Maginot Line. The Maginot Line, you may recall, was a series of tunnels, or as we call them now, people movers. The idea was they were going to stop the Germans from invading by building these tunnels. Well, guess what? Invaders aren't stupid. Terrorists aren't stupid.

3. Comments and Responses

If you move the parking a mile away, they are going to attack a mile away. You're not going to make anyone safer. Read the RAND Corporation study and you'll see.

Let's assume it does make the airport safer. Let's assume that they don't sneak a bomb into a truck going to the main terminal. Does that make any of us safer? No, because the next time the terrorists will go to the Third Street Promenade and they'll machine gun everybody there, or they'll park a truck bomb by a skyscraper downtown. It doesn't make anyone safer.

I see the people here with the yellow T-shirts and the red T-shirts. I know you want jobs. I know you'd like a cut of the \$ 9 billion. But you know what, there are other things you could build. I myself have not written any checks for \$ 9 billion dollars, so I had to think about how much money that is.

With \$ 9 billion dollars, you could buy 26,000 houses at the median price in this town. You could buy 450,000 Toyotas at \$ 20,000 each. Or if you're really concerned about security and you want to hire police officers at \$ 85,000 a year, do you know how many police officers we could add? Ten thousand every year for ten years. You want security, spend \$ 9 billion on that instead of moving a parking lot down the hall.

The RAND Corporation study also shows that in the past 23 years, you know how many people have been killed by bombs at airports? Four. That's a slow night in South Central. Why don't we apply some troops where people are dying in droves every day? Why don't we send some police there with our \$ 9 billion?

I'm here to tell you the emperor has no clothes, and he has no suit of armor. This security is not enhanced, and I want you after the meeting to come up and talk with me. I'll give you my card because when this meeting ends, our battle begins.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHF00027 Kay, Morty

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00027-1

Comment:

Thank you gentlemen. My name is Morty Kay. I live here in Westchester.

The implementation of Proposal D and the other airport proposals are realistically about two things: Political power and making money. The incomplete cost estimate of Alternative D is \$ 9 billion dollars. The realistic cost estimate is between \$ 11-and \$ 15 billion dollars. Who is going to pay for the majority of this? Where is the money going to come from? Don't we have anything better to do with this money?

Response:

Comment noted. The proposed Master Plan improvements under all of the alternatives would be funded by aviation users with a combination of FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, airline fees, and other state/federal grants.

SPHF00027-2

Comment:

There are basically two groups of people here. One group is comprised of people who wish to maintain their homes, their health and the quality of life. They are against added pollution from increased air and road traffic and increased congestion. The other group generally is comprised of persons who one way or another will make money from this expensive and poorly conceived airport plan.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed health impacts in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, 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 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, S-4, and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. 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.

SPHF00027-3

Comment:

Seventy-eight million passenger cap, will anyone here as a private citizen stand up, raise their hand and guarantee to me as a private citizen that the passenger load at LAX will not at any time in the future exceed 78 million passenger cap? I don't see anybody standing.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D does not cap passenger activity. Facilities that comprise Alternative D are designed to serve approximately 78.9 million annual passengers. As described on page 3-25, in Section 3.3.2, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D is a long-term regional approach to serving air traffic demand in the Los Angeles basin by designing facilities at LAX to accommodate passenger activity levels as projected in regional plans, such as the SCAG RTP.

LAWA determined that constraining the aircraft gate frontage at the terminals is a component of the airport system that is within its control. LAWA can constrain the development of this frontage and believes that this will, in turn, place an effective constraint on total passenger activity at LAX. However, as explained in detail in Section 3.3 in the Draft EIS/EIR, "it is important to understand that the levels of passengers that each alternative is designed to accommodate are not finite limits where the airport would somehow be closed or where aircraft would be redirected to some other facility when this number is reached. These levels are an indication of the number of passengers that can be accommodated at a reasonable level of service."

There is no federal law or regulation that would permit FAA or a local airport sponsor to prohibit the use of a public use airport. As the level of service at LAX degrades due to inadequate facilities to meet demand, it would be in the interest of the airlines to shift service to other airports to service the demand in the Los Angeles region.

SPHF00028 Schneider, Denny Alliance for Regional Solution to 8/23/2003
Airport Congestion

SPHF00028-1

Comment:

I'm Denny Schneider, 7929 Breen, Westchester. I thank you for the opportunity to speak again today. I come before you as the vice president for ARSAC, Alliance for Regional Solution of Airport Congestion, and as an active participant in numerous community oriented organizations here in Southern California, including our neighborhood council as Osage Neighborhoods Association, Intermodal Planning, all kinds of environmental planning, et cetera.

I want to first state that every one of the four alternatives the Mayor's plan has done is an expansion, and he has not met his pledge. And that is what we were told and all of the 10,000 people who voted for him when he made that pledge.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level of 78.9 million annual passengers (MAP), which is comparable to the 78.7 MAP projected to occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. As such, Alternative D is not considered to represent an expansion of LAX. The other build alternatives (Alternatives A, B, and C) are designed to serve a future activity level substantially more than that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and therefore represent an expansion of LAX. Alternative D is consistent with the Mayor's commitment to no expansion of LAX.

SPHF00028-2

Comment:

I oppose Alternative D on several different levels. And it's not that it's -- and I just want to make sure that everybody understands that it's certainly not as onerous as A, B and C, but it still isn't good enough. It's very expensive. What it costs, we really don't know because the way Alternative D is set up, it has a whole lot of options for every facet of Alternative D.

And so we don't know which one of those facets is going to be chosen. So it could be \$ 9 billion. It could be \$ 25 billion. And that does not include all of the other organizations such as Caltrans, DOT, Federal Highways, et cetera, that also have projects that have to support this.

Response:

Comment noted. The cost estimate for Alternative D includes only the cost of projects that will be undertaken if Alternative D is implemented.

SPHF00028-3

Comment:

This continues to perpetuate the concentration of all air commerce at LAX as opposed to -- or the majority of it, I should say, instead of spreading it out around the entire region.

If anything happens to LAX, this economy is going to tank, even according to the EIR figures that are presented to us here. It says that one out of every 20 people in this Southern California area is tied to the business of LAX. So think about what that's going to do to all of us.

In terms of jobs, every one of us is concerned about jobs. And if we were to take the same building that we're doing now or attempting to do at LAX, and it's not to say that there isn't something that needs to be done at LAX, but the majority of it could be done at the other airports such as Ontario, Palmdale and many of the other airports. And this will help not only us as a community at large, but it actually adds better jobs for the unions. They are going to have more infrastructure. And that's where the growth we're being told from the census is occurring. So let's get on with it.

Response:

LAWA only controls the operations and potential improvements at LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Other jurisdictions are responsible for developing the other regional airports. Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports. The master plans will recommend improvements to meet the projected demand. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX and necessary improvements to safety and security.

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

SPHF00028-4**Comment:**

Now, this plan also adds many more environmental impacts locally. And that is another issue.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Section 3.6, the CEQA Environmentally Superior Alternative, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding the determination that Alternative D is the environmentally superior alternative.

SPHF00029**Barnes, Eddie****United Association****8/23/2003****SPHF00029-1****Comment:**

My name is Eddie Barnes. I'm the business manager of Steam/ Refrigeration/ Air Conditioning and Pipe Fitters and Welders and Apprentices of the United Association of the Piping Industry. We're located at 18355 South Figueroa Street, Gardena, 90248.

I'm here speaking on behalf of 5,000 members that I represent, Pipe Fitters Local Union in Los Angeles inside the area with borders of Manchester and Firestone to north of the 710 Freeway to the east Imperial Highway to the south of Pacific Coast Highway to the west, which includes the following ZIP Codes, 9001, 9002, 3, 44, 45, 47, 59, 61, 301, 304, 305. There is over 640 members in the flight path in a ten-mile radius.

This time I'd like the UA members that are here today to support Alternative D to please stand up. I would also like to discuss with the speaker, if you'll notice, our color is neutral. We're very diversified, and we have no discrimination against anybody. Thank you brothers and sisters.

We believe it is important to maintain and support Alternative D. It's a 78 million limit that they proposed. It is maintained. We believe that creating 351,000 jobs by 2015 is essential for the future of Los Angeles and its people. We believe that the 49,000 construction jobs are essential for the future of the people of Los Angeles.

It will create \$ 64 billion dollars to the regional areas. It will create \$ 22 billion dollars to the City of Los Angeles. It will create 102 direct -- or indirect jobs. The total construction-related output for Los Angeles County will be \$ 11.3 billion dollars.

I don't know if anybody's been watching lately for the last few years, but the stock markets are down, the infrastructure is going south. It's not up to par. The jobs and the people, there is more on welfare and there is more on unemployment. These jobs LAX needed for Los Angeles.

And I'm speaking just at this point to jobs simply because we need the health and welfare. Nobody has mentioned that. If anybody has looked at the rising cost of health and welfare today, you can't afford it. The unions today have been able to do that as well as the commerce that's here today have been able to give health and welfare for our women, children and our families. And that to us is important.

The concern that we have today on the regional plan is the 9-11 and safety. I was in the blackout in Michigan. It took me three days to get home on a flight. We had people passing out in the airport because the air conditioning didn't work. It was terrible.

We believe, as members -- and I represent Local 250 as well as a citizen of Los Angeles, that Alternative D, through the past five years we've been trying to get somewhere, is the only way to give a chance to our working families in the service as well as the construction industry an opportunity to survive for their health and welfare.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00030 Brands, Tom

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00030-1

Comment:

My name is Tom Brands. I've lived in Westchester for 40 years at 6739 West 87th Place, which is just a couple of blocks north of the north runway.

The new plan for LAX upgrading is still faulty for much the same reasons as the old one is. Even though safety has required a new dimension since September 11th, 2001, the safety hazards that existed prior to that time have yet to be addressed.

The air space around LAX is already oversaturated, witnessed the Cerritos accident a few years ago and various 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 the security plan, even though these numbers are a roll back from the 98 MAP that was proposed previously.

Development of the Palmdale facility would alleviate the currently existing safety hazard. The safety problem is not just a LAX problem. It's an L. A. 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, could be just as devastating.

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.

SPHF00030-2

Comment:

Now, the existing ground transportation congestion has a potential for real gridlock. I've recently been driving to Claremont from Westchester about once per week in the early morning. And each time I see the traffic crawling west of the I-105 and I-210, I'm thankful I'm headed east.

Expansion of various venues around LAX such as Playa Vista 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:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR do indeed account for other venues, such as Playa Vista. This cumulative impact analysis is provided in Section 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR (Alternatives A, B and C) and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR (Alternative D).

SPHF00030-3

Comment:

Now, how many businesses will get displaced by LAX acquiring additional real estate for the planned security improvement? That's job loss.

Response:

Business acquisition and relocation impacts were addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Under Alternative D, a total of 38 light industrial, air freight, office, and retail business would require relocation. The Proposed

Relocation Plan to be implemented by LAWA (refer to Appendix P to Chapter V of the Master Plan and Chapters 2.7 and 2.8 of the Master Plan Addendum) would provide all affected businesses with an array of relocation assistance that would meet and may exceed requirements under state and federal law, and may include special assistance for displaced businesses in finding relocation sites within nearby areas of the City of Los Angeles, including LAX Northside/Westchester Southside. As was also discussed in Section 4.4.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the businesses to be relocated comprise an estimated total of 1,671 jobs. Of those businesses not expected to be accommodated within airport developments, if suitable relocation sites cannot be found, a potential loss of 597 jobs could occur under Alternative D, as compared to 9,568, 11,272, and 3,681 job losses that could occur under Alternatives A, B, and C, respectively.

SPHF00030-4

Comment:

However, as Palmdale jobs are -- at Palmdale jobs are just as important as they are around LAX and the potential for growth is much greater.

A significance of the population and business in Los Angeles is north of the Santa Monica mountains. And recent projections show the fastest growth in the near future is 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:

Comment noted. 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.

SPHF00030-5

Comment:

Now, L. A. already cannot meet Federal Air Quality standards. Pollution is a problem for the entire city of L. A. since the prevailing wind has descended west-side 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:

Please see Response to Comment PC00070-1 regarding existing air pollution in the South Coast Air Basin. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR also addressed the environmental baseline ambient air quality for the vicinity of LAX in subsection 4.6.3.3. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

SPHF00030-6

Comment:

Now, the proposed security plan I hear is estimated at about nine and a half billion. The new facility of Palmdale can be designed from the ground up for maximum safety and security and still save money over any existing LAX upgrade proposal.

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 and Draft 2004 RTP, which call for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding Palmdale. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHF00030-7

Comment:

Besides, when we hear an estimate as high as nine and a half billion dollars based on virtually all previous experience, that number is just for starters. But 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?

Response:

Comment noted. The cost estimate for Alternative D includes projects that mitigate traffic congestion and environmental impacts as discussed in the various Mitigation Measure sections of Chapter 4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHF00031 Acosta, Jose None Provided 8/23/2003

SPHF00031-1

Comment:

Hello everyone. My name is Jose Luis Acosta. 10120 Firmona Avenue, Lennox, California 90304.

I have lived in the area of Lennox and Inglewood for 23 years in the flight path of LAX. Together, my wife and I raised two children in Lennox. My sons are 13 and 17 years old. I've worked in tourism for 17 years as a bartender in Manhattan Beach Marriott.

It is not easy to live in Lennox and raise children here. Our community is poor. We have traffic. Our schools are crowded and noisy from the planes flying overhead. But one thing that makes it worthwhile for me to raise my family here is that I have a good, stable job in the tourism industry.

Modernization will affect us in Lennox. It can hurt us, or it can help us. Modernization could cause more traffic, more noise, more pollution without giving anything in return, or the City can do everything possible to make sure modernization benefits our community and provides good jobs with living wages and health care.

If modernization can benefit our community, then we are willing to support it.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic, noise, and air quality impacts associated with Alternative D in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.6, Air Quality, respectively. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

SPHF00032 Worthington, Emma None Provided 8/23/2003

SPHF00032-1

Comment:

My name is Emma Worthington. It's E- m- m- a, W- o- r- t- h- i- n- g- t- o- n. I live at 710 South Fir Avenue, Inglewood, California 90301.

I live in Inglewood. I also work at the airport, and I have worked there for almost 30 years. Like myself, many people who work at the airport live in the surrounding communities. We live in Inglewood, Lennox, Hawthorne, El Segundo and Westchester.

We understand the connection between good quality jobs and quality life. We need more jobs, but we don't need minimum wage jobs. What we need is jobs that provide a livable wage and affordable family health coverage. The companies at the airport provide those types of jobs. And that is how I as a single mom have been able to raise my family and not be on welfare.

We need to ensure this modernization plan provides good employment opportunities for our communities. We encourage the mayor to include in his plan a local hiring program so that others in my community can also raise their family, and that our youths can strive to emulate their parents.

When we talk about modernization, we say we are bringing the airport and Los Angeles into the 21st Century. Well, we the workers would like to be able to bring our communities into the 21st Century along with the airport and the rest of Los Angeles.

That is why we urge the Mayor to ensure that his plan provides good paying jobs with good benefits and a community package that will ensure we are all along for the ride and not left behind.

Response:

Comment noted. Employment was 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 S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Regarding a local hiring program, please see the discussion of the Jobs Outreach Center in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7) of this Final EIS/EIR, and note that LAWA will set-aside a substantive portion of LAX Master Plan construction-related jobs to qualified DBEs or minority/low-income individuals with emphasis on those located within the communities surrounding LAX. Also, note a similar emphasis on non-construction job opportunities for those in communities most adversely affected by airport modernization.

SPHF00033 Davis, Thom

IATSE

8/23/2003

SPHF00033-1

Comment:

Yes, I am. Thank you. Thom Davis, Camarillo, California, offices in Burbank, California. And Thom is spelled T- h- o- m, D- a- v- i- s.

I represent the IATSE, which is the union that represents the motion picture and television technicians. And I'm here to express our support for the measure. This project is important to the people I represent in a number of ways. LAX and the Master Plan is vital to the entertainment industry, the jobs that are sustained and the further creation of future jobs.

This plan goes a long way in mitigating the potential impacts of the various proposals. For my members who live in the immediate area, there is an understanding that the benefits will have a real and positive impact on their neighborhoods, their community and the entire region.

Modernization of the airport is critical not only to the industries that are normally associated with the airport, but also to those industries within the entire region such as the entertainment industry and, also, to the entire economy of the entire region.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHF00034 Garnholz, Liz

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00034-1

Comment:

My name is Liz Garnholz. I live in the City of El Segundo. Garnholz is G- a- r- n- h- o- l- z, and my address is on my sign-up sheet. I have my comments already written, and I will submit them. It was ready by the August 25th date.

I'm here to dispel the comments made by the Mayor of El Segundo, who by the way is a telemarketer and running for higher office, that the City of El Segundo supports Mayor Hahn's Alternative D.

When the Mayor, our telemarketer mayor made this comment, there was no public input. There was no City Council discussion. There was no City Council. He was king for a day. He made the statement and many of us in El Segundo are absolutely irate.

The Mayor on -- Mayor Gordon, our telemarketer mayor, on July 9th made the following speech. It consists of 32 lines. The first sentence or sentences I should say, is a good morning. Sentence two, three, four and five and six are your basic telemarketer dribble.

Number 7 is very important. It says, "But Mayor Jim Hahn brought a new vision and a new style of leadership to Los Angeles City Hall and Los Angeles airways." That's absolutely true. I agree with this statement. He's a democrat. And my mayor is a democrat, and he's running for the 53rd assembly seat as a democrat.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00034-2

Comment:

Let me see here. As for the Hahn signing a pledge, all five candidates signed a pledge, republicans and democrats, equal opportunity pledge. Let me see. Right here he -- the Mayor says on Sentence 12, "And I am pleased to announce today that the City of El Segundo, Mayor Hahn, the World Airports have reached an agreement in principal" -- that means a cup with a hole in it -- "and are committed to finalize a formal agreement with the City of El Segundo that will absolutely limit growth at LAX to the capacity that exists today through the year 2020."

The date is July 9th and the capacity is 54 to 55,000. Boy, time really goes. I'm going to have to sum up a bunch of stuff here.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00034-3

Comment:

The City -- the El Segundo residents are against Mayor Hahn's plan. It supports a region. We are for a regional approach. The residents are against moving the runway further south.

The Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990 says an airport proprietor cannot restrict capacity. Why is after spending millions of dollars, actually 55K a month for consultants to protect us from LAX, why is the Mayor supporting it? Very simple. He wants democrat Mayor Hahn's support when he runs for assembly, and he wants the union votes.

And I would like to remind the unions that the function of an airport is airport service, not jobs.

3. Comments and Responses

I came today to let you know I support modernization of LAX. Mayor Hahn's design with Alternative D will fulfill the concerns that many area residents have had, especially in regard to the number of passengers that will be able to use the airport.

Mayor Hahn signed a letter that he would not support any airport design that allowed more than 78 million passengers a year to fly in and out of LAX. Alternative D by design caps the number of passenger and cargo as well. This will push other airport sites to build airport facilities and redirect flights there.

A regional approach to air travel and cargo handling will be required when Alternative D is constructed and all other area residents will realize they should provide airport sites. This is a great plan, and it should move forward as soon as possible.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00038 Kenton, Jack

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00038-1

Comment:

My name is Jack Kenton. That is K- e- n- t- o- n, 835 Dune Street in El Segundo, also on the LAX Airport Advisory Committee.

El Toro was shot down pretty much because the people around there were upset with noise. Today I think there is no one here that isn't either looking for a job or here because of 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, 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.

SPHF00038-2

Comment:

The EIR/EIS says that my house is under a single event noise impact of 94 DB. The averaged out thing comes to a CNEL of only 74. With the reduced number of operations since 9-11, this is actually livable, but now we're talking about moving the runways closer. And even now when we have one of those rush hours with an airplane going off every minute or every two or three minutes, it gets unbearable because you never get relief from the noise.

Response:

Comment noted. It is unclear as to how the commentor is trying to compare the 94 dB single event levels and a CNEL of 74 dB. The commentor is a resident of El Segundo and his residence is currently located within the No Action/No Project Alternative 2015 94 dBA SEL Contour as identified in Figure S3, No Action/No Project Alternative 2015 94 dBA SEL vs. 2000 94 dBA SEL Areas Newly Exposed. As stated on page 4-200, of Section 4.2, Land Use of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Mitigation Measure MM-LU-5 indicates that the boundaries of the ANMP will be expanded to include residential uses newly exposed to single event exterior nighttime noise levels of 94 dBA SEL, based on the Master Plan Alternative that is ultimately approved. Under all the build alternatives the commentor's residence is not newly exposed. However, the commentor's residence is already included within the ANMP contour and is eligible for sound insulation. The commentor is correct that operational levels are down since September 11, 2001. However, forecasts show that they will increase and mitigation measures are included with each of the build alternatives. These are identified in Section 4.1, Noise and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, please see

Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

SPHF00038-3

Comment:

When you get the runway closer, that gets just that little bit more extra noise. Now, we're talking about moving it so that we can put a taxiway in between. Now, that's supposed to be because of safety. And, yet, the incursion statistics show that those are not significant, and we can get around it by going off the end of the runway with a taxiway.

Response:

Alternative D would move Runway 7R/25L south approximately 55 feet to gain enough separation for constructing a Group V center taxiway between the two parallel runways in the south airfield complex. The commentor is a resident of El Segundo and his home is located within the ANMP and 70 dB CNEL contour for all Alternatives and No Action/No Project. He is correct that under Alternatives C & D, Runway 7R/25L is going to be relocated 50 feet south of the existing centerline. For 2015 forecasted noise levels for all build Alternatives (A-D) and the No Action/No Project Alternative show that noise levels to the south will be reduced. However, due to the commentor's proximity to LAX (a few blocks south of Imperial Highway) the benefit of that reduction will not be as noticeable as it is further south in El Segundo. Additionally, noise impacts are addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

As stated on page 3-41, in Section 3.3.2, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the primary purpose for modifying the airfield in Alternative D is to develop a physical solution that will greatly reduce the risk of runway incursions. LAX ranked first as the airport that had the greatest number of runway incursions for the four-year period based on 2002 Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Safety Runway Report. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding runway incursion at LAX. Airport surface radar technology and airport infrastructure implementation at LAX are some of the strategies identified by FAA to help solve the problem. Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) has already implemented improvements to airfield lighting, taxiway marking, runway signage, and has sponsored on-going seminars on airfield familiarization with airport users. Taxiway system configuration is one of the key infrastructure methods to solving the problem. The purpose of the proposed center taxiway is to enhance safe aircraft operations and reduce the potential for runway incursions. The lack of this center taxiway slows the arrival stream by requiring time-consuming coordination of runway crossings. While these conditions do not create an unsafe environment, they do add to airfield congestion as operations increase. Providing a center taxiway between the two parallel runways allows aircraft to queue and maneuver without blocking runway operations. At the same time, the proposed center taxiway in the north complex would be designed to accommodate New Large Aircraft (NLA) based on the forecast which anticipates NLA operations in the future and the proposed center taxiway in the south complex would be able to accommodate Group V aircraft to minimize noise impacts. LAWA, in cooperation with NASA Ames Research Center, conducted a study titled "Los Angeles International Airport Runway Incursion Studies, Phase III - Center Taxiway Simulation" (published on July 31, 2003), comparing the costs and benefits of a center parallel taxiway and an "end-around" taxiway on the south airfield complex. The study concluded that the end-around taxiway greatly increased taxi time and delays for arriving aircraft and thereby increased the operational costs of this option and did not give any increased safety margin. Air traffic controllers also found the center parallel taxiway which increased their flexibility while controlling arriving aircraft on the south airfield complex. In a separate LAWA study ("Los Angeles International Airport Taxiway B-16 Operational Analysis" - published on November 27, 2001) of these two optional taxiway improvements, the "end-around" taxiway was found to increase noise impacts on El Segundo residential land uses from taxiing aircraft.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHF00038-4

Comment:

What it does do is put an infrastructure in place that should we have a mayor that says, "Well, Mayor Hahn's 78 MAP is not my MAP," the infrastructure is going to be there and he can expand. And I disagree with that concept of putting that kind of infrastructure. It provides the ability for more operations per hour by having that taxiway down the middle.

Okay. So beyond spending a lot of money to move a runway 50 feet and put a taxiway in and everything, what do we got? Well, we've got infrastructure for more movement. I don't think the gates will resolve that at all.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D does not increase airfield capacity. As described in Section 1.4 of Appendix E of the Draft Master Plan Addendum, the runways would operate similar to the existing airfield with arrival operations primarily on the outboard runways and departures primarily on the inboard runways. See Response to Comment SPHF00021-3.

Runway 7R/25L would be relocated 55 feet south of its existing location to provide sufficient separation for construction a center parallel taxiway between the two parallel runways in the south airfield complex. The addition of a center parallel taxiway would improve airfield safety through a reduced potential for runway incursions.

LAX had the greatest number of runway incursions in the U.S. for the four-year period ended 2002 based on the 2002 FAA Runway Safety Report.

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1. Every runway incursion has the potential to cause enormous loss of life and property. The existing airfield geometry must be changed to reduce the potential for runway incursions.

SPHF00038-5

Comment:

Moving the secured areas out further to the remote parking, to the Green Line Transportation Center, to the general transportation check in point, you're still going to have areas where people congregate and still be targets for security.

Response:

Alternative D allows for the dispersal of people and security processes away from critical points on the airport complex by having four secured entry points (GTC, ITC, RAC, and FlyAway) to the future airport instead of one roadway used by all passengers coming to the airport today. By doing this, Alternative D would reduce the overall size of the groups of people, thereby making them a less attractive target. In addition, the GTC would be designed to act primarily as a train station, so there will be constant movement and dispersion of people over a large area, minimizing dwell times. Passengers will not be queuing in either a ticketing lobby or baggage claim area at the GTC. This is significantly different from the existing CTA where at peak hour, there are hundreds of people queuing on the second level for ticketing, security and on the first level at baggage claim all within 25 to 50 feet of open and accessible lanes of traffic.

SPHF00038-6

Comment:

With all this expense and moving of everything, yes, safety, security, those are magic words, but will we really get the safety, security that we are after with all these millions and billions of dollars. I'm not sure that we will. And I'd like to be more sure before I see all these dollars spent for this project.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHF00040-3

Comment:

Our children lose hours of education time yearly due to the interruption caused each time a plane is landing.

Response:

Comment noted. The effects of classroom disruption from aircraft noise are addressed in detail 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 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 and Response to Comment AL00034-38 regarding the "Settlement Agreement."

SPHF00040-4

Comment:

There are many things to be taken into consideration when a community is located as close to the airport as Lennox. There is the health of our children, the quality of life for the residents and the impact of the noise and traffic the airport causes.

If the airport is going to modernize, then it is time for our community to modernize also. This plan must have some real community benefit if it is in it so that the future health problems can be alleviated, our schools can be safer, our communities can be protected. And measures are put in place to ensure that the people of Lennox are treated fairly.

Community benefit means that our community is not forgotten in the modernization program. It means that with \$ 9 billion dollars being spent for airport modernization, there is money actually being spent in our community to make those infrastructure changes needed to accommodate the expected increase of noise and traffic. While there is a push for modernization, we also want to push for increased and visible benefits in our community.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, 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-C1 and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

Regarding measures that ensure that the people of Lennox are treated fairly, please see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-D. Also see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of this Final EIS/EIR and the measures and benefits proposed under the Environmental Justice Program.

SPHF00041 Pereira, Mel

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00041-1

Comment:

Thank you. My name is Mel Pereira. That's Pereira spelled with a P- e- r- e- i- r- a. I'm a 16-year resident of Westchester. And my address is 7811 Fordham Road, 90045.

I'm coming here as a resident. And I feel that all my brothers in yellow shirts, the yellow shirts have one letter missing, one word missing. They are "Safety Security." I think we need to add the word "Sanity," because what's missing in all this planning is basic common sense.

We talked about security, safety, and I'm totally in unison with Maxine Waters. And nobody said it better. But I talked to -- and she's going to add it to her report. They are not addressing the safety and security of the tunnel. It's not fiction. It's a fact that just on the eve of the millennium at Canada we stopped some terrorist who had some explosives headed for LAX.

This is a prime target, and we have an open tunnel with no security. One truck bomb, one suicide bomber shuts down the whole tunnel. And with the new positioning of the runways, we have only one runway. And that will knock off all the jobs of our friend here. They will have jobs, but it will be to reconstruct LAX. So I really think that we need to address the security of the tunnel, even if it's forced to close the tunnel.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHF00041-2

Comment:

The other thing I would like to address is what Mr. Schneider said. And I don't want to repeat what he said, but basically we need to strengthen the planning of the regional airports. That's all bologna that people don't fly from other airports. We live near Westchester, and all my neighbors will attest to the fact that a lot of our friends park at our house when they go from LAX.

This year the number of friends who parked at our house was only two because they flew out of Long Beach. They flew out of Ontario. There are some better rates available. So in the planning I would suggest that the government give them some aid or some -- some subsidy so that the other airlines that move out from other airports, they can give cheaper ride fares and people will fly out of Long Beach.

