

PC03412 Keyantash, John None Provided 6/27/2001

PC03412-1

Comment:

See comments on enclosed sheet. No expansion of LAX!

Response:

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

PC03412-2

Comment:

Thank you for your steadfast opposition to the expansion of Los Angeles International Airport. After attending a city meeting in El Segundo, hearing from concerned citizens in other communities near the airport, and reviewing the LAX Master Plan, I am convinced that it is a large step in the wrong direction for the people and infrastructure of Los Angeles.

Response:

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

PC03412-3

Comment:

The airport is a great facility, but it should not be allowed to grow. Demographic studies for the Los Angeles/Southern California basin show that population growth over the next 30 years is expected to occur in Riverside and San Bernardino counties, to the largest extent. Los Angeles is far removed from these locations! We should not service the needs of outlying areas by expanding the facilities of a central hub. Like we are learning with the recent power (electricity) crisis, a decentralized structure is less subject to the vulnerabilities of "putting all of our eggs in one basket." Applying the analogy to LAX,

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03412-4

Comment:

further concentrating the mechanical activities at LAX will lead to increased issues of congestion on our already gridlocked freeways and avenues (e.g., the 405 freeway and Sepulveda Blvd., plus the ancillary connections),

Response:

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

PC03412-5

Comment:

not to mention the near ceaseless drone of planes. Looking at most military bases as a design paradigm, there is a reason that they are sited away from urban areas, and it is not solely due to security; It is due to issues of noise pollution. Living on the south side of LAX in El Segundo, I hear a barrage of hums and roars day and night. Most of the time, I can ignore them, but if airport traffic were to further increase, it would be thoroughly overwhelming.

Response:

The commentor lives about as near the departure end of the south runway complex as possible, and well within the area eligible for sound insulation under all LAWA guidelines. The airport has attempted to deal with the issue of noise in his area through the posting of signs at the end of each runway calling for flight to the coastline prior to turns, but occasional deviations from the procedure continue to occur. A part of the reason is the alignment of the runways relative to the community. The west end of the runways nearest El Segundo are closer to the community than the east ends (the runways are aimed more toward the community's west end).

The commentor is correct in identifying that most military bases which are owned by the federal government are located outside of urban areas as a result of security, however, as a result of being located in remote areas noise benefits are provided as well. Non-military airports are usually owned and controlled by a local entity or municipality, a port authority or airport authority. The owning agency usually has control over the surrounding land use and zoning, but this is not entirely the case at LAX. Airports such as LAX that were built in the 1940's did not have the urban density that they have today. They were encroached upon as the surrounding communities continued to grow. Regarding early turns over El Segundo, please see Response to Comment PC00237-1, Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2, and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.4. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PC03412-6

Comment:

I fear that an expansion of LAX would be economically damaging to the City of El Segundo, not to mention other communities on the LAX perimeter.

Response:

The economic effects of Master Plan alternatives were provided in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data in Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The estimated employment impacts of Alternatives A, B, and C on the City of El Segundo are presented in Technical Report 5, Table 48, LAX-Related Employment in the South Bay and North Bay Cities and Communities for the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR Alternatives, 1996, 2005 and 2015. Employment impacts of Alternative D on South Bay communities are provided in Table S13 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03412-7

Comment:

Concerning airport operations, I believe we should have the air traffic distributed more equivalently between the many communities in the Los Angeles Basin. For citizens that live in Palmdale, Ontario, or Orange County, traveling to LAX is a burden, given not only the geographic distance but the severe roadway congestion at virtually all hours. These people deserve facilities that are within closer reach. Furthermore, for the economic growth that is concentrated in these outlying areas, the transport of freight via air is much more logical and energy-efficient if it were done at terminals much closer to the freight destination.

Response:

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

PC03412-8

Comment:

From all large view perspectives, the proposed expansion of LAX described in the LAX Master Plan would be an extremely poor economic, social, and energy-minded decision. It does not make sense for an economically and architecturally mature city like Los Angeles (proper) to increase its number of runways, buildings, noise, and diesel pollution for the benefit of fringe communities. In fact, municipalities such as Palmdale are actively seeking increased airport service. For the people and organizations that require increased airport activity -- and for the people that don't -- the proposed expansion of Los Angeles International Airport would be a large step backward for the greater Los Angeles area.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, energy supply in Section 4.17.1, Energy Supply, and social impacts in Section 4.4, Social Impacts. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 5, and 8 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03413 Jusko, Andrew None Provided

PC03413-1

Comment:

1. We are impacted by airport noise. It will be worse with the new 600 passenger planes.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-6.3 regarding relationship between aircraft size and noise levels.

PC03413-2

Comment:

2. The LAX Master Plan does not address the air & noise pollution impact on the 6 schools & 3 high schools surrounding the LAX.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. All identifiable schools near LAX were used as receptors in the air quality dispersion modeling analyses. The modeled maximum air quality impacts would not be exceeded at any school receptor. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00018-10 regarding the placement of dispersion modeling receptors.

PC03413-3

Comment:

Aircraft pollute heavily on takeoff & landing. Often we smell jet fuel, AQMD has no affect or jurisdiction on LAX.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC03413-4

Comment:

3. Traffic on 405 & Lincoln Blvd is stop & go resulting in heavier car pollution. Cars pollute heavily during acceleration.

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.

PC03413-5**Comment:**

4. Excess aircraft on runways lead to unsafe airport operations.

Response:

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

PC03413-6**Comment:**

5. Sepulveda Tunnel under LAX is crowded. Have a safety engineer analysis.

Response:

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

PC03414 Simmons, Mildred None Provided

PC03414-1**Comment:**

LAX is already a "nightmare"! We don't need to enlarge it!

Response:

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

PC03415 Warman, Minnie Lee None Provided

PC03415-1**Comment:**

We need to enlarge Palmdale airport. I have a grandson & family there not LAX. I have too much noise even from the Torrance airport where I live -

Response:

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

PC03416 Page, Joanne None Provided

PC03416-1**Comment:**

I believe that growth at LAX must be curtailed, and a regional airport plan be put into effect.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC03416-2

Comment:

The traffic now on the San Diego (405) Freeway is impossible. If it continues to worsen (as it surely would with LAX expansion) the South Bay area will be unliveable.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03417 Khalil, Kaaren None Provided

PC03417-1

Comment:

Don't want LAX to grow bigger. I grew up in Westchester when things were quiet at LAX. Now it is very busy.

Response:

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

PC03418 Espinosa, Raymond None Provided

PC03418-1

Comment:

After reading your report, I have to agree with your view on regional airports. It makes sense to me besides all the money the regional airport plan would generate. Think in terms of a major natural disaster like earthquakes, we would have more facilities on hand to accomodate emergency officials to disaster areas also more jobs to attract people out to our two largest counties -

Response:

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

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

PC03419 Bible, Darlene None Provided

PC03419-1

Comment:

If the original, major expansion plan were to take place, the airport would take property to within 3 blocks of our home. They plan to knock down dozens of current and NEW businesses on Sepulveda (Ralphs, Office depot, etc) which would affect all of us in the neighborhood.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land acquisition for each of the alternatives in Chapter 3 and Section 4.2, Land Use. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the Community of Westchester. As stated therein, Ralphs Supermarket is not proposed for acquisition under any of the Master Plan alternatives and Office Depot is proposed for acquisition under Alternatives A and C. In contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not propose any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester Business District.

PC03419-2

Comment:

We bought our home here, in part, because of the ball park on Wiley Post (Neilson Field) and that would also be taken by the airport and used for parking or other uses.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01014-3 regarding expansion of Carl E. Nielson Youth Park.

PC03419-3

Comment:

The value of our home will fall tremendously, after just going up recently.

Response:

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

PC03419-4

Comment:

The pollution, smell and traffic will be unbelievable. This airport is right smack in the middle of big neighborhoods. Please don't support its expansion!!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03420 Foster, R. Wayne None Provided

PC03420-1

Comment:

LAX is located in a highly congested population area. Surface access to the airport is physically limited with little opportunity to improve. Only so cars & buses can service the airport at any one time.

Response:

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

PC03420-2

Comment:

It is time to develop an airport in an area with plenty of room to grow. Palmdale for example. This along with expanded use of the satellite airports.

Response:

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

PC03420-3

Comment:

High-speed surface transportation should be developed to interconnect the airports.

Response:

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

PC03420-4

Comment:

Airport terminal could be built in high population areas where people could check in at their airline, including their bags. They would be removed by high speed surface transportation to one of the airports, where they could proceed directly to their gate/departure. These downtown terminals could include parking, thus help relieve airport congestion/traffic.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03422 Davis, Jean None Provided

PC03422-1

Comment:

I think the Master Plan is appalling! It is unthinkable for those of us who have suffered the increasing intensity of airplane noise and destruction of our small fruit trees, and whose automobiles are covered daily with an oily film. Our representative was voted into office with promises that she would fight expansion of the L.A. International. Since she has done an "about face" and is now in the business of promoting her 'soundproofing' of homes in our area (e.g. - model home 419 Waterview Street, P.D.R.) we cannot expect any support for your logical alternative. I think you, and your supporters are the best hope of all of us in this area.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G, and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding deposition of pollutants in urban areas and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC03423 Borakove, Andrew None Provided

PC03423-1

Comment:

I live in Marina Del Rey. It is already too crowded & with Playa Vista picked through by Richard Riordan, Katzenberg & cronies - we have NO Room. We need to use Oran County Ontario, Palmdale etc. LAX is an old bison, barely breathing. PUSH for regional airports that & ELECTRIC ZERO EMISSION CARS.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2 regarding potential impacts from Playa Vista.

PC03424 Perruzza, John None Provided

PC03424-1

Comment:

The LAX Master Plan's only intent is to preserve all the fees they earn for landing rights. We have airports capable of handling international air traffic which are totally underused. I.E., Palmdale, Ontario and Long Beach.

If caps were put on the amount of flights that LAX was allowed to handle, these airports could handle all increases in air traffic with little cost to the tax payers. Plus air and automobile congestion to and from LAX would disappear.

3. Comments and Responses

Why is such a simple and inexpensive solution so difficult for politicians and bureaucrats to put into operation? Must politicians continually ignore the public's rights?

Or do the politicians and their friends have too much invested in preserving the status quo for their financial benefit?

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, and Response to Comment PC01018-29 regarding the inability of FAA and LAWA to limit activity at airports. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03425 Gerhardt, Kenneth None Provided

PC03425-1

Comment:

I have lived in Playa Del Rey, West Westchester, and Marina Del Rey since 1951. My wife and I have lived happily in this area watching it grow and develop, sending our three sons to school and experiencing the changes over the years. Airport expansion bought out our house in West Chester in 1971 after about twenty years of pleasant living. Our children were grown and we moved to a condo in Marina Del Rey. We have been happy here too. But after all these years of airport expanding noise and increasing traffic and congestion we feel that LAX expansion in this area would be a great mistake.