Response:

LAWA only controls the operations and potential improvements at LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

SPHF00041-3

Comment:

The last thing is traffic. We can't even go down the freeway from Brentwood to my office in Westchester even on a Sunday. The traffic is just horrendous. I don't know how you're going to handle traffic. And traffic is a major, major concern. We can't go down Lincoln Boulevard.

And all the planners that spoke at the outset of meeting, none of them live in Westchester or Lennox or Inglewood or El Segundo. They all live in the boondocks, you know, in Pasadena or Rancho Palos Verdes. They need to travel on these freeways. Even on a Sunday you can't even travel on Lincoln Boulevard.

Response:

The impacts and mitigation measures to traffic are discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR (Alternatives A, B and C) and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR (Alternative D), Section 4.3.2, and in Technical Report S-2b.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHF00042 Slawson, Richard

**Los Angeles Building &
Construction Trades Council**

8/23/2003

SPHF00042-1

Comment:

My name is Richard Slawson. I'm the Executive Secretary of the L. A. and Orange County Building and Construction Trades Council. Our council represents workers in the construction industry for the various trade unions. We represent approximately 130,000 craft workers living and raising their families in every community around the airport and other areas of Los Angeles and Orange County. I live at 4634 Deelane Street in Torrance, California 90503.

Many of the speakers here today have suggested that they have a better plan. I'm here to say it isn't true, including the area officials who want to start over again. These speakers aren't interested in a better plan. They don't want an airport at all. Taking apart of the Draft Environmental Impact Report is only a delay in tactic to stop the improvements at LAX. This will be a disaster for our economy and for jobs.

These discussions have gone on for nine years, and not one of those that are against the plan have come up with their own plan.

Now, what happens if we don't move forward with the Master Plan and Alternative D? You have an airport with no growth restrictions. LAX unrestricted could grow to 98 million annual passengers according to the Southern California Association of Governments, Aviation Subcommittee, which most of the area cities had representatives sitting on over the last four years. And that's not what any of us want.

Without Alternative D, we won't have an upgraded security system to handle passengers and baggage. We won't have an intermodal transportation center to connect the Green Line. We won't have people movers and trams to move people around the airport. And everyone knows how difficult it is to access the terminal now.

Without a modern and secure airport, we will lose business to other areas and other airports around the country, and especially to west coast cities. Alternative D fulfills Mayor Hahn's commitment to the residents of this area in capping annual passengers to 78 million.

With the security designs that have been added, like passenger and baggage drop-off buildings, we have a plan that offers more than was promised. I say we move on and build an airport we can all be proud of.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00043 Walter, Marvin

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00043-1

Comment:

I'm Marvin Walter. I reside at 7015 Sepulveda Boulevard in Los Angeles.

In prior hearings such as this, in numerous newspaper articles regarding Alternative D, many factors as passenger caps, traffic, noise, jobs and security have been raised. Yet, the major impetus behind Alternative D continues to be security regardless of the more recently raised slant toward modernization. So I'd like to address that particular issue.

3. Comments and Responses

And, frankly, it's not easy to assess the value of Alternative D in that light by reviewing the EIR document. And I offer these direct quotes from various sections of that document.

From the comparative analysis Section of D Versus No Action, "Vehicular traffic in the Central Terminal Area results in crowded terminal areas that create attractive targets for terrorists and allows baggage containing potentially significant explosive devices into passenger congregation areas" and "People approach all facilities with unsecured baggage until they reach the TSA checks."

"Security screening stations at the Ground Transportation Center and Intermodal Transportation Center will protect the Central Terminal Area from attack by persons armed with weapons."

By moving arrival and departure passengers rapidly through the single entry point, only a small number of people would be clustered as a potential terrorist target.

From the Development and Refinement Section, paragraph 2.2.8, "First level screening at the Ground Transportation Center will be random baggage and passenger checking and use of video surveillance and sniffing dogs."

Same Section, 2.2.8, "The architectural design intent of the GTC is to create a partially climate controlled open-air structures to help diffuse potential blast impacts at the curb front by eliminating glass curtain walls."

Again, from the comparative analysis section, "The people mover presents a problem as it is unsecured and subject to attack, but this can be partially mitigated by use of technology."

Again, from the Development and Refinement Section, paragraph 2.2.8.1. "Passengers not using sky cap services may carry baggage on the automated people mover to the Central Terminal Area where screening will be made by the appropriate airline."

So if unsecured baggage in the central terminal is currently a problem, and it probably is, it doesn't appear this multi-million-dollar alternative solves that at all.

All passengers spread out through eight terminals currently, and you've seen the lines all down the sidewalk. Here all the passengers will be funneled through this one entry point, but they are going to move rapidly so as to only present a small number of a potential terrorist target.

The six-car people mover really sounds like an exciting entry to a world-class airport, baggage carts, passengers rolled in and out, meeters and greeters who are going to be allowed in that terminal area. Of course, in case of a blast, partially climate air controlled is exactly what I would want between me. Security solution, no, this is a joke.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHF00044 Gonzalez, Romeo IBEW Local 11 8/23/2003

SPHF00044-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Romeo Gonzalez. I'm union member of the IBEW Local 11 District 3. I live at 712 6th Avenue, Number 1, Venice, California 90291.

I would like to show my support for the LAX Master Plan and Alternative D. After almost eight years of planning and dozens of hearings and testimony, Mayor Hahn has introduced a plan that takes into account of all the concerns that have been raised.

3. Comments and Responses

With the heightened awareness of the possibility of airport disaster, either by accident or by human hands, this plan would reduce all consequences. With the remote passenger and baggage handling facility, the flying public should have more confidence in L. A. security. This design, with the early scanning of passengers, carry-ons and baggage makes the Central Terminal Area and airline gates more safe.

I also like the use of people movers and trams in the design. Moving around LAX today is very difficult. The only way to get from airline to airline or different terminals is to walk or wait for a bus. Alternative D's transportation system saves time and confusion. I hope Alternative D is adopted soon.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00045 Anderson, Homer None Provided 8/23/2003

SPHF00045-1

Comment:

Yes. Good afternoon. My name is Homer Anderson. I live at 15824 South Western Avenue, Gardena, California 90247.

All of us here today use airports at some time or another. And if you've ever been at LAX lately, you know how difficult it can be to get through the check-in procedures or even pick up someone. That's why I support the new proposal for the Master Plan.

As it is indicated on the boards that are set up outside, there will be new passenger ticketing and a baggage handling building built away from the central terminal and gates. With the larger area for passenger drop-off and pick up and the baggage check-in facilities being expanded, passengers should be processed much faster.

Getting the people in and out of the drop-off area faster will also give us a safer and more secure airport. The chances that someone will be injured and in a disaster will be greatly reduced with the new design. Any idea that the existing security level at the current airport will be more secure than the expanding airport is ludicrous and damn near stupid.

And to the gentleman that is aspiring to become a mayor, he is already 500,000 votes behind. Anyone with common sense, because with all your Princeton education, you have none.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00046 Rose, Harry OSAGE Neighbors Association 8/23/2003

SPHF00046-1

Comment:

Good afternoon, gentlemen. Welcome to Westchester. My name is Harry Rose, 7725 Hindry Avenue, Westchester, 90045. I am not running for mayor.

I come before you today on behalf of Osage Neighbors Association. We represent approximately 3,600 homes in East Westchester. And because it would seem that none of our city officials have noticed, we would like to point out that most modern airports operate on a much larger footprint than LAX and are not located in densely populated urban areas.

Denver had the vision to build a world-class airport on 53 square miles in a rural area and actually closed their old airport. Total cost, less than half the price of Alternative D. Los Angeles, where is the vision?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01790-3 for a discussion of how the size of an airport relates to activity levels and the addition of Alternative D to the Master Plan process. Denver's new airport is only about 25 miles from downtown and required the closing of Stapleton to be successful. There is no similar site within 25 miles of downtown Los Angeles. Much of LAX's existing competitive advantage is due to the foresight of the City thirty to forty years ago building sufficient facility capacity to handle long-term growth in aviation demand. As the first jet facility in the region, it was already well established by the time the region had grown enough to support a multiple airport system. Many businesses in the region that depend on air transportation chose to locate near LAX and made substantial investments in facilities and improvements. Airlines and other service providers have supported LAX by making major commitments to this facility. The level and diversity of service provided at LAX has also created a synergy unmatched by other airports in the Los Angeles region. The extensive capital investment at and around LAX would be impossible to replace at the cost to construct Denver International Airport.

SPHF00046-2

Comment:

We love -- while we love a good public works boondoggle just as much as anyone else, this one is ill-conceived and a violation of Mayor Hahn's election pledge to our community. Airport use of residential property violates his pledge to operate the airport within its current boundaries. And the capacity of 78.9 MAP stated in the EIS violates the Mayor's election pledge to us by nearly 1 million annual passengers.

Response:

The content of this comment is the same as Comment SPC00079-2; please refer to the Response to Comment SPC00079-2.

SPHF00046-3

Comment:

Alternative D would dramatically enhance the flight field throughput and lay the groundwork for vastly increased ground transportation infrastructure setting the stage for future expansion of LAX operations.

We have heard that FAA is currently studying the feasibility of simultaneous landings on three runways under the new configuration. Do LAWA and FAA plan to visit this practice upon us in the near future?

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D does not increase airfield capacity. Neither LAWA nor FAA are studying the feasibility of triple simultaneous approaches during IFR conditions at LAX now or in the future. As described in Section 1.4 of Appendix E of the Draft Master Plan Addendum, the runways would operate similar to the existing airfield with arrival operations primarily on the outboard runways and departures primarily on the inboard runways.

Simultaneous approaches to the outboard and inboard runways on the same runway complex are conducted only during VFR conditions. Neither the north nor south runway complex in Alternative D meet the centerline separation requirements to conduct parallel approaches during IFR conditions and would operate the same as the No Action/No Project Alternative.

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00021-3.

SPHF00046-4

Comment:

Alternative D would move airport bound traffic two miles to the east subjecting East Westchester, Lennox and Inglewood to increased vehicular air pollution and noise. How does this even begin to comply with the environmental justice provisions of CEQA?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

It is not clear what the commentor means by stating that Alternative D would move airport bound traffic two miles to the east, since physical improvements to the airport are generally concentrated along the airport's existing boundaries. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addresses environmental justice and related effects associated with traffic, air pollution and noise, in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, with supporting data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

As further described in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, traffic impacts associated with Alternative D, including the location of the GTC, would not have an adverse and disproportionate effect on minority and low-income populations to the east of LAX. Under Alternative D three intersections, located west of the I-405 freeway, would be significantly impacted after mitigation compared to the 1996 baseline conditions. Compared to what would occur without the project as presented under the No Action/No Project Alternative, Alternative D would result in 32 significantly impacted intersections, of which only nine are located in minority and low-income communities. In addition, the GTC and other roadway improvements and mitigation measures proposed under Alternative D would benefit overall traffic conditions to the east compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Regarding effects associated with air pollution and noise, see the Environmental Justice Program beginning on page 4-336, which includes mitigation measures and benefits that address these effects. Also see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Final EIS/EIR, which provides a final Environmental Justice Program based on additional public input received during circulation of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHF00046-5

Comment:

Alternative D locates a Ground Transportation Center in a tract of land currently zoned R1. The EIS clearly states that no residential property is to be acquired for the project. This leads us to assume that LAWA plans to use property acquired through an ongoing and supposedly voluntary noise mitigation acquisition program.

This method of residential property acquisition for airport use ignores FAA guidelines in Order 5100.37A, Chapter 3, Section 9 implementing the Uniform Act of 1970. We would like a complete explanation as to how LAWA's acquisition and conversion of this property to airport use approaches any semblance of legality.

Response:

The relocation of residences in the Manchester Square area has always been and will continue to be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Act, thereby minimizing community disruption, limiting adverse economic impacts and protecting human rights. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.1.2 and Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.2 regarding legality of the acquisition of Manchester Square. In addition, please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.6 regarding conversion of the property to airport use.

SPHF00047 Hossan, Carole

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00047-1

Comment:

Carole Hossan, Westchester. And I'm against Mayor Hahn's unsafe and unsecure Alternative D debacle. Debacle in terms of money for what it achieves, and as we've been hearing today, a debacle in safety and security.

Again, I get so tired of saying it, but it just doesn't seem to sink in. How safe and secure is it for Los Angeles International Airport to be the only major airport from Central California to the Mexican border. Los Angeles City should be sued for planning negligence because they have had Palmdale and Ontario for decades.

What was Palmdale bought for? To wait for the desert community to develop into another city of Los Angeles to utilize it? Wasn't it intended to be an international airport with transportation provided for people to go to it? How can you have that facility sitting out there unused, and then say we need to make LAX accommodate more plane traffic? It doesn't make sense.

But then it does make dollars for contractors, doesn't it? I want to see the unions have jobs. I want to see them have jobs out there in Palmdale. They would get a time differential. They would be building something that needs to be built instead of something -- if something happens to Los Angeles, LAX, an earthquake or something, we'll lose the \$ 1 billion dollars a day, as he said. And how would you feel, then, having no alternative?

Response:

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.

SPHF00047-2

Comment:

Now, some specific things for my neighborhood. If the traffic on the 405 is backed up and traffic is coming from the north and they get off on La Tierra, how are they going to get to the Ground Transportation Center? What routes are they going to take?

Response:

If the I-405 interchange at Lennox Boulevard (a mitigation measure) is implemented, the access system from the I-405 Freeway will be designed to provide non-stop access directly to the GTC if the motorist stays on I-405 southbound. Therefore, there would be a large incentive to stay on I-405 and not use surface streets. However, if a motorist does exit the freeway at La Tijera Boulevard, they could be directed to use either southbound La Cienega Boulevard to the airport entrance opposite Lennox Boulevard, or southbound Airport Boulevard to the Century Boulevard entrance east of Aviation Boulevard. LAWA would work with the Los Angeles Department of Transportation to determine the need for and placement of guide signs on City of Los Angeles streets.

SPHF00047-3

Comment:

And what is the signage on the freeway going to be? Is it going to be directing only to a certain interchange, or is it going to be saying like it does now, "5 Exits to LAX?" How is traffic if they get off at Sepulveda going to be routed to the Ground Transportation Center? Have these intersections been implemented or studied?

I want to see results of that study.

Response:

Alternative D proposes a new I-405 interchange at Lennox Boulevard as a mitigation measure. This new interchange would be the primary entrance to the airport and the freeway signage would direct I-405 motorists to use it to access LAX. Westbound I-105 Freeway motorists would be directed to a new interchange between La Cienega Boulevard and Aviation Boulevard. If the I-405 interchange is not approved, I-405 freeway traffic would be directed by signs to use one of a series of off-ramps, similar to today. Traffic would then be directed either on La Cienega Boulevard to the airport entrance opposite Lennox Boulevard, or southbound on Aviation Boulevard to the Century Boulevard entrance. The operations of the access system are summarized in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHF00047-4

Comment:

You say fewer gates. Well, how many planes can these gates accommodate if we're having simultaneous landings? And is there amplification problem with noise with simultaneous landings and takeoffs? These are things that need to be addressed.

Response:

Alternative D would provide a total of 153 contact gates in 2015.

If constructed, Alternative D is forecast to accommodate 2,279 total daily operations in 2015.

As described in Section 1.4 of Appendix E, of the Draft Master Plan Addendum, the runways would operate similar to the existing airfield with arrival operations primarily on the outboard runways and departures primarily on the inboard runways.

SPHF00047-5

Comment:

I don't know, there are so many things to say. But I wanted to add something for a man. He says, "During the construction phase, the current LAX capacity will be reduced as existing runway and terminals are raised."

What kind of safety and other problems will that situation engender?

Response:

The commentor is correct in anticipating the current LAX capacity would be reduced to a certain extent while the runways are under construction; however, on-airport construction projects, whether for improvement or maintenance are a usual and on-going circumstance. The potential reduction in capacity during construction cannot be avoided, but it would be temporary. The construction sequencing plan for Alternative D is intended to minimize the interruption in operations (see Section 2.10, Construction Sequencing Plan - Alternative D, of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum). The actions taken may include local or national air traffic flow control restrictions, amended flight schedules and scheduling of construction during non-peak hours. The LAX Airport Traffic Control Tower staff and LAWA Airport Operations personnel are very familiar with managing construction projects to ensure the safety of the flying public. A similar project was done at LAX in 1983 when Runway 24L was completely rebuilt with minimal impact. The air traffic management techniques employed at that time have been enhanced and are applied at airports throughout the nation. Once the construction period is over the capacity would revert back to previous levels, and the operational efficiency and safety levels would be increased from the proposed improvements.

In Alternative D, terminal capacity would be able to maintain the same level during the construction and remodeling of the terminal facilities. Please see Chapter 3, Section 2.10 of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum for more information.

SPHF00047-6

Comment:

Please show some sense and some consideration and really plan for the region, not just for the greedy city of Los Angeles.

Response:

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

SPHF00048 Joseph, Malcolm None Provided 8/23/2003

SPHF00048-1

Comment:

My name is Malcolm Joseph, and I live at 1076 Raymond Avenue, Long Beach, California 90804.

LAX has been a very large factor in the daily lives of all of us in Los Angeles County. Those who live near the airport have special concerns, even though the airport is an economic boom to us all. Obviously, traffic and noise have to be dealt with. And I think that the LAX Master Plan with Alternative D does that.

The traffic plan, with improvements being proposed for the intersections, extra lanes on La Cienega Boulevard and the improvement to the cargo delivery access roads will aid the flow of traffic in the airport's immediate area. But the greatest change to increased traffic will be the connection to the Green Line light rail transportation center.

Finally, a public transportation system would be available from flyaway parking facilities or stations where passengers will be dropped off at over 50 sites throughout Los Angeles County. Alternative D is my choice, and I hope the FAA and the City will approve the plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00049 Geben, Joseph Rogers, Geben and Christensen 8/23/2003

SPHF00049-1

Comment:

Mr. Joseph Geben; Rogers, Geben and Christensen. We're environmental community planners, Westchester, 40 years worth.

First of all, before I even start, I understand that the airport commissioners have rubber-stamped voluntarily taking land. I told them a year ago, two years ago they couldn't take no land because there is laws in the State of California that says they cannot say I'm going to take the land.

The airport comes after the people, after the people, after the businesses. Somebody lied. And I don't know where it was. I'd like to ask Mr. Stein who lied. Volunteered, none of the people volunteered. They had scalawags and carpet baggers run right through the lawns of these people's houses, and they gave them the old bologna, B. S.

The thing is is most of the people did not really volunteer. They volunteered under duress. And I'd like to -- they absolutely volunteered under duress. And we have to have an investigation of the city attorney who knew about it. And I told him about it that they couldn't take any land.

So they turned around and they went underneath the ceiling and said they volunteered. The people didn't volunteer. They had to say they volunteered because I told them they couldn't do it. It's illegal. Illegal to take land from people. And I'd like you to investigate it.

Maybe the district attorney might investigate it because something happened in the commissioner's office. They lied to the people. It is the people's land, for the people, by the people, so help you God. Patrick Henry said it. Lincoln said it. He gave up his life. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

You see, somebody lied in the commissioner's office, and I don't know whether the president or anybody else. They rubber-stamped volunteer. People didn't volunteer to sell the land. That's bologna. But I told them almost a year ago that it was illegal to take land. I want to know what's going to happen with that.

3. Comments and Responses

I mean, why does Mr. Stein turn around and say these people volunteered. These people didn't volunteer. They volunteered under duress. It's wrong.

Response:

As stated in the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, homes in Manchester Square area are being acquired through the existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program currently underway within the Airport/Belford and Manchester Square areas near the airport, in support of LAWA's ANMP. The program was instituted after LAWA received a high level of interest from those who reside in the area, which is subject to high noise levels. As noted in the Draft EIS/EIR, a Mitigated Negative Declaration was approved by the City of Los Angeles for the Manchester Square and Airport/Belford Voluntary Acquisition Program. The relocation of residences in the Manchester Square area has always been and will continue to be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Act, thereby minimizing community disruption, limiting adverse economic impacts and protecting human rights. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.1.2 regarding legality of LAWA's on-going Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program, and Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.2 regarding the acquisition's compliance with the Uniform Act.

SPHF00050 Ferruccio, John None Provided 8/23/2003

SPHF00050-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is John Ferruccio. That's F- e- r- r- u- c- c- i- o. I have lived in the city of Gardena for nearly 50 years.

LAX has provided a safe and efficient transportation for me and my family to other parts of the country and the world for many years. And I feel that most of the people here in this room have received the same service.

But improvements are overdue. Safety, security and the threat of terrorism are the most important concerns we all have in what happens at the airport. However, I also believe that jobs and the economy are equally important. Without a strong economy, Americans would be at the mercy of foreign interest and would be vulnerable to more attacks.

California and Los Angeles are important parts of our overall economic viability. And LAX has always been a large part of the regional economy. Over 300,000 jobs will be supported by the modernization plan for LAX. And it will generate billions of dollars into the regional economy and tens of thousands of dollars into the City of Los Angeles economy.

That is why I hope the recommendations to move forward on the Master Plan and Alternative D can be made soon. Waiting another six years for more rounds of hearings over redesign after redesign will hurt many working families in this area's economy.

I presently serve as a union pipe trades organizer, hopefully providing good working jobs for the Southern California area. I feel that this project would create a great opportunity for all the working people of our community.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00051 Kom, Tony None Provided 8/23/2003

SPHF00051-1

Comment:

My name is Tony Kom. I'm an environmental planner. I live at 3639 Roseview Avenue, Los Angeles 90065.

The LAX Master Plan spends \$ 9 billion dollars plus to tear down airport structures that are possibly not even yet paid for,

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to comments SPC00099-6 and SPC00162-5; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00099-6 and Response to Comment SPC00162-5.

SPHF00051-2

Comment:

concentrates airport congestion in a single vulnerable location,

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00051-3

Comment:

promotes traffic gridlock and provides no new rail transit access to LAX,

Response:

Comment noted. The traffic analysis and mitigation plan for Alternative D are summarized in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.3.1 and 4.3.2, and in Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

SPHF00051-4

Comment:

and would make LAX the most inconvenient airport in the world.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00051-5

Comment:

Tokyo, Seoul Korea, Hong Kong and even Washington, D. C. built new international airports far out from the city and kept their old airports for domestic airports only. That is a solution for Los Angeles as well.

We could have a new secure Los Angeles International Airport at Palmdale with all the built-in security features that are now proposed for LAX. You could have a tram from the Palmdale station into a security center and onto terminals and a tram back into parking areas and provide a lot of parking, 500 acres, 50- to 70,000 cars, 180 acres for bus and terminals and car rental lots. And we already have the existing Metrolink Line that goes from Los Angeles to Palmdale.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 which discusses several examples of failed attempts to build/develop airports that were too far from the city center, or attempted to split domestic and international operations that depended on shared connections. Where airports have been successfully developed many miles from the city, restrictions on or closure of the existing airport were required. Washington Dulles, Dallas/Ft. Worth, and Denver are the most recent examples. As a responsible public agency, LAWA will only develop Palmdale when demand can be demonstrated. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHF00051-6

Comment:

LAX could become the Los Angeles-Westchester domestic airport at LAX. Take no homes, that should reduce the number of flights. We could even have the same security facilities that are proposed in the current D Plan.

You could have a security building outside of LAX near Century and Aviation and the trams going in. If you're going to have inspections for vehicles, for truck vehicles, why not have inspections for all cars entering LAX and not have to tear down airport parking garages that are probably not even yet paid for.

We could have transit -- rail transit to all Los Angeles airports for much less money than this scheme proposes. Only 15 miles of new Metrolink, Metrorail would connect the Green Line to LAX all the way to Burbank and to the Antelope Valley line.

Only 12 miles to bring the Metrorail that now ends at Wilshire and Western down Crenshaw and then on the MTA owned right-of-way directly to a station at Aviation and Century, and then go on down and tie into the Green Line. We haven't been able to get the Green Line in. We shouldn't even try.

On the other end we could go from the end of the red line two miles --

Response:

Comment noted. As described in Chapter 1.1 of the Draft Master Plan Addendum - Policy and Planning Objectives, the first goal is to continue to satisfy regional demands for global air transport of passengers and cargo by adding new and optimizing existing facilities at LAX, along with distributing commercial service not essential to the LAX international gateway role to other airports in the region.

There would be no residential acquisition under Alternative D. The acquisition of homes in the Manchester Square area is voluntary and occurs under the Airport Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) with the cooperation of existing homeowners. This program is not a part of the LAX Master Plan.

As described in the Draft Master Plan Addendum in Chapter 2.2.8 - Ground Transportation Center (GTC) - all vehicles approaching the GTC would be closely monitored by video surveillance. The existing parking garages would be removed to make room for four new modern terminal facilities with improved safety, security, and efficiency.

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5.

SPHF00052 Garcia, Joe

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00052-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Joe Garcia. I'm a consulting engineer. I live at 23445 Glenridge Drive, Newhall, California.

I'm here as a citizen to just express my support of Alternative D for the following three reasons. One, it is consistent with a plan that Mayor Hahn committed to and the limitations that the LAWA staff had to adhere to.

Two, it, as indicated earlier by the representatives of the police department, represents and provides for significant security improvements that are sorely needed here.

And, three, it provides an efficient movement of passengers and vehicles. As a passenger in and out of LAX for over 30 years and having flown, like a number of speakers in the area in and out of other airports, I think we can all agree that these improvements are sorely needed here. It's time to stop waiting, stop stalling and let's get on with improving our airport.

3. Comments and Responses

Finally, as a principal of a small local minority owned consulting firm, I'm here to say to you that this project is significantly needed right now as a boost to our local economy and the business opportunities that will result from that.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00053 Davis, Andrea

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00053-1

Comment:

Hi. My name is Andrea Davis. And my husband and I are both residents and homeowners in Playa del Rey.

I'm coming here to tell you that I believe that creating jobs is a wonderful thing, and I think this airport, for all of our U. S. airports, we should have them as modern and maintained as possible. That's certainly wonderful.

My husband is a heavy consumer of air travel. He flies all the time. We bought the house in Playa because it was at the time very convenient. I don't know about the future, but I have to say that I must say no emphatically to Alternative D.

Mayor Hahn's PR machine keeps repeating that the \$ 9-billion-dollar plus Alternative D will be safer and more secure. However, experts from the RAND Corporation and a study requested by Congresswoman Jane Harman disagree. After studying the plan, they found the airport would, in fact, be less safe and less secure than the existing LAX.

In fact, the study concluded, modernization could be accomplished at a much lower cost than Alternative D. Concentrating all the travelers into one remote check-in just creates an even more attractive target for any terrorist activities.

We, the residents that surround LAX, we the travelers, we all will be put at tremendous risk if we allow Mayor Hahn to create one giant bull's-eye at what was once Manchester Square. It's not safer. It's not more secure. It's certainly not more convenient and it's unnecessarily expensive. Alternative D is not community planning, Mr. Mayor, and it's not good governance.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHF00054 Cope, Danna

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00054-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. I'm Danna Cope, D- a- n- n- a, C- o- p- e, in Westchester. I'll hand in the thing with the address.

While Alternative D is a definite improvement over Alternatives A, B and C, it does not achieve its stated purpose to provide safety and security. Alternative D would cost over \$ 9 billion dollars, exacerbate the traffic and air pollution problems, expand the boundaries of LAX and provide very little in mitigation measures.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments below. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic and air quality impacts associated with Alternative D in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and Section 4.6, Air Quality, respectively. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR presented a broad range of mitigation measures that were proposed to reduce or avoid environmental impacts associated with the Draft LAX Master Plan, including impacts associated with Alternative D. Please see Chapter 5, Environmental Action Plan, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, for a complete listing and description of mitigation measures proposed for the LAX Master Plan Alternatives.

Please also see Topical Response TR-HRA-4 regarding human health mitigation strategies, Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation, and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

SPHF00054-2

Comment:

By expanding LAX into the Manchester Square area, Alternative D would merely transfer the dangers from the facilities in the Central Terminal Area out into the community, thereby leaving the traveling public and the residents still at risk. Gathering a large number of people into one area would create a terrorist target, and that is what a Ground Transportation Center in Manchester Square would be. Concrete, metal and plastic would get protection, people would not.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPC00288-2 which discusses dispersion of people at the GTC.

SPHF00054-3

Comment:

Extending LAX boundaries into Manchester Square sends the message that LAWA intends to just keep expanding LAX, and it can handle all the Southern California traffic, no regional approach is needed. Other counties and communities should be taking on their share of air traffic, not told they can rely on LAX.

Response:

Under Alternative D, the capacity of LAX is limited to 78.9 million annual passengers. That is approximately the capacity of the existing facility. Locating the GTC (Ground Transportation Center) at Manchester Square is designed to improve the safety and security of LAX, but does not increase its passenger handling capacity. The acquisition of Manchester Square is a separate Program from the LAX Master Plan that is currently being implemented by LAWA and will continue to be implemented whether or not the LAX Master Plan is approved. As stated on page 4-96, in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR, the Voluntary Residential Acquisition and Relocation Program for the Manchester Square and Belford area was established based on interest from homeowners and residents who requested that LAWA purchase their properties in lieu of soundproofing.

SPHF00054-4

Comment:

There have been very few Category A runway incursions at LAX, certainly not enough to warrant a \$ 9-billion-dollar renovation which includes moving runways. Adequate safety precautions could be instituted with the cooperation of FAA, LAWA and the airlines.