Response:

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

PC03426 Brillhart, Judy None Provided

PC03426-1

Comment:

Traffic noise and pollution would impact our lives. Please do not let the LAX Master Plan go thru.

Please send some of the air traffic to Palmdale or Lancaster. They need the jobs and transportation for their cities.

I would like to see a bullet train for S.F. to L.A. & Palmdale.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-3 high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air

quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03427 Schultz, Sue None Provided

PC03427-1

Comment:

I do not support the expansion of LAX. There are lots of Regional airports in the area that should take the overflow and expand instead of LAX.

Response:

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

PC03427-2

Comment:

Traffic around the airport is already horrific, and expansion will increase it. I live in Manhattan Beach, and it is almost impossible, even now, to get north of LAX.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03428 Burger, Jenifer None Provided

PC03428-1

Comment:

As a Manhattan Beach "Tree Section" resident, my main concern is an increase in pollution in our area. I already feel that the pollution from the Chevron plant and various power & water factories that are prevalent in Manhattan Beach & El Segundo are impacting our health already. Since moving to the tree section (3 blocks from Rosecrans/3 blocks to Highland) our 3 year old son has developed asthma. There are several other families in the area that have young children w/asthma as well. I know LAX is a source of the bad air he's breathing - Please fight this expansion.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03429 Lunstad, Robyn None Provided

PC03429-1

Comment:

While we agree that airports are necessary and vital to our economy and way of life, the location of airports is certainly a negotiable variable we can control and manipulate so that fewer people's lives are adversely affected by noise, air and traffic pollution. The South Bay's streets freeways and airways are currently saturated. Our population keeps increasing at an alarming rate. We believe that adding and expanding to the LA airport will negatively impact our lives.

Response:

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

PC03430 Kallas, Nancy & Chris None Provided

PC03430-1

Comment:

WE ARE STRONGLY OPPOSED TO EXPANSION OF LAX - THE REGIONAL PLAN MAKES GOOD BUSINESS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SENSE. WE HAVE ALREADY BEEN AFFECTED BY THE CHANGE AND INCREASE IN FLIGHT PATTERNS NEARER OUR HOME AND ONE OF US WORKS IN THE PLAYA DEL REY AREA - THE GROWTH, AND THEREFORE CONGESTION IS ALREADY OUT OF CONTROL - THE 405 FWY IS OVERTAXED, AND WE BELIEVE THERE HAS BEEN TOO MUCH GROWTH ALLOWED IN THE SOUTH BAY, WESTSIDE AS IT IS. LIVING IN SOUTH TORRANCE, WE DON'T FEEL AN ECONOMIC IMPACT FROM THE AIRPORT, BUT BELIEVE ITS TIME TO STOP THE GROWTH - EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO DEVELOP LAND FROM PLAYA DEL REY TO PALOS VERDES IS UNDERWAY - ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC00148-2 regarding potential impacts from Playa Vista.

PC03431 Cook, Allan None Provided

PC03431-1

Comment:

We support your effort Re Lax - to much noise already.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03432 Lee, Darryl & Venora None Provided

PC03432-1

Comment:

We firmly support limiting LAX to its present size & distributing air traffic throughout the region - based on an impartial & thorough regional plan.

Response:

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

PC03433 Garcia, M. Gladys None Provided

PC03433-1

Comment:

Even after the retrofitting my house & windows shake very hard - My yard is very noisy.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the residential soundproofing program, Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration impacts, and Topical Response TR-LU-4 for a discussion of outdoor noise levels, including thresholds used to identify significant noise levels.

PC03433-2

Comment:

I have developed breathing problems from the pollution.

Response:

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

PC03434 Coerver, Howard None Provided

PC03434-1

Comment:

Congratulations on your work in securing a way to a regional airport alternative - I have lived in Westchester & Playa del Rey since 1957 - In 1974 I loss my Westchester home due to LAX expansion.

3. Comments and Responses

The recent years have brought more traffic, noise & pollution to our area caused by LAX - We don't need more expansion. Please continue your fight.

Response:

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

PC03435 Cunningham, Nancy None Provided

PC03435-1

Comment:

LINCOLN BLVD. IS ALMOST UNUSABLE DURING NORMAL RUSH HOURS. THE SAN DIEGO FREEWAY IS GRIDLOCKED FOR AT LEAST 4 HOURS IN THE MORNING & 4 HOURS IN THE EVENING.

Response:

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

PC03435-2

Comment:

BOTH AN EXPANSION OF LAX AND THE HUGE DEVELOPMENT AT BALLONA CREEK WILL MAKE TRAFFIC CONGESTION - WHICH CAN BE SEEN - & AIR & WATER QUALITY SO OVERLOADED AS TO ALMOST SHUT VENICE AND SURROUNDING CITIES DOWN.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Regarding Ballona Creek, it is believed that the commentor is referring to the Playa Vista project. The Playa Vista project was accounted for in the cumulative impacts analysis of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and water quality impacts in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, and 6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2, S-4, and S-5 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC03435-3**Comment:**

I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO SAY THAT I AM TOTALLY FED UP WITH THE TAXPAYES SUBSIDIZING FURTHER DEVELOPMENT. IF DEVELOPERS &/OR AIRLINES WANT INCREASED PUBLIC SERVICES, LET THEM PAY FOR THEM.

Response:

Comment noted. No taxpayer funds are used in the operation of LAX nor are any proposed to be used in the implementation of the proposed Master Plan.

PC03436 Zimmerman, Mary None Provided

PC03436-1**Comment:**

No more expansion at LAX please! Those of us who are longtime residents of Westchester already have enough of the noise, traffic congestion, etc. that is the result of living so close to a large International Airport.

If nearby counties in Southern California were to have airports located there -which some apparently do - it would be fairer then to continue to expand LAX. Please work for Regional development.

Response:

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

PC03437 Rosenberg, Diane None Provided
Heath

PC03437-1**Comment:**

The numbers of acreage at LAX tell the story. (3425 acres). Traffic for 67 million passengers filtering in and out of such a confined area is not feasible. The 105 freeway onto Sepulveda is already gridlocked. The 405 corridor from South to North is often bumper to bumper, stalling completely at the airport.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03437-2

Comment:

I am very concerned Orange County is blocking the most viable regional airport solution at El Toro.

Response:

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

PC03437-3

Comment:

Palmdale, if developed with rapid rail transit into the city would be an incredible regional solution.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 which discusses high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03438 Neff, Marlene None Provided

PC03438-1

Comment:

The Master Plan for increased routes to LAX includes the widening of La Tijera Blvd, and that means the removal and loss of our homes with no place to go

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46. Please also see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. No residential acquisition is proposed under Alternative D.

PC03439 Vivian, W. None Provided

PC03439-1

Comment:

I agree with you wholeheartedly in your common sense principles for developing airports.

Response:

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

PC03439-2

Comment:

Also I think we need a railway system for transportation as it seems we have the worst system of any large city in the country. Is there something wrong with monorail?

Response:

In terms of the appropriateness of monorail to the airport, monorail systems in use today generally lack the passenger capacity and passenger loading characteristics necessary for an application to a major air complex like LAX Airport. A higher capacity mode like the Metro Green Line is more suitable. Please see Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding development of an on-airport automated people mover system that would connect to a proposed Intermodal Transportation Center adjacent to the MTA Green Line Station. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.2 and Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.4.

PC03440 Cox, Mary Ellen None Provided

PC03440-1**Comment:**

I strongly support your efforts regarding the regional plans. LAX is much too crowded already, and the outlying areas would benefit from sharing the air traffic.

Response:

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

PC03441 Riessen, Hallie None Provided

PC03441-1**Comment:**

I am totally opposed to the expansion as proposed by L.A.X. Living in El Segundo, we are subjected to horrendous noise & pollution.

Response:

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

PC03441-2**Comment:**

Many times large jet liners that couldn't land go right over the city from N.E. to S.W. A crash would be disastrous.

Response:

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

PC03441-3**Comment:**

The traffic on Sepulveda in the A.M. trying to get through the airport tunnel is backed up solid clear to Rosecrans and very heavy stop & go to Manhattan Beach Blvd.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC03442 Guerena, Charles None Provided

PC03442-1

Comment:

- TRAFFIC, NOISE, POLLUTION WILL INCREASE TO UNACCEPTABLE LEVELS WITHOUT LAX EXPANSION. IMAGINE WITH, UGH!

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03442-2

Comment:

- WITHOUT A FAST, PRACTIBLE, VIABLE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM TO LANCASTER/PALMDALE & ONTARIO, REGIONAL PLAN WILL NOT BE ACCEPTABLE. THIS IS "TASK ONE"!!!!

- NO "TASK ONE," NO SOLUTION.

Response:

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

PC03443 Williams, Nema None Provided

PC03443-1

Comment:

Other airports should be built. LAX should not be expanded.

Response:

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

PC03444 **Gamlin, Bonnie & Richard** **None Provided**

PC03444-1

Comment:

I agree with you on your regional plan that fairly shares the burden & benefits of air transportation across our region. LAX is already over burdened.

Response:

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

PC03445 **Winters, Nancy** **None Provided**

PC03445-1

Comment:

I strongly support the Regional Airport plan! LAX is too crowded with traffic. I would take public transportation 1 hour away to take a flight at other airports. My friends in Riverside & San Bernardino would like more flights at airports closer to them. LA needs more public transportation - spread out the people & the flights at all airports & get them there via bus, rail, etc.! Reduce traffic & pollution!

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC03446 **Schable, Tina** **None Provided**

PC03446-1

Comment:

There's already more than enough - too much! - traffic, noise, and pollution from LAX and I'm happy you are working against its expansion. It is only common sense that airports should be in non-congested areas, and surprising there's so little common sense.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and 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.

PC03447 Stein, David W. & Norma None Provided

PC03447-1

Comment:

I am opposed to the expansion plan of the Airport. LAX is already too crowded. All viable alternatives should be attempted first (regionalization) before expansion is considered.

Response:

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

PC03448 Hofer, Albert None Provided

PC03448-1

Comment:

A LARGE AMOUNT OF LAX USAGE COMES FROM ORANGE COUNTY, WITH THE RESULTING TRAFFIC ON THE 405 FREEWAY. LETS DEVELOPE THE EL TORO FACILITY AND LET OUR NEIGHBORS SHARE.