Response:

The Category A runway incursion referenced by the commentator is classified by Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) as "the highest severity when extreme action is needed to avoid a collision or if a collision occurs." Five of the 38 runway incursions at LAX during the period of the 2002 FAA report

were in this category and none of them resulted in a collision. LAX ranked first as the airport that had the greatest number of runway incursions for the four-year period based on 2002 FAA Safety Runway Report. The goal of FAA is to raise awareness of runway incursions, identify solutions, and implement strategies to reduce their severity and frequency as well as the risk of a runway collision. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding runway incursion at LAX. Airport surface radar technology and airport infrastructure implementation at LAX are some of the strategies identified by FAA to help solve the problem. Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) has already implemented improvements to airfield lighting, taxiway marking, runway signage, and has sponsored on-going seminars on airfield familiarization with airport users. Taxiway system configuration is one of the key infrastructure methods to solving the problem. The purpose of moving runways is to gain enough separation for a center taxiway to enhance safe aircraft operations and reduce the potential for runway incursion.

SPHF00054-5

Comment:

Air traffic has not rebounded to pre-9-11 levels. This gives us the luxury of taking time to reexamine the assumptions previously made that air traffic would return to and increase from those levels. There is no reason to rush to prejudgment. There is time to explore more options on bringing other airports into compliance with a regional approach to air traffic.

As to jobs, we fully support jobs. We wish to keep the union strong here, but the jobs would be created at any regional airport or all regional airports. We do not have to jam everything into LAX and into our communities.

Response:

Comment noted. Air traffic demand is projected to return to pre-9-11 levels and resume growing at rates similar to previous forecasts.

SPHF00055 McCutcheon, Jim Republican Central Committee 8/23/2003

SPHF00055-1

Comment:

My name is Jim McCutcheon. I'm a resident of Westchester. And I am the Chairman of the Republican Central Committee here, a member of the Democrat Central Committee here also is in opposition to this airport, a big opposing organization.

So we have both republicans and democrat central committees in opposition to the airport. The reason is that is a big boondoggle. It is not necessary when we could regionalize the airports for the same money and put in mass transit at the same time, or we could get you at the federal level joining the state and local officials to take over El Toro Air Force Base, which has a 10,000-foot runway eight and a half feet deep which would be ground up into concrete, sawdust or whatever you want to call it, dust.

If -- it was built over 50 years by us taxpayers to defend America. It's a good airport. However, it was to be abandoned by the Navy and at that time republican for civil service as an airport. And I can't understand why we destroy, grind up the best airport in this area, five times larger than LAX, 38 miles before you go into the first house going east.

And not like LAX where you have all of the schools and the people living under the airport, the noise and other pollution, because there you've got to go 5,000 feet up into air and go in the wrong direction before you go to the first house.

So that would be a perfect airport and within the purview of the Federal Government who owns the airport, which is giving it to Irvine who says they want to turn it into a great park, which will spend billions of dollars cleaning it up because of what's underneath of it, which could be cleaned up over a longer period of time a lot cheaper.

3. Comments and Responses

And so it's a travesty on the taxpayers and it's a big boondoggle, and it's an insult to the intelligence of Americans to think we have to expand this airport when we can't move traffic up and down the freeway now.

I guess last year it was 56 million passengers. We're talking about going to 78. And we're realistically thinking what it is, is it is going to be over 100 million passengers. And you can't move them now, and there is no plan for mass transit. And it could all be done with the 9 million -- probably with 4 or 5 of the 9 billion, I mean.

And so what we need to do is get on with the plan that's good for the taxpayers as well as everybody else.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County's vote on Measure W, the City of Los Angeles' attempt to gain the ability to operate El Toro as a part of LAWA airport system, and Orange County/Irvine plans for multi-use of the former El Toro property.

SPHF00056 Hefner, Roy

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00056-1

Comment:

Roy Hefner, H- e- f- n- e- r, 6548 West 80th Place, Westchester, 90045. Gentlemen, we meet again.

I would like to correct the gentleman from Princeton. Wearing a red shirt does not affiliate me with any particular organization. The people in yellow probably do not want me to belong to their organization.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00056-2

Comment:

The other item was the executive secretary who from a labor union lived in Torrance indicated there has been no attempt made by any other city group to try to improve upon the possible EIR of the airport.

And we take issue with that because there is a strong group of residents in Westchester and Playa del Rey that composed what we call Alternative E. And it was presented to the blue ribbon committee of the Mayor and request they investigate that, but they chose not to do so for various reasons. So I did want to clarify that.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPC00035-4.

SPHF00056-3

Comment:

The other thing, the Mayor has come out and has said on more than one occasion that LAX is safe. The board of airport commissioners has come out and said LAX is safe. However, in every single comparison in the EIR that compares the no action, no project with Alternative D, Alternative D is obviously superior.

So I assume we must be operating in an unsafe neighborhood and an unsafe airport. The word "enhanced security" that word "enhanced," I don't really know what it means. However, it is something that can be used both pro and con.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The development of Alternative D was an iterative process which included the consideration of many concepts, including an existing CTA security modification analysis. Please see Appendix H, Concept Development, of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum for a discussion of the different concepts considered during the development of Alternative D.

Please see Response to Comment SPC00035-4 regarding the residents' concept, Alternative E.

SPHF00057-2

Comment:

And you should have been considering data more recent than 1996.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00022-12 and Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues.

SPHF00057-3

Comment:

I also want to take issue with the person who made the comment that the neighbors of the airport want to see it closed down. The neighbors of the airport are not totally opposed to the airport. We are not just nimbus. I, in fact, like living near the airport in some respects. It's very convenient. I travel a lot on business.

But it is also very problematic in other respects, the noise, the pollution, the soot on my house, my car and my patio.

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.

SPHF00057-4

Comment:

No, what the neighbors of the airport are opposed to is the expansion of the airport. And Mayor Hahn has promised us it won't expand, but Alternative D will enable that expansion. And we are opposed to that.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level of 78.9 million annual passengers (MAP), which is comparable to the 78.7 MAP projected to occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. As such, Alternative D is not considered to represent an expansion of LAX. The other build alternatives (Alternatives A, B, and C) are designed to serve a future activity level substantially more than the No Action/No Project Alternative, and therefore represent an expansion of LAX. Alternative D is consistent with the Mayor's commitment to no expansion of LAX.

SPHF00057-5

Comment:

To limit the security risks, you really need to disperse air traffic throughout the region instead of giving terrorists a spruced up, more compact, more inviting target. I agree that a terrorist taking LAX out would

be devastating to the region, but it would be less devastating if there were other airports that were already equipped to handle that traffic.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding other airports in the region.

SPHF00057-6

Comment:

To respond to those people who say Palmdale is too far away for people to travel to or too far away to develop, I say look at the experience of Dulles Airport. When Dulles was built, there was nothing near there. In fact, I wish I would have bought property in that area at the time. Now, it's the center of a thriving commercial district, and building it brought substantial numbers of jobs to that area. So if the point -- the point I want to make with Palmdale is, if you build it, they will come.

Response:

The success of Dulles was dependent on the restrictions placed on operations at Washington National. Topical Response TR-RC-1 cites several examples of where "build it, they will come" did not come true. Millions of dollars have been wasted developing airports where demand did not exist. As a responsible public agency, LAWA will only develop Palmdale when demand can be demonstrated. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

SPHF00057-7

Comment:

I also have very substantial concerns about the 12-year construction project that is envisioned with Alternative D and the impact of that project on the surrounding neighborhoods. And part of my concern comes from the fact that the airport cannot even finish a small landscaping project like the one they started two years ago on Waterview. If they can't do that, how can we expect the airport to do this job properly and on time?

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00058 Carpio, Sparky None Provided 8/23/2003

SPHF00058-1

Comment:

Sparky Carpio, 407 Exten, Inglewood 90302. I'm quoting from the Supplement to the Draft EIR/ EIS.

"As of October 31st, 2002, progress in acquiring properties under the Voluntary Residential Acquisition/ Relocation Program for Manchester Square and Belford indicates that 62 percent of the property owners (351 properties and 1130 dwelling units) have volunteered to participate in Acquisition Program."

But what about the other 38 percent? What about the people who have lived there for over 50 years and don't want to move? I guess no one from Los Angeles World Airports or L. A. City really cares, but then, I guess, why should they?"

3. Comments and Responses

trade association for minority and women who do business and who work at airports throughout the United States.

And I'm here today to speak in favor of Alternative D. I don't think any of us, if we were planning LAX today, would choose the current location. However, I think all of us would have to admit that the current location is a strategic location for all of us who use the airport.

LAX is one of the leading entry points into the United States for Pacific Rim passengers as well as cargo. We operate four concessions at international terminal, and we know that the use of LAX is very important -- the location of LAX is very important to international travelers who are accessing our downtown area and our other corridors of business.

So we think it's very important we move forward with Alternative D if LAX is going to remain competitive with the other airports that serve the Pacific Rim nations. I can tell you from personal experience that San Francisco, Seattle would love to have the competitive position that LAX has. And a lot of it has to do with the current location of our airport.

I also think that although LAX is safe, I can tell you of someone who has either worked there or has been an employer there since 1986 that there are a number of safety considerations that are addressed in Alternative D that would make all of us more secure as citizens here in LAX.

One thing I didn't mention at the beginning is my offices are in Westchester. I've been in Westchester since early 1990. We employ 70 people who live in the Inglewood/ Hawthorne area. I don't presume to speak for my employees. I think their union and others have spoken well on their behalf.

But I can tell you that all of us are in favor of it. It's not simply jobs. It's that we realize the importance of LAX as an economic generator for this region. Besides the Harbor, there is nothing more important to our economy than LAX.

And I think the plan that is currently proposed, and I won't use the word "enhanced" since that word has been negatively spoken to, but it is going to improve, I think, the quality of life for all of us, and it will certainly improve our economy.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00060 Mego, Gordon

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00060-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Gordon Michael Mego, 4535 West 141st Street. I've been a resident since October of 1952.

I've seen a lot of changes in the South Bay area and in the Los Angeles region. And I -- you know, being an aerospace engineer working at various companies including here at nearby El Segundo, Rockwell International during the 1980s on the B 1 program there and Weapons Systems Division and, of course, also mentioning that my father worked at American Airlines as the senior lead mechanic and thus he was a union member.

There are four aspects I really want to kind of touch on in that really the Hahn proposal does not really satisfy those so-called goals that they are trying to achieve.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

And, of course, perhaps as it has been repeated that, you know, there is many, many jobs, not only permanent -- I mean, not only temporary jobs of which I represent and our other sister trades out there, but permanent jobs.

If we want to keep our L. A. economically strong, then we better think about it. With all due respect to the concerns of other people, believe me, we do respect their concerns. But, nevertheless, we must see the future of what is upon us when it comes to L. A. And, yes, we also support later on the one in Palmdale.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00062 Eisen, Bill

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00062-1

Comment:

Welcome. Good afternoon. My name is Bill Eisen. I'm a resident of Manhattan Beach. I agree with a recently released county report finding that Mayor Hahn's new Alternative D plan misrepresents a number of gates that would be available for aircraft.

And according to the county report, Hahn's plan would redesign the gates to allow more capacity and improve the airfield to accommodate larger aircraft. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out that Hahn's plan is laying the groundwork for a massive expansion of LAX in order to accommodate twice as many passengers as the airport accommodates today.

Response:

Comment noted. In 2015, Alternative D would provide 153 contact gate positions and No Action/No Project Alternative would have 163 gates including 48 remote positions. Alternative D would require the use of fewer gates to achieve the same passenger level due to the higher utilization rates of contact gates at a level of service that exceeds the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Section 2.2, Aircraft Gates (subsection 2.2.7), of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum for more information.

Alternative D does not increase airfield capacity. As described in Appendix E of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum (subsection 1.4.1), the runways would operate similar to the existing airfield with arrival operations primarily on the outboard runways and departures primarily on the inboard runways. Simultaneous approaches to the outboard and inboard runways on the same runway complex are conducted only under visual approach procedures. Neither the north or south runway complex in Alternative D meet the centerline separation requirements to conduct parallel approaches during non-visual weather conditions and would operate the same as the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00021-3 for more information.

SPHF00062-2

Comment:

There are, of course, alternatives to the massive expansion of LAX. For example, some of the \$ 9 billion dollars that Hahn proposes to spend on the expansion could instead be used to purchase all or a portion of the El Toro Marine Air Base in order to accommodate the hundreds and thousands of Orange County residents that are currently using LAX.

Common sense tells us that a project should make sense other than to provide construction jobs and a doubtful increase in airport security. And common sense tells us that our community is better served by a regional transportation plan which enables airport service to be distributed among more than one airport; and, therefore, making air travel more convenient to the community.

Response:

The City of Los Angeles does not have any authority to construct and operate a civilian airport at the former MCAS El Toro. The Department of the Navy, the owner of the closed installation, has stated the

3. Comments and Responses

base will be reused for non-aviation purposes consistent with local Orange County Measure W. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County's vote on Measure W, the City of Los Angeles' attempt to gain the ability to operate El Toro as a part of LAWA airport system, and Orange County/Irvine plans for multi-use of the former El Toro property.

SPHF00062-3

Comment:

Moreover, expanding LAX beyond its current capacity forces an unmitigated environmental disaster on those of us currently living near the airport. Recent studies recently conducted by the Texas Transportation Institute shows that the portion of the 405 Freeway near the airport is currently the busiest section of freeway in the entire country.

Obviously, more passengers accessing LAX will mean even more automobile traffic on the 405 and local streets.

Response:

Alternative D does not expand LAX beyond its No Action/No Project capacity. The impacts on I-405 are summarized in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Sections 4.3.2, in Technical Report S-2b, and in Topical Response TR-ST-2.

SPHF00062-4

Comment:

And it will mean more air pollution and even more congestion of already congested air space around LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please refer to Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding airspace capacity in the Los Angeles Basin.

SPHF00062-5

Comment:

Not long ago LAX was certified for only 40 million annual passengers. Since that time, the surrounding streets and freeways have become even more congested. There is absolutely no logical reason to expand LAX beyond its current capacity, especially when viable alternatives exist.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the historical growth of LAX, including increases from the 40 million annual passenger (MAP) activity level. It should be noted that Alternative D is designed to serve a future (2015) level of airport activity of 78.9 MAP which is comparable to the activity level of 78.7 MAP of the No Action/No Project Alternative. As such, Alternative D is not considered to represent an expansion of LAX. The other build alternatives (Alternatives A, B, and C) are designed to serve a future activity level substantially more than that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and therefore represent an expansion of LAX.

SPHF00062-6

Comment:

If Mayor Hahn thinks otherwise, I suggest that he put the issue to a vote of the people.

Response:
Comment noted.

SPHF00063 Hamilton, Patricia None Provided 8/23/2003

SPHF00063-1

Comment:
Okay. Greetings, gentlemen. The topic, L. A.'s current plan for expansion. Los Angeles, 90045.

Okay. Technology for the future cannot be predicted at this time. So the cost involved to build the new airport plan cannot be estimated today, which is only a rough estimate.

Response:
Comment noted.

SPHF00063-2

Comment:
Our life here in the United States changed on 9-11. Security and time is of the essence. The RAND Corporation and the airlines have given some helpful information for modernizing the airport.

Response:
Comment noted.

SPHF00063-3

Comment:
Nine years and millions of dollars have already been spent on non-practical plans without taking into consideration the big picture, a regional solution. To enlarge LAX on the small and confined acreage, including off-site check-in facility in the metropolitan area should not be an option.

For serious safety, security, efficiency, convenience, the City of Los Angeles should follow the lead of the major cities in the United States, Europe and Asia by using larger acreages outside of the metropolitan areas.

Los Angeles already owns larger acreages in Palmdale and Ontario. These air fields should be developed and enlarged with connecting Metrolink Rail Transportation systems to accommodate the new jumbo jets that will hold 500 passengers that are already in the planning stages.

More people's lives could be spared in the event of the type of catastrophe that has already occurred on 9-11 in New York City.

Response:
Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports. The master plans will recommend improvements to meet the projected demand. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail plans for the region.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHF00064 Davis, Cresia

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00064-1

Comment:

My name is Cresia Green Davis. My address is 930 South 3rd Avenue, City of Inglewood. And I am also a member of the Inglewood Unified School District, Board of Directors, even though I'm not here in the official capacity, I'm here as a community resident.

But before I start speaking, today I just happened to be breezing the Daily Breeze and it says coming up tomorrow, Sunday, 100 miles north of Los Angeles the airport in Mohave reflects the continuing slump at LAX, and the sad state of the United States airline industry in general. So maybe we should read that tomorrow.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHF00064-2

Comment:

I am here because LAX expansion will greatly, greatly impact the city of Inglewood. We have 18,000 students who attend our schools in Inglewood. One of our schools sits right here on the slow-05 Freeway. It's called Oak Street. That's one of the proposals that the previous report wanted to take out and put in an on-ramp for people coming down the slow-05 so they could get to the airport.

I'm telling you, if I had known that the unions were going to show up in force today -- and I do appreciate unions, my dad is in a union. I have ten brothers, eight of them are union guys. I would have had the students from Inglewood Unified School District come here in T-shirts saying, "Let us get a fair education."

They have airplanes that are flying over their heads. We are losing instructional time. For every ten minutes, we are losing four minutes of instructional time for our kids. That's not fair for our kids.

What the pros say that the most wanted jobs will be needed in the future? They are airline mechanics, airline pilots. They have to do with the industry. Let us educate our kids. It's not fair that our kids will be impacted and not get the education. They are already talking about our schools -- most of the employees, I dare to say, do not let their kids go to school in Inglewood because they have such a negative connotation to our schools, but our children graduate and matriculate at colleges such as Berkeley, such as Harvard, Yale, all over this United States. Give our kids a chance to have a fair education.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00035-36 regarding noise impacts on the Inglewood Unified School District. Under LAWA staff's preferred Alternative D, three schools would be newly exposed to 65 CNEL noise levels or experience an increase of 1.5 dB or greater within the 65 CNEL compared to 1996 conditions. As stated in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.8), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1 schools determined to be significantly impacted by aircraft noise levels would be eligible for soundproofing to applicable interior noise level standards or relocation under the ANMP, excluding schools with existing aviation easements, as described in Response to Comment AL00035-23.

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 analyzed lost instructional time in terms of significant noise impacts that result in classroom disruption. The data presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR indicated a maximum loss of instructional time to schools within the Inglewood Unified School District of less than three minutes per school day under 1996 baseline conditions and less than 9 minutes per school day under Alternative D. These findings indicate substantially less in the way of classroom disruption than stated

by the commentor. While the commentor suggests an approximately 40 percent loss of instructional time per day, the data presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR shows a maximum loss of approximately 0.62 percent instructional time per day under 1996 baseline conditions and 1.8 percent under Alternative D (based on an 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. school day). As shown on Table S31 in Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, within the Inglewood Unified School District, Oak Street Elementary School would be exposed to the greatest number of minutes per school day that exceed 84 dBA. Noise levels at Oak Street Elementary School would exceed 84 dBA a total of 2.7 minutes per school day under 1996 baseline conditions, 3.8 minutes per school day under Year 2000 conditions, 4.7 minutes under the No Action/No Project Alternative, and 8.6 minutes under Alternative D. As shown on Table S32 of the Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, no schools within the Inglewood Unified School District are exposed to noise levels that exceed 94 dBA. As listed in Response to Comment AL00035-36, under Alternative D, three schools in the Inglewood Unified School District would be newly exposed to high single event or cumulative noise levels that result in classroom disruption. Mitigation Measures MM-LU-1, MM-LU-3, and MM-LU-4 provide 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.

SPHF00064-3

Comment:

I'm going say a nimbi for Inglewood Unified School District. Not in our backyard. We don't want the traffic. We don't want the pollution. We don't want the illnesses that's going to be caused by major traffic.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to schools in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.27, Schools, 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 Appendices D and G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14, and 17 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

SPHF00064-4

Comment:

Take it to Palmdale. Take it to Ontario. Take it to El Toro. They will have jobs. They will have to travel to those jobs. Let them go there. Let our kids have a future.

Let them build some of these airports. Let them work on the proposed -- on traffic that -- traffic lines that you're going to be building around to make sure the airports are there for the other people in the community.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA only controls the operations and potential improvements at LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Other jurisdictions are responsible for developing the other regional airports. Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. Master plan updates are currently underway for both Ontario and Palmdale airports. The master plans will recommend improvements to meet the projected demand. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding the elimination of the proposed conversion of El Toro to a commercial service airport. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX. For further information regarding the role of the LAX Master Plan in a regional approach to meeting demand, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1. Also, please see Topical Responses TR-RC-1 and TR-RC-5 regarding other airports in the region generally, and the airports at Ontario and Palmdale specifically.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHF00064-5

Comment:

Do not hold the City of Inglewood hostage. Do not hold the kids who cannot vote, who do not have a job. Most of them come from single parent families. Our kids qualify for free lunches because their income in their family is not high. Give them a chance to become something in the society. Do not impact our schools.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments SPHF00064-2 and AL00035-36 regarding noise impacts on the Inglewood Unified School District. Also see Response to Comment AL00035-23 regarding aviation easements, prior noise mitigation payments, and other provisions of the "Settlement Agreement" which resolve land use incompatibility and aircraft noise mitigation issues associated with airport operations and the Inglewood Unified School District. See Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

SPHF00065 Carpio, Cecil

None Provided

8/23/2003

SPHF00065-1

Comment:

Cecil Carpio from Inglewood.

"LAX noise variance, Number 1, 11 minutes after midnight; weird landing flight path into the south complex; downwind east leg of route followed by short turnover the new Manchester Square."

Did you all know there is a new Manchester Square east of Crenshaw? Pretty interesting how the planes are making that short turn right over that square. "Continued on a sharp downslope to south complex."

I'm impacted by the operations of the north complex. I'm on the north side of Florence about two blocks away from La Brea.

"12: 16: 00" -- we're still talking midnight -- "Landing jet loud comes in through to the south complex." I can hear operations from the south complex. Okay?

Number 3, "Midnight 38: 37 another short turn over the new Manchester Square." What are you all doing? "Midnight 39: 12, wrap it up baby as the airline pilot comes in to arrive at the north complex gunning it. Must be cargo."

Number 5, "Midnight 41: 41, another jet landing. Noise not so loud, but that's because it's heading to the south complex." Okay. This is after midnight. When are we supposed to get our sleep? Damn it.

Number 6, "Midnight 49: 45, another jet jars my peace."

Number 7, "So I skipped a while, like an hour because I wanted to have sex and I didn't want coitus interruptus. Okay. But around 2: 00 o'clock in the morning, I got back to it. And I hear the jet as it makes a short turn over new Manchester Square to the south complex."

So, okay, I'm logging all these things sitting in my driveway. All right. And I'm watching the flight path so that it's not just about me in my house hearing this, but I'm watching it. I'm at an advantage in that respect.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor is seeing and hearing westerly arrivals to LAX during the nighttime hours when over-ocean procedures would be in effect. LAWA has a policy of preferred operating procedures that call for over-ocean procedures to be used at night when practicable. However, during

3. Comments and Responses

certain weather conditions it is necessary for aircraft to continue arriving in a westerly flow. 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. For additional information on nighttime operations at night, please see Topical Response TR-N-5. LAWA has evaluated sleep awakenings and potential mitigation actions for those effects in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Additionally, Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Manchester Square area referred by the commentor in South Los Angeles was a proposed development by Vidal Sassoon that was supported by Maxine Waters. It was a mixed-use project that included a supermarket, a school and community center with various retail commercial uses and housing. The project boundaries were generally Manchester Blvd on the south, 84th Street on the north, Vermont Ave on the west and the alley east of Vermont on the east. There is no official designation of a community, district or neighborhood entitled Manchester Square in that location. The neighborhood designation for that general area is Vermont Knolls.

SPHF00066 Morrison, Nancy- None Provided 8/23/2003
Gene

SPHF00066-1

Comment:

Thank you, gentlemen. I'm Nancy-Gene W. Morrison. I am one person and I am a woman. The last time I spoke to you, I have been receiving mail that's all addressed with part of my name as mister.

But I am here to remind everyone that at the millennium, LAX was the number one target for the United States and the world for terrorism. Why? Because all our eggs are in one basket. We seem to have a very short memory about this. We need to do something about a regional approach, and not continue to put even more eggs in one basket.

If security and TSA inspection is going to be random at the site at Alternative D for the Ground Transportation Center, if there is random inspection there, then there is really no safety there. And, again, all passengers are going to be in one area, again, even more passengers and they are -- we are, again, going to have all our eggs in one basket.

We need to work toward a regional plan, and we need to -- we have the time now since the airline traffic is down, as the article that's coming out in the Daily Breeze tomorrow is going to state, according to the teaser that was quoted earlier.

So please think about a regional plan and overall safety and not having all our eggs in one basket.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

SPHF00067 Parrish, C None Provided 8/23/2003

SPHF00067-1

Comment:

Thank you. My name is C. L. Parrish. I live at 9606 Hindry Avenue. I'm one of the last survivors of the persons in Manchester Square.

I'm a laborer. I've held three union cards in my time, but I have to tell you that my constitutional rights and those of my neighbors in Manchester Square are paramount to anything.

3. Comments and Responses

The mayor would have you believe that the Manchester Square persons and those of Belford have voluntarily left their homes. The Mayor would have you believe that 9,000 people voluntarily gave up their homes in order to accommodate noise from the jets.

Nine thousand people were willing to walk away according to the Mayor. Nine thousand people were lined up and stripped of their constitutional rights. Their constitutional rights is that of the 5th Amendment and the 14th Amendment, those who guarantee that the state would not take private property for public use. The Mayor had lied to you, the FAA, to the citizens of Manchester Square. The community is now vaporized, and to the public.

He said that this is a voluntarily acquisition, and under that voluntary acquisition there are no rights. LAX sealed the fate of Manchester Square residents by having their hit man, the Board of Airport Commissioners, headed by President Stein, deny those same targeted 9,000 people in Manchester Square and Belford areas, denied them soundproofing for what was supposed to be a voluntary noise mitigation process, noise mitigation by jet noise, but yet those Belford people in that geographical area, Manchester Square, was denied soundproofing by LAX.

How can this happen in the United States of America when we're fighting abroad for the rights of others, when the Mayor can run rough shod over the citizens of Westchester, those existing, formerly existing in Manchester Square. I'm the last survivor and I'm here. I don't have 9,000 people behind me because they are gone.

Our rights as citizens are paramount to any Master Plan. If the Mayor can lie and say that 9,000 people were willing to go away, because this was not part of the Master Plan. He said Manchester Square was not -- Jack Graham from LAX said it; Manchester Square is not part of the Master Plan. Therefore, the Mayor could not say he needed this land.

If you look at the EIR study, Manchester Square is the focal point. It is the most integral part of Alternative D and the Master Plan. That was the lie by the Mayor.

LAX knew this. Mr. Ritchie knew this. This is why President Stein would laugh when the residents of Manchester Square appealed to him for their rights, their constitutional rights. He laughed. Now we know why.

Response:

The relocation of residences in the Manchester Square area has always been and will continue to be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Act, thereby minimizing community disruption, limiting adverse economic impacts and protecting human rights. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.1.2 regarding legality of LAWA's on-going Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program. Please also see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.4 regarding the purpose of the Ground Transportation Center in Manchester Square under Alternative D.

SPHF00068 Sambrano, Diane None Provided 8/23/2003

SPHF00068-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Diane Sambrano. Today we heard an assortment of presentations. We had the unions with their great backers say "Yeah, yeah, we love jobs." And yet it struck me as that young lady just sat down. Somehow I don't remember the great American dream is to have a job.

The great American dream that we promote everywhere is to have a home and a house you can call your own. So our unions are saying, and one of them so boldly told me, "I don't give a rip about your home. I want a job."

So I'd have to ask what profit of man to have a job if he loses his home? Where is he going to go home and lay his head? You heard from Ms. Carpio. She gets the north runway traffic. Her pains are from midnight on. I'm on the south runway. I have the same kinds of logs, except mine are from 3: 05, 3: 15, 3: 18, 3: 29, 3: 45, 4: 05, 4: 15, 4: 19, 4: 26, and on and on.

We get no sleep. Our quality of life has been reduced to nothing. And you wonder why we're cranky. Try going a couple of years without consistent sleep. It will do it to you.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00065-1 regarding nighttime operations and sleep disturbance.

SPHF00068-2

Comment:

But you know, someone had a great phrase they didn't get to use. So I'll take the liberty. This plan is building the airport of tomorrow based on yesterday's traffic. Isn't that great? How far did you think Disney would go if you said there is a great big beautiful tomorrow. We're just building on the plans of yesterday. Safety, security, jobs, there is no safety. There is no security in this plan. It's a few jobs.

At the end of building time, those jobs will vaporize. And in the meantime, just as this young lady's home and all of her neighbors were vaporized, our quality of life will, too.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and safety impacts in Section 4.24.3, Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 2, 3, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As indicated on page 4-298 in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under Alternative D, there would be a decline in direct LAX-related jobs in the Los Angeles Region over the planning period due to productivity increases. However, when the direct employment impact is combined with indirect and induced jobs, the total employment impact on the regional economy by 2015 would equate to about 629,000 jobs. During the initial years of the Master Plan under Alternative D, employment growth similar to that projected for the other alternatives would occur. Refer to Technical Report S-3 for further discussion. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security, and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

SPHF00068-3

Comment:

It's really kind of sad we're at a point where everyone is going toward emotionalism. Thank goodness we have young people still coming up like Sparky who will deal with the EIR and what is actually in it, because only then can you see what we've been pointing out.

It's the residents of Westchester with their assorted degrees came out here and said, as a civil engineer, as a planning person, as an aerospace techno person, I've looked at the plan and it has serious flaws.

I would hope that when we look at the EIR/ EIS, we will look at those serious flaws. We want to impose upon the people of this community because we aren't about 5- or 6,000 who work. We are about 120,000 who live or try to, another 100,000 over here who try to live under the control of a noisy and greedy administration.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

SPHR00001 Spaulding, John

None Provided

10/20/2003

SPHR00001-1

Comment:

Good evening. I'm John Spaulding. My office address is 150 East Corson, C-o-r-s-o-n, Pasadena, California. I am also a resident of Pasadena, California. And I have been involved in these hearings since 1997 since we've started into this process. I think it is very important we move forward so that we retain our place as the best airport in the world, and I think we need to do this.

I'm here to testify on behalf of Alternative D because it is the best plan for the City of Los Angeles. This plan will provide 49,000 construction jobs. And with the budget cuts and layoffs pending, these jobs will help stimulate the regional economy and keep people working. Simply, I support Alternative D of the LAX Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHR00002 Slawson, Richard

**Los Angeles Building &
Construction Trades Council**

10/20/2003

SPHR00002-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Richard Slawson. I'm the Executive Secretary of the Los Angeles and Orange Counties Building and Construction Trades Council. Our council represents craft workers and their families, over 130,000 that live all in the area of Los Angeles surrounding the airport as well as the other communities in Los Angeles and Orange County.

I wanted to provide further testimony tonight. Mayor Hahn has suggested Alternative D. I believe this plan will provide the security design that is needed to satisfy the needs of passengers in the airlines. With the Central Terminal Area being accessed by tram and foot traffic only, the chances of a terrorist action will be almost eliminated completely. The security message that this plan sends will help to bring the flying public back to the airlines and improve our economy. The overall plan fits well into the area and will improve traffic and noise concerns of all the residents in the communities surrounding LAX.

I noted in the information that has been provided by LAWA to the communities, as well the mayor's commitment to restrict the annual passengers under this design to 78.9 million lives up to the commitment that was made, I guess it is three years ago now when he was elected mayor and, also, limits LAX and the surrounding communities' responsibility for handling aircraft traffic and then allows other communities to take up the slack.

We all know that we need a regional approach to our airports throughout the area, and eventually Palmdale and March Air Force Base. Ontario will probably also be able to take up some of the traveling needs of the traveling public as well as the cargo handling that is necessary to keep our economy going here.

We believe in this particular alternative. We think it is the best one and hope that the LAWA and FAA will continue the process and improve this Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHR00003 Kitchen, Theo

**Los Angeles Convention and
Visitors Bureau**

10/20/2003

SPHR00003-1

Comment:

Thank you very much. My name is Theo Kitchen. I'm with the Los Angeles Convention of Visitor's Bureau. Our office address would be 333 South Hope Street, 18th Floor. That is Los Angeles, California 90071. And as I said, I'm with the L.A. Convention of Visitor's Bureau. We represent the tourism industry, an 11.3-billion-dollar industry to the County of Los Angeles and also L.A. County's second largest employer providing some 255,000 residents with jobs.

We're definitely supportive of this measure. We think that the core strategies will improve safety and security and also maintain L.A.'s position as an international gateway, position which is fairly important because our competitors, being San Francisco, Vegas, Minneapolis and New York, are all increasing their own airport facilities, which means that we potentially lose market share. If we lose international travelers, that translates into a loss of jobs as well as a loss of tax revenues.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHR00004 Alpern, Ken

Friends of the Green Line

10/20/2003

SPHR00004-1

Comment:

Hello again. Good evening. Ken Alpern, Co-chair, Friends of the Green Line. There has been a lot of learning on our part and I think on your part as sort of the processes and the legality of construction and traffic mitigation that has come along, but this is the three realistic goals that we're going to present to the City Council of L.A. and the press. This is what we've already begun to pursue.

We are very much in favor of many of the features of Alternative D. We want this to be the best alternative possible. Specific goals for LAX reconfiguration plans, Green Line connections, Friends of the Green Line has concluded as its realistic goals to ask the City of L.A. and L.A. World Airports to not prevent LAX rail access from the north and/or to prevent the Green Line from proceeding north beyond LAX.

Where Friends of the Green Line now stands with respect to the Green Line and L.A World Airports traffic mitigation as part of its Final EIR is that non-automobile related traffic measures should include, one, a written promise for LAWA to fund the necessary trench west of Aviation Boulevard along the MTA Harbor subdivision right away to allow the Green Line to proceed north from the current Aviation/Imperial Green Line station without interfering with LAX radar beacons and/or other electromagnetic operations associated with LAX.

Two, a written promise for LAWA to fund and construct its final Ground Transportation Center whether it is at Manchester Square or anywhere else in a manner that allows for a future Green Line station. LAX found passengers from the north, like the West Side and the valley. A large component of LAX users should not have to overshoot LAX if there is a northern rail access to reach the future Intermodal Transit Center at Aviation/Imperial in order to connect with the Central Terminal Area via the LAX people mover. To overshoot LAX by a mile and then go all the way back does not make sense to the MTA, the planners that I've spoken to, and I'm sure you understand where the West Side might feel the same way.

Three, a written promise for LAWA to fund and staff any future preliminary engineering for a Green Line that connects Westchester and the West Side in a manner that does not preclude the Green Line from

SPHR00005-3**Comment:**

Airport security issues: Supporters of the proposed project to construct a remote passenger check-in facility claim that the facility is necessary to improve the safety and security of LAX and prevent terrorist attacks at LAX. Theoretically, diverting all vehicular traffic to remote parking structures and the remote passenger check-in facility would protect the Central Terminal Area from car bombs.

The RAND Corporation conducted a study of the proposed remote passenger check-in facility, which was released May 14th, 2003. The study concluded that the proposed project would not significantly improve the security of LAX. The study also concluded that concentrating passengers in the proposed remote passenger check-in facility could make the check-in facility the likely target of a terrorist attack.

Finally, the study concluded that concentrating several airport functions in the remote passenger check-in facility could exacerbate the effects of an attack on airport operations.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHR00005-4**Comment:**

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR makes the astounding claim that Alternative D would not displace any residents. Instead, the Supplement predicts that 2,500 houses and apartments will be acquired by the residents relocated under LAWA's existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program, through which LAWA may acquire property and relocate residents on a voluntary basis in order to mitigate the impact of airport noise.

The Supplement then concludes that Alternative D would not require the acquisition of any additional dwelling units or the relocation of any additional residents. This claim is especially ironic given the fact that several Manchester Square residents and apartment owners have already said that they would not leave their homes voluntarily.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00001-4 regarding the use of Manchester Square in Alternative D.

SPHGH00001 Cohen, Roger**Air Transport Association****10/22/2003****SPHGH00001-1****Comment:**

Good evening. My name is Roger Cohen, C-o-h-e-n. I am managing director of state and local government affairs for the Air Transport Association in Washington, D.C. We will be submitting detailed comments for the record.

(The comments were not submitted at this hearing.)

Let me take a moment to thank everybody and explain who ATA is. ATA and our 23-member airlines provide 95 percent of these scheduled service both passenger and cargo here in the United States. We and our member airlines share the same goal of everyone else here in Southern California, and that is to maintain a safe, secure and efficient LAX so that it continues to be the community's number one economic asset.

3. Comments and Responses

ATA's purpose for appearing this evening is to emphasize the importance of the LAX Master Plan to the airline industry and to the national aviation system. Our goal is that at the end of the Master Plan process, LAX not only is an efficient cost-effective airport, but that by working with all parties we can make LAX great once again.

Doing nothing is not an option. And there are several improvements long overdue and should begin immediately, including immediately undertake the south airfield runway improvements. We must alleviate the roadway congestion, and we must upgrade the security related infrastructure.

Going forward there are several principles that we at ATA will focus on. First is flexibility. And the airline industry is rapidly changing and has undergone more radical upheaval in the last two years than it has in its 75-year history. Future customer patterns, security rules, and so forth, cannot be predicted. So LAX should not lock into any plan that forecloses future options.

Response:

Comment noted. LAX Master Plan Alternative D would provide facilities, such as the GTC, which would remain dynamic in their ability to best utilize the most current aviation safety and security technology. As described in the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum, the alternative would incorporate, to the greatest extent possible, TSA recommendations as they are developed as well as the latest passenger and baggage security screening technologies.

SPHGH00001-2

Comment:

Secondly, we must maintain the multifaceted LAX mission. It's the world's largest O&D airport, most unique in the country, if not in the world in this regard. It serves long haul domestic, short haul domestic flights. It is an international center and cargo hub. The Master Plan should not sacrifice any of these missions since Southern California has no other viable airport options.

Response:

Comment noted. The Master Plan Alternative D does not alter the mission of the airport, but it does constrain the capacity to approximately the capacity of the existing facility.

SPHGH00001-3

Comment:

Thirdly, we must improve aviation safety, security and capacity. The project should be prioritized to fix the immediate aviation issues such as the south airfield.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00038-3 regarding runway incursion at LAX and discussion about the proposed Alternative D to enhance safe aircraft operations and reduce the potential for runway incursions.

SPHGH00001-4

Comment:

I would like to also focus on customer and marketplace based solutions. LAX must be fixed to maximize customer convenience and make it easier, not harder, for commerce to flow freely at the airport. And in this regard we strongly believe that funneling all passengers through Manchester Square will be a barrier to good customer service.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, would improve the safety and security of LAX. As described in the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum, the GTC is designed to address a variety of safety and security issues as well as improve the landside system that currently

3. Comments and Responses

exists in the CTA. Alternative D would separate the commercial and private vehicle landside components from the passenger terminal facilities and gates in the CTA. This would eliminate the threat of blast in close proximity to large congregations of queuing passenger at functions such as ticketing and baggage claim.

Though the primary concern in constructing the GTC is providing passengers with a safe and secure airport environment, passenger convenience is also addressed. The existing CTA would not efficiently accommodate the forecast volume of passenger traffic in 2015. Construction of the GTC, ITC and RAC would address this issue by improving the landside facilities available to LAX airport users in the future, as discussed in chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Travel times to the airport would be reduced due to improved access to the ITC and GTC from roadways in the airport vicinity, such as the 405 and 105 freeways, versus access to the existing CTA. Upon arrival at the GTC, passengers would find both E-Kiosk check-in facilities as well as Skycap baggage check facilities. The ITC and GTC would be separated from the CTA for safety reasons. However, the APM connecting the GTC to the CTA would be able to deliver passengers in six minutes or less while the APM connecting the ITC to the CTA would be able to deliver passengers in 9 minutes or less.

Improved airport access and enhanced safety and security would provide improved levels of customer service for airport users.

SPHGH00001-5

Comment:

Finally, LAX is paid for by the users. It must not be a burden on already -- and it is not a burden on the already strapped local government. \$10 to \$12 billion dollars is more than this industry has earned in total over its 75-year history. And even a scaled back plan would create thousands of jobs locally and would represent one of the largest public works projects in the United States.

Response:

Comment noted. The modernization of LAX will improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft and reduce runway incursions, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking. The cost to operate at congested, constrained airports in an environmentally sensitive state such as California will ultimately be reflected in the airline fees and passenger ticket prices. This is especially true for airports in the large metropolitan areas such as San Francisco and Los Angeles.

SPHGH00001-6

Comment:

We at ATA will work with all parties through this process so that at the end of the day we could all point with pride to an LAX that works for the next generation.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHGH00002 Dixon-Davis, Diana None Provided

10/22/2003

SPHGH00002-1

Comment:

My name is Diana Dixon-Davis. That's spelled D-i-x-o-n, hyphen, D-a-v-i-s. I live at 10832 Glendora Avenue in Chatsworth. I'm actually a member of a local neighborhood council. I'm a demographer by training. And I have -- first I have a housekeeping question.

3. Comments and Responses

Frankly, this is the first time. I know there have been hearings and they've been around the city; however, I have never seen the EIR document. And I'm wondering, is it available in our libraries? I don't want to take up my time. Can you redo that because I think that is more for the benefit of everyone? Where are they available and what is the internet and website for access to this document? Pardon?

Well, I think it's for everyone's benefit to know how to get ahold of these documents. It shouldn't just be myself knowing privately.

[It was indicated to Ms. Davis by Jim Ritchie that the EIS/EIR is available at various libraries throughout the L.A. basin and at LAXMasterplan.org.]

Okay. That is basically what I wanted to hear.

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.

SPHGH00002-2

Comment:

Okay. I'm going to bring up three points. I don't know if I'll get to all three of them.

First, I wanted see -- I don't know how this plan fits into the regional air traffic needs without the community. And I think that -- I don't know if that's stressed in there. We could not get an answer in the workshop as to how it fits into the needs throughout the -- not only the L.A. basin, but the Southern California air passenger traffic needs.

Response:

According to SCAG's draft 2004 RTP, LAX will handle 45.9 percent of the forecast passenger demand in the Los Angeles basin in 2030; 78.0 of 170.1 MAP.

LAWA only controls the operations and potential improvements at LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. Other jurisdictions are responsible for developing the other regional airports. Alternative D for LAX, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, emphasizes safety and security improvements, rather than capacity increases. By not increasing the capacity of LAX, it is incumbent on the other airports in the region to serve a larger percentage of the regional demand. Master plan updates are currently being prepared for both Ontario and Palmdale airports in order for these airports to play their part in addressing the anticipated regional demand. Expansion at Ontario, Palmdale, or any of the other regional airports will not negate the need for modernization of LAX. Please see Topical Responses TR-RC-1 and TR-RC-5 for more detail on the relationship between LAWA's planning for its three commercial service airports and the plans of other airport jurisdictions in the region.

SPHGH00002-3

Comment:

Secondly, I'm concerned about the choke points. If you have everyone coming into two or three places, one abandoned suitcase or bag, such as my purse over there, could trigger a security alert. You could shutdown tremendous portions of the entire LAX facility. Everyone coming in or everyone leaving, I think there needs to be a study of what would happen if you have security alerts in certain sections and how much -- right now security alerts are, in essence, isolated because of this first nature of the check-in and check-out system.

Thirdly, and this is the most important point I wanted to raise is concerning handicap facilities. I have an inherited problem of muscular dystrophy. And I find it very tiring to go through LAX because of the long walks that currently exists. And it looks like this will increase walking distance extensively. And I'm wondering if there have been studies done as to right now if I'm dropped off at the curb and I have to walk to the check-in and then to the airplane, how many feet I walk versus what it will be with now all these remote access and constant changing of -- you have to go from your car, to the train to -- or to the

walkway, to a train, to another walkway, to another place. It's just -- I think there is going to be a significant increase in the walking distance. And this will have a significant impact on handicapped passengers who are traveling alone.

And then those who are traveling with an attendant might find it even more difficult. Because currently if I take my mother to the airport, I can get dropped off right at the curb. And, basically, we arrange for a - a wheelchair right there at the entrance or I escort her using a wheelchair or other type of conveyance up to the plane. And they give me special permission for this. But right now I don't see this -- I don't know whether this is incorporated into your study. And I think giving the federal requirements of ADA access, if this is an important thing, then perhaps needs to be added to your study.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security-related aspect of the comment. Walking distance under Alternative D would be similar to that of the other alternatives. All the remote facilities proposed under Alternative D, such as GTC and ITC would be connected to CTA via an APM, thereby minimizing walking distance and increasing passenger convenience. LAX has been in compliance with the ADA, and Alternative D would further improve elements associated with the ADA and would not discontinue any of the special features currently provided to disabled passengers.

SPHGH00002-4

Comment:

And, also, I would suggest that you do make notification to all the neighborhood councils in the city about these last few hearings. We have not heard about this hearing in advance. I saw it in the paper today. And I am the vice president of the local neighborhood council. And there are 90 of us out there who need to be notified.

Response:

Comment noted.

Pursuant to Section 509 (b) (6) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended [49 U.S.C. Section 47106(c) (1) (A)], the FAA and the City of Los Angeles (LAWA) provided sufficient public notice of availability of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also in compliance with State and Federal regulations regarding the facilitation of public involvement in decisions which affect the quality of the human environment, FAA and LAWA conducted twelve public hearings and three Environmental Justice Workshops at locations dispersed throughout Greater Los Angeles, in order to provide the most convenient access for all affected and interested parties.

In accordance with City practices regarding notification for public hearings and/or meetings, LAWA's notification included, but was not limited to, affected residents, businesses and/or organizations within a 500-foot radius of LAX property boundaries. Approximately 20,000 Notices of Availability regarding this extended public comment period, which included a schedule of the last three hearings, were also mailed to LAX adjacent state, local and federal municipalities, and agencies, including adjacent neighborhood councils. Additionally, notice of the three additional public hearings was published in the following periodicals more than a month before the hearing dates:

The Los Angeles Times

Antelope Valley Press

The Daily Breeze

Los Angeles Sentinel

Los Angeles Business Journal

Daily News Los Angeles

Inland Valley Daily Bulletin (Ontario)

3. Comments and Responses

The Wave

Argonaut (Westchester/South Bay)

El Segundo Herald

Riverside Press Enterprise

San Gabriel Valley Tribune

Finally, please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

SPHGH00003 Blanks, Bobby

**Congressmember Maxine
Waters' Office**

10/22/2003

SPHGH00003-1

Comment:

My name is Bobby Blanks, B-I-a-n-k-s. And I am the Field Representative to Congressmember Maxine Waters of the 35th Congressional District and which LAX resides. Address, 10124 South Broadway, Suite Number 1, Los Angeles, California 90003.

Alternative D is a \$9-billion-dollar project that would demolish homes and disturb communities without improving the safety and security of LAX. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is an inaccurate and misleading document that fails to reflect the true impact of this project.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPHGH00003-2

Comment:

Local families could no longer drive to the Central Terminal Area in order to drop off passengers. Instead, an automated people mover would be constructed to transport people to the airport terminals, and a baggage tunnel will be constructed to transport baggage. All airport employees and passengers would access the Central Terminal Area from the Ground Transportation Center, the Intermodal Transportation Center, and the Rental Car Center via the automated people mover carrying their carry-on baggage with them. This would be extremely inconvenient for most passengers, and it would present special hardships for the elderly, the handicapped and families traveling with small children.

Response:

The plan is designed to provide increased security for all passengers with little, if any, inconvenience. While there would be an additional people mover trip that does not currently exist for most passengers, the APM would be a state-of-the-art design, with facilities to easily accommodate the handicapped and elderly without any special hardships.

SPHGH00003-3

Comment:

On July 25th, 2003 I introduced H.R. 2985, a bill to condition construction of a remote passenger check-in facility at LAX upon a finding that such a facility would promote the safety and security of the public. H.R. 2985 would require the Secretary of Homeland Security to review the proposed facility prior to its construction to determine whether it will protect the safety and security of air passengers and the general public more effectively than the existing facilities at LAX. If the Secretary of Homeland Security does not determine that the facility will improve public safety and security, the Federal Aviation

3. Comments and Responses

Administration would not be allowed to approve its construction. On September 2nd the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County passed a motion to support my legislation.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHGH00003-4

Comment:

In reality, Alternative D will displace thousands of Manchester Square residents. In order to construct the remote passenger check-in facility, the City of Los Angeles would have to acquire and demolish 38 houses, 179 apartment buildings and a 52-year-old elementary school, in addition to the 263 structures it has already acquired. It would also have to relocate about 6,200 people, some of whom have federally subsidized housing vouchers. I strongly oppose the forced relocation of any of these residents.

Response:

As stated in the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, homes in the Manchester Square area are being acquired through the existing Voluntary Residential Acquisition/Relocation Program currently underway within the Manchester Square and Airport/Belford areas near the airport, in support of LAWA's ANMP. Please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.1.2 regarding legality of the acquisition of Manchester Square, and Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.2 regarding relocation.

SPHGH00003-5

Comment:

The American people are sick and tired of deficits and bloated government spending. The State of California is now running a \$38-billion-dollar deficit, and the federal government has a \$374-billion-dollar deficit in 2003. Furthermore, Congress is in the process of providing the President an additional \$87 billion for continuing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The American people cannot afford to spend \$9 billion on an outrageously expensive boondoggle at LAX. Alternative D is simply a continuation of former Mayor Richard Riordan's plan to expand the airport in the name of safety and security.

Response:

The comment does not pertain to the content of the Draft EIS/EIR or the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHGH00004 Ramos, Sergio

Laborers Local 300

10/22/2003

SPHGH00004-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Sergio Ramos. And I'm a union representative. I'm here on behalf of my business manager Sergio Rascon of Laborer's Local 300. We represent 7,000-plus members.

I'm here to testify on behalf of Alternative D because it is the best plan for the City of Los Angeles. The plan provides for 49,000 construction jobs. With all the budget cuts and layoffs, jobs will help to stimulate our regional economy and keep people working. We support Alternative D of LAX Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHGH00005 Ayer, Mike

**Democratic Party for the San
Fernando Valley**

10/22/2003

SPHGH00005-1

Comment:

My name is Mike Ayre spelled A-y-r-e; address 17128 Lanark Street, Van Nuys, 91406.

I am here to speak in favor of the Mayor's Alternative D plan. Mayor Hahn's plan addresses the safety, security and regional needs. Most importantly, it addresses the modernization that is necessary to LAX to maintain LAX as a key international gateway and one of the largest origination and destination airports. Our regional economy needs -- our economy depends on it. Modernization is long overdue. Let's move forward with the Alternative D plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHGH00006 Heywood, Chris

**Los Angeles Convention and
Visitors Bureau**

10/22/2003

SPHGH00006-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Chris Heywood. I'm representing L.A., Inc., the Convention & Visitor's Bureau, L.A.'s official tourism marketing organization. And we are here in support of LAX Master Plan Alternative D.

Tourism is L.A.'s second largest industry representing 240,000 jobs in L.A. County alone in 2002. We believe that Alternative D modernization of LAX is key to maintaining L.A.'s key international gateway status. Consumers have more choices than ever before in terms of international gateway airports, and is crucial for LAX to step up to the plate and ensure that its already antiquated facility is brought up to modern times.

LAX must also be in a comfortable position to access its primary U.S. domestic markets. And we believe that Alternative D does that. International visitation to LAX represents 30 percent of total visitors' spending. And ensuring that LAX is perceived as a safe and secure airport from the international market will ensure the steady flow of international consumers. And we certainly want to continue to have those consumers come to Los Angeles.

The plan also addresses the regionalization of air travel demands throughout Southern California, and we believe it is a sound and prudent Alternative.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHGH00007 Sheffron, Harry

None Provided

10/22/2003

SPHGH00007-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Harry Sheffron, S-h-e-f-f-r-o-n, at 17121 Lorillaro Street, Granada Hills. I speak as a local resident.

The first I heard about this was in today's paper.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHGH00002-4 regarding noticing of the public hearings. Also, please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

SPHGH00007-2**Comment:**

My main concern is the 405 and the 105 freeways. People bring us all these wonderful ideas. You want to increase the body flow through LAX by another ten million people. And that's great. We are going to need that because we want the community to grow. But we also have to address, and this is what my main concern is, traffic on the freeways. We have the longest parking lot in the world. And I don't want to be on it any longer than I have to.

So for the record, I want to make sure that somebody is going to address the fact that we have ground transportation in and out of the city, not just at the airport, so that we could handle this extra ten million people including the people that are going to be living in the new communities that are being built around the San Fernando Valley upwards of 30,000 homes.

That's going to add more bodies to the freeway every single day. Frankly, I'm tired of sitting on the freeway.

So this is just for the record I want to make sure it gets addressed.

Response:

The project generates about the same number of passengers as if nothing is constructed (i.e. the No Action/No Project Alternative).

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts of the proposed project. While the analyses conducted for the project incorporate background (i.e. non-airport) traffic, the project does not, and legally cannot, mitigate impacts caused by this background traffic. Only project-related impacts are mitigated by the project.

SPHGH00008 Bryson, M**None Provided****10/22/2003****SPHGH00008-1****Comment:**

My name is M.E. Bryson, B-r-y-s-o-n. I'm speaking as a concerned Northridge citizen.

I am against this proposal. One of the main reasons I am against this proposal is to turn around and make this one airport in Los Angeles the major source of transportation in and out of this city and this country would turn around and make it a very opportunistic place for terrorists. If terrorists wanted to attack this city and cause more harm to this country and our economy, LAX would be a prime target. Wake up.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHGH00008-2**Comment:**

The other reason I'm against this is the airport now is too big. It has poor highway access.

We'll add to check-in time. We'll increase access time when weather is bad.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Any of the project alternatives would vastly improve the airport's highway access, even during bad weather. A description of the new facilities is presented in the Draft LAX Master Plan and Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum. Further, the projects would incorporate new, state-of-the-art access and check-in facilities that would also improve check-in time.

SPHGH00008-3

Comment:

We'll add noise to the surrounding area. We'll increase the probability of overhead accidents. And I've already told you about terroristic opportunities.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts are addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. Please see Response to Comment SPHGH00008-1 above and Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues.

SPHGH00008-4

Comment:

Too many people north of Mulholland Drive need a better way to get in and out of the Los Angeles, and the facility is available in Palmdale. It is an international airport. It was intended to be an international airport. The city has flubbed the dub. Okay. The state at the current time has absolutely nothing in their budgetary or planning stages to turn around and provide better freeway or highway access to the Los Angeles International Airport.

Response:

Comment noted. Traffic studies have shown that travel times to most of the Los Angeles area--including many areas north of Mulholland Drive--are shorter to LAX than to Palmdale, even with the traffic congestion on many LA area freeways, simply due to the long travel distance to Palmdale. Still, LAWA is committed to improving Palmdale Regional Airport to whatever extent necessary to accommodate its demand.

The project would provide the needed funding to improve access to LAX, as described in Topical Response TR-ST-2 and, in particular, Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.16.1. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the regional solution for airline demand.

SPHGH00008-5

Comment:

Now, my reasons why it should be the international airport in Palmdale is Palmdale, like I've already said, is a major international airport. And it will make less attractive for terrorists. If there is a terrorist bomb down in the Los Angeles International Airport, you can kiss this city good-bye. The economic effects would be unbelievable. You might as well just drop an atomic bomb right in the middle of the Civic Center. And I hope you people realize that.

We made a horrible mistake when we moved our Navy fleet out of Long Beach and put it down in San Diego for Admiral's Holiday. And everybody that knows anything about planning knows you never put your major forces in one place where they can all be attacked at one time.

Response:

Comment noted. As a responsible public agency, LAWA will only develop Palmdale when demand can be demonstrated. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding LAWA's efforts to encourage operations at Palmdale and the master plan update that is currently underway.

SPHGH00009 Arrizon, Francisco Laborers Local 300 10/22/2003

SPHGH00009-1

Comment:

Yes. My name is Francisco Arrizon. I'm with the Laborer's Local 300. I'm here representing Mr. Sergio Rascon, our business manager and, also, the 8,000 members of the local.

We are here in support of Alternative D. This will create jobs for our labor force, for the community. We have -- throughout the City of Los Angeles we have residents. I represent the public sector employees that work in the school district, the County, the L.A. Housing Authority, that they constantly are using our airports. And it facilitates all of the air travels for business, for pleasure. And once again, we are here in support.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHGH00010 Hilfenhaus, Jim None Provided 10/22/2003

SPHGH00010-1

Comment:

My name is Jim Hilfenhaus. It is spelled H-i-l, F like Frank, e-n-h-a-u-s, like Sam. Address is 9732 Via Siena, S-i-e-n-a, Burbank, but actually it's in the City of Los Angeles, mailing address Burbank, 91504.

Okay. And I'm here to speak as the Regional Director of the Democratic Party for the San Fernando Valley. The Democratic Party has gone on record in support of the LAX Modernization Plan and has been in that position since it was first brought up as the expansion. We're strongly supportive on both jobs, environmental and security issues involved here.

The modernization of the LAX is well needed. It's a 40-year-old structure that was designed for first jet flights. We're now expanding to larger jets. Of course, the runways need to be separated, widened. But, basically, everything from 9-11 forward has been a retrofit. The modernization enables security to be smooth and efficient and expeditious through the airport.

The airport is an economic driving engine for the City of Los Angeles. It's our port of entry for international tourism and travel, and tourism is the largest basis of the economics of the City of Los Angeles. So we do need to continue our tourists' travel, which is subdued since 9-11, but will be continuously expanding as it is throughout the country.

This is a well overdue project. We have gone on record in the L.A. County Democratic Central Committee on support. I think three years ago we had a huge hearing with both sides appearing. It was voted overwhelmingly in support of the LAX. At that time it was modernization. We continue to support this plan, and Plan D the Alternative.