Response:

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

PC03449 Orr, Keith & Marva None Provided

PC03449-1

Comment:

I agree 100% that using the regional airports at Palmdale, Ontario and probably El Toro in Orange County. Increasing LAX like suggested would cause nothing but problems with traffic as well as other problems to the entire South Bay area

Response:

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

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

PC03450 Holder, Lyle None Provided

PC03450-1

Comment:

I live about 5 minutes from the LA Airport. I don't think expanding LAX is a good idea. Our streets are over taxed now with Heavy traffic. Getting in & out of the airport is a real hassle during incoming & out going flights. Parking is at a premium. Stop expansion if all possible. Thank you

Response:

Comment noted. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03451 Hoff, Sheila None Provided

PC03451-1

Comment:

1. Regional Distribution should provide a safer & more efficient system. It will also enhance business in more areas. To consolidate more traffic here adds to our pollution, noise, reduces traffic flow & discourage suitable growth in the area that will be impacted by airport traffic. Regional Distribution will provide more airline business & accommodates a growing population that has moved out of L.A.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03451-2

Comment:

2. LAX Expansion not only drives down property values but is a deterrent to an upscale community in the beach towns that is in the need for more services.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC03451-3

Comment:

More traffic impacts local traffic to local services & will drive local business out.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC02613-28; please refer to Response to Comment PC02613-28.

PC03452 Lundy, Tate None Provided

PC03452-1

Comment:

Expanding regional airports would not only alleviate the burden from LAX itself but would lessen traffic on all LAX bound freeways. In turn, this could have a positive effect on our air quality. Please consider expanding regional airports instead of going forward with the LAX Master Plan.

Response:

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

PC03453 Gokcen, Nev A. & None Provided
Emel

PC03453-1

Comment:

We agree with you wholeheartedly. Please consider also a FAST RAILROAD from San Diego to San Francisco!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan, in particular Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.2 and Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.4. Alternative D would connect a people mover to an Intermodal Transportation Center near the Aviation station of the Green Line, with no extension of the Green Line necessary for terminal access. The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03454 Henderson, Marion None Provided

PC03454-1

Comment:

There is not an economic impact directly on us. Our main concern for an expanded LAX is the congestion at LAX and the traffic in and around the terminals. Air pollution and noise are also factors that will increase with expansion. Common sense dictates to our planners, to utilize and expand airport traffic to those other outlying airports. (Ontario - Palmdale)

Response:

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

PC03455 Sullivan, Eleanor None Provided

PC03455-1

Comment:

We don't need to enlarge L.A. airport. Let's go elsewhere. We do hear planes over our house now. Don't need more.

L.A. is too crowded now, parking & etc - bad.

Lets go some place else, where they need it.

Response:

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

PC03456 Cope, JoAnn None Provided

PC03456-1

Comment:

I am in favor of a major regional airport to be built in PALMDALE. This plan has been bantered about for the past 30 years. If action had been taken then, the costs would have been minimal. As conditions stand now, LAX is maxed out and we don't have the backup that we need in the pipeline. Late as we are, now is the time to make our move & build a regional airport.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC03457 Hitchcook, Jo Nell None Provided

PC03457-1

Comment:

I am in total agreement with your letter regional airport alternative and I will help to vote the Plan in or help in any way I can

Response:

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

PC03458 Mearing, Dorothy None Provided

PC03458-1

Comment:

I think the "Maser Plan" is a disaster for all of the South Bay residents.

Response:

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

PC03458-2

Comment:

The traffic is so bad now you hate to have friends or relatives come to see you. I live in Torrance - maybe 10 or so miles away - it takes 45 to 50 minutes to drive to LAX - so you tell them to take a taxi or shuttle & you pay the the bill.

Response:

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

PC03458-3**Comment:**

Why not "share" some of the "wealth" with the other airports - they need it more than we do. I'm wondering, just who, is going to benefit from this plan.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental impacts both adverse and beneficial in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures.

PC03459 Meyers, Linda None Provided

PC03459-1**Comment:**

I live 3 blocks from Imperial Blvd. In El Segundo. I have not adjusted to the NOISE. I am awakened many times by what sounds like bombers overhead -

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC03459-2**Comment:**

BUT worse is the pollution - a black film of jet fuel covers everything outside -

Response:

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

PC03459-3**Comment:**

I, and this community, cannot tolerate one IOTA more of noise or pollution!!!

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03460 Wiener, Marguerite None Provided

PC03460-1

Comment:

Your proposed plans sounds carefully thought out and well done. It will alleviate some of the noise and pollution at LAX. I'm curious as to how international connections and domestic travel will be distributed. Will the other regional airports serve regional and domestic travel only?

Response:

Please see Table S3-2, Summary of Activity by Alternative -2015, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Table S3-1, Summary of Activity by Alternative-2015, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a forecast of aircraft activity. Airlines will continue to operate where there is market demand. LAX is expected to be the dominant airport when it comes to international airline operations, however, other regional airports will not be prohibited from offering international flights. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC03461 Rubin, Irving None Provided

PC03461-1

Comment:

Common sense dictates that a regional plan be adopted.

Response:

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

PC03462 Courtois, Barbara None Provided

PC03462-1

Comment:

As an Audubon Program docent at the Ballona Wetlands for the past nine years, I have noticed a constantly increasing amount of air traffic noise. It is now so bad that we must shout to be heard by the school children who are trying to have an outdoor learning experience. Airport noise pollution is ruining the wetlands for people.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to Comment PC02613-9; please see Response to Comment PC02613-9.

PC03463 Hoffman, Walter None Provided 6/5/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00515; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00515.

PC03464 Yuzuki, Kristi None Provided

PC03464-1

Comment:

Because north/south traffic is already limited to four or five main routes around the airport, traffic tends to be terribly clogged on the ones that are used the most: the 405 freeway and Lincoln/Sepulveda. Traffic coming from the 105 freeway makes things worse, because cars are dumped right before the tunnel that leads to LAX. The Green Line might have improved the situation had it been allowed to be extended right into the airport, which would've provided much-needed non-car access. Traffic within LAX is horrible. There are too many cars, mainly because there are no alternatives other than the free LAX shuttles.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding improved mass transit options, the new Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, Alternative D, which is analyzed in detail in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR incorporates remote passenger parking with people mover systems, which eliminates the need for a Ring Road or a western passenger entrance from Pershing Drive. In addition, the Green Line is proposed to be extended north to provide access to LAX.

PC03464-2

Comment:

Playa Vista will make traffic in the LAX/Westchester/Marina del Rey area much more congested.

Response:

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

PC03464-3

Comment:

Noise and pollution from the planes are already bad for those people who live near LAX. There's no room to expand LAX. I agree with expanding & increasing traffic to other airports in outlying areas, so that people who live out there can stop using LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and 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.

PC03464-4

Comment:

The near collisions recently reported should be adequate justification for reducing traffic to LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC03465 Scordan, Michael None Provided

PC03465-1

Comment:

Your "Regional Airport Plan" sounds like a better idea to me. As to the North L.A. County region, I think expansion of the Palmdale Airport would be a good way to go. The county (or whatever appropriate entity) could purchase all the land they need at a much cheaper price than Burbank or anywhere in the San Fernando Valley. Now would be the time for them to obtain enough land to plan for the indefinite future.

Although Torrance would be handier for me, I think that expanding the Long Beach Airport would be more suitable for the South Los Angeles area.

Response:

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

PC03466 Arciri, Johnny None Provided

PC03466-1

Comment:

The expansion of LAX would affect me by creating more airplane noise in the So. Bay. The economic impact would be the result of lower rents creating less cash flow & the decline of prices of single family residences.

Response:

It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PC03466-2

Comment:

I'm totally opposed to any expansion of LAX today or in the future.

Response:

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

PC03467 Snook, M. Jean None Provided

PC03467-1

Comment:

1st I would like to thank you for opposing the proposed LAX Master Plan. My husband came home from the war 1946 & like many G.I's wanted to settle down here in Westchester & build our home & raised our children here. At that time Century Blvd was a 2 lane street with ditches on each side & LAX was known as Mines Field & jets had not been heard of. I was born in Inglewood on Rosewood Ave 1923 so knew the area well. The lots here were sold by McCarthy. We choose one & soon we were building our dream home. We were such pioneers, our mail wasn't even delivered & the nearest phone was on Sepulveda & 95th St. The years passed & so many our neighbors were ex-G.I's and we were all happy until the airport put in the North runways. We were a family. My husband a nose gunner on a B-24, Fran a 3 yr. POW - Joe - Navy U.S.S. Enterprise & Sherman in the marines. We had our own army & now a war. We lost our war here at home. In 1970 we begin to move & look for other homes. We were waiting for our son to come home from Viet-Nam & so was Sherman our neighbor. The affect the airport had on us was terminal. Our homes were taken from us, made into parking lots - post-office, etc. We lost thousands of \$'s as fair market value is not replacement value, and the Airport officials were so cruel to us & so was Major Yorty. I remember at one of our meetings at the High School Major Yorty was there & he said "Looks like you got the wrong end of the stick." I've never forgotten. I remember seeing one of our neighbor being carried out of her home. The tears I've shed - & my children can't go home & see where they grew up. How sad! So you see I have no love for the Airport - I have never used it.

Response:

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

PC03467-2

Comment:

I don't know who designed the entrance but these lights look like Pop Cycles to me. All different flavors. I'm sure the money spent for that would of been used better on the tunnel.

Response:

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

PC03467-3

Comment:

The traffic already is too much, we are being sandwiched between the airport & Hughes Plaza, if the airport keeps creeping north there will soon be No Westchester

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03467-4

Comment:

There is plenty of room in Palmdale - now that's a desert & how about the airbase Torra in Orange & Ontario??

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC03467-5

Comment:

I heard the Hughes Plaza -- with it's movies was for people from the airport to be entertained. We did have Loyola Theater & Paradise Theater. They are now closed.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03467-6

Comment:

Forgive me for raddling on but I'm angry at the officials have no concern for the people here in our community. Thank-you again.

Westchester Pioneer & Native

Please don't round file this as some old lady. It is my voice!

Response:

Comment noted. In accordance with 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. Response to individual comments included in this comment letter are provided above.

PC03467-7

Comment:

P.S. To me this expansion is only a band-aid. In 10 yrs from now it will have to expand again, so why not open Palmdale to take care of all traffic from Fresno to here and El Torra to take care of Orange counties points East & South.

Response:

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

PC03467-8**Comment:**

I have seen as many as 11 planes out on the approach ways to LAX at night coming in to land. This is a disaster to happen.

Response:

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

PC03468 McInerney, William None Provided**PC03468-1****Comment:**

Heavy traffic on the freeway and on Sepulveda (Pacific Coast Highway) is presently a dreaded experience anywhere around the airport on Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays. Certainly a substantial portion is due to the heavy concentration of residents, but the airport traffic makes the congestion far worse during certain hours of the day.

Response:

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

PC03468-2**Comment:**

People are driving in from all parts of Orange County and the inland cities. Why can't they be forced to carry a portion of the airport traffic - by building a medium sized airport at the old Marine base - and also directing a fair share to inland airports that currently exist?