The work is needed. From an economic engine of jobs for the work itself, a 12-billion-dollar input into the L.A. economy, which may not be the issue here at hand, but can't be denied, can recoup the energy of California in our current recession. We are in a job crisis, and we do need to have these jobs out there rehabilitating the airport that will drive other economic engines within this economy. The purchasing of houses, the scholarships of schools, sending children off to further their careers in college, we need that. We need the jobs that come about through that. The local community needs the jobs, as far as the maintenance in the airport that the modernization will bring, the securitization, the internal shopping centers and such.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHGH00011 Nunez, Javier

Laborers Local 300

10/22/2003

SPHGH00011-1

Comment:

Thank you. My name is Javier Nunez, N-u-n-e-z. And my address is 11006 Noble Avenue, Mission Hills, California. And I am vice president of Laborer's Local 300 in the construction industry. Also along with that, I'm also a minister with Victory Outreach Ministries and have done some extensive traveling in, you know, other countries. And been as a minister and as a union official have done quite a bit of traveling.

In my opinion, Los Angeles is in desperate need of change at LAX. There has to be a system that has to be put in place where we're able to not only at the same time provide jobs for our community and provide work, because that's one of the reasons why I'm here, but foremost what's most important is the security of the people, the security of children going through the airport and making sure that we do the best that we can do as residents of the Los Angeles County in securing our airport for visitors that are coming in from other countries as well as from those that live within the County of Los Angeles that are leaving to other countries or to other destinations.

I think what we have in place right now, it's a place where the world has changed tremendously. From the 1950s -- and we won't go back that further -- to the year 2003 the minds of people have changed. The attitudes of people have changed. For some reason there seems to be the attitude of people is, if you don't do what I say, then I'm going to go ahead and be vindictive and I'm going to use violence to make my point across.

And that's what we need to stop. We need to be careful and make sure that we put a plan together that that will not occur. That we will not -- that we will have the people traveling that are coming in and out of LAX first of all and foremost be safe and that we implement a system at LAX that will meet those needs because Los Angeles in the minds of many people is a great target.

But I know together, with all of us coming together we could have a safe and a beautiful terminal that people will feel secure. And we need to bring the business back to L.A. And we need other people to feel secure that when they come fly into Los Angeles and they are going to Hollywood, that they are secure. We need tourists from all over the world to come and visit L.A. and leave their money here.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00001 Parks, Bernard

City of Los Angeles

10/25/2003

SPHE00001-1

Comment:

Good morning. I understand this is the last meeting. I appreciate you having this extension so the community could have input. I also appreciate and want to say thank you to my staff Jessie and Yolanda for bringing this meeting to this facility.

One of the things you will hear, and I think it's important -- oh. You're going to hear from the 8th District residents. And that is that they have felt as a historical process -- That's better.

I want to thank you and thank the staff. But I think what you're going to hear from the 8th District residents, they feel they've been historically ignored as it relates to airport issues. They hear and read

in the newspaper constantly that issues that deal with Westchester, El Segundo, maybe Inglewood are really what dominates the airport's view of the world.

We have thousands of residents that live in the flight path. When you go to the area Century and Westwood, the area of Vermont and Manchester many times you cannot conduct business outside without having to give deference to airplanes. There is a great deal of concern about what has been used by the airport as to the noise ordinances, and when houses will be insulated and when they are not. What people do not understand is the issue of where a house right next door is insulated and the one next door is not. And they do not believe that your 1992 chart is accurate, and that it's something in which they believe many decisions have been made based on that information.

Response:

Comment noted. Sections 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified the number of residents in the City of Los Angeles, including the 8th Council District currently exposed to high noise levels under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions as well as areas that would be newly exposed to high noise levels under the Master Plan alternatives. The area in the 8th Council District affected by high noise levels is primarily in South Los Angeles. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise mitigation.

As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, some areas of South Los Angeles are eligible for soundproofing as they are located within the current ANMP boundary, which is defined by the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour. This same contour is used to define eligibility for noise mitigation in all communities surrounding LAX. Those areas referenced by the commentator, near Century and Westwood and Vermont and Manchester, are located outside the ANMP boundary and do not qualify for noise mitigation. Monitoring methods used to ensure that areas exposed to 65 CNEL noise levels are made eligible for noise mitigation are described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4. The 65 CNEL is the applicable standard for high noise levels as defined by FAR Part 150 and Title 21 (see Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4) of the Draft EIS/EIR). Priority for sound insulation is given to residential properties within the highest noise level band above the 65 CNEL contour. As of June 2002, 600 units have received sound insulation out of 1,100 dwelling units eligible for soundproofing in South Los Angeles, and in conformance with the 2001 Noise Variance, the 500 units remaining in South Los Angeles are scheduled to receive sound insulation by March 2008. Since publication of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA has notified all property owners within the City of Los Angeles ANMP boundaries of their eligibility to participate in the program. Meetings to explain the concepts of soundproofing and the process for participation in the program have also been held in these areas. Areas exposed to high noise levels have decreased in South Los Angeles from 1992 conditions, as depicted on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S-1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the ANMP and how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

SPHE00001-2

Comment:

Also, you're going to hear the issues of mitigation. They are fully aware that years ago that airport middle school was abandoned because of the noise, but, yet, little or nothing has been done in the schools in this community that also suffer from the noise.

Response:

Comment noted. See Response to Comment AL00038-6 for a description of noise mitigation payments ordered by the Court to mitigate noise and other impacts of aircraft operations in LAUSD classrooms (including Airport Junior High School) and other provisions of the "Settlement Agreement." Details regarding the use of these funds should be directed to the LAUSD. Ultimately, it was the decision of the LAUSD to close, rather than provide sound insulation to, Airport Junior High School.

3. Comments and Responses

Regarding high noise levels on public schools located within Council District 8, as shown on Table 14 of Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report of the Draft EIS/EIR, Tables S4 and S9 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, no public schools within Council District 8 are exposed to 65 CNEL or high interior noise levels that result in classroom disruption under 1996 baseline or Year 2000 conditions. As presented in Response to Comment AL00038-6, no public schools within Council District 8 would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL or significant single event or cumulative aircraft noise levels that result in classroom disruption. Therefore, no significant noise impacts on these schools have been identified and no mitigation measures would be required.

SPHE00001-3

Comment:

They also are going to be concerned about the lack of mitigation for traffic and how people drive through their community to get to the airport. But there has been no traffic mitigation or concerns as relates to their streets being widened, having park and rides for traffic mitigation to take them around their community.

Response:

The comprehensive off-airport traffic study prepared for the project did not indicate increased traffic volumes at intersections within the 8th Council District that would necessitate project mitigations. Traffic mitigations were only developed for the LAX Master Plan at those locations which were determined to have a significant impact caused by the project, and not due to the increase in non-project traffic that is expected regardless of whether the project occurs. It is typical for a traffic study to reveal that the further the distance from the project site, the less of a traffic effect the project will have upon the street system or at a particular intersection.

A future park-and-ride ("FlyAway") could be located within the 8th District if it is shown that the potential ridership by airport passengers and employees would justify such a facility.

SPHE00001-4

Comment:

You're going to hear comments about what is perceived to be a violation of rules about late night flying in the sense of flights certainly coming in much later than what the airport has said historically.

You're also going to hear information about low flying in the sense that people believe the flights fly lower than what the rules require.

Response:

There are special operating rules for night flight activity and ground run-ups. However, for discussion of night noise and LAWA regulations please see Topical Response TR-N-5, regarding nighttime aircraft operations and TR-N-7, regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. Additionally, please see Sections 4.1, Noise and 4.2, Land Use, and Appendix SC and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for single events on nighttime awakenings.

On approach the aircraft are following glide slopes in their descents from the east - a standard practice for many years that has not changed to result in lower flight. The Pilot-in-Command has the ultimate responsibility of the safe operation of his/her aircraft. The statutory role of the FAA is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace. The FAA's primary function is to ensure safety. Noise abatement/mitigation is secondary to safety. To that end FAA's Air Traffic Control provides services to pilots to ensure that minimum separations are maintained between aircraft. Normal practice within the FAA is to notify pilots of their deviations from standard operating procedures, such as low flying over the communities and to inform them that the areas are noise sensitive. For further information, see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement/enforcement.

SPHE00001-5

Comment:

Also, some health issues. There are people that live in the area of Century and Western that believe there are many health issues that are caused by repetitiveness of flights, the amount of exhaust. And I know there have been discussions for years whether there is a droppage of fuel in the area and where many tests have been given. And the airport says that doesn't happen, but, yet, people believe that is a common practice as they go outside and look at their vehicles and look at their lawns and look at their homes as it relates to what they believe is fuel that basically will drop from the airplanes.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition and fuel dumping. Fuel dumping from aircraft (either while on the ground or airborne) is not allowed at LAX or any U.S. airport, except for emergency situations for several important regulatory, economic, safety and environmental reasons. Please also 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.

In response to public comment, additional analyses were presented in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and were summarized in the Executive Summary of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was prepared to integrate a new alternative, Alternative D, into the existing environmental review process and to incorporate supplemental information and analysis for the LAX Master Plan. Such information and analysis were based upon the availability of new or updated information since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR in January 2001.

Please refer to Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment (subsection 4.24.1.6, Environmental Consequences, and subsection 4.24.1.9, Level of Significance After Mitigation), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for discussions of acute and chronic hazards for all build alternatives and the No Action/No Project Alternative. As described in these sections, health risks (cancer, non-cancer chronic and non-cancer acute) for the majority of nearby residents would be lower for Alternative D than for 1996 baseline, Year 2000 conditions and the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D provides for airfield improvements that would enable aircraft to move more efficiently, thereby reducing air pollutant emissions from aircraft operating in taxi/idle mode, and provides substantial improvements to the on-airport and off-airport surface transportation systems, thereby reducing air pollutant emissions from motor vehicles. Additionally, Alternative D, unlike the No Action/No Project Alternative, includes Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions.

SPHE00001-6

Comment:

So these are the kinds of things that the 8th District community feels they've been ignored. They feel as though the airport makes -- oh, okay. They make millions of dollars providing a very valuable asset to the City of Los Angeles. I think half a million jobs are associated, but they also realize that their lives are negatively impacted and should be dealt with.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPHE00001-1 through SPHE00001-5 above.

SPHE00001-7

Comment:

The other issue you're going to hear about is contracts, who gets the contracts when it is built and the issue of the safety. Is it really safe when you deal with bringing everyone into one area of the airport to have their baggage as opposed to a diverse plan that moves people throughout the airport?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHE00001-8

Comment:

With that, before she pulls the gong on me, I just want to say thank you for coming out to this community. Again, you're going to hear frustration because there is a sense in this community that they've been ignored for a long time on many issues, but particularly this issue.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00002 McDowell, Kelly City of El Segundo 10/25/2003

SPHE00002-1

Comment:

Good morning. I'm Councilman Kelly McDowell, representing the City of El Segundo.

Given the length and complexity of the Master Plan and the environmental documents, our complete documents, including those on technical issues, will be finalized and submitted soon. And my City's comments today are preliminary.

We continue to oppose Alternatives A, B and C for the many reasons we expressed both orally and in writing during the public review and comment period for the original Draft EIS/EIR in 2002.

The City of El Segundo has not endorsed Alternative D. However, we feel that its stated objective of constraining LAX to its current capacity is appropriate and supports a regional aviation approach.

To be clear, my city could only support an alternative that by design will accommodate passenger and cargo levels no greater than the physical capacity of the airport as it exists today.

We have retained a nationally respected expert to assess the capacity of Alternative D. And to the extent our expert's findings are that the passenger and capacity of Alternative D, as currently designed, exceeds 78 million annual passengers, we would hope that LAWA cooperate with El Segundo in incorporating any revisions to the plan necessary to ensure the capacity is not increased beyond 78 MAP.

Limiting LAX's capacity to its current capacity has always been our number one goal. And we believe that limiting capacity at LAX will allow other airports in the region to develop and handle their fair share of future regional aviation demand.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00002-2

Comment:

However, my city is concerned about the impacts of southside airfield changes that would move the southernmost runway 50 feet closer to El Segundo. LAWA has stated that it believes these changes are necessary to improve runway safety.

3. Comments and Responses

However, we're currently studying the impacts of the proposed reconfiguration and the options for the southern runway complex.

In particular, we urge full public consideration of end-around taxiways as an alternative that could provide greater safety at lower cost and with fewer new burdens on local communities.

Safety at LAX must be a priority for everyone.

We are prepared to support measures necessary to enhance safety, even if those measures increase our burden, but only if we are assured through an independent expert that Alternatives with fewer impacts are not equally effective.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00038-3 regarding the potential noise impacts of moving the southernmost runway approximately 55 feet south and discussion on runway incursion at LAX and an analysis conducted by NASA Ames Research Center comparing the costs and benefits of a center parallel taxiway and "end-around" taxiway on the south airfield complex.

SPHE00002-3

Comment:

In conclusion, we are grateful for Mayor Hahn's responsive leadership and his pledge to constrain growth at LAX and to foster a regional approach to meeting future aviation demand. And it is our hope that the ultimate outcome of the Master Plan process will be a regional airport approach that ensures that LAX does not exceed its current capacity.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00003 Norton, Kevin International Brotherhood of 10/25/2003
Electrical Workers

SPHE00003-1

Comment:

Good morning. My name is Kevin Norton. I'm a business representative with International Brotherhood of Electrical workers Local 11; 833 Airport Boulevard, Los Angeles.

I wanted to testify on LAX Master Plan and in support of Alternative D that Mayor Hahn has presented. I know that LAX needs to be fixed. Most people here know that LAX needs to be fixed. They also know that doing nothing won't improve safety. Doing nothing will not make our lives more secure, and doing nothing will not stop people from using this airport. If we want a limit of the number of people who will be flying out of LAX, we need to adopt Alternative D. If we want traffic improvements that are a part of this plan, we need to move forward. If the airport is to be improved and made safer, we need to use the designs that are built into Alternative D. I hope your recommendations will be to improve the environmental impact reports and support Mayor Hahn's recommendation.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHE00004 Schneider, Denny Alliance for Regional Solution to 10/25/2003
Airport Congestion

SPHE00004-1

Comment:

I'm Denny Schneider; 7929 Breen, Westchester.

I'd like to address many issues. I also speak on behalf of ARSAC, the Alliance for Regional Solution to Airport Congestion. We're the ones that got the mayor to his no expansion pledge, which he is not meeting. We do not feel that this plan holds the airport to 78 million annual passengers. It allows for future expansion of significant size.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level of 78.9 million annual passengers (MAP), which is comparable to the 78.7 MAP projected to occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. As such, Alternative D is not considered to represent an expansion of LAX. The other build alternatives (Alternatives A, B, and C) are designed to serve a future activity level substantially more than the No Action/No Project Alternative, and therefore represent an expansion of LAX.

SPHE00004-2

Comment:

With all that said, I have personal concerns, and that is safety, health, and what it's doing to our communities. We have a problem here that as they are now doing research, they are finding that we have problems from the noise levels that are current criteria that is causing us to endure high blood pressure, gastro problems and everything else that you could imagine. This plan does not resolve the issue.

Response:

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

SPHE00004-3

Comment:

It helps foster concentration of air traffic at LAX, not the region. 75 percent of all the traffic in the region will still be going out of LAX. And that's like putting a sign that says "If anything happens there, this community's economy will tank." That is totally unacceptable.

Response:

According to SCAG's 2001 RTP, LAX will serve 46.6 percent of the regional passenger demand in 2025. According to the draft 2004 RTP, LAX will serve 45.9 percent of the regional passenger demand in 2030.

LAWA and Mayor Hahn have developed Alternative D in response to the concerns of the public that the City of Los Angeles should participate in a regional solution for the fair and reasonable distribution of air service. Alternative D is consistent with the "fair share" that is allocated to LAX by SCAG in its regional plan.

SPHE00004-4**Comment:**

There are some good things in the plan. There are several unacceptable things including the Manchester Square. This is a very unique situation where we, as many of the community organizations -- and I could tell you that our neighborhood council has also come out against it with a very strongly worded article.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00004-5**Comment:**

I also sit on the LAX Community Noise Round Table where numerous serious questions of noise issues have been raised. And the real issue is one of, how do we resolve these issues? We need more cooperation and listening. I can give you an example.

The OSAGE Neighbor's Association, of which I am a board member, has represented the eastern half of Westchester. For 14 months we have been requesting a meeting with the Mayor's office, Board of Airport Commissioners and LAWA. We have yet to have them find a day that's available.

So in conclusion, I'm going to hand you a small package of comments. And I wish you would consider them because the documentation doesn't always meet the videos and the words that we're hearing.

Response:

Comment noted. The referenced comments submitted by Mr. Schneider are identified as Comment letter SPC00309. Please see Response to Comment letter SPC00309. LAWA is not aware of a formal written request from the Osage Neighborhood Association for a meeting to discuss the LAX Master Plan. However, it should be noted that Denny Schneider is a member of the District 11 LAX Working Group, with which LAWA had numerous meetings, briefings, and discussions on the LAX Master Plan (the meetings occurred on the following dates: January 27, 2003, February 10, 2003, March 6, 2003, April 7, 2003, and June 9, 2003). Mr. Schneider was present for all of the meetings. Mr. Schneider is also a member of the Westchester/Playa del Rey Neighborhood Council and Board Member of the LAX Task Force. The Westchester/Playa del Rey Neighborhood Council also includes the area that would encompass the Osage Neighborhood Association. LAWA had meetings with the Westchester/Playa del Rey Neighborhood Council on at least four separate occasions (August 6, 2002, October 21, 2002, June 26, 2003, and October 21, 2003).

SPHE00005 Heru, Shabaca**Community Coalition for
Change****10/25/2003****SPHE00005-1****Comment:**

Good morning. My name is Shabaca Heru. I live at 207 East 136th Street. That's H-e-r-u. My organization's name is The Community Coalition for Change. We have been in business for about eight years.

I've lived in L.A. County all my life. I've moved around. What I'm concerned about primarily is environmental injustice. The largest polluter in the L.A. County area is the airport.

Just this morning in talking to people and looking at the various proposals, they are very ambitious. And it seems as though the biggest concern isn't for the people because people have been affected by the noise. They have been affected by the vibrations of the aircraft. They've been affected by the

3. Comments and Responses

emissions. They have been affected by fuel falling on their homes. They have been affected in various ways by what's going on right now.

We'd like to have proposals that consider the people first. The people seem to be put in a confrontational position with the developers and with the money interest.

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, environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix E, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, Appendix S-F, and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

In addition, please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits, Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration, and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

SPHE00005-2

Comment:

All of the plans, I think, have not been presented to the public in a way that we can have some sort of idea of what's going on. I think the people in the city right now are held hostage. And we would like to see something occur where there is actually a clear dissemination of the information as to what is going on.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

SPHE00005-3

Comment:

We'd like to have some clear-cut idea as to how we're going to stop the pollution, not just vague promises, not just lip service. And we'd like to see that the expansion plan right now is capped and some of the traffic is diverted to some of the airports in the other outlying areas. There comes a point where it becomes fruitless to just expand LAX, to concentrate and to all of the development there.

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

SPHE00006 Worthington, Emma None Provided

10/25/2003

SPHE00006-1

Comment:

My name is Emma Worthington. That's W-o-r-t-h-i-n-g-t-o-n; 4634 West Imperial Highway, Inglewood, California 90304.

I also work at the airport, and I have worked at the airport for almost 30 years. I live in Inglewood. And like a lot of my coworkers, we live in the surrounding areas, Inglewood, Lennox, Hawthorne, El Segundo and Westchester. We understand the connection between good quality jobs and quality life. We need

new jobs, but we don't need minimum wage jobs. What we need is jobs that provide a livable wage and affordable family health coverage. The companies at the airport provide those types of jobs, and that is how I've been able to raise my family and not be on welfare.

In order to ensure this modernization plan provides good employment opportunities for our communities, we encourage the Mayor to include in his plan a local hiring program, apprenticeships and programs for the youth so that our youth can strive to a better future.

When we talk about modernization, we say we are bringing the airport and Los Angeles into the 21st Century. Well, we the workers would like to be able to bring our communities into the 21st Century along with the airport and the rest of Los Angeles. And that is why we urge the Mayor to ensure that his plan provides good paying jobs with good benefits and a community packet that will ensure that we're along for the ride and that we're not left behind.

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to Comment SPHF00032-1; please see Response to Comment SPHF00032-1.

SPHE00007 Muhammad, Tony Nation of Islam 10/25/2003

SPHE00007-1

Comment:

I'm Minister Tony Muhammad. I'm the Western Regional Representative for the Nation of Islam. Muhammad is M-u-h-a-m-m-a-d.

First of all, I certainly thank you all for coming to South Los Angeles. Our big concern here in South Los Angeles that if this airport is going to be expanded and built, then we want to make sure that our community of South Los Angeles benefits in a great way. And that we refuse to allow any constructions to go on if we don't have our fair share.

So, therefore, we would hope that the Mayor's office as well as your commission will partner, not just with the multi-million dollar companies, but grass root organizations. I'm talking about that man at the bottom. And that there be apprenticeship programs set up where we have proven programs that works with ex-offenders, that worked with those gentlemen, men and women, who are coming out of a lifestyle of gangs, who wants to change their life, but there are no jobs.

So we're going to be watching you. We're going to be circling our wagons to make sure that whatever you're going to do is going to partner. We want a real partnership with the community where you can guarantee certain jobs as well as training. And if these young men and women get the training and their skills are used correctly, this is something they could take for a lifetime. You could be very beneficial in correcting a lot of social ills that is in our community. For when we meet with many of the young men and women who live a negative lifestyle, number one, they said "we have no jobs." When there is no jobs, there is hopelessness. And hopelessness becomes the mother of violence.

And so, therefore, we would hope that you would partner with our community and bring meaningful jobs, not just jobs, but as well as work with African-American and Latino contractors where we also can get a big piece of the pie, I mean a big piece of the pie. All right.

So we thank you and may God bless you all in this endeavor. And we certainly will be watching.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Final EIS/EIR regarding the Environmental Justice Program. This program includes provisions for a variety of job and educational related opportunities, including efforts to involve at-risk youth.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHE00008 Robinson, Brenda None Provided 10/25/2003

SPHE00008-1

Comment:

Good morning. My name is Brenda Robinson. That's R-o-b-i-n-s-o-n. I live at 1900 West 91st Street, 90047. And I have lived in the community for 31 years.

I am here today to give testimony to the damage being done to our homes as a result of the increased air travel in our community. This issue is not new to us. We have tried over the last ten years to engage in a constructive dialogue with LAX airport representatives time and time again. Yet, they have decided to ignore our concerns and request for assistance in repairing our homes that are impacted by the increased air services. Many of our homes have cracks in the foundations. Our doors and window frames are out of alignment with the structure of the homes. Our roofs have been damaged as a result of low flying and the fumes traveling down. The noise has been so loud when the airplanes are traveling over our homes that we have to play an up-and-down game with the volume control sound on our televisions in order to be able to hear what is being said, in addition to our phone calls not being able to hear someone talk to us because the noise is so loud.

When representatives have met with us, and that's only been on a few occasions, and have stated that they wanted to work with us and to work hand-in-hand in trying to address this issue, they are not being true to their word. We have shown them based on the MAP that you have as your flight path the noise box indicators that it is outdated. It is well over ten years old. And we are not even anywhere in the indication of those noise box indicators.

We have requested time and time again that new boxes be reestablished and put into the community and that we be an active part in identifying where those boxes are placed. Yet, to no avail have we received any kind of response to that request.

We are requesting -- and let me state it. No, not requesting. We are demanding that the action take place to address our concerns and to establish a relationship with us in helping to resolve the issues and the concerns of repairing our homes in the same manner as you have done with Westchester, Inglewood and a small portion of South L.A. close to the Inglewood City line. Keep in mind that LAX is owned by the City. And we as residents of the City pay taxes and we patronize the facility and should be entitled to the level of customer service you pay to visitors using that facility.

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to comment SPC00182-1. Please refer to Response to Comment SPC00182-1.

SPHE00009 Heckman, Tom Local 12, Operating Engineers 10/25/2003

SPHE00009-1

Comment:

Good morning. My name is Tom Heckman. I'm member of Local 12 Operating Engineers. I'm also a resident of the Village Green area of Los Angeles.

And I would like to say that I'm totally in support of Mayor Hahn's Alternative D as the best plan for the City of Los Angeles which would give jobs and the proper flight plans and maybe deal with some of these issues that we have coming up today.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00010 Henke, Skip

**Los Angeles Building &
Construction Trades Council**

10/25/2003

SPHE00010-1

Comment:

Thank you. My name is Skip Henke. Last name is spelled H-e-n-k-e. I live at 3200 Whitney Lane in the City of Burbank. I'm also in very close proximity to the Burbank Airport. So I'm quite familiar with the airplanes and noise and the other things that happen when you live around it. And it's always not so nice.

I'm a council representative for the Los Angeles Building and Construction Trades Council. Our constituents live throughout the Los Angeles, Orange County, Ventura County area. And they fly when they travel.

I myself find myself coming down to Los Angeles International Airport periodically to fly to a destination that I cannot reach from the Burbank Airport in a very easy fashion.

I enjoy going to Burbank because it's convenient. It's easily accessible. It's safe. They have good security systems. And it's also near my house. When I come to Los Angeles International Airport, I find myself in a traffic jam. I find myself not easily accessible standing in long lines being detained for a long period of time to get access to the ticket areas and to other locations within the airport facilities.

When I get on the plane and I go to my eventual destination, I do not find that. I find airports that have been modernized, airports that have been expanded, airports that have increased their security system, their accessibility and the transportation modes that are used in and around the airport.

I stand here today to support Mayor Hahn's Master Plan Alternative D. This plan limits the number of passengers that can use LAX in the future and will require the other airports in our region to take some of the impact of new passengers. That along with the security designs being incorporated into the plan will benefit the flying public of the Los Angeles Regional area.

Once again, I thank you for the opportunity to speak here, and I urge your support of Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00011 Blauers, Keith

None Provided

10/25/2003

SPHE00011-1

Comment:

I'm Keith Blowers. I live at 6672 West 86th Place in Westchester. I want to thank you for holding these hearings because I think they give us information we need to make decisions on the effects of a new airport. I believe the City is on the right track with the LAX Master Plan, especially with Alternative D.

Alternative D designed has taken into account all of the concerns. The traffic, noise and safety have been voiced by elected officials. This plan will improve the City's need to modernize the airport and the responsibility to maintain a high degree of security.

This plan should be approved since it has fulfilled the commitments that the airport has made to the adjacent communities in the past. And with the time and cost of the project being critical to improving the City's airport commitments, I believe that the approval process should be completed as soon as possible.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00012 Hopkins, James None Provided 10/25/2003

SPHE00012-1

Comment:

Hi. My name is James Hopkins. I live at 6510 West 84th Place in Westchester right straight across from the tower at LAX. And I just want to express my favor of this expansion and this plan. It certainly beats the other plans that they had up here before.

Also where Westchester Parkway and the Manchester Boulevard and Lincoln Boulevard, I think that would accept and handle all the traffic in that area, quite well on our side anyway, the Westchester side.

And as far as -- I hear a lot of people come up here and express their concern about the noise. And I just want to say that I only live four blocks from Manchester right in the middle. And I have more problems with neighbors' dogs making noise than I do with the airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00013 Wehus, Steve International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers 10/25/2003

SPHE00013-1

Comment:

Good morning. My name is Steve Wehus. You said it right. Thank you. W-e-h-u-s. I live at 733 Hindry Avenue in the City of Inglewood. And if I raise my hand, the airplane tires can touch me, but that doesn't bother me.

I represent the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 11. And I'd like to express my support for Mayor Hahn's Alternative D. This project will create 49,000 construction-related jobs which impresses me because I'm pro Los Angeles, pro Los Angeles County. I can work anywhere in the United States. I chose L.A. to live. I love this city. I support everything that this city does or doesn't do, major projects, anything that concerns citizens. But this project here environmentally isn't going to disrupt anything. It's going to create jobs in the future. And in the future and in the long run if we look at it, it's going to benefit the City of Los Angeles.

I'm not too familiar with all of the programs and all of the -- everything going on with the city, but I do know one thing. It creates jobs. And to me 49,000 jobs is very impressive for Los Angeles residents.

Under the PLA agreement the jobs will be good paying jobs. I think the plan is good for the workers in Los Angeles -- no, I know it's good for the workers Los Angeles.

I support Alternative D. I support the City of Los Angeles.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00014 Odom, James Sheet Metal Trade 10/25/2003

SPHE00014-1

Comment:

Good morning. My name is James Odom, O-d-o-m. I'm sorry. You were supposed to call --

I reside at 3975 Cherry Wood Avenue in the City of Los Angeles. I'm a Representative of the Sheet Metal Trade Local 105 that covers Los Angeles, Orange County, San Bernardino and Bakersfield. I bring support of 5,000 members supporting the L.A. Master Plan Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00015 Badras, Liz None Provided 10/25/2003

SPHE00015-1

Comment:

Yes. Thank you. My name is Liz Badras. And it's spelled B-a-d-r-a-s. I reside in Glendale and I work in Hollywood.

I thank you very much for taking the time to come out this morning to hear us. I've been in the tourism and hospitality industry for over 20 years. I work for a company that has been in tourism for over 35 years.