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03469 Coward, Irene None Provided

PC03469-1

Comment:

Thanks for fighting for a regional plan regarding air transportation. We in the South Bay should not shoulder the entire burden of crowded skies and crowded traffic to & from LAX.

Response:

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

PC03469-2

Comment:

Also money should be spent on updating technology in the control towers and laws giving pilots enough rest between flights.

Response:

FAA is responsible for maintaining ATCT technology. Pilot rest is regulated by the U.S. Department of Transportation. Additionally, most airlines have regulations requiring pilots to rest a minimum amount of time per day.

PC03470 Holm, Nora None Provided

PC03470-1

Comment:

We need to decrease or limit the traffic at LAX. The access to the airport (roads) are too congested. Many times it takes longer to get to the airport (coming from Torrance) than to get to your destination by air. We need other facilities where people can fly from not only LAX. Why drive from Orange County to catch a plane at LAX?

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03471 Takara, Jean None Provided

PC03471-1

Comment:

Our house has had planes flying lower than before. I see them now flying above the skylights where they hadn't previously.

Response:

Slight variations in aircraft altitudes and flight tracks are common around an airport, as aircraft performance is dependent on a number of factors that may change many times during a given day. These factors include wind/weather, aircraft type, and pilot technique. However, prior to the release of the Draft EIS/EIR, the FAA's Los Angeles Terminal Radar Approach Control facility implemented a series of air traffic route changes that relocated aircraft flight paths in areas south of LAX. That action was taken independent of the Master Plan actions assessed under the Draft EIS/EIR and falls outside of the scope of this project. If the commentor lives in the area south of LAX, this may be the reason for the changes described. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC03471-2

Comment:

I worry about falling debris and pollution. There is black soot all over the windows and porches outside.

Response:

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

PC03471-3

Comment:

Traffic on the streets is dangerous.

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.

PC03471-4

Comment:

I know of friends who drive over 100 miles just to take flights out of LAX. They live in developing areas where there is room for population growth, and they deserve regional access to air travel.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC03472 Hall, Dorothy None Provided

PC03472-1

Comment:

The site at the Long Beach Naval Shipyard should be considered. Take offs and landings over water instead of residential areas. The surrounding space that would be impacted is commercial and industrial. Easy access to freeways and Blue Line Transit.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03473 McGrath, Jeff None Provided

PC03473-1

Comment:

Since I drive on the 405 every day, traffic is already intolerable, and the alternates of Sepulveda & Aviation are the same.

Response:

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

PC03473-2

Comment:

Although several miles away, we can hear the planes now. The black soot that appears is not coming from car traffic on a residential street. Devaluing my property from noise and pollution yields an extremely negative response.

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, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PC03473-3

Comment:

Exactly why all the resources that are available in Palmdale are not even being looked at or mentioned is absurd. That community would welcome airport/road/rail expansion.

Response:

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

PC03473-4**Comment:**

The 405 is FULL. and the traffic reports are now saying "It's always slow."

Response:

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

PC03474 Muckey, Betty None Provided

PC03474-1**Comment:**

As a 51 yr. resident of Westchester, I am very opposed to the LAX Master Plan. I believe it will destroy much of the area.

Response:

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

PC03474-2**Comment:**

The traffic has increased greatly the past year or two -and with the Playa Vista area to be developed and the expansion of the airport -will we be able to move??

Response:

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

PC03475 Weimer, Edward L. & Patricia None Provided

PC03475-1**Comment:**

Thank you Rep. Harmon for this information & opportunity to respond. We are aware of the controversy & agree that regional plans for airports & ground transportation plans to get individuals out of their cars is absolutely necessary. The time spent stop & slow on the 405 & Century etc takes more time than the fit. to SFO. even for us in Torrance. The cost of gas & the pollution of cars & planes could wreck huge areas around Lax. People in other areas need access to airports closer to where they live.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03476 Paolucci, Shirley None Provided

PC03476-1

Comment:

Wouldn't people, who don't live close to LAX, rather have an airport more convenient to them.

Response:

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

PC03477 Fost, Betty None Provided

PC03477-1

Comment:

The date is June 13-01 & I received this in the mail. Wasted effort & postage for all of us who are opposed to the Master Plan & expansion of LAX. A realtor in the area was to drop by papers to take to the meetings. She also never showed up. I'm handicapped & cannot attend meetings. I live on 91st St. & enough is enough. Fighting big business & politics has just about knocked me out. I'm willing to struggle on if I can.

Response:

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

PC03478 Carlton, Walker None Provided

PC03478-1

Comment:

My family is affected by airport expansion as:

Response:

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

PC03478-2**Comment:**

1. Sepulveda & La Tijera Blvds. are already so overcrowded as to be either gridlocked bumper to bumper or frustrated drivers going at dangerously high speeds and cutting in & out and tailgating (almost no law enforcement present).

Response:

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

PC03478-3**Comment:**

2. Noise level ever increasing

Response:

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

PC03478-4**Comment:**

Cannot leave automobiles outside due to fuel falling

Response:

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

PC03479 Wilson, Margaret None Provided

PC03479-1**Comment:**

- Supports JH position on airport
- attended Westchester hearing
- liked Tom's presentation at

Response:

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

PC03480 Bear, Michael None Provided

PC03480-1**Comment:**

I agree with your concerns on the expansion of LA.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC03480-2

Comment:

I live approximately 200' from Lincoln Blvd in Venice. The traffic on Lincoln is already congested and will only get worse with a larger LAX. Public transportation must be improved and other So. Cal airports expanded and built.

Response:

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

PC03481 Duran-Reed, Clara None Provided

PC03481-1

Comment:

My husband and I are residents of Rancho Palos Verdes. Despite the exorbitant taxes we pay, we are continuously disturbed by the airport noise from LAX - morning & late evening when we need to sleep.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC03481-2

Comment:

If Palmdale and Ontario want more growth - we say let them have it. We moved to this area for the QUIET OPEN SPACE. The noise has, however, been increasing in the last few years. I am vice-president of our homeowner's association and have heard the same concerns from my neighbors. Do we need more congestion, smog and noise here? Absolutely not. I'd rather wait at the airport for a delayed flight than be subject to a worse alternative.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03482 Cain, Alison None Provided

PC03482-1

Comment:

Having commuted to San Francisco from Venice regularly over the last 12 years - I have to question the intelligence of any expansion plan that doesn't include a high speed rail extending from San Diego to Seattle. This is loooong overdue - common sense approach to people moving embraced everywhere but the USA. Could \$12 billion build the LA-SF segment of a high speed rail? Think about it.

Response:

This comment appears to be in favor of developing a high speed rail line from southern California to San Francisco. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan (see Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.1 regarding high speed rail connection).

PC03483 Aguiar, Lee None Provided

PC03483-1

Comment:

I agree with your analysis above. The Denver airport used to be in the middle of town and Denver moved it out of the residential area. Great idea because it means less noise, less pollution and the land is less expensive. Same can be said about the Dallas airport too. LAX needs to move!!

Response:

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

PC03483-2

Comment:

The traffic is bad near the airport. At times Sepulveda is backed up over 1 mile trying to get through the Sepulveda tunnel.

Response:

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

PC03483-3

Comment:

The airport noise at nite is very bad and I believe it is mostly from Fedex, UPS, etc because there aren't very many passenger flights at LAX after 10 PM. The problem is cargo flights too!

Response:

Living in Redondo Beach, the commentor may be affected by easterly takeoffs circling back to the west on their departures to Asia. LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction to alleviate that situation by making over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. During a recent 18 month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. As noted by the noise abatement procedures

3. Comments and Responses

delineated in Topical Response TR-N-7, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather or wind conditions require east traffic flow. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1, and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.4.

PC03483-4

Comment:

Move the cargo flights to Palmdale or Ontario or Burbank or Long Beach or Orange County.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03483-5

Comment:

LA keeps saying that LAX brings jobs to the South Bay. Don't Agree. El Segundo continues to have many vacant commercial buildings, bye for now.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01045-2 regarding the geographic distribution of job growth associated with the Master Plan.

PC03483-6

Comment:

P.S. Traffic is also backed up on the 105 Freeway Sepulveda exit. This situation is very dangerous because cars are stopped/merging in 2 lanes on the right while cars are going at freeway speeds (65 mps) on the left lane.

Response:

The westbound off-ramp from I-105 to Sepulveda Boulevard is an existing facility under Caltrans' responsibility. At the request of LAWA, Caltrans recently improved this off-ramp by adding a second lane. This has doubled capacity and helped to reduce operational problems associated with this off-ramp. Additional improvements are programmed for this off-ramp and will be implemented by Caltrans in the very near future. As shown in Technical Report 3b, traffic volumes on this ramp will continue to increase until they exceed the new capacity during the AM peak hour in 2015 if the LAX Master Plan is not implemented. With implementation of Master Plan Alternatives A, B, C, or D, traffic growth on this ramp will grow less quickly, and will stay below capacity through and beyond 2015.

PC03485

Sato, Dale Ann

None Provided

PC03485-1

Comment:

- I do not want more air traffic at the Torrance airport nor all the related pollution.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-4 regarding potential environmental impacts at surrounding other airports as a result of the LAX Master Plan.

PC03485-2**Comment:**

- I support ground and public transit system to service LAX directly (Red Line etc.) LAX is an important Pacific hub airport.

Response:

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

PC03485-3**Comment:**

- If I really want to voice an informed objective opinion, you need to give more information re LAX master plan in the letter vs the alternative proposals stated here.

Response:

Comment noted. Additional information regarding the LAX Master Plan was included in Section 1.1.2. The Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) Master Plan, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PC03486 Marinkovich, Leah None Provided

PC03486-1**Comment:**

Los Angeles does not need more pollution. Noise, light and air pollution are horrible already. Our community is affected by these negatives on a daily basis. Please spread the burden around. No more expansion at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and impacts from light in Section 4.18, Light Emissions. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendices D and G and Technical Reports 4 and 9 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PC03488 Cohen-Edwards, None Provided
Phyllis**

PC03488-1**Comment:**

LAX expansion would be devastating to the lifestyle of the people in the So. Bay.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03488-2

Comment:

Manhattan Beach already suffers from low fly overs, noise pollution, traffic congestion.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing and future noise levels.

PC03488-3

Comment:

If the airport is allowed to expand, Real Estate property values would be dramatically effected.

Response:

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

PC03488-4

Comment:

The threat of an airport disaster over our homes would become highly likely.

Response:

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

PC03488-5

Comment:

NO LAX Expansion!! We know they are working on the expansion, as we speak....stop it!

Response:

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

PC03489 Williams, Roberta None Provided

PC03489-1

Comment:

I would have loved to prepare some comments however I just received this in the mail - today is June 8. Unfortunately this doesn't give me time to comment - or to help you before the hearings. I wish I had received this sooner

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03490 Freed, William None Provided

PC03490-1

Comment:

NO EFFECT WHATSOEVER ON ME.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03490-2

Comment:

WHAT I WOULD LIKE IS TO HEAR THE PROS AND CONS ON MOVING ALL FREIGHT FROM LAX, AND DIVERTING IT TO OUTSIDE LOCAL AIRPORTS.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand. Please see Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity.

PC03491 Sala, Elizabeth None Provided

PC03491-1

Comment:

Please continue your efforts to stop the expansion of LAX. The surrounding counties should expand their airports. We hear enough noise from plane - let's distribute it.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03493 **Fishburn-Longo,** **None Provided**
Mary

PC03493-1

Comment:

I LIVE IN PLAYA DEL REY & OPPOSE FURTHER LAX EXPANSION, INCLUDING RING ROAD EXPANSION.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please note that Alternative D does not include the Ring Road.

PC03493-2

Comment:

NOISE IS AN ONGOING PROBLEM (JETS). MY HOME HAS DOUBLE PANED GLASS WINDOWS AND I STILL HEAR PLANES (INDOORS).

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the effectiveness of sound insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, Subtopical Response TR-N-6.1 regarding existing and future noise levels, and Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PC03493-3

Comment:

THERE IS A CONSTANT LAYER OF SOOT/DIRT ON MY BALCONY FROM PLANES OVERHEAD. THAT'S TODAY! EXPANSION & MORE AND/OR LARGER PLANES WILL INCREASE THE PROBLEM.

Response:

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

PC03493-4

Comment:

THE 405 FWY. IS ALREADY SEVERLY CROWDED - MORE PASSENGERS WILL MAKE THE FWY. IMPASSABLE.

Response:

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

PC03493-5**Comment:**

AIRPORT FACILITIES MUST BE BETTER DISTRIBUTED THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE METRO AREA. REGIONAL AIRPORTS ARE IMPERATIVE.

Response:

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

PC03494**Kulschbach, Joanie None Provided****7/12/2001****PC03494-1****Comment:**

I am against expanding LAX. This would over-burden an already taxed infrastructure of roadways and parking, in addition to more pollution and noise.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03494-2**Comment:**

If the regional airports had more flight options, people wouldn't have to commute to LAX, thereby creating more air pollution, and taxing its capacity.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03495 Craig, Robert None Provided 7/12/2001

PC03495-1

Comment:

THE ONLY IMPACT I KNOW IS TRUE (I HAVE BEEN IN MY HOME SINCE '76 [YES 25 YRS]) IS THE NOISE FROM JET ENGINES IS UNACCEPTABLE. I DO NOT KNOW THE FACTS ABOUT ANYTHING ELSE. BUT I DON'T WANT ANYMORE POLLUTION AND TRAFFIC. SO NO TO ANYMORE GROWTH.

Response:

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

PC03496 Carranza, Carolyn None Provided

PC03496-1

Comment:

"NO EXPANSION AT LAX"

Too crowded congested as it is at the Beach!! "NO"

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed population growth in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement), and coastal zone impacts in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers.

PC03497 Aikens, Ann None Provided

PC03497-1

Comment:

Develop the other airports!
They want it.
LAX doesn't. Our area has gotten bad enough!
Please do not increase congestion on our streets!

Response:

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

PC03498 Stool, Bruce None Provided

PC03498-1

Comment:

THE LAX MASTER PLAN WILL SINGLED-HANDEDLY DESTROY THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN SOUTH BAY AND SURROUNDING AREAS.

Response:

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

PC03498-2

Comment:

ALREADY THE NOISE IS TERRIBLE SINCE THE PLANES HAVE BEEN FLYING LOW AND NOT RESPECTING THE PROPER FLIGHT PATHS.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2.

PC03498-3

Comment:

POLLUTION DESTRO OUR OUTDOOR FURNITURE.

Response:

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

PC03498-4

Comment:

AND WHEN I CALL THE COMPLAINT LINES, ALL I GET ARE RUDE PEOPLE WITH BAD ATTITUDES.

Response:

Responding to noise complaints is a difficult process. Aircraft noise events are unique and subjective, in that what might bother one individual may not bother another. Weather, aircraft type, operational procedures may all play a factor and may be considered consistent with normal operations. This response may be frustrating to the concerned citizen, however, LAX staff attempts to provide citizens with an honest, truthful and professional assessment of the identified noise event. LAX does keep records of the noise complaint and complainant. In the event that a complainant does request a written response and includes a mailing address, LAWA's Noise Management staff policy is to provide them with written response. However, no more than five noise events will be investigated on a monthly basis. LAWA has also recently incorporated a policy to place the complainant on a monthly mailing list where all incoming identified noise complaint calls are put on a monthly log, are addressed by LAWA Noise Management staff then the responses (broken down by date, time and block address) are sent to the requesting community members. LAWA has recently installed a PASSUR system to assist the community in tracking aircraft operations. By going to the LAWA website www.lawa.org and entering

3. Comments and Responses

the Noise Management section community members can specifically identify LAX operations that cross their community.

PC03498-5

Comment:

OTHER CITIES AROUND THE WORLD BUILD THEIR AIRPORTS AWAY FROM POPULATED AREAS. WHY CAN'T LA.

Response:

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

PC03498-6

Comment:

WHY NOT USE PALMDALE FOR FREIGHT. I THINK THAT IDEA IS BEING DISCARDED BECAUSE IT CUTS INTO PROFITS.

Response:

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

PC03498-7

Comment:

DAMN THE PEOPLE, LETS NEAR IT FOR THE ALMIGHTY DOLLAR! I COULD GO ON BUT WHAT DIFFERENCE WILL IT MAKE. NO FAITH IN GOVERNMENT

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03499 Barra, Joan None Provided

PC03499-1

Comment:

No expansion.

Response:

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

PC03499-2

Comment:

Pershing Drive would be a bottleneck.

Response:

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

PC03499-3**Comment:**

Pollution increased for El Segundo to hazardous.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-2 regarding toxic air pollutants and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC03499-4**Comment:**

Noise is intolerable now. Can't sleep.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC03499-5**Comment:**

More "early turns" - more noise.

Response:

Early turns over El Segundo have been a focus of public complaint for years. The airport has attempted to deal with the issue 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). For additional information related to early turns over areas north and south of LAX, please see Topical Response TR-N-3, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2.

PC03500**Galanter, Ruth****City of Los Angeles****11/9/2001**

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00106; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00106.

PC03501**Galanter, Ruth****City of Los Angeles****9/28/2001****PC03501-1****Comment:**

The following letter was forwarded from Ruth Galanter's office.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R) for LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT (LAX), PROPOSED MASTER PLAN IMPROVEMENTS, Los Angeles County, California (CEQ #010024. #D-FAA-K51039-CA). Our comments on this DEIS/R were prepared prior to the tragic events of September 11, 2001. Along with all Americans, we are stunned by what has happened and continue to grieve the loss of so many innocent lives. We know our country is deeply affected, and recognize that the Federal Aviation

3. Comments and Responses

Administration's (FAA's) priorities and future activities will respond to these events. As FAA develops a course of action, EPA stands ready, as a Federal partner, to provide assistance to FAA now and in the future.

The subject DEIS/R is a joint Federal/State document, prepared to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead agency for this document under NEPA and the City of Los Angeles is the lead agency under CEQA. Our comments are provided under NEPA, the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) NEPA Implementing Regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act (CAA). We sent scoping comments to FAA on the Notice of Intent to prepare the DEIS/R on July 31, 1997, and attended one of the three June 9, 2001 public workshops held in connection with the DEIS/R (Inglewood session). We have had a number of phone conversations with Mr. David Kessler of FAA to discuss issues raised by EPA's review of the DEIS/R. We acknowledge the extensive effort in preparing this DEIS/R and commend FAA's decision to conduct six additional public workshops and extend the comment period to September 24, 2001.

In addition to No Action, the DEIS/R fully evaluated three action alternatives: construction of a new north side runway, construction of a new south side runway, and relocation of an existing runway (Proposed Action, Alternative C). Each build alternative proposes the construction of new taxiways and runway extensions; construction of new terminal buildings and parking garages and a rental-car consolidated facility; construction of a ring road and connection to I-405; construction of new and relocated air cargo and maintenance facilities and roads; extension of the Metro Green Line into the airport; and land acquisition.

Based on our review, we rate the DEIS/R as EO-2, Environmental Objections - Insufficient Information. Please refer to the attached Summary of EPA Rating Definitions, found in EPA's Policy and Procedures for the Review of Federal Actions Impacting the Environment (1984). EPA's policy provides for a rating of Environmental Objections (EO) where EPA's review finds that "an action might violate or be inconsistent with achievement or maintenance of a national environmental standard, and in cases where there are no applicable standards...but there is a potential for significant environmental degradation that could be corrected by project modification or other feasible alternatives." The "2" rating (Insufficient Information) serves to identify additional or clarifying information that FAA should provide in the Final EIS/R (FEIS/R). Issues upon which we base our EO-2 rating include:

- (a) The DEIS/R's acknowledgment that all three action alternatives, as well as No Action, cause violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS); additional information is needed to determine the project's contribution to the projected NAAQS violations and to assess the effectiveness of associated mitigation;
- (b) The DEIS/R's acknowledgment regarding disproportionately high, adverse impacts from aircraft noise to low-income and minority communities; additional information is needed to assess whether other reasonable alternatives and/or associated mitigation can successfully reduce these acknowledged disproportionate effects;
- (c) Potential adverse health effects associated with air pollution increases, especially diesel particulates; and
- (d) Failure to fully analyze a regionally-based alternative that may reduce disproportionately high, adverse impacts on low-income and minority communities.

These issues are summarized below and described in greater detail in our attached comments.

Response:

The content of this comment letter is identical to comments AF00001-1 through AF00001-9; please see Responses to Comments AF00001-1 through AF00001-9.

PC03501-2

Comment:

NAAQS Violations: The DEIS/R projects violations of the NAAQS for at least two criteria air pollutants for the three action alternatives (see p. 4-509). Due to the severity of existing and projected air quality challenges in the South Coast Air Basin, EPA is seriously concerned about Federally-approved actions projected to yield additional air quality burdens. The DEIS/R projects that all three action alternatives (as well as No Action) will cause NAAQS violations in one or more years, i.e., 2004, 2005, and/or 2015. For Alternative C (Proposed Action), the DEIS/R informs us that maximum concentrations for nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and particulate matter (PM₁₀) are predicted to violate the annual NO₂ NAAQS, and the 24-hour and annual PM₁₀ NAAQS in 2004 and 2005. The PM₁₀ NAAQS are predicted to be exceeded in 2015. Documenting the project's contributions to these projected NAAQS violations, and how they would be successfully mitigated, is a critical consideration in terms of NEPA public disclosure. All affected agencies should participate in developing adequate, enforceable air quality mitigation that can be shown to have quantifiable emissions reductions such that any NAAQS violations are successfully avoided and/or mitigated. Absent this finding in the FEIS/R, the public has no assurance that the project complies with the CAA. EPA will continue working cooperatively with FAA and other parties as planning for this project moves forward.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment AF00001-2; please see Response to Comment AF00001-2.