We are in support of the LAX Master Plan because it's vital to the fundamental and continuation of business growth and travel and tourism in Los Angeles. The Master Plan outlines modernization and security that are key elements required to ensure that LAX remain an international gateway city for years to come. Most important is the necessity to ensure our airports in and around Los Angeles remain free from the threat of terrorism. Widening the south runways to prevent future airfield incursions when consolidating rental car companies into one facility at LAX are some of the merits that will encourage success of a well-run airport.

Since tourism is the second largest industry in Los Angeles, we feel it is very vital to support this Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00016 Lazer, Tammy None Provided 10/25/2003

SPHE00016-1

Comment:

I am standing, by the way. My name is Tammy Lazer, L-a-z-e-r. I reside at 14159 Dickens Street in Sherman Oaks. I'm a tour guide in the City of Los Angeles for the last 20 years.

This expansion plan will be well situated to meet the needs of the future of Los Angeles. An airport that is modernizing is an airport with improved security and conveniences. These perceptions help the case for visiting Los Angeles and will certainly add to the \$11 billion dollars in visitor spending in this city. And, of course, we all know that we all benefit from this, but what we need is a personal identity. So let's become a first-class airport in the first-class city so that we could maintain a standing as an international Gateway.

3. Comments and Responses

LAX should provide passengers with direct connections and protect its access to the primary U.S. markets that are so important to us. The competition is fierce out there. And everyone is investing their ability to capture business which had traditionally come to Los Angeles. Major destination at airports all over are reinvesting to capture this international travel market. And each year this international consumer and domestic consumer is given other options in quality and in quantity to his access to the United States. The LAX modernization is necessary to meet the current and the future aviation needs of this city. LAX is a Gateway to the world. And we should certainly maintain a critical role in aviation systems.

This expansion is a long-term investment and will keep L.A. in the forefront. The eyes of the world right now are on us with the advent of the Walt Disney Hall, the new cathedral, the Getty museum. Thousands of tourists and business people will be visiting Los Angeles. So let's start to begin to take our bows for a change as a first-class city with a first-class airport. Let everyone know here today that there is even more to come from Los Angeles.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00017 Adelman, Charles None Provided 10/25/2003

SPHE00017-1

Comment:

Hi. My name is Charles Adelman, A-d-e-l-m-a-n. I live at 6146 Eleanor Avenue in Los Angeles. That's in Hollywood.

This plan proposes to spend billions of dollars to fix up the airport, but it kind of leaves things kind of the way they are, really. It just moves congestion on the ground from one place to another, moves a major security risk from the Central Terminal Area to a new Central Parking Area off of the airport, but doesn't really fix those problems.

The thing you have to remember about LAX, it is a main trans pacific hub for the United States. Every international flight going into or out of LAX carries both local origin and destination passengers as well as people connecting from other areas or to other areas. The airlines need that to keep their airplanes full on long international flights.

Response:

Comment noted.

Alternative D is a master plan proposal to improve LAX safety and security and maintain its role as the primary international gateway to Southern California. The facilities associated with Alternative D would allow the airlines to continue serving and even improve their level of service to the pacific rim for both O&D and connecting passengers.

LAX Master Plan - Alternative D would improve airport safety and security in addition to improving airport efficiency and passenger convenience. Construction of the GTC, ITC, RAC and the rework of the CTA would improve passenger safety and security by removing passenger vehicles from the CTA. As described in the Draft Master Plan Addendum this would eliminate the threat of a blast in close proximity of large congregations of queuing passengers at functions such as ticketing and baggage claim.

Additionally, access to the airport would be improved because the GTC and ITC would have more efficient access from the road network in the vicinity of the airport. For example, passengers would be able to access the GTC from the 405 or 105 via roadway connections free of traffic signals. The GTC would also be closer to the freeways than the existing CTA further reducing travel time to the airport.

The GTC is designed for passengers to flow more efficiently through the facility than through typical terminal facilities to reduce passenger queuing at the facility where passenger vehicles would be allowed.

SPHE00017-2**Comment:**

Transit, one of the major problems with LAX, of course, is ground congestion. We cannot solve the ground congestion problem by just moving the parking from one place to another. We have got to build a real mass transit system into the airport. We have got to build direct rail connections from LAX to the other airports in the region if you want the other airline -- airports to take some of the load off of LAX. You have got to build real transit into LAX from downtown and from the San Fernando Valley as well as from Orange County because people are not all going to come in by car and they are not all going to come in on the Green Line coming from Norwalk because very few people are coming to LAX from Norwalk.

Response:

Rail connections, and specifically High Speed Rail/Maglev connections from LAX to other airports and population centers in the region have been studied by SCAG and other planning agencies. In their draft update to the Regional Transportation Plan, SCAG continues to study the feasibility of Intra-regional Maglev service in Southern California. However, the technical analysis for the traffic element of Alternative D does not assume a direct rail connection to be in place to the LAX airport for horizon year 2015. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

Under Alternative D, as stated in Table S17 of Technical Report S-2a, only 4.3 percent of the domestic passengers and 4.6 percent of the international passengers are expected to arrive at LAX by public transit, with 50 percent of those passengers traveling by means of the Green Line.

SPHE00017-3**Comment:**

Also the thing that needs to be dealt with at LAX is we need to provide a little more in the way of services for those people who are having to kill a lot of time there between connecting flights. And that, by the way, by providing more services for those people will provide a new source of revenue for the airport to make up for the revenue that is going to be lost if people take public transit rather than paying to park.

Response:

Table 2.2-1, Alternative D - Comparison of Existing and Proposed Terminal Facilities, in Chapter 2 of the Draft Master Plan Addendum identifies 209,000 square feet of existing (1996) concession space within the LAX terminals. Alternative D would increase the amount of terminal concession space to 579,000 square feet.

The additional concession space would provide improved services for all LAX passengers as well as augment airport revenue.

SPHE00018 Watkins, Timothy None Provided 10/25/2003

SPHE00018-1**Comment:**

Good morning. My name is Timothy Watkins. That's T-i-m-o-t-h-y, W-a-t-k-i-n-s. I live at 1143 East 88th Place and I work at 10950 South Central. Both of those locations are just about three minutes apart from each other, and they are both under the flight path into LAX.

I live in South Central Los Angeles, and I don't mind much about the name change. It's South Central Los Angeles for me because I live right off of Central Avenue and 88th. It is South Central Avenue. I've raised six children there and I've mentored two children through college at the same location. And all the while I've been there because I believe that we make a contribution to the community.

3. Comments and Responses

When you get down to, you know, the impact that the airplanes have on the community -- I'm happy to see my brothers and sisters from the unions here because I know that they are looking out for the best interests of their membership. But as a community member, it's my job at WLCAC to look out for their brothers and sisters, mothers and fathers, grandparents and children that aren't necessarily members of the union.

So I was especially pleased that Jim Hahn kept one of his old campaign promises to reach out to the community and invite people that are not ordinarily invited into these discussions to have their voices heard and to understand that there are, too, opportunities for people that are not union members and are not skilled yet, that there will be training opportunities and there will be job development opportunities to includes, again, those brothers and sisters and sons and daughters of union members and others.

At the end of the day, though, the question that I'm raising -- and I hope everybody in this room hears loud and clear -- is that the poor communities that lie in the pathway of those flights that approach the airport are going to feel the impact of whatever is done for another 100 years and that we should be involved in something that outlives the project to put these improvements in place. We should be involved as communities in something that either supplies a service, a product, some goods or something else that brings sustenance back to the community that helps improve quality of life conditions.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

SPHE00018-2

Comment:

Last thing I would like to say is that because my daughters go to Westchester High School and they are now going into the 12th grade, for two years I've had the pleasure of getting on that freeway. And if I get on the freeway at 7:15, I get to the school in ten minutes. If I get on the freeway at 7:30, it takes a half an hour. If I get there at about 7:40, it takes even longer and it's because the freeway just backs up at that off-ramp to the airport. So I'm hoping that the people mover system that's an integral part of this project will alleviate that backup pressure and let us have that beautiful 105 that dumps us out on Sepulveda in that five-minute run from Watts to the end of the freeway.

Response:

As a traffic mitigation, the project proposes to create a direct connection from the westbound I-105 Freeway directly into the planned on-airport roadways that will lead to the Ground Transportation Center and the Intermodal Transportation Center. From these two facilities, passengers will ride the automated people mover to the Central Terminal Area.

The new freeway interchange will be located on the I-105 between La Cienega Boulevard and Aviation Boulevard. As a result, it is anticipated that the vast majority of airport-related traffic currently exiting the I-105 Freeway at Sepulveda Boulevard will be using this new exit instead. This will allow non-airport related traffic to use the Sepulveda Boulevard exit more easily. In addition, a new interchange on I-405 at Lennox Boulevard is also recommended as a mitigation measure under Alternative D, which would serve to reduce impacts to, and congestion on, existing freeway ramps in the local area.

SPHE00019 Bernard, Sheila

**Grass Roots Venice
Neighborhood Council**

10/25/2003

SPHE00019-1

Comment:

Good morning. I'm Sheila Bernard. That's S-h-e-i-l-a, B-e-r-n-a-r-d. I'm the President of the Grass Roots Venice Neighborhood Council. Many months ago our council passed a resolution against the widening of Lincoln Boulevard and for consideration of rail transit along Lincoln Boulevard.

3. Comments and Responses

Advocates for rail such as the Friends of the Green Line have proposed a number of ways that rail could lead to points north including Venice and Santa Monica, but also including Northern California, including western states, et cetera.

Now, your technical people who are very talented, very articulate, explained Alternative D does not preclude rail transit. However, not precluding rail transit is not enough. We need you to design rail into the airport improvement. Now, we know it's not your department and we know that the airport is not MTA's department, but the public needs for LAWA and MTA to provide leadership by designing the airport improvement together.

We need both facilities to view the transportation of problems of Los Angeles wholistically. The public needs to see a decrease in air traffic, but an overall increase in public transportation. Building and maintaining and operating public transit can be an enormous source of good jobs that will not pit working people against community members seeking to protect their health against the effects of increased air traffic.

The decrease in air traffic can be accomplished using high speed rail for destinations in Northern California and western States. Those local destinations are taking up at least a fourth of the air traffic in LAX and will continue to do so in the future unless we do otherwise.

While it's true that millions of dollars have gone into the current design, it's worth millions more to revise the plan to ensure its intentional inclusion of both local and high speed rail to avoid billions of dollars of expense later relative to continued erosion of people's health, our environment and the quality of life in our city.

Response:

Alternative D proposes a user-friendly, convenient connection between the Green Line light rail and the LAX terminals via an Automated People Mover. In addition, Alternative D does not preclude the LAC-MTA from using their right-of-way along the west side of Aviation Boulevard for a future transit project.

Any decision to extend the Green Line would be made by the MTA. Currently, the MTA has no plans for extending the Green Line northerly, and LAWA and the FAA have no authority to force them to do so.

LAWA has had several discussions with MTA staff regarding their plans for transit in the LAX vicinity. MTA staff will be invited to participate in the advanced planning of the Ground Transportation Center and Intermodal Transportation Center.

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding further discussion of rail and transit connections to LAX airport, including inter-city high speed rail.

SPHE00020 Ivory, Nelle

None Provided

10/25/2003

SPHE00020-1

Comment:

My name is Nelle Ivory. My last name is spelled I-v-o-r-y.

Yes, I think it is now. I made notes. It may not be in order. However, I'm kind of angry because -- and when I refer to you, don't take it personal. I'm referring to, I guess, Master Plan of LAX and who put it together. I feel it's an insult to have all that information out there and expect us to absorb it and come back and relate it to this project because I hear people said C and D and all of that. I tried to read as much as I could. And it's insulting to me to think that you -- when I say "you," I'm not talking about you personally. You're just a liaison between them and us.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIS for public review.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHE00020-2

Comment:

Now, I think that project is for, and I've had consideration into it, is the politicians, the rich and all of that because they did not come into our community and ask us to do a ground walk-through and suggest how they should do it because the people in the neighborhood could tell them, but we didn't have that.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00007-1 regarding the scoping undertaken for the LAX Master Plan. This response identifies the public informational meetings/workshops and the formal public scoping meetings held on the LAX Master Plan. In response to input from the community obtained through the public scoping process as well as other outreach efforts by LAWA, three of the four original build alternatives were eliminated from consideration and two new build alternatives (subsequently referred to as Alternatives B and C) were proposed. Following input from the public on the Draft EIS/EIR, and the events of September 11, 2001, a fourth build alternative (Alternative D) was proposed.

SPHE00020-3

Comment:

And another thing I would like to say, you can't insult me, but I said that it's insulting for people to think that we can absorb all of that and then give you feedback to take back to the entities that is involved in this. I think it's a regime to enrich the rich, politicians and the other people, not the people that live in the area and all of that because I find out a lot of times jobs are given to out-of-state people. I think it should be in-state, California people, and mainly our area.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00020-4

Comment:

And like Mr. Muhammad said, all of these people come in our prison, they have paid their price. Why shouldn't they have jobs? All of them are not murderers and all of that. However, they should have jobs. And we want that.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00020-5

Comment:

Another thing, I was asking one man out there where the funding is coming from. He said federal bonds, grants, which is our money that we sent to the Federal Government and paid taxes. And he said revenue bonds. Revenue bonds come from us taxpayers, whatever concession, landing fees, passengers worldwide, airline concessions and all much that? 4.

Response:

Comment noted. The proposed master plan improvements would be funded with a combination of FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, and other state/federal grants.

The FAA Airport Improvement Fund is funded by passenger ticket taxes, not personal or corporate income taxes. Airport revenue bonds are repaid from airport revenues which are generated from the users of the airport.

SPHE00020-6**Comment:**

However, all of that said, let everybody -- and I'm not ashamed to live in South Central Los Angeles, any place like that -- let the people of the community be employed, and like the lady said, pay decent wage and don't pay for all of these other rich companies to suck us up. I don't think it's necessary to tear our airport down, just renovate it.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00020-7**Comment:**

And if you want the terrorists to stay out, you don't have to tear down the whole airport and renovate it. Have some place outside the airport to do that before they get in. You wouldn't open your door to a terrorist. You would keep them outside. So don't let them get in.

Response:

Alternative D is designed to accomplish many more objectives than just moving the passenger vehicles out of the terminal core. Alternative D will improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking. The design of the improvements incorporated in Alternative D was given much thought and review. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding purpose of the security improvements under Alternative D.

SPHE00020-8**Comment:**

I think that another thing, if you don't believe I'm telling the truth, the planes start dumping their fuel between Central Avenue and Avalon. I don't live in that area right now, but I used to. And if you don't believe it, sit on Century. They start dumping their fuel between Central Avenue and Avalon, and they dump it all over. I thought it was smoke, but I'm sorry, I just wanted to say this. It's the fuel that the airplanes dump before they go to the airport.

Response:

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

SPHE00021 Blanks, Bobby**Congressmember Maxine
Waters' Office****10/25/2003****SPHE00021-1****Comment:**

My name is Bobby Blanks. Last name is B-l-a-n-k-s, Field Representative to Congressmember Maxine Waters. Address is 10124 South Broadway, Suite Number 1, L.A., California 90003. I would like to read a prepared statement.

Alternative D is a \$9-billion-dollar project that would demolish homes and disturb communities without improving the safety and security of LAX. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is an inaccurate and misleading document that fails to reflect the true impact of this project.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPHE00021-2 through SPHE00021-7 below.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHE00021-2

Comment:

The centerpiece of Alternative D is the Ground Transportation Center, a large remote passenger check-in facility that would be constructed at Manchester Square several blocks away from the airport terminals.

The RAND Corporation conducted a study of the proposed remote passenger check-in facility, which was released May 14, 2003. The study concluded that the proposed project would not significantly improve the security of LAX.

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHE00021-3

Comment:

On July 25th, 2003 I introduced H.R. 2985, a bill to condition construction of a remote passenger check-in facility at LAX upon a finding that such a facility would promote the safety and security of the public. H.R. 2985 would require the Secretary of Homeland Security to review the proposed facility prior to its construction to determine whether it will protect the safety and security of air passengers and the general public more effectively than the existing facilities at LAX.

If the Secretary of Homeland Security does not determine that the facility will improve public safety and security, the FAA would not be allowed to approve its construction. On September 2nd the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County passed a motion to support my legislation.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00021-4

Comment:

In reality, Alternative D would displace thousands of Manchester Square residents. It would also have to relocate about 6,200 people, some of whom who have federally subsidized housing vouchers. I strongly oppose the forced relocation of any of these residents.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHGH00003-4.

SPHE00021-5

Comment:

My constituents living next door to LAX in Westchester, Inglewood, Hawthorne, Gardena and South Central Los Angeles must contend with excessive noise, pollution and traffic congestion caused by the airport. These residents suffer many sleepless nights due to deafening jet noise. Residents have reported increased cases of asthma, respiratory illness and hearing problems.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The 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, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and Response to Comment AI00017-246 regarding hearing loss.

SPHE00021-6

Comment:

The American people are sick and tired of deficits and bloated government spending. The state budget of California is now running a \$38-billion-dollar deficit. And the Federal Government has a \$374,000-billion-dollar deficit in 2003. Furthermore, Congress is in the process of providing the President an additional \$87 billion for continuing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The American people cannot afford to spend \$9 billion on an outrageously expensive boondoggle at LAX.

Response:

The proposed master plan improvements would be funded with a combination of FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, and other state/federal grants. No City general fund dollars will be used to pay for any of the proposed on-airport improvements.

Alternative D will improve the safety and security of the airport, reduce traffic congestion, change the airfield and terminal airside to accommodate new aircraft, improve the efficiency of terminal operations, and eliminate the remote aircraft parking. The design of the improvements incorporated in Alternative D was given much thought and review.

SPHE00021-7

Comment:

Alternative D is simply a continuation of former Mayor Richard Riordan's plan to expand the airport in the name of safety and security. I urge the City Council of the City of Los Angeles to reject this ill-advised and expensive scheme that will displace thousands of Manchester Square residents and others without improving the safety and security of LAX.

Response:

The content of this comment is the same as that of Comment SPC00169-7; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00169-7.

SPHE00022 Roberts, Sondra None Provided 10/25/2003

SPHE00022-1

Comment:

My name is Sondra, S-o-n-d-r-a. And my last name is R-o-b-e-r-t-s. I live at 3503 West 113rd Street in Inglewood.

When I moved to Inglewood 30 years ago -- 31 years ago as a matter of fact, the airport was innocuous. Inbound planes flew in a pattern which seemed to follow Century Boulevard. Outbound planes did not affect us. The air traffic was minimal. The street traffic was bearable. The air was breathable. My sleep was not disturbed at night. Now residents anywhere in the city have either seen or heard an airplane over their houses. All of this, all of these changes have resulted in some very detrimental things.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SPHE00022-2

Comment:

Traffic congestion, our main arteries as well as our neighborhoods are now affected, the speeding traffic, very heavy traffic which has damaged our streets and roadways.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00022-3

Comment:

Noise pollution is evident 24 hours a day not only by aircraft, but by street traffic. And if you're unfortunate enough to live near the freeway, freeway traffic.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00022-4

Comment:

These are a main cause. Noise pollution can be a cause of neurosensory disorders.

Response:

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

SPHE00022-5

Comment:

Air pollution is a known fact and it certainly comes with what we have to deal with from the airport. Aircraft emissions, traffic, street traffic emissions, particulate matter, which is something we have to breathe day in and day out. Most of our adults suffer from some respiratory disorder, but alarmingly the problem is wide-spread among our children whose young lungs should be uncontaminated.

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.

In response to public comment, additional analyses were presented in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and were summarized in the Executive Summary of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was prepared to integrate a new alternative, Alternative D, into the existing environmental review process and to incorporate supplemental information and analysis for the LAX Master Plan. Such information and analysis was based upon the availability of new or updated information since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR in January 2001. Please refer to Section 4.24.1.6, Environmental Consequences, and Section

4.24.1.9, Level of Significance After Mitigation, in the Human Health Risk Assessment of the LAX Master Plan Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for discussions of acute and chronic hazards for all build alternatives and the No Action/No Project Alternative. As described in these sections, health risks (cancer, non-cancer chronic and non-cancer acute) for the majority of nearby residents would be lower for Alternative D than for 1996 baseline, Year 2000 conditions and the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D provides for airfield improvements that would enable aircraft to move more efficiently, thereby reducing air pollutant emissions from aircraft operating in taxi/idle mode, and provides substantial improvements to the on-airport and off-airport surface transportation systems, thereby reducing air pollutant emissions from motor vehicles. Additionally, Alternative D, unlike the No Action/No Project Alternative, includes Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions.

SPHE00022-6

Comment:

We have neurological and psychiatric disorders, sleep deprivation, anxiety, depression, learning disorders. Airports are on their descent directly over many of our schools.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise. In addition, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings and school disruption associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Also, please refer to Response to Comment AL00038-11 regarding the impact of high noise levels on children.

SPHE00022-7

Comment:

Safety issues such as low-flying aircraft, too many aircraft flying in close proximity to one another.

Response:

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

SPHE00022-8

Comment:

More airport related facilities moving closer and into our communities bringing with them the possibility of terrorist attacks.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00022-9

Comment:

Property damage, which is caused by air pollution and sound waves.

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition and Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHE00022-10

Comment:

LAX has been methodically increasing the airport's capacity without the benefit of the required environmental impact reports.

Response:

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

SPHE00022-11

Comment:

The current report is sorely lacking in validity. It does not address the solutions to any of our quality of life issues, traffic, noise and air pollution, mental and physical health, property damage and safety. It is based on old, erroneous, unsubstantiated and irrelevant data.

Response:

The comment is the same as Comment SPC00219-10; please see Response to Comment SPC00219-10.

SPHE00022-12

Comment:

LAX is not an asset to Inglewood. It is the worst possible neighbor any community could have. It profits from our misfortune. But what better place to exploit than a low income minority community?

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00022-13

Comment:

If I had any lung capacity left, I would go outside -- it would be nice to go outside and take a nice clean breath of air.

Response:

Comment noted.

**SPHE00023 Delahoussaye-Bond, None Provided
Sandra**

10/25/2003

SPHE00023-1

Comment:

I'm the next Sandra, S-a-n-d-r-a, D-e-l-a-h-o-u-s-s-a-y-e, hyphen, Bonds, B-o-n-d.

I am opposed to Plan D. The MAP now is already over-tasking my community of Inglewood. I didn't mention, I am from the City of Inglewood, 10503 South 2nd Avenue.

The mitigation measures that are currently being performed within my city are grinding along very slowly. Unfortunately not quick enough to keep up with the adverse effects that those in the flight pattern are having to endure.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. The effect of the operation of LAX on the City of Inglewood under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions were presented throughout Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Although LAX would be improved under the Master Plan, it is important to note that Alternative D is similar to the No Action/No Project Alternative when considering aviation activity levels and noise impacts.

In an effort to mitigate current noise impacts from LAX operations on adjacent communities, LAWA and other jurisdictions affected by high noise levels (defined under FAR Part 150 and Title 21 as the 65 CNEL) prepare and administer their respective ANMPs. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the ANMP. Although implementation of the ANMP by other jurisdictions is outside the direct control of LAWA, LAWA is working with other jurisdictions to improve and accelerate their soundproofing efforts. Concerns about the progress of the ANMP in Inglewood should also be directed to the City of Inglewood residential sound insulation program at the number listed in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.11. As indicated on page 4-88, in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, as of June 2002, in the City of Inglewood 577 units have received sound insulation and 1,591 units have been acquired under the ANMP. Although much progress has been achieved over time, the following obstacles have slowed implementation of the ANMP in the City of Inglewood: a preference of acquisition rather soundproofing residential units (which is a longer process), substandard or non-code compliant housing stock, and residential properties located in areas zoned for non-residential use (inconsistency zoning). Although the 2001 Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, prepared by LAWA, authorizes the mitigation of incompatible residential properties regardless of the zoning designation, it is not the policy of Inglewood to provide sound insulation for such properties. As stated under Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with implementation of the Master Plan, LAWA would accelerate fulfillment of existing commitments to owners wishing to participate within the current ANMP boundaries prior to proceeding with newly eligible properties and would provide additional technical assistance to local jurisdictions to support more rapid and efficient implementation of their respective ANMPs.

SPHE00023-2

Comment:

I am not in favor of the flyaway sites off the perimeters as they are currently being considered. I don't think the terrorists will not know that we have hundreds of people in one convenient place in which they've -- if that was their desire, wanted to do any bombing.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00023-3

Comment:

The 1992 noise evaluation guides I think are very skewed as well. They don't accurately today represent the noise contours that have been expanded from the time they were first performed, the evaluation process. I encourage the lowering of the decibels from 65 to 60. I think that would more accurately address the contours as they are now being impacted.

Response:

Comment noted. As stated in Topical Response TR-LU-3, the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour identifies the ANMP boundaries and properties eligible for sound insulation. The 65 CNEL is the established threshold to determine significant noise levels as defined by FAR Part 150 and Title 21. Structures exposed to noise levels below 65 CNEL would have interior noise levels of 45 CNEL or lower, in compliance with Title 21 requirements. As described in Topical Response TR-LU-3, the

3. Comments and Responses

boundary of the 65 CNEL contour is validated through the continuous monitoring of 25 sites in the area surrounding LAX and quarterly noise reports are submitted by LAWA to Caltrans and the County of Los Angeles. Even though the ANMP was developed based on 1992 conditions, noise levels have decreased over time primarily due to the phasing out of noisier (stage 2) aircraft. This decrease is depicted on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. See Subtopical Response TR-N-2.2 regarding reducing the noise standard to 60 CNEL.

SPHE00023-4

Comment:

There is another situation that is currently in effect with the mitigation measures. And that is the process of only mitigating with noise insulation half of many many blocks, as someone earlier had mentioned, neighbor from neighbor next door. One is given mitigation, the other is not. They are still involved with pollution, structural damage, noise and, of course, particulate particles that are coming down on them.

Response:

Comment noted. FAA and LAWA acknowledge the concern of the commentor and are working with jurisdictions affected by high noise levels from LAX operations to address noise complaints. Areas eligible for sound insulation are based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour 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, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

See Topical Response TR-LU-3, regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and for a description of how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. See Topical Responses TR-N-2 regarding the difference between single event and CNEL noise levels and Subtopical Response TR-N-8.1 regarding structural damage from noise-based vibration. Air quality under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions is described in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHE00023-5

Comment:

I support regional airport planning. To me this is the most logical way of sort of spreading the burden that is currently being forced upon those in the flight pattern of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D was designed to be in compliance with the SCAG RTP and to reflect public comment on earlier LAX Master Plan alternatives that the capacity of LAX should not be expanded.

SPHE00023-6

Comment:

The infractions of nighttime curfews I think are horrendous. Those who are in the flight pattern know 4:00 o'clock in the morning almost religiously you're going to be awakened. It goes on and on. No matter how many times you call and make a complaint, you are sent, if you're lucky enough to get a letter in response there is some lovely explanation. The thing is we're missing sleep. Our children, those who are having to get up and go to work, they are rest broken. We don't deserve this. We think we in the flight pattern deserve as much as anyone else. My word is regional regional regional.

Response:

There is not, nor has there ever been, a nighttime curfew in effect at LAX. There are special operating rules for night flight activity and ground run-ups. 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 to and approaches from the east when over-ocean procedures are in effect. LAWA has recently initiated an

3. Comments and Responses

RFQ to Prepare a 14 CFR Part 161 Study for Los Angeles International Airport. LAVA is seeking to establish a partial curfew at LAX that would prohibit the easterly departure of all aircraft, with certain exemptions, between the hours of 12:00 Midnight to 6:30 a.m. when LAX is in Over-Ocean Operations. Over-Ocean procedures have been in place since the 1970's and they require that under appropriate weather conditions arrivals and departures occur over-ocean on the inboard (6R/24L and 7L/25R) runways between the hours of 12:00 Midnight and 6:30 a.m. For discussion of night noise and LAVA regulations please see Topical Response TR-N-5, regarding nighttime aircraft operations particularly night run-up activity and TR-N-7, regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. Additionally, please see Sections 4.1, Noise and 4.2, Land Use, and Appendix SC and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for single events on nighttime awakenings. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1, LAX Master Plan Role in Regional Approach to Meeting Demand, that discusses demand and capacity at the region's airports.

SPHE00024 Solomon, Willie None Provided 10/25/2003

SPHE00024-1

Comment:

My name is Willie Solomon. I live at 120 East Century Boulevard, Los Angeles, California.

Why are planes permitted to take-off and land between the hours of 11:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m.?

Response:

Airlines and cargo operators routinely schedule flights during the nighttime hours where there is a demand by passengers and/or for cargo. The heavily loaded flights to Asia and Pacific Rim 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 the Asian markets. Mitigation measure MM-N-5 calls for LAVA to initiate a 14 CFR Part 161 study to seek Federal approval of a locally-imposed restriction on departures to and approaches from the east when over-ocean procedures are in effect. Additionally, LAVA has recently initiated a Request For Qualifications to prepare a 14 CFR Part 161 Study for Los Angeles International Airport. LAVA is seeking to establish a partial curfew at LAX that would prohibit the easterly departure of all discretionary aircraft, with certain exemptions, between the hours of 12:00 Midnight to 6:30 a.m. when LAX is in Over-Ocean Operations. During a recent 18-month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. When over-ocean procedures are not practicable for reasons of adverse weather or winds (as defined in Section 4, of LAVA's Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Restrictions), aircraft will continue to depart to the east between midnight and 6:30. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5, regarding nighttime aircraft operations and TR-N-7, regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. In addition, please see Sections 4.1, Noise and 4.2, Land Use, and Appendix SC and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for impacts of single events on nighttime awakenings.