PC03501-3

Comment:

We recognize that the DEIS/R identifies areas where mitigation can make a significant difference in the magnitude and occurrence of specific impacts. Recognizing that this project's NEPA documentation needs a more detailed discussion of mitigation measures, we look forward to working with FAA in developing an effective, efficient package of mitigation with respect to air quality impacts. Such mitigation efforts could include diesel retrofits for construction equipment and support vehicles, the use of alternative-fueled vehicles at LAX, and other measures. It is important to involve local communities and local authorities in developing mitigation measures.

Response:

Since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.6, Air Quality, has been revised to include more data regarding mitigation measures, assumptions, and associated emission reductions. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed mitigation measures in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-E. LAWA is developing a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program that describes in greater detail those air quality mitigation measures being carried forward as well as their associated control efficiencies. Measures include, but are not limited to: diesel retrofits such as PM filter traps on construction equipment and the use of cleaner-burning diesel fuel such as PuriNOx. To the extent possible, on-airport vehicles will be fueled with natural gas or other alternative fuels.

LAWA has worked closely with both the SCAQMD and EPA to develop the list of mitigation measures included in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03501-4

Comment:

We note that, based on information in 4.6 (Air Quality), it appears that the project will cause significant emissions, which may make it difficult for FAA to make a positive conformity determination under CAA Section 176(c) and EPA's general conformity regulation. The DEIS/R does not discuss how FAA will address CAA general conformity, including whether an appropriate level of air quality mitigation will help

3. Comments and Responses

ensure that the project conforms under the CAA. EPA recommends that the FEIS/R address how the project will meet the general conformity regulations.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments AF00001-4 and PC02203-92 regarding LAX emissions and the general conformity determination.

PC03501-5

Comment:

Disproportionately High, Adverse Impacts: Executive Order 12898 requires that Federal agencies identify and address disproportionately high, adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations as a result of Federal projects. The U.S. Department of Transportation's (DOT) Environmental Justice Strategy provides that when such disproportionate impacts are identified, DOT is to ensure that any of their respective...activities that will have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority populations or low-income populations will only be carried out if further mitigation measures or alternatives that would avoid or reduce the disproportionately high and adverse effects are not practicable.

Page ES-46 acknowledges significant, disproportionate impacts to such communities due to aircraft noise, and potentially air quality and health. Pages 4-395 and 4-396 state that projected increases in aviation activity at LAX would have a disproportionate impact on minority and low-income communities under all three action alternatives, and that noise mitigation may be inadequate to eliminate associated impacts. The DEIS/R informs us that increased emissions of NO_x, particulate matter and toxic air pollutants could have significant impacts throughout the South Coast Air Basin, and that health effects associated with these pollutants (such as asthma) are more prevalent among low-income and minority populations. According to the DEIS/R, these air quality impacts have the potential to affect minority and low-income individuals "more severely than the general population." Although the DEIS/R refers to mitigation to avoid or minimize adverse impacts, the FEIS/R should identify what mitigation and/or alternatives will be implemented, and determine the extent to which adverse impacts can be reduced or eliminated. We are willing to assist FAA in developing mitigation such as the Environmental Justice Action Plan, which should be developed in close coordination with affected local communities, in keeping with the Council on Environmental Quality's guidance on environmental justice under NEPA.

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as Comment AF00001-5; please refer to Response to Comment AF00001-5.

PC03501-6

Comment:

Other Air Pollutants: The DEIS/R includes a major health effects analysis and we acknowledge this effort. However, the DEIS/R does not satisfactorily address two air pollutants of concern: toxic particulates and acrolein. Page 4-1008 acknowledges that diesel particulates, a State of California-listed carcinogen account for 70% of the cancer risk due to air pollution in the air basin. Diesel particulate emissions are linked to adverse respiratory effects, e.g., asthma, especially in children of low-income and minority communities. The State of California recently listed acrolein as one of five air toxics significantly impacting children's health. The DEIS/R projects large increases in toxic particulate and acrolein emissions from aircraft, cargo transport, ground service vehicles and construction equipment. The FEIS/R should assess the health impacts of these toxic emissions and the extent to which such impacts will be adequately mitigated.

Response:

Please refer to Response to Comment AF00001-29 and AF0001-38 regarding diesel particulates and acrolein, Responses to Comments AL00033-226 and AL00033-346 regarding health risks associated with acrolein and acute health impacts of construction, Topical Response TR-HRA-4 regarding mitigation of human health impacts, and Section 4.24.1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a reevaluation of chronic and acute hazards for acrolein.

PC03501-7**Comment:**

LAWA's Air Quality and Source Apportionment Study: EPA commends LAWLA for undertaking the 'Air Quality and Source Apportionment Study of the Area Surrounding Los Angeles International Airport,' and we remain committed to our continued role in the completion and implementation of this study. LAWLA's air quality and source apportionment study is designed to remedy deficiencies in current information about LAX's current operations on air quality and surrounding communities. Given the existing and projected air quality impacts associated with LAX, this study is extremely important. The data and analysis that becomes available through this study will facilitate full disclosure of impacts, identify appropriate mitigation measures, and inform the NEPA decision-making process. As it becomes available, FAA should fully integrate the information and analysis of the air quality and source apportionment study in this project's NEPA document and decision-making process.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-2 regarding the Source Apportionment Study.

PC03501-8**Comment:**

Alternatives: NEPA requires disclosure of adverse impacts and how such impacts may be avoided or minimized. Since the project's stated purpose is to respond to local and regional demand for air transportation during...2000-2015 (p. ES-6), we believe the range of fully evaluated alternatives is too narrow. This is critical in light of FAA's recognition of disproportionately high, adverse impacts on minority and low-income communities from aircraft noise, and potentially air quality and health. While the DEIS/R mentions an alternative for other regional airports, FAA determined it is not reasonable. EPA believes there is not sufficient information in the DEIS/R to support this conclusion and strongly recommends that the FEIS/R include an analysis of the extent to which greater use of existing commercial airports in the five-county region may help to meet the project's stated purpose and need while potentially reducing adverse impacts. While new and/or additional information could be presented in the FEIS/R, a supplemental EIS may be more useful and appropriate to present a broader range of fully evaluated alternatives. Given the scope and complexity of managing projected increases in air traffic over the next 15 years in the five-county region, FAA should consider a comprehensive, long-term effort beyond this particular NEPA document to examine strategies to fairly and effectively distribute air traffic at the commercial airports of the five-county region. We believe such an approach is consistent with the recent commitment by the Secretary of Transportation to establish a task force to assess aviation demand and airport capacity in southern California.

Response:

This comment is identical to comment AF00001-8; please see Response to Comment AF00001-8.

PC03501-9**Comment:**

Conclusion: As noted, EPA is particularly concerned with the projected NAAQS violations attributable to this project, lack of a detailed plan to avoid and/or mitigate disproportionately high, adverse impacts to minority and low-income populations, potential health effects, and the narrow range of alternatives that were fully evaluated. EPA believes there are serious deficiencies in the information presented in the DEIS/R, which leads to a high level of uncertainty about the magnitude of potential impacts associated with this project. The findings and recommendations of LAWLA's air quality and source apportionment study are especially relevant to FAA's decision-making, and merit careful consideration in this NEPA process. The FEIS/R should include FAA's general conformity determination and related mitigation commitments. No matter what alternative under NEPA is finally selected, including No Action, there are major regional air quality, environmental justice, and other issues needing resolution. Because of the complexity of issues involved in avoiding and/or mitigating the projected NAAQS violations attributable to this project, it is important that such issues be addressed with the involvement and cooperation of all

3. Comments and Responses

parties (e.g., the public, industry, and Federal, State, regional and local governments), utilizing existing regulatory processes to protect air quality in the South Coast Air Basin. EPA looks forward to working with FAA, LAWA, and Secretary Mineta's Task Force to find an effective, comprehensive approach to air transportation in the region and to address the issues raised by the DEIS/R and the public comment process.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments AF00001-10 through AF00001-60 for responses to each of the US EPA's concerns noted in the comment's Conclusion.

PC03502 Schubert, Lynn None Provided

PC03502-1

Comment:

Fight LAX expansion

In a March 1 Los Angeles Times article about the mayoral candidates' views on LAX expansion, John Agoglia, president of the Airport Commission, was quoted as saying, "Here, if you don't build it, they will come anyway." He has his own "field of dreams," obviously, but in a democracy, we, the people, ought not to be told we are helpless.

There are ways to cap flights in time, there are rules to make about noise and air pollution, communities to join together and protest being swallowed up by big business expansion. In my field of dreams, I see leadership coming forward in Los Angeles and the South Bay communities saying loud and clear that we have enough now. Let there be other airports surrounding Los Angeles. If they build, the business and jobs will come to them.

All over the United States and the world, shuttles are bringing people into town for whatever. They are not flying them right into beautiful residential communities like our South Bay and destroying the quality of life there.

I hope Soboroff and others supported by Riordan and Agoglia will not be voted in so they can continue trying to frighten everyone into passivity or into active greed with the monster plan for LAX finally taking over and telling everyone everywhere that we have no limits here, just bring your money and come.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, and Response to Comment PC01018-29 regarding the inability of FAA and LAWA to limit activity at airports. The 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.

PC03503 Reed, Nancy None Provided

PC03503-1

Comment:

I am a pilot (inactive) and feel that LAX is @ capacity. I live here in (for 35 years) in Westchester, and clean the Blk fallout off of my patio, windows, cars & I breathe it!

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition and Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects.

PC03503-2

Comment:

Why not enlarge Burbank - Van Nuys or Palmdale?

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA do not control the development of Burbank Airport. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03504	Dawson, Ruth	None Provided	6/23/2001
----------------	---------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC03504-1

Comment:

Please find enclosed a copy of my letter to the MASTER PLAN LAX. I am very much against the EXPANSION plan at LAX. I think you, the folks in "downtown LA" and "all around Los Angeles" are very much aware to this and I hope for many reasons that you will say NO to LAX expansion. Who really has the final say about expansion??

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Master Plan will not be implemented until the Final EIS/EIR is certified by the City of Los Angeles; the City Council approves implementation of one of the alternatives, makes written findings, and adopts a Statement of Overriding Considerations, if needed; and the Federal Aviation Administration publishes a Record of Decision.

PC03504-2

The attachment included as part of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00545; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC00545.

PC03505	Stevens, Mike	LAX Expansion No!
----------------	----------------------	--------------------------

PC03505-1

Comment:

After reviewing the EIR/EIS LAX Expansion No! (L.A.X.E.N!) has a series of questions that we would like to have answered and if you can identify where in the LAX Master Plan EIR/EIS these answers could be located we would appreciate it. Before we address those issues we would like to state publicly that we are oppose the any expansion of LAX that would result in additional pollution, negative environmental affects, increase in jet aircraft, increase vehicle traffic/trips, increase passengers, including but not limited to negative health affects, inclusive of both mental and physical.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, human health and safety in

3. Comments and Responses

Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03505-2

Comment:

We would like to make a special note that the Inglewood Meeting hosted by LAX at the Hollywood Park Casino was poorly attended by Inglewood Residents due to a lack of public outreach on the part of LAX. LAX should have scheduled a second meeting after being notified that Congresswoman Maxine Waters had publicized the wrong date. LAX did not notify Inglewood Residents in an effective way explaining the process and the purpose for the Public Hearing concerning LAX.

Response:

A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PC03505-3

Comment:

The following are the objections and questions that we have concerning the LAX Master Plan EIR/EIS:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC03505-4

Comment:

1) The document (EIR/EIS) does not identify the factor airport planners use in figuring out how many vehicle trips are associated with each passenger. Please identify what the factor is that the airport planners have used and what is the number of passengers that the factor is predicated on? Where and on what page is this addressed in the EIR/EIS?

Response:

Vehicle occupancy information is provided in Technical Report 3a, On-Airport Technical Report.

PC03505-5

Comment:

2) The document (EIR/EIS) does not address the action of the Regional Board of the Southern California Association of Governments removal of the Arbor Vitae Interchange from the Regional Transportation Plan or the Regional Transportation Implementation Plan as a transportation project. Where and on what page can we find this acknowledgement. If it is not necessary to mention the Arbor Vitae Removal from the RTP and RTIP please identify why?

3) The document (EIR/EIS) does not identify who will pay for the construction of the Arbor Vitae Interchange if funding is removed for the Arbor Vitae Interchange Project?. Where and on what page is the alternative funding source addressed if the Southern California Association of Governments continues to have funds pulled from the project?

4) Did LAX calculate what the negative affects would be concerning the computations contained in the EIR/EIS with the elimination of the Arbor Vitae Interchange Project? If there was a calculation done what would be the negative effects? Also how would the elimination of the project impact traffic flow, pollution levels, passenger movement, and overall environmental impacts on the surrounding communities of LAX and LAX itself? If this is documented where in the EIR/EIS is it located?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-8.

PC03505-6

Comment:

5) Did LAX calculate what the negative affects would be concerning computations contained in the EIR/EIS with the elimination of the Sepulveda Blvd. HOV (High Occupancy Vehicle Lane? Where is it located in the EIR/EIS?

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. LAWA coordinated closely with the Cities of Los Angeles, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Inglewood, Culver City, Santa Monica, Los Angeles County, LACMTA, SCAG, and Caltrans to identify all planned and funded transportation improvements in the area, as discussed in Technical Report 3b (Alternatives A, B, and C) and S-2b (Alternative D). The possibility of placing HOV lanes on Sepulveda Boulevard was not identified by any of these agencies. It would therefore be improper to consider the effects of removing a project that is not on the list of planned and funded transportation improvements.

PC03505-7

Comment:

6) Why did LAX not address two air pollutants of concern: Toxic particulates and acrolein? Why did LAX not address how they would mitigate them? If this is documented where in the EIR/EIS is it located?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed acrolein and particulate matter (PM), including diesel PM in Section 4.24.1, Health Risk Assessment. In addition, please see Responses to Comments AF00001-29 and AL00033-346.

PC03505-8

Comment:

7) Why did LAWA not include its own air quality and source apportionment study in the EIR/EIS that would have identified deficiencies in current information about LAX's current operation on air quality and surrounding communities? If this is documented where in the EIR/EIS is it located?

8) Given the existing and projected air quality impacts associated with LAX, why did LAWA not wait until its own air quality and source apportionment study was completed before releasing the EIR/EIS? If the study was completed where in the EIR/EIS is it located?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-2 regarding the Source Apportionment Study.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03505-9

Comment:

9) How does LAX intend to circumvent the ruling of the Southern California Association of Governments that LAX remained constrained to its current foot print and held to 78 Million annual passengers or less? If this is documented where in the EIR/EIS is it located?

Response:

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

PC03505-10

Comment:

10) Where does it address in the EIR/EIS when does it become unsafe to land and take off over the ocean simultaneously, how many planes simultaneously landing and taking off before night time operations are declared to be unsafe? If this is documented where in the EIR/EIS is it located?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. Also see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, including over-ocean operations. It should be noted that any and all operations at LAX occur within the National Airspace System which serves to protect public safety in all operating conditions.

PC03505-11

Comment:

11) Where is the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Inglewood and Los Angeles World Airports located in the EIR/EIS. Also what are the ramifications concerning the air space over each home and the individual home owners ability to take legal action concerning environmental effects upon them and their family.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01916-2 regarding the nature and purpose of the MOU.

PC03505-12

Comment:

12) Extension of the Runway across Sepulveda Blvd or any movement of any runway can only be completed with an approved EIR/EIS. What is the Federal Citing? Where is it documented in the EIR/EIS that an approved EIR/EIS is necessary for moving the runways or taxiways?

Response:

Airport projects which require an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement (EIS) pursuant to NEPA, are identified in FAA's Airport Environmental Handbook (Order 5050.4A). As identified in Chapter 3 of the Handbook, an EIS is required for a Federal action that includes a new

runway capable of handling air carrier aircraft at a commercial service airport in a standard metropolitan statistical area. Other projects, such as major runway extensions, are subject to the analysis of an environmental assessment and subsequent decision as to whether to prepare an environmental impact statement or a finding of no significant impact. For the LAX Master Plan, it was determined that an EIS would be required.

PC03505-13

Comment:

13) Where is Mayor Hahn's of Los Angeles Alternative 5 located in the EIR/EIS? Does Alternative 5 identify moving the runways at LAX closer to the terminal areas located in the interior portion of LAX? What would be the distance between inboard runways on the northern and southern complex sides. If it is documented where in the EIR/EIS is it located?

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provides a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan alternative, and was circulated for public review and comment. Details regarding this alternative are provided in the Draft Master Plan Addendum (published in July 2003), including information about runway modifications. Under Alternative D, the separation between runways in both the north and south airfields would be increased to allow for the construction of parallel center taxiways. In the north airfield, Runway 6L/24R would maintain its current location; however, it would be extended approximately 1,495 feet to the west for a total length of approximately 10,520 feet. Runway 6R/24L would be reconstructed approximately 340 feet south of the existing runway centerline and would be extended approximately 135 feet west and approximately 1,280 feet to the east for a total runway length of approximately 11,700 feet. The distance between the proposed inboard runway centerline locations would be 4,196 feet as documented on the Draft Airport Layout Plan for Alternative D that was submitted to FAA for review and comment June 2003. In the south airfield, Runway 7L/25R would be reconstructed 50 feet south of its current location and a new center parallel taxiway would be constructed between the south pair of runways.

PC03505-14

Comment:

14) How does LAX justify using the phrase "complete breakdown" on page 3-25 concerning meeting passenger demand of 97.9 million? When the maximum identified by the Southern California Association of Governments is 78 Million Annual Passengers or less. If it is documented where in the EIR/EIS is it located?

Response:

The capacity of LAX under the various build and no build alternatives was summarized in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and was discussed in detail in Chapter V, Concept Development, Section 3.3.2 of the Draft LAX Master Plan, and Chapter III, Alternative D Constrained Activity, Section 3.1, of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum. Without the implementation of substantive improvements, the existing airfield, roadways, and terminal buildings would not be able to accommodate the projected demand of 97.9 million annual passengers in 2015. Rather, it is expected that the existing facilities could only accommodate a passenger demand of 78.7 if no Master Plan-related improvements were to occur. Without substantial improvements, the runways and taxiways would not be able to accommodate the increased operations that would be associated with the unconstrained forecast of 97.9 million passengers, the terminals would not be able to handle the additional passenger load, and the roadway system would not be able to efficiently convey the related traffic. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG RTP. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative but with an improved level of service.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03505-15

Comment:

15) Why does the unconstrained forecast and Alternative A, B, and C all show identical volumes of Cargo, since annual operations are not identical across the board. Even different fleet mixes under the three alternatives and the unconstrained forecast would not likely result in identical volume of cargo (4,172,000 tons) for each alternative? If it is documented where in the EIR/EIS is it located?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand. Descriptions of the annual cargo activity levels associated with the various alternatives were provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The cargo tonnage volumes and total aircraft operations for the four alternatives are not strictly comparable. For Alternatives A, B, and C, adequate cargo facilities are provided to meet the unconstrained demand of 4.2 MAT. Total aircraft operations vary among the build scenarios because of constraints that impact the level of passenger demand that is served. In all cases, sufficient cargo lift is available in the bellies of passenger aircraft, particularly international, to meet the projected demand for belly cargo. The forecast cargo tonnage for the No Action/No Project Alternative is approximately 3.1 MAT, the constrained capacity of the No Action/No Project cargo facilities.

PC03505-16

Comment:

16) Can the total emissions of criteria air pollutants and toxic air pollutants be reduced by a comprehensive regional analysis?

Response:

The air emissions associated with LAX are assessed in the context of the comprehensive air quality management plan for the Los Angeles region. Please see Response to Comment PC02203-92 for further explanation of this regional approach to reducing air pollution.

PC03505-17

Comment:

17) If the FAA's recognition of disproportionately high adverse impacts to low-income and minority communities and associated with questions of equity concerning pollution, noise etc. how can LAX be allowed to expand by the FAA or any other Governmental Agency? What other Governmental Agencies are involved in giving approval of the LAX Master Plan EIR/EIS If it is documented where in the EIR/EIS is it located?

Response:

Environmental Justice was addressed in Section 4.4.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Under both NEPA and CEQA, a project can be approved despite significant, unavoidable impacts. Please see Response to Comment PC02217-7. A list of approvals required as part of the Master Plan was included in Section 2.7, Proposed Federal, State and Local Actions and Required Permits, of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03506 Schneider, Denny LAX Community Noise Roundtable

PC03506-1

Comment:

REGIONAL SOLUTION REQUIRED. . .

Response:

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

PC03506-2

Comment:

LAX EXPANSION. . .