SPHE00024-2

Comment:

Referring to jet noise levels, why haven't some criteria been established to account for flight patterns over areas such as Vermont Knolls?

Response:

Noise impacts in the Vermont Knolls area 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-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHE00024-3

Comment:

Why can't jet engine noise be muffled within ten miles from the landing?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Although jet engine noise has been significantly reduced in the last 20 years, the improvements have predominantly come in the departure phase of operation with the development of the high bypass engine. The Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990 was passed by Congress and required the phase-out of the noisier Stage 2 aircraft weighing more than 75,000 pounds and this was completed by December 31, 1999. However, even with the high bypass engines as the hot gasses pass through the turbines, exhaust noise will continue to be made in order to keep the aircraft in flight. Another source of noise that the commentor may experience living approximately seven miles east of LAX is airframe noise. The ability to reduce airframe noise is a much more difficult challenge.

This is the non-propulsive noise that is made when the unsteady airflow is deflected by the landing gear, wing flaps and wing slats that are in the extended position and tends to be most prevalent during the aircraft approach. Therefore, even if additional measures are taken to address arrival jet engine noise the commentor will still be in exposed to other aircraft related noise.

SPHE00024-4

Comment:

How can the residue from jet fuel be reduced over our community?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition, soot, and fuel dumping. Please see Response to Comment SAL00013-125 regarding aircraft operation mitigation measures.

SPHE00024-5

Comment:

Why not extend the airport and runways out into the ocean? Japan has done this very successfully.

Response:

The commentor is referring to Kansai International Airport (KIX) in Osaka, Japan. The Osaka community faced different constraints than Los Angeles when they chose to move forward with construction of an off-shore airport. The extremely high costs (KIX cost \$14 Billion to construct), limited size (one runway and 33 gates) and continuing problems with the island (the operators of KIX have already spent in excess of \$2 Billion on repairs to fix the airport island as it subsided 38 feet in its first six years which is more than was anticipated) present challenges LAWA would like to avoid in moving forward with a master plan for LAX. KIX is faced with some of the highest landing fees in the world yet remains in debt. Lastly, KIX was built in more shallow and protected waters than those off of the Southern California Coast suggesting LAWA would face even greater challenges than KIX in pursuing a similar solution. In order to control costs and minimize environmental impacts, it was decided that off shore airport construction was not an appropriate solution for LAX.

Further, extending the airport runways west into the ocean was evaluated in the earlier phases of the Master Plan, please see Formulation and Refinement of Alternatives in Chapter 3.1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The concept was eliminated to keep costs down and minimize environmental impacts.

The El Segundo Blue Butterfly which resides in the dunes to the west of the airport is a federally listed species. The Butterfly and its habitat are protected under the Endangered Species Act.

LAX Master Plan - Alternative D reconfigures components of the airfield and landside environments at LAX in order to improve safety and security at the airport. These improvements to the airport can be made within the existing property boundary of the airport and will not require the airport to be expanded west into the Pacific Ocean. In order for LAX to meet the goals of the Regional Transportation Plan, LAX Master Plan - Alternative D is designed to accommodate the constrained forecast level of passenger traffic in 2015 of 78.9 MAP. There is no need to expand the airport west to achieve improvements in safety, efficiency and security.

SPHE00024-6**Comment:**

What methodology has been devised to mass transit passengers to terminals if no curbside drop-off is permitted?

Response:

Drop-off and pick-up of passengers will be permitted curbside at the Ground Transportation Center. From the Ground Transportation Center, passengers will ride the Automated People Mover to the Central Terminal Area. Airport passengers will also have the option of parking at one of the proposed remote FlyAway terminals, where an airport-operated shuttle bus will take them directly curbside to their airline in the Central Terminal Area.

Passengers who choose to arrive to the airport by the Green Line light rail service would depart at the Imperial/Aviation station, use the moving pedestrian walkway directly from the station platform over Imperial Highway to the Intermodal Transportation Center, and ride the Automated People Mover directly to the Central Terminal Area.

SPHE00024-7**Comment:**

Local residents have been told from the start that the general aspects of the plans were not negotiable, then why are you holding public hearings?

Response:

This comment is similar to comment SPC00308-30; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00308-30.

SPHE00024-8**Comment:**

Since existing airport was designed to accommodate 40 million passengers, last year 56.2 million used the facilities, and the expansion will accommodate 78.9 million. What are your plans to not further impact our quality of life or has it been factored into your plans?

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment SPC00220-8; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00220-8.

SPHE00024-9**Comment:**

Now the economical part of this airport, 49,000 jobs that the airport expansion project to create. How many jobs for the residents in these communities that have and will be impacted be made available?

The Mayor has addressed certain Unions with expansion plans. Are there plans to reach out to non-union workers, give them an opportunity for employment?

How would this -- how will the public be notified of available -- these employments?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02204-14 for clarification on the net change in jobs associated with airport operations under Alternative D and regarding the types of new jobs to be created. Also see

3. Comments and Responses

Response to Comment PC01045-2 regarding the distribution of projected job growth. The 49,000 figure cited in the comment above refers to the approximate number of construction jobs to be created under Alternative D, which, similar to projected airport jobs, can be expected to draw from an applicant pool residing throughout the region and in the areas surrounding the airport in particular. In general, the employment opportunities generated by Alternative D can be expected to draw both union and non-union applicants. A variety of notification methods will likely be utilized to advertise job opportunities, such as listings in major publications, on job boards or employment web sites, or through professional organizations or unions, as appropriate. Refer also to the Job Outreach Program described in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHE00025 Ferruccio, John None Provided 10/25/2003

SPHE00025-1

Comment:

Thank you. Good morning. My name is John Ferruccio. That's F-e-r-r-u-c-c-i-o.

Myself and my family have been longtime residents of Los Angeles in the City of Gardena. And I am here today to testify on behalf of Alternative D because I feel it is the best plan for the City of Los Angeles.

As a union organizer for both journeymen and apprentices in the pipe trades, in the construction field, my obligation to the local communities is hopefully to provide an opportunity for employment. This plan will provide for more than 50,000 construction jobs and numerous employment positions after construction in the local area. With all the budget cuts and layoffs in our city, very obviously here currently more jobs will help stimulate our region, our regional economy, and most importantly, keep people working.

As for the security concerns, I support Mayor Hahn's efforts to incorporate safety as a key element of the design of the airport. It is vital to the LAX Master Plan.

In closing, let's not waste any more time. We need to be pro-active with safety, security and jobs. Let's move forward with Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00026 Swiney, Ethel Wilton and Gramercy Place Club 10/25/2003

SPHE00026-1

Comment:

My name is Ethel Swiney spelled S-w-i-n-e-y. And I'm stakeholder in this area. I represent the Wilton and Gramercy Place Club.

And I'm here in opposition to the expansion of the LAX Airport because of the fact that most of us I would say from Century Boulevard to north of Manchester -- which I live 500 feet -- or from Manchester Boulevard, and I am in direct landing pattern, I can see the landing wheels go down at night. If I'm in my play room, I can see the lights go on, the landing lights.

I've been in the area for 38 years. I was there when they opened up what is now called the North Runway. Which when the 747s started coming in during the '70s, the closest I was to the landing pattern was Century Boulevard. I also worked at Manhattan Place Elementary School, which is 1850 West 96th Street. During the assembly the principal had to stop her announcements in order to let the planes go by.

The children have been affected at least 37 years by the taking off and landing. And we in that particular area get a double portion because when the weather is bad, the airplanes come eastward. And we also get the ones that is coming into the airport.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise thresholds, impacts, and mitigation measures for schools. Schools without aviation easements that are determined to be newly exposed to significant aircraft noise levels are eligible for mitigation. Please see Response to Comment AL00035-23 for a description of the aviation easements, noise mitigation payments, and other provisions of the "Settlement Agreement" resolving land use compatibility and noise mitigation issues. Mitigation measure MM-LU-1 provides mitigation for schools determined to be significantly impacted by aircraft noise, excluding schools with aviation easements. Mitigation may take the form of sound insulation or relocation. Further mitigation is provided under mitigation measures MM-LU-3 and MM-LU-4 in the form of study of aircraft noise levels that result in classroom disruption and sound insulation for schools determined by the study or interim noise measurements to be significantly impacted. As also shown in Response to Comment AL00038-6, under Alternatives A, C, and D, Manhattan Place Elementary would not be newly exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels compared to the 1996 baseline. In addition, Manhattan Place Elementary would not be newly exposed to high single event noise levels that result in classroom disruption under any of the Master Plan alternatives, compared to the 1996 baseline. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular, Subtopical Response TR-N-5.2 regarding eastward airplane approaches in bad weather. As described in mitigation measure MM-N-5, 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.

SPHE00026-2

Comment:

So for health reason I'm really against it because it causes children to become asthmatic. I work in my garden and I plant plants and things. And I can feel the residue that come from these planes on my beans, my greens, or whatever, and it is detrimental to the people that's in this particular area.

Response:

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

SPHE00026-3

Comment:

And I also have been on the list for soundproofing for three and a half years. No one has taken the time to come out to check out my house. I call every three months. And they tell me they will get back to me and to let me know they are still working in my area, but they have not contacted me.

Response:

Comment noted. Although this is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR or Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, please see Topical Response TR-LU-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4, regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined, Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.8 regarding how priority for soundproofing is established, and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 regarding how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP (which includes an accelerated schedule to meet existing commitments).

3. Comments and Responses

SPHE00026-4

Comment:

So I would like to go on record as the President of the Wilton and Gramercy Club, we are against the expanding of the LAX.

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.

**SPHE00027 Williams, Roger International Brotherhood of 10/25/2003
Electrical Workers**

SPHE00027-1

Comment:

Good morning. My name is Roger Williams, W-i-l-l-i-a-m-s. And my address is 733 South Hindry Avenue in Inglewood, 90301. And I'm representing the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 11. I am basically here today to testify in support of Mayor Hahn's Alternative D Master Plan.

I feel that Alternative D is the most sound and balanced approach to modernization at LAX. And I, therefore, voice my support of Alternative D and the Mayor's effort to bring modernization at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

**SPHE00028 Slawson, Richard Los Angeles Building & 10/25/2003
Construction Trades Council**

SPHE00028-1

Comment:

Good morning. It's still morning. My name is Richard Slawson. I'm the Executive Secretary of the Los Angeles and Orange Counties Building and Construction Trades Council. Our council represents construction craft unions that represent approximately 130,000 members living and working and raising their families throughout Los Angeles and Orange County.

I wanted to comment on a couple of things that have been said today about the difference between moving forward and not moving forward. I've participated in quite a few of the meetings that have been held by the Southern California Association of Governments, participated on the Aviation Subcommittee when many of the proposals were put together talking about the numbers of actual passengers that would be able to be handled by not only LAX, but the other airports in the area.

Without this Master Plan or without a Master Plan going forward, the SCAG reports say that LAX could expand to 98 million passengers annually. With the plan, Mayor Hahn has limited that to 78 million. So I want everyone that is here today to understand that we need to do something to correct the problems at LAX, not do nothing and see the problems be exaggerated and continued.

We support the airport working with all of the communities. I know that they have in many cases held many many community meetings. I've attended probably 90 percent of them, everything from around the airport to the San Fernando Valley. I live in Torrance. Our office is in the City of Los Angeles at 1626 Beverly Boulevard. So we live and work throughout every region here.

3. Comments and Responses

And I also wanted to talk about our membership. As you can see from the people that are here today, we represent people that live everywhere in Los Angeles and Orange County. They live in Inglewood. They live in Los Angeles. I live in Torrance. There are people that live in Redondo Beach, El Segundo. We represent 130,000 members. We think we represent the community as well. We are in support of Alternative D because we think it is the solution to problems, not -- and will not allow the situation to continue to get worse.

Talking about the jobs, our members make up this community. We don't come from Arizona. We don't come from Northern California or some other state. We all live right here. Our 130,000 members who are raising their families, purchasing homes, paying their bills, sending their kids to school just like everyone else here. There are 49,000 construction jobs approximately. I think there is even more than that that will be involved in this project. We have put together an agreement with the City that utilizes apprenticeship, that continues to open up entry level positions in the construction trades to create careers for people that live in our community, pay their taxes in our community. And we are committed to making sure that those jobs -- that everyone in the community has opportunities for all of those jobs as well as the people we already represent.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that, without implementation of the LAX Master Plan, LAX would accommodate 78.7 MAP. Under Alternatives A and B, LAX is projected to accommodate 97.9 MAP in 2015.

SPHE00029 Netherly, Tarlise

None Provided

10/25/2003

SPHE00029-1

Comment:

My name is Tarlise Netherly. And it is spelled, N as in Nancy, e, T as in Tom, h-e-r-l-y.

I'm going to start by saying I do support Alternative D. However, it took me a total of 12 days, 3 hours a day, to read and understand the proposed plan and the drastic changes being proposed. I originally began reading the plan to get an insight on a piece of property in your proposal that I would like to develop. However, in doing research I found something quite alarming.

With myself being handicapped, I am thoroughly aware of my surroundings. Therefore, I notice that the plan had not stated specific handicapped or disabled safety precautions being developed. The Alternative Master D Plan states "it's accessible" but what does that mean?

For instance, in the proposal, the proposed people mover, there are no intended railings for the blind to hold on to. There are no seating schematics -- excuse me, there are no seating schematics and there are no wheelchair safety locks. Anyone who knows anything about wheelchairs knows that the wheel locks on the wheelchairs are not always sturdy. There is also no mention of our exceptional four-legged friends, our dogs, to assist us in getting around. They, too, are a part of us. Posting the well-recognized handicap placard is meaningless if there is no actual assistance to back it up.

Your suggestion of Alternative Master D Plan utilizes a great deal of paper, but, yet, leaves out a part of a social class that is still alive -- excuse me, still alive, well and extremely vital to the community. It is imperative that precautions for the handicapped and disabled be included on paper and not just phased in while construction takes place. This would be improper procedure.

All too often society ignores the fact that someone who looks, talks and walks differently may, indeed, have feelings just like the next normal person. This is precisely why I am asking the council to go back and review the schematics of Alternative D before making a commitment of spending millions of dollars in order to construct and redevelop LAX and its surrounding areas. Should you decide to research the information I have given you regarding the handicapped and disabled, you will find there is a substantial amount of people both young and elderly who enjoy and/or are required to travel. Your people mover must accommodate us as well.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Accommodations for the blind and disabled will be addressed during the advanced planning stages of the Automated People Mover and other proposed components of Alternative D. Federal requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act will be followed during design of these facilities.

SPHE00030 Hawn, Dan Operating Engineers, Local 12 10/25/2003

SPHE00030-1

Comment:

Good morning. My name is Dan Hawn, H-a-w-n, at 150 East Corson, Pasadena, California. I'm a representative of Operating Engineers Local 12, heavy equipment operators. We represent approximately 23,000 members. Our members work on projects such as the Alameda Corridor, the Alameda Corridor east that is currently underway, the cost and freeway construction going around Southern California and hopefully that improves the lives of the residents in the communities.

Now, we would certainly benefit, our members would, from all the work that would be generated by L.A. expansion. But not only that, we're concerned about when our members go home if they have quality of life to enjoy their families when they do get home. That's an important factor. For that reason we are -- we believe that Mayor Hahn's Alternative D design serves the local communities, the communities that our members live in.

I understand that a lot of people in those communities have concerns about the workers or the openings for the construction work that is going to be generated through there. Our apprenticeship programs -- like Mr. Slawson indicated, our apprenticeship programs are deeply involved in the career days in all the communities. So they pass out the applications for the apprenticeship programs who are always open to the communities. Our members live in the communities. I appreciate your time.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00031 Hernandez, Lisa Communities for a Better 10/25/2003
Environment

SPHE00031-1

Comment:

Thank you. Hi. My name isn't Carlos, but Lisa Hernandez, but I am making a statement for Carlos Porras who is the Executive Director of Communities for a Better Environment, CBE.

In L.A. County African-American, latinos and Asians are three times more likely to have a hazardous waste treatment, storage or disposal facility within one mile of their homes than a white population. Schools with more than 50 percent people of color population are three times more likely to have a facility reporting to the Federal Toxic Release Inventory within a mile of the school. Children attending schools with the highest risk of respiratory health problems score significantly lower achievement. These are health problems due to poor air quality. There aren't enough studies that study the effect of exhaust. And the EIR does not sufficiently address this problem.

People of color have historically been burdened with negative impacts of development that benefits the broader society while forced to live in poverty. People of color are now declaring this environmental racism unjust. We demand environmental justice. Any project at LAX will have impacts on the surrounding communities of color. And we demand justice for these communities. Any project that benefits the economy must benefit the people impacted.

Response:

Comment noted. Regarding the study of effects from exhaust, 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.

Regarding populations who may be predisposed to health problems, and benefits that apply to those who would be disproportionately impacted by the proposed project, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed these issues in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Specifically, regarding predisposition or vulnerability to health problems, please see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.5), of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsections 4.4.3.5.2 and 4.4.3.5.3), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Regarding mitigation measures and benefits intended to avoid, eliminate, reduce or offset the potential for disproportionate effects relating to air quality, health, and noise, see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and this Final EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities and Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

LAX is a public use airport. Rates and charges are imposed to cover the cost of maintaining and upgrading the facility for public use. LAX is a public entity not a "for profit" entity. It is an agency of the City and any "economic gain" in the form of increased revenue must be utilized for airport purposes.

Although benefits may be taken into account in making findings regarding a project's potential for disproportionately high and adverse environmental and health effects pursuant to U.S. Department of Transportation Order 5610.2, there is no legal requirement under NEPA or CEQA for economic benefits, or for benefits to be proportionate to environmental burdens. The primary focus of the EIS/EIR under NEPA and CEQA is to disclose and mitigate physical impacts on the environment. Accepting that the project would result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income communities, a benefits program has been developed with public input as further described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2.

SPHE00032 Carpio, Sparky

None Provided

10/25/2003

SPHE00032-1

Comment:

S-p-a-r-k-y, Carpio, C-a-r-p-i-o; 407 Exton Avenue, Number 4, Inglewood, California 90302.

When I was skimming through the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and listening to different LAWA staff people and elected officials, I have come to believe they seem to be more concerned and careful of the infrastructure and the economics of the buildings and money-making resources than of the health, welfare and sanity of the communities. All I see in this plan is greed on all levels of government. Why don't people who are not elected officials get the compensation and quality of life they deserve?

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 14a and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-4 regarding human health mitigation strategies and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on the quality of life. 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.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHE00032-2

Comment:

Also in 2001 SCAG had an item in its RTP about the Arbor Vitae interchange. And time and time again elected officials had said that it had nothing to do with the airport or its expansion, and LAWA staff even went so far as to say that the interchange was for the Forum, which is now a church, Hollywood Park, which needed financial help from the City of Inglewood, and a K-Mart that is no longer existent. So if the interchange is not for the airport, why is it in the EIS/EIR?

Response:

Using proper forecasting procedures, funded future transportation improvements that are not part of the proposed project itself were accounted for as background improvements in the traffic model networks. Since the southern half of the Arbor Vitae Interchange on the I-405 Freeway is a funded improvement according to the most recent Southern California Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan, it was assumed that the project will be built by 2015, even though it is completely independent of the airport or the Master Plan.

SPHE00032-3

Comment:

There is also an MOU between LAWA and Inglewood that is mentioned in the EIS/EIR that its aviation easement requirements are currently suspended - the requirements to the aviation easements that the residents had to sign takes away their rights to sue the airport. In the past Inglewood's mayor had wrongly stated at a City Council meeting that the easements had been eliminated while in fact they were merely suspended.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00032-4

Comment:

And then with Manchester Square as the GTC, how will it improve security and safety? And, by the way, there are two -- there are now two Manchester Squares because a while ago L.A. City Council had -- had -- I forgot. I think they had -- they had renamed a park in -- in L.A., Manchester Square, but it is not the one near the airport adjacent to the airport. So that's a bit confusing. I think in the EIS/EIR that should be clarified to which one you were addressing.

And I guess if you want to keep the CTA safe, Manchester Square helps. But how is putting all the people closer to the residents of Westchester going to keep the passengers and residents safe? If someone really wanted to do something to improve safety and security, they would do the best thing and regionalize.

Response:

The location of the GTC is clearly identified as the area defined as north of Imperial Highway, east of Aviation Boulevard, south of Arbor Vitae, and west of Interstate 405 in the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum as well as the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Figure ES-1 of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum and Figure ES-5 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a depiction of the GTC site. Please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security concerns related to the GTC.

In addition, the area the commentor is referring to as another Manchester Square was a proposed development by Vidal Sasson in South L.A. There is no official designation of a community, district or neighborhood entitled Manchester Square in that location. The neighborhood designation for that general area is Vermont Knolls.

SPHE00033 Furtado, Anthony International Union of Operating Engineers 10/25/2003

SPHE00033-1

Comment:

I'm Anthony Furtado, F-u-r-t-a-d-o. I live at 2300 Bellevue Avenue, L.A., 90026. That's Echo Park. I'm also a member of International Union of Operating Engineers Local 12. I'm an apprentice. I've lived in Echo Park just about all my life. I'm here to voice my support for Mayor Hahn's Alternative D.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00034 Logan, Styles None Provided 10/25/2003

SPHE00034-1

Comment:

Thank you for giving us time to address some of our concerns here.

I have some comments about the quality of life in the surrounding areas. First of all, pollution. Both noise and aerosol components will increase dramatically because airline traffic will expand the level required by the planned MAP.

Response:

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

SPHE00034-2

Comment:

Included in the plan should be a proposal to provide funds to complete the existing soundproofing contracts and identify the remaining homes that are affected based on 55 DNL noise levels and above.

Response:

A description of available funding for the current ANMP is provided in the Los Angeles International Airport Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) 2001, prepared by LAWA. See Topical Response TR-LU-3, regarding how the ANMP boundaries are established and current progress of soundproofing under the ANMP. As defined by FAR Part 150 and Title 21, the 65 CNEL is the established threshold to determine significant noise levels. Structures exposed to noise levels below 65 CNEL would have interior noise levels of 45 CNEL or lower, in compliance with Title 21 requirements. See also Subtopical Response TR-N-2.3 regarding evaluation of noise impacts beyond the 65 CNEL contour. Priority for sound insulation is given to residential properties within the highest noise level band above the 65 CNEL contour. However, Section 4.2, Land Use of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR identified noise-sensitive uses exposed to an increase of 3 CNEL between the 60 and 65 CNEL contour and increases of 5 CNEL below the 60 CNEL under the build alternatives. Although significant progress has been made in soundproofing residential properties, there have been challenges to a more rapid implementation of the ANMP including: a preference in some jurisdictions for acquisition

3. Comments and Responses

rather soundproofing residential units (which is a longer process), substandard or non-code compliant housing stock, and residential properties located in areas zoned for non-residential use (inconsistency zoning). As stated under Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA would accelerate fulfillment of existing commitments to owners wishing to participate within the current ANMP boundaries prior to proceeding with newly eligible properties and would provide additional technical assistance to local jurisdictions to support more rapid and efficient implementation of their respective ANMPs.

SPHE00034-3

Comment:

The infrastructure, Century Boulevard from the 110 Freeway to La Cienega and other heavily traveled streets to and from the airport should be resurfaced regularly with funding support from the LAWA to eliminate potholes and other irregularities.

Response:

Comment noted. Federal law does not permit the airport to use airport revenue to pay for street resurfacing projects, particularly since the majority of vehicles on these streets are not related to the airport. Individual jurisdictions are responsible for maintenance of their streets. Century Boulevard between the I-110 Freeway and La Cienega Boulevard falls within three jurisdictions, namely the County of Los Angeles, City of Los Angeles, and the City of Inglewood.

SPHE00034-4

Comment:

Homeowners residing in the flight path of Los Angeles International Airport are significantly impacted by the airplane noise making it difficult to plan and enjoy activities in the backyard or leave doors and windows opened for ventilation. The constant drone of the airplanes taking off and landing does not permit normal phone conversations without interruption or the enjoyment of a television program without exceeding the 60 decibel levels, which have been determined to be a normal level for a conversation.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment SPC00224-4; please refer to Response to Comment SPC00224-4.

SPHE00034-5

Comment:

Environmental issues, health issues and surrounding soundproofing for residents living in the flight path and around LAX must be mitigated prior to approval of any Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted. Pursuant to NEPA and CEQA requirements, the focus of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was to analyze the potential environmental impacts that would result from the development of the proposed LAX Master Plan improvements and provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. Existing environmental conditions (including air quality, health and safety, and noise) of communities affected by airport operations under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions are described in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. LAWA and the FAA are working with surrounding jurisdictions to address their concerns about current LAX operations. As presented in Topical Response TR-LU-5, current efforts are primarily directed at aircraft noise and include the ANMP, the Aircraft Noise Abatement Program, the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Los Angeles and the City of Inglewood, methods to file complaints and flight tracking system, the LAX Community Noise Roundtable, and the LAX Area Advisory Committee. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the ANMP. Master Plan Commitments and mitigation measures that avoid or reduce potential environmental impacts of the LAX Master Plan are listed in Chapter 5 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHE00034-6

Comment:

The environmental; the environmental impact, particularly air pollution and noise will be substantially increased during the physical construction as well as when the expansion is complete.

Response:

Comment noted. Construction noise and air emissions would impact surrounding areas. However, Mitigation Measures MM-N-5 through MM-N-9 (Section 4.1.8.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR) are intended to reduce noise effects from construction activities to the extent practicable and Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-1 (Section 4.1.8.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR) is intended to reduce air emissions. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed construction impacts in Section 4.20, Construction Impacts, 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 for more information on Construction Emissions. 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.

SPHE00034-7

Comment:

Health issues. Studies dating back to 1977 report that continued exposure to loud noise is a health hazard to individuals living near and around the flight corridor.

Airplane noises are linked to stress, hypertension, sleep deprivation and interruptions, work-related performances, learning and academic performances.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise. In addition, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings and school disruption associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Also, please refer to Response to Comment AL00038-11 regarding the impact of high noise levels on children.

SPHE00034-8

Comment:

The residents of the 8th District would like to go on the record opposing any expansion until the environmental health and economic issues are mitigated to assure that our quality of life will not be further compromised. My name is Styles Logan. That's S-t-y-l-e-s, L-o-g-a-n. I live at 1243 West 80th Street in Los Angeles, 90044.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SPHE00034-1 through SPHE00034-7 above.

3. Comments and Responses

SPHE00035 Holmes, Jimmie

None Provided

10/25/2003

SPHE00035-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Jimmie Holmes, J-i-m-m-i-e, H-o-l-m-e-s. I live at 3933 6th Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90008. And I'm not here really about the expansion. I understand that government is going to do what they want along with the cooperation and support of billion-dollar businesses. The thing I'm here for is the increased air traffic over my home in the last two months.

I moved in my house approximately six years ago and I saved a long time to buy it. Upon moving there I never even noticed the airport. Now, every day starting at approximately 4:30 a.m. and until 1:30 -- 1:30 a.m. and through the night there is constant air traffic. I've tracked it on the internet, planes of shapes and sizes traveling at altitudes of three thousand, five thousand feet to three thousand feet. I don't understand.

Response:

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 to and approaches from the east when over-ocean procedures are in effect. Additionally, LAWA has recently initiated a Request For Qualifications to prepare a 14 CFR Part 161 Study for Los Angeles International Airport. LAWA is seeking to establish a partial curfew at LAX that would prohibit the easterly departure of all discretionary aircraft, with certain exemptions, between the hours of 12:00 Midnight to 6:30 a.m. when LAX is in Over-Ocean Operations. During a recent 18-month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. When over-ocean procedures are not practicable for reasons of adverse weather or winds (as defined in Section 4, of LAWA's Aircraft Noise Abatement Operating Restrictions), aircraft will continue to depart to the east between midnight and 6:30. For discussion of night noise and LAWA regulations please see Topical Response TR-N-5, regarding nighttime aircraft operations particularly night run-up activity and TR-N-7, regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. Additionally, please see Sections 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and Appendix SC and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for single events on nighttime awakenings.

SPHE00035-2

Comment:

Airport expansion? Yeah, people will stand to make billions of dollars from it, no doubt, but why over the homes in the African-American and Hispanic communities?

The plans that I have reviewed do not address that. It's not going to slow air traffic over my home. It's not going to limit exhaust fumes over my home. It's not going to assist me with funding to buy a new home outside of the area that has been attacked with these planes. What am I to do? What is my six-year-old son to do and all his playmates that are running up and down the street? I'm really here just to get my name on the record because I know you people are going to do what you're going to do?

I make \$100,000 a year. And I'm sure that no one making this decision is living in an area with planes flying over their homes, except that one gentleman who enjoys it, but that's not me. So please take those things into consideration before the plan is executed.

Response:

Comment noted. Regarding why certain effects of existing and proposed LAX operations, such as aircraft noise, fall disproportionately over minority communities, please see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, 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.