HEALTH & SAFETY IMPACT ON SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES THAT WILL HAVE LONG TERM NEGATIVE ECONOMIC IMPACT ON ALL OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

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, economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socioeconomics. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 5, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-3, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03506-3

Comment:

Our advise to the LAWA Commissioners is JUST SAY NO!

Oppose further LAX expansion. Those surrounding LAX continue to bear the brunt of prior growth.

Response:

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

PC03506-4

Comment:

The latest expansion proposal would remove a third of the Westchester-Playa del Rey Business District and many more affordable homes.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land acquisition for each of the alternatives in Chapter 3 and Section 4.2, Land Use. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 concerning impacts within the Community of Westchester. Also note, as described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in contrast to the other build

3. Comments and Responses

alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not propose any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester Business District. As was described in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA's programs for the acquisition of residences and business properties would conform to governing federal and State requirements for the payment of just compensation for the purchase of any needed property and applicable relocation assistance and payments would be provided to any person displaced from their home or business. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PC03506-5

Comment:

Complete West Side and South Bay gridlock is inevitable. Aside from the obvious health and safety risks of an over crowded sky, another LAX expansion will add several million cars and trucks to the 405 freeway and local roads. Even the LAX Environmental Impact Report admits that traffic impacts cannot be mitigated!

Response:

As disclosed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternatives A, B, and C would have nine intersections with significant and unavoidable impacts, while Alternative D would have three intersections with significant and unavoidable impacts. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC03506-6

Comment:

It's no wonder that the So. Cal. Assn. of Governments (SCAG) voted AGAINST including any further LAX expansion in their Long Range Plan. Their staff estimated LAX "improvements" would add capacity but result in increased air traffic delays!-and at a \$2-\$4 billion dollars penalty for building at LAX.

Response:

Please see Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding the SCAG RTP.

PC03506-7

Comment:

The proposition that people will only go to LAX is fallacious-especially as traffic gridlock expands. Los Angeles also owns Ontario and Palmdale airports. These airports are capable and anxious to grow-now, but can't compete with the LAX power base for the limited funding without forward planning.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03506-8**Comment:**

Another round of LAX "modernizations" will surely cause economic loss to the region. In twenty years freight capacity will be inadequate and require more lead time, than available, to be built. Jobs and businesses will leave California.

Response:

Comment noted. The economic effects of Master Plan alternatives were provided in Section 4.4.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Employment/Socio-Economics, with supporting technical data in Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03506-9**Comment:**

Further, minority areas bear an undue amount of the impacts from growth at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, 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.

PC03506-10**Comment:**

Subsidiary projects such as the "LAX Connector Road" severely impacts our heritage as it will destroy the 1937 National Historic Landmark, the Centinela Adobe, birthplace of Inglewood.

Response:

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

PC03506-11**Comment:**

LAX Expansion Issue

Four Scenarios

- No Action/No Project (78 MAP, 3.1 M tons cargo)
 - Alternative A- Additional north runway and lengthened other north runway with west concourses (98 MAP, 4.2 M tons cargo)
 - Alternative B- Additional south runway and lengthened other north runway with west concourses (98 MAP, 4.2 M tons cargo)
 - Alternative C- No additional runway, but one north runway moved 350' N and both lengthened and one south runway moved 50' S and lengthened. (90 MAP, 4.2 M tons cargo) (Mayor Riorden endorsed June 1999) RUNWAYS MOVED NORTH, MADE LONGER AND MOVED EAST!
- All add Ring Road and Western Concourse and expand Cargo Facilities.

Response:

Comment noted. This comment restates the general characteristics of the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, and C. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and

3. Comments and Responses

efficient. Please note that Alternative D does not include a ring road or concourses on the western portion of the airport.

PC03506-12

Comment:

Impact starts immediately with preliminary notices of proposed purchases to homes/businesses.

Response:

Acquisition of residences or business would not occur until after the Los Angeles City Council certifies the Final EIS/EIR and approves one of the alternatives, makes written findings, and adopts a statement of overriding considerations, and the FAA issues a Record of Decision. Please note that no residential acquisition is proposed under Alternative D.

PC03506-13

Comment:

EIR/EIS expects major construction impact 3-4 years after go-ahead.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03506-14

Comment:

Many MTA/Caltrans/Fed Hwy/City/County "traffic mitigation" projects separate, but complementary.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03506-15

Comment:

Timetable of Events

- Notice of Preparation Document Released 6/11/1997.
- Draft Master Plan & Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Stmtnt (EIR/EIS) Released 1/18/2001.
- 180 day public comment/meetings ends 7/25/2001.
- Revisions of EIR/EIS to address comments and submission LAWA Airport Commissioners for recommendations and approval. FAA approval of Title VI Environmental Justice report.
- Los Angeles City Mayoral review and approval (MAKE YOUR VOTE COUNT!).
- Los Angeles City Council review and approval (MAKE YOUR VOTE COUNT!).

Verbal and written comments may be submitted at the Public Hearings. The Hearings will be conducted simultaneously on Saturday, June 9, 2001 from 12:00 noon to 7:00pm at the following locations:

Furama Hotel Los Angeles
8601 Lincoln Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90045
(310) 670-8111

The Pavilion at Hollywood Park
3883 West Century Boulevard
Inglewood, CA 90303
(310) 330-2841

Manhattan Beach Marriott
1400 Parkview Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
(310) 546-7511

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that the public review period for the Draft EIS/EIR was extended to November 9, 2001, for a total of 295 days. Moreover, six additional public hearings for the Draft EIS/EIR were held in October and November, 2001, for a total of nine public hearings.

PC03506-16

Comment:

EXPECT BIG INCREASES IN TRAFFIC CONGESTION. The last major expansion approval, 1984, was to 40 MAP yet we are currently at 65 and increasing! The EIR/EIS baseline is July 1997. Required mitigation per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is as of 1997.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PC03506-17

Comment:

MANY parts of THE NORTH SIDE, Inglewood, and the South Bay having 55-64 CNEL noise are not counted. They don't qualify for soundproofing or other mitigation. EIR/EIS states that the noise impact of Alt A/Alt C "reduce the total population exposed to noise above 65 CNEL..." The FAA considers only people at 65 CNEL (noise) to be impacted! The FAA will route more aircraft to larger areas but keep them just under 65 CNEL list.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 and Subtopical Responses TR-N-2.2 and TR-N-2.3 regarding the 65 CNEL threshold and evaluating impacts below the 65 CNEL. Significant noise impacts were identified in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.6), and Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for noise-sensitive uses newly exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels or that experience an increase of 1.5 CNEL or greater within the 65 CNEL contour. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR do not state or imply that impacts do not exist at noise exposure levels less than 65 CNEL only that they are less than significant. Based on 1992 Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON) criteria, noise-sensitive uses newly exposed to an increase of 3 CNEL within the 60-65 CNEL contour and an increase of 5 CNEL below the 60 CNEL were identified in Section 4.2.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for informational purposes. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included an analysis of single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakenings. 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-2, the ANMP would be revised to include areas newly exposed to these noise levels (defined by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour). As stated in Sections 4.1.6.1 and 4.2.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the overall population exposed to the 65 CNEL under Alternatives A, C, and D would be reduced compared to the 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions. Alternative D would result in the greatest reduction of population exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels in comparison to Alternatives A and C. See Subtopical Response TR-N-1.4 regarding the routing of aircraft used for noise modeling.

PC03506-18

Comment:

HEALTH (noise/illness) AND SAFETY (crash) RISKS WILL BE SHARED THROUGHOUT THE WESTSIDE AS ROUTES AROUND LAX BECOME MORE CONGESTED.

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 traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC03506-19

Comment:

Under Off-Airport surface transportation the Environmental Action Plan states, "measures would eliminate all remaining CEQA 'significant' impacts of the Master Plan alternatives by 2015 except for six intersections..." This document considers impact of new issues only, not the ones already existing!

Response:

The project compares conditions with the project to conditions without the project, via the Adjusted Environmental Baseline. It would be inappropriate for the project to mitigate existing traffic deficiencies. Also please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC03506-20

Comment:

"Alternative C would also have a significant unavoidable impact [Business Relocations]... insufficient relocation space..." (84 more homes also impacted beyond Manchester Square and Belford areas).

Response:

The acquisition and relocation impacts associated with Alternative C were detailed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses (subsection 4.4.2.6.4), of the Draft EIS/EIR. As discussed therein, significant relocation impacts would occur for industrial/business park uses and freight handling/warehousing uses to be acquired; however, impacts to office, hotel, and retail businesses would be less than significant. With implementation of the Proposed Relocation Plan, residential relocation impacts would also be less than significant. Please see Response to Comment PC00035-2 for further discussion of residential acquisition; and Response to Comment PC00013-5 regarding business acquisition and relocation impacts, proposed collateral development at LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, and the proposed Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan.

Subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a fourth Master Plan build alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was proposed and evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D involves the acquisition of far fewer businesses than the other build alternatives, would not require acquisition within the Westchester Business District, and does not propose residential acquisition.

PC03506-21

Comment:

TELL YOUR ELECTED OFFICIALS TO SUPPORT A TRULY REGIONAL SOLUTION! IF LAX CONTINUES TO EXPAND, THE OTHER AREAS WILL NEVER INCREASE THEIR SHARE AND BUSINESS WILL ULTIMATELY BE LOST TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.

In the 1980s LAX was renovated to accommodate 40 million passengers per year (MAP). Everyone agrees that LAX is presently overtaxed, operating at 65 MAP with 2.1 Million tons of cargo-but can we stand another round of facility "improvements" instead of a truly regional solution? Even those proposing facility expansion expects us to outgrow any planned expansion without distributing the load outside of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels.

PC03506-22

Comment:

AIR SAFETY WILL BECOME A FACTOR.

The local environment will get worse (safety, noise, ground traffic, air quality, etc.) regardless of airport actions. Arrivals and departures (routes and quantity) are controlled by the FAA and there is no indication of any inclination on their part to reduce or regulate the amount of air traffic coming to LAX.

Response:

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

PC03506-23

Comment:

THE HEALTH & SAFETY OF THOSE LIVING UNDER FLIGHT PATHS IS IMPAIRED AS AIR TRAFFIC INCREASES

Interestingly, the EIR/EIS projects a reduction of people impacted by noise. The report, however, only considers people "impacted" if they are within an area subjected to the weighted average 65 dB CNEL currently mandated by Congress. Any less magnitude of noise is ignored. LAX Noise Management recently monitored the Osage Area of Westchester. Osage is not "impacted" with an average hourly instantaneous noise level of 70 db and an average of 40 noise events per hour all day and into the late night/early morning.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences. Also, see 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 for new analysis of single event noise levels. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential effects of Master Plan alternatives on the community of Westchester.

PC03506-24

Comment:

Health studies at other airports have shown increased probability of repertory diseases and cancer around airports. Jet fuels