SPHE00036 Woo, Shu

None Provided

10/25/2003

SPHE00036-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Shu Woo. I live in Los Angeles near the airport area and work first in El Segundo and then downtown Los Angeles for over 30 years. Prior to that I lived in another big city right underneath the flight path. My son went to Westchester neighborhood school for the past nine years. As an airport user and a person who travels near the airport often, I enjoy the convenient location but at the same time see the shortcoming of the current airport, particularly after 9-11.

I am here to speak to support Mayor Jim Hahn's Alternative D plan. This plan basically is a safety and security modernization plan. It is also an efficient plan aimed at improving quality of life for travelers and residents alike. It is to reduce waiting at the terminal and on the airfield, move passenger in and out of the airport quickly and safely, mitigate negative impact on the surrounding, making everything flow smoothly. This is the main idea here. Runways are to spread further apart to improve safety. And when arrival and check-in parcels are dispersed in a much wider area and streamline it through a multi-layer of securities, everything flows. When everything flows, there is very little concentration along lines of passenger at airport. The likely terrorist target would be diminished.

Pollution will be reduced when everything flows. Security as well as traveling experience and the quality of life will be greatly enhanced. This is part of a regional solution that would allow air traffic flow to be shifted to other airports. This plan allows some growth at LAX without negatively impacting the neighborhood. It would not bring the neighborhood more congested traffic in the air or the ground. However, it is not decided to be an expansion plan that the residents hates or some airline would like to see, but nothing should be more important to the airline industry than security and safety. You can't put a price tag on that. You don't want to -- you can't afford to have another 9-11 to happen. A few dollar each passenger each time is well worth it.

It's like buying an insurance policy, but is actually much better. An insurance policy pays the beneficiary some money after something bad happen. Most people would much prefer a plan that could spend some money and be able to reduce the chance of something bad from happening in the first place.

LAX is probably the most important infrastructure in the region. It is like a major artery carrying economic lifeblood to all the communities. We simply can't ignore this. LAX has one major advantage over most big city airports in the world. LAX is very close to the heart of the city. This is great for tourism, international trade, local jobs and business alike. We want to preserve this major advantage that makes Los Angeles great. However, LAX fall behind in modernization compared to most other big city airports. I believe Mayor Jim Hahn's plan is the most balanced and well thought through approach. Let's get to work.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00037 Lim, Shawn

Korean Community Service

10/25/2003

SPHE00037-1

Comment:

My name is Esther Kwon. I'm the Korean Community Service Active Member.

My name is Jason Ahn, A-h-n.

My name is Kay Lee. It's Buena Park -- I come from Orange County, just one I want. I was impressed - - I read -- when I read Thursday and the July 10th and James Hahn said doing nothing is not a potion we have an antiquated airport from the standpoint of modern -- if you read on there something, people will fly somewhere else. That's it.

3. Comments and Responses

My name is Tua, P-e-k.

My name is Peter Rhee, R-h-e-e, 2701 Wilshire Boulevard.

My name is Don Jung. I'm the President of a company named Trim Life.

My name is John Oh. Spelling is O-h.

My name is Jay Kim. Last name is K-i-m.

Good afternoon. My name is Chun, S-o-n-k-o. Thank you.

Good afternoon. My name is Samuel In. Spell is I-n, 952 Westchester Place, L.A., 90019.

Good afternoon. My name is Shawn Lim. Last name is L-i-m. We are here --

Okay. I'm starting -- we are speaking only two person. I'm starting --

My name is Shawn Lim. Last name is L-i-m. I'm trying to save the time for all of you. We come in here Korean-American, we support Mayor James Hahn, the expansion Alternative D Plan because that -- we had a lot of trouble coming in all of the others for the country. Our LAX is old, small. We have a lot of people coming in here. Then we have a lot of problem of inconvenience. We need to let all people know in the world L.A. is a big city. We need the security. We're going to let them know. We're going to expand the airport, better -- better technology. We're going to put it up there. People knew we have the security.

I had a lot of people living in Korea. They are not coming here after 9-11. Because of that, the United States after 9-11, all these people think we have a lot of problem, we have a lot of security reason. So we had a better expansion, Alternative D plays a help that all the other foreign country know L.A. is a safety place. They come in here and travel.

Then, also, in Korea a lot of years ago they had a big expanded international airport. They had a separated international airport. They separated. They built on it years ago is a real convenience because you don't need to carry the luggage on it. You stop by the terminal, luggage you check-in, luggage go to the airport. Wherever you go just a little package you carry, go inside the airport. This saves a lot of time. And then, also, they had a lot of safety reason. It is a good security. So we need the expansion LAX so people know LAX is a better community, a better safety place.

So my point is our Korean-American business owner, a lot have a difficult time for leave because our businesses, some of them belong to Korea, some of them belong to China and Japan. Nobody come in here and visit the United States. So we need the expansion, the LAX people convenience. People come in here. They feel safety. They feel like it is security also. That's why I support James Hahn Expansion Alternative D Plan. 100 percent our Korean-American organization supports the James Hahn plan. Thanks for letting me talk.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00038 Kim, Susan

None Provided

10/25/2003

SPHE00038-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Susan Kim. The address is 952 South Western Avenue, L.A., California, 90006. I'm here to represent Korean community.

I have come here today to support Alternative D of the LAX Master Plan. To me when we buy a house, we move into the house. If we live there for like 10, 20 years, we spend money to operate the houses whether we're going to sell it or still living in there. We make it to moderate changes to have a better

3. Comments and Responses

My concern is small, but significant. The name Manchester Square is meaningful to anyone who is familiar with the Master Plan for LAX. Manchester Square is, or I should say was, a neighborhood within Westchester. Westchester is a community within the City of Los Angeles. The homes within Manchester Square are being acquired and demolished by Los Angeles World Airports. Manchester Square is slaughtered to become the site of a huge Ground Transportation Center. Manchester Square is part of the Mayor Hahn's Master Plan for expansion of LAX.

The name Manchester Square is in the minds and on the lips of anyone who seriously discusses Alternative D. However, how many people know that the City Council of Los Angeles approved a resolution to name a neighborhood within the community of South Central Manchester Square. On an editorial aside, I think that's rather sinister. There are two Manchester Squares in the City of Los Angeles. The question I pose to the respondents to public comments, how are you going to differentiate between the old Manchester Square and the new one?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00001-4 regarding validity of the acquisition of Manchester Square, and Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.4 regarding the purpose of the GTC in Manchester Square under Alternative D.

SPHE00040-2

Comment:

I oppose all Alternatives that increase the capacity of Los Angeles International Airport. All Alternatives including the no-action no-project Alternative increase the capacity of LAX. Until the Department of Airports aggressively protects the communities from noise and pollution, I will not support any Alternative for LAX. The noise variance is coming up. It is time to aggressively address the issues -- I'm sorry, that was -- thank you. If I may just --

Thank you. I would hope that the Department of Airports would aggressively address those issues within that noise variance, otherwise you're going to have a lot of problems on your hands. The noise variance will probably be submitted by February of next year. It's time we sit down and start talking about some real resolutions to what's going on, particularly in the City of Inglewood. And I propose that those involved with that variance start talking to community members rather than city officials or there is going to be a lot of problems in Inglewood.

Response:

Comment noted. While Alternatives A, B, and C would increase the capacity of LAX, the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D would accommodate aviation activity levels consistent with the levels forecast in SCAG's 2001 Regional Transportation Plan and Regional Aviation Plan.

LAWA is working with the City of Inglewood to address their concerns about noise and pollution effects from current LAX operations. As described on pages 10 and 11 of Technical Report S-1 Supplemental Land Use Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City of Inglewood in February 2001 to study and mitigate the possible environmental impacts on Inglewood of existing and possible future operations and improvements at LAX. Components of the MOU include: suspending aviation easement requirements, providing air conditioning for sound insulated residents, establishing the LAX Community Noise Roundtable, undertaking a study to identify the concentrations of toxic air pollutants in neighborhoods surrounding LAX, and continuing and enhancing job training and recruitment programs. As presented in Topical Response TR-LU-5, current efforts are primarily directed at aircraft noise and include residential soundproofing under the ANMP, the Aircraft Noise Abatement Program, methods to file complaints and flight tracking system, the LAX Community Noise Roundtable, and the LAX Area Advisory Committee. See also Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the soundproofing under the ANMP and progress in implementing the ANMP. Regarding air pollution concerns, see Sections 4.6, Air Quality and 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4 and 14a of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-4 and S-9a of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. A discussion of the current noise variance is provided in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SPHE00041 Sambrano, Diane

None Provided

10/25/2003

SPHE00041-1

Comment:

Thank you. My name is Diane Sambrano. That's D-i-a-n-e, S as in Samuel, a, M as in Mary, B as in boy, r-a-n-o.

I couldn't help but notice today as she went through the list of persons who had requested to speak that so many of the persons that did leave had names like mine, Garcia, Hernandez, Enriquez. And how they came to this meeting simply amazes me to begin with because 120 pages of the EIR/EIS, how many of them can you count that were in Spanish? Oops, kind of like the lady about handicapped awareness. I think we have totally disregarded populations most impacted.

As I look at my community, no matter how many reports I pick up from various institutions that like to put us in those little boxes and say we look like this and we sound like that, no -- no agency has come up with less than 56 Hispanicity. The vast majority of our students, 67 percent Hispanic came from non-English-speaking homes. How are they made aware of the impacts to their lives, the respiratory ailments?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC02236-15 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR in the Spanish language.

SPHE00041-2

Comment:

We all talk about noise. Do you realize that every time a speaker gets up to speak here if you live in my house, three planes have flown over you, three planes where you had to stop speaking. So we're very accustomed to this very quick and rapid speaking where we can get a lot said very quickly because we do it on a regular basis. Unfortunately that does not help our children learn in their institutions we call educational.

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.

SPHE00041-3

Comment:

Now I know that LAWA is very much aware of the great outreach to community and they give our children Barbie dolls and Tonka trucks at Christmas, but that doesn't give them an education nor does it help the respiratory ailments. It frustrates me that as I listen to several people from the unions come up and give an address, many of those addresses are in that area that I know is now airport compatible because it is only industrial. So I think the address frequently given was not of a residence but of a business office.

So how then can they talk about how good it is for them to make so many thousand dollars a year when they aren't the ones losing the sleep because they don't live in that business address? It also amuses me coming up is a seminar called "Keeping the Public Trust, Ethics In Government." When we decide any community is not entitled a quality of life and environment justice, that definitely smacks in the face of public trust.

3. Comments and Responses

I operate right now at Tom Bradley International Terminal. So we serve the international carriers, and I'm in terminal six which serves domestic carriers. And we interact and talk to airport station managers and airline employees all the time. And the real issue is, when we are going to make LAX as safe as secure as we all want it to be. I think Alternative -- I know -- I believe that Alternative D is finally an Alternative that would allow us to remain competitive.

Also, I think it's important as an African-American business owner to point out that LAX has a disadvantaged business enterprise program, a minority business enterprise program that ensures right now in the concession area 40 percent of all the concession opportunities go to minority and women-owned companies. I employ 70 employees. 90 percent of them are minority who live in Hawthorne, who live in Inglewood, who live in Westchester.

And those employees would greatly benefit from the Alternative D. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00043 Young, Byrd

None Provided

10/25/2003

SPHE00043-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. Hello, Mr. Ritchie. I think you've met me before. My problem is pollution.

Federal environmental protection, that's Code 40 of the CFR, and I think that's Chapter One that gives the outline of what we should be doing. Now, I found -- I was researching this. I'm sorry my time was so limited in the research effort, but my beef is with cancer. Since 1990 cancer has been the second leading cause of deaths of illnesses in the 90047. Okay. Recently I had to take a leave because I contract it. Many of my neighbors, I -- in case Mr. Logan is one of my neighbors, and I think Mr. Ritchie was at one of the seminars. And according to UCLA studies -- and it's continually on the rise. So, you know, CDC in 1990 report stated that there were clusters of illnesses that were not investigated. And I think -- and chronic diseases, and I don't think all of them have been reported. Because in one of the neighborhoods there have been 11 people to die of cancer within maybe, what, 200-foot block -- foot block. And I was really concerned about that. I'm sure that's not all. Those are not all of the problems and the health problems.

Response:

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

SPHE00043-2

Comment:

So, as he said, you know, we are not going to have it. Our children are not going to have -- want to be alive if this continues. So I think this problem should be -- that I recommend that people protect whoever is beneath the flight path. And that's whether that is doing the -- doing the noise protection -- what is that called? But I think --

Soundproofing, because it's known that 50 percent of the population is deaf.

3. Comments and Responses

My name is Byrd Young with the Y -- the Y with the I. And I live at 9416 South Hobart directly beneath a flight path.

Response:

Comment noted. As shown on Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the commentor's property is located outside the boundary of residential properties eligible for soundproofing. The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP and monitoring methods used to validate the current 65 CNEL contour are described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4. The 65 CNEL is the applicable standard for high noise levels as defined by FAR Part 150 and Title 21 (see Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4) of the Draft EIS/EIR). Priority for sound insulation is given to residential properties within the highest noise level band above the 65 CNEL contour. Although this is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts.

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, in particular Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 regarding how approval of the LAX Master Plan would affect the ANMP. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Please also see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences.

Regarding the statement that 50 percent of the population is deaf, it is not clear what this is in reference to or where this statistic was obtained. However, health effects of noise was analyzed in Section 4.24.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data and analysis presented 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. Based on durations of high noise levels presented in the Time Above (TA) tables in the Aircraft Noise Technical Report and the Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, and OSHA and CalOSHA standards listed in Table 4.24.2-1 of the Draft EIS/EIR, no significant hearing loss are expected to occur under any of the build alternatives.

SPHE00044 West, Bill

None Provided

10/25/2003

SPHE00044-1

Comment:

Bill West, 8929 South Sepulveda Boulevard, Los Angeles, 90045.

I wear many hats. Where do I begin? I am currently the business representative of the neighborhood council in Westchester/Playa del Rey. I'm also the general manager of the HP Drolinger Company (phonetic). We have 28 properties just north of LAX, about 400 tenants. I'm also a homeowner, born and raised in the city, went to that wonderful school just down the street. And I'm happily retired from the Los Angeles Police Department. And I guess I'm still a member of that union.

With that, I am happy to tell the panel that on Tuesday last the neighborhood council of the Westchester/Playa del Rey voted to oppose Alternative D. I remind you that neighborhood councils were enacted as part of the City Charter to take up local issues and recommend courses of action for their consideration. And we have reviewed this for months and months. And it was the overwhelming vote of that council to reject Mayor Hahn's Plan D.

Response:

Comment noted.

SPHE00044-2

Comment:

One of the issues that has come up is the toxicity of airline fuel. I might remind you that airline fuel is located -- or loaded with toxic chemicals. As the planes decelerate for landing, their engines operate

less efficiently than while cruising and, thus, they discharge more pollutants than they do when they are cruising.

We have teachers and we have children and we have families that live probably in three or four counties that are affected by this. I understand that LAUSD has an environmental section that has done some studies on this. And I would urge that those studies be made part of the public record on this.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition. A health risk assessment was performed for the Draft EIS/EIR (Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment) and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR (Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment). The health risk assessment evaluated potential risks associated with emissions generated as a result of Master Plan activities. Emissions were evaluated for sources such as aircraft, on- and off-airport vehicles, ground service equipment, aircraft maintenance facilities, fuel tank farms, and the Central Utility Plant. Jet fuel emissions were included in the evaluation in as much as tank farm emissions, emissions during fueling, and emissions from aircraft operation were accounted for in the emissions inventory. Jet fuel is composed of many compounds; therefore, potential health effects associated with exposure to jet fuel emissions were evaluated in terms of the components of jet fuel. Aircraft air pollutant emissions were calculated based on five aircraft operational modes: approach, taxi, queue, idle, takeoff, and climbout. Airport-specific times-in-mode were used in the modeling effort.

Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR presented figures that show potentially affected areas associated with each alternative, along with anticipated geographical extent of incremental cancer risks and non-cancer hazards. In addition, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided figures that show the extent of incremental cancer risks and non-cancer hazards by census tract. LAWA and FAA are not aware of studies performed by LAUSD on this matter.

SPHE00044-3

Comment:

Also there are certain areas that are going to have to be dealt with based on an overriding consideration issue which basically means that if you choose to go forward with this plan, you have to acknowledge that there are adverse environmental impacts. You don't care and you're going to go forward anyway, which would include children's health issues, which would include cancer clustering, other respiratory conditions, hearing loss. You have decrease in productivity as motorists spend more hours stuck in traffic. While the construction workers will see increase work during the years this plan would take to build out, everyone else traveling to or within miles of the airport will spend more time on the road and less at work or with their families.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor is correct that the City of Los Angeles would have to adopt a statement of overriding considerations if it were to approve any of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health impacts in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, hearing loss in Section 4.24.2, Health Effects of Noise, and surface transportation impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2, 3, 14a, and 14b of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that, under the build alternatives, traffic conditions in the area surrounding LAX would be better than they would under the No Action/No Project Alternative due to the implementation of numerous mitigation measures designed to reduce project-related traffic impacts.

SPHE00044-4

Comment:

Public safety at the airport; LAX now states that they operate the airport quite safely. And I believe they do. If they do that, why do we need to "increase the safety," quote, unquote, going a mile and a half to the east. And I would refer to the RAND report on that. They need to create jobs where people live rather than move people through congested traffic from where they live to LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

This comment does not raise or pertain to any environmental issues that are subject to NEPA or CEQA review requirements. Notwithstanding, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1, which addresses the most frequently raised security-related issues pertaining to the design and ability of Alternative D to enhance existing safety and security at LAX.

SPHE00045 Harris-Dawson, Community Coalition in South 10/25/2003
Marqueece Central Los Angeles

SPHE00045-1

Comment:

My name is Marqueece Harris-Dawson. I am a staff member at the Community Coalition in South Central Los Angeles at 8101 South Vermont Avenue in the South L.A. Manchester Square.

M-a-r-q-u-e-e-c-e.

So Manchester Square in South L.A. is where our office is located. We represent 3,500 members who live in the Vermont Knowles area and throughout South Central. We wanted to come to this hearing to make a couple of points.

One, is that any expansion or public works project of this size should include both the needs and the interests of the people who live in the flight pattern. And actually our offices are in the flight path. And one of those things is repaving of our streets and other public works projects like soundproofing at the homes of our members.

Response:

LAWA and the FAA have considered both the needs and the interests of the surrounding communities, including those who live in the flight pattern. As described in Topical Response TR-EJ-2, four community workshops were held in South Los Angeles to inform attendees about the concept of environmental justice and potential impacts associated with the proposed Master Plan alternatives and to gain an understanding of community concerns and needs and potential environmental justice benefit and mitigation programs. In addition, community input was also received during the 9 month circulation period and at 12 public hearings.

Pursuant to NEPA and CEQA requirements, the focus of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement of the Draft EIS/EIR is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. As presented in Section 4.2.8, Land Use of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under mitigation measures MM-LU-1 and MM-LU-2, areas newly exposed to 65 CNEL noise levels or high single event noise levels (defined as 94 dBA SEL) that result in nighttime awakening would be eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP. It should be noted that based on the analysis provided in Section 4.1, Noise and 4.2, Land Use of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, areas east of Vermont Avenue, including the Vermont Knowles area, would not be newly exposed to 65 CNEL or 94 dBA SEL noise levels.

See Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4 regarding how eligibility for soundproofing is determined and Topical Response TR-LU-5 for a discussion of current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels, significant impacts, and mitigation measures. See Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding the difference between single event and CNEL noise levels.

Regarding the need to repave the streets in South Los Angeles as a result of Master Plan development, as presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, no surface transportation impacts would extend to South Los Angeles as a result of Master Plan development, therefore this suggested mitigation is not warranted.

SPHE00045-2**Comment:**

The other point we would like to make is that any public works project of this size should include a significant community benefits package. We believe if taxpayer money is going to be spent, especially with this big a price tag, that the primary beneficiaries ought to be people who pay taxes. So jobs at living wage for the source of hiring and making sure that this project improves the quality of our lives as best it can rather than us being built over and built through, like we get done over and over again. So I want to thank you for your time and invite you all to come to the community Coalition and hear from our members sometime.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.3.7), of this Final EIS/EIR regarding the Environmental Justice Program. This program includes provisions for community benefits geared to those who are most effected by LAX operations.

SPHE00046 Rose, Harry**None Provided****10/25/2003****SPHE00046-1****Comment:**

Good afternoon. I'm Harry Rose. I live in Osage Park neighborhood of Westchester. I believe you probably know where that is by now. We're eight-tenths of a mile north of where you say you would like to locate your Ground Transportation Center. There is a couple of issues I would like to talk about.

One is the lip service that the City of Los Angeles pays to affordable housing. Now, Manchester Square is an area that once contained affordable housing. There were 7,000 residents that lived there. On October 29th, 1999 Los Angeles City Council adopted resolution 99, dash, 2013 to purchase 33 single-family dwellings and five multi-family dwellings located in Manchester Square. They've been doing this under an airport noise mitigation program.

Now, normally when you buy property in an airport noise mitigation program, what you do is you buy the property on a voluntary buy-out, place an avigation easement on the property and you resell it on the residential market, thus maintaining affordable housing.

With the council's resolution began a multi-year program to purchase residential property with passenger facility charges collected for the stated purpose of noise mitigation. The initial purposes were properties from owners who had approached LAX and asked their homes to be acquired. Throughout the ensuing years about 50 percent of the homes in Manchester Square have been acquired. None of it has been resold. None of it has been placed back on the market.

It should be noted before this process began, LAX had entered into a Master Plan process that considered all of Manchester Square properties as belonging to the airport and usable for airport operations. Yet, the current executive summary for LAX Master Plan Alternative D tells us that the entire process will be able to move forward without the purchase of a single residential property. In the regional discussions of voluntary buy-out for residents that desire to have their homes purchased, LAX had assured people that the purchased homes would be well maintained and kept in a condition that would not blight the neighborhood. This soon changed. As vacant homes were looted and crime in the neighborhood increased, LAX began the demolition process of its purchases. Remaining residents found themselves increasingly surrounded by fenced-off vacant lots. And the question now rises, when does voluntary acquisition become involuntary?

The community of Westchester has historically lost homes to airport expansion time and time and time again. And the residents of Westchester are tired of this. And it's time that it stop.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding affordable housing, and Response to Comment SPHF00001-4 regarding validity of the acquisition of Manchester Square. In addition, please see Subtopical Response TR-MP-3.4 regarding the purpose of the GTC in Manchester Square under Alternative D.

SPHE00047 Hossan, Carole

None Provided

10/25/2003

SPHE00047-1

Comment:

A little lower. I'm short. Thanks.

Carole Hossan, Westchester. I have a couple of questions at the beginning.

How long -- or what is the cost going to be to fix LAX to accommodate the new large airplanes? How much would the cost be to have Ontario accommodate those new large airplanes?

My second question is, how long will it take at LAX, the profits generated by the new NLAs to pay for the cost of the renovations and the same at Ontario? Onto something else.

Response:

The airfield changes in Master Plan Alternative D are designed primarily to enhance aircraft safety. The proposed airfield changes are also designed to safely accommodate the New Large Aircraft (NLA) Airbus 380 (A380). Runways that are lengthened to 12,000 feet, for example, are to accommodate departures by the A380, B747, B737-300, and MD-11 at maximum takeoff weight in hot day conditions, reduce airfield congestion and eliminate excessive coordinated crossings in the air, thus reducing departure delays. The center taxiway in the north airfield is being constructed to reduce runway incursions. However, the separation between the center taxiway and the north airfield runways is designed to accommodate the NLA. A total of 6 terminal contact gates will be able to accommodate the A380. Accommodating the NLA serves one of the project goals, i.e., sustaining and advancing the international commercial gateway role of LAX.

As these improvements are not specifically designed just to accommodate the A380, costs related to alterations needed by the NLA cannot be separately identified. Thus, the funding sources for A380 specific improvements have also not been allocated.

The A380 aircraft have been ordered and will be put into service by carriers to upgrade their current large aircraft service at constrained airports like LAX. These carriers do not serve Ontario. These aircraft will be used to serve only high density city pairs and depend on the connecting feed provided at major gateway airports. While the improvements needed at Ontario to accommodate the NLA and the cost of those improvements are beyond the scope of the LAX Master Plan and EIS/EIR, LAWA has evaluated the expansion potential at Ontario and concluded that Ontario cannot feasibly accommodate the demand, including the NLA demand, by 2015 that will be accommodated by Alternative D of the LAX Master Plan. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 for more detail.

Landing fees paid by the airlines operating NLA equipment will be a function of the certificated landed weight times the then applicable landing fee rate. The landing fees are not a function of a specific set of improvements. Revenues and costs in the airfield cost center are calculated to generate an annual break-even operation, thus no profits are generated.

SPHE00047-2

Comment:

The Alternative D EIS/EIR states that under Alternative D the LAX Master Plan would be consistent with the policy of the regional aviation plan, that's SCAGs, which calls for no-expansion of LAX. So explain how can that be possible when the centerpiece of the plan, the GTC, is not owned by LAX?

Response:

The acquisition of Manchester Square is independent of the Master Plan. Please see Response to Comment SPHF00001-4 regarding validity of the acquisition of Manchester Square, and Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding SCAG's RTP.

SPHE00047-3

Comment:

The Alternative D EIS/EIR states the purposes of objectives of the Master Plan are to provide sufficient airport capacity for passengers freight in the L.A. region. So why did your original scoping outreach effort not include a single agency within San Bernardino, Orange, Riverside or Ventura Counties?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00007-1 regarding the scoping undertaken for the LAX Master Plan.

SPHE00047-4

Comment:

Here is a quote from an article in the Sierra Club Magazine. According to the NRDC a single jet landing, taxiing, idling and taking off causes as much pollution as a car traveling 5,600 miles. Also, some of today's quieter more fuel-efficient aircraft engines generate an average of 40 percent more smog forming nitrogen oxides than the engines they replaced. So why is it that your analysis in your Alt D EIS/EIR indicated that aircraft emissions account for 90 percent -- 97 percent of total emissions and contribute most to the emissions of individual toxic air pollutants, yet, none of the mitigation measures address aircraft emissions? Why is that?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SAL00013-125 regarding aircraft mitigation measures.

SPHE00047-5

Comment:

I think your analysis of air pollution has been widely lacking. And since we do live there, it would be nice to know exactly what it is we are breathing and how it can be fixed.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00070-1 regarding existing air pollution in the South Coast Air Basin. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR also addressed the environmental baseline ambient air quality in the vicinity of LAX in Section 4.6.3.3. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a detailed discussion of air quality mitigation measures in Section 4.6.8 and in Appendix S-E Section 2.3.

SPHE00048 McDaniel, Bruce Lennox School District 10/25/2003

SPHE00048-1

Comment:

Hi. My name is Dr. Bruce McDaniel. I'm the superintendent of the Lennox School District which is located immediately west of LAX and it's bordered on two sides by the 405 Freeway and 105 Freeway.

We serve over 7,000 children in this very condensed area, nearly all of whom are from ethnic minorities and extremely low socioeconomic families. We have a paramount interest in the LAX Master Plan because of the direct effect on our community. We've carefully analyzed the impacts of the new option

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. However, as depicted in Response to Comment AL00035-36, under Alternative D, Oak Street Elementary would not be newly exposed to 65 CNEL or high single event noise levels that result in classroom disruption.

Regarding hearing loss, based on durations of high noise levels presented in the Time Above (TA) tables in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Draft EIS/EIR, Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and OSHA and CalOSHA standards listed in Table 4.24.2-1 of the Draft EIS/EIR, no significant hearing loss is expected to occur under any of the build alternatives. See also Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the ANMP.

SPHE00050 Washington, James S.E.I.U., Local 347

10/25/2003

SPHE00050-1

Comment:

I did sign a card. My name James Washington. I represent Local 347, Service Employees International Union. I am here to read into the record a statement from the general manager of Local 347 Julie Butcher and president of the Local, Bob Schoonover.

W-a-s-h-i-n-g-t-o-n. The address is 1015 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles. I am a longtime city resident. I live in between two airports, Long Beach and LAX and several general aviation facilities.

"On behalf of the Service Employees International Union, I would like to express our strong support for Alternative D of the LAX Master Plan.

SEIU Local 347 represents over 700 employees that work at LAX and thousands that live in surrounding communities. The employees we represent are directly impacted by what happens at LAX. We feel your efforts to modernize LAX are a step in the right direction. Alternative D is a balanced approach to maintaining LAX as an economic engine for our regional economy while considering the environmental and traffic impacts to the surrounding communities.

Your safety and security alternatives address many security concerns at LAX and allows the flexibility to accommodate evolving federal security requirements and technology. SEIU Local 347 has a great interest in providing a safe and secure work environment for its members at the airport and in surrounding areas.

SEIU Local 347 feels strongly that the modernization of the airport is long overdue and necessary. The improvements that Alternative D poses will provide for improved operations, increased efficiencies that will benefit passengers and concessions at LAX. Maintaining LAX as an international gateway to the country will maintain hundreds of thousands of jobs directly related to LAX. We recognize the importance of preserving LAX as a premier airport in the world.

We appreciate your leadership and continuous effort to modernize LAX. We look forward to working closely with you through the Master Plan process. Sincerely, Julie Butcher."

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

This page intentionally left blank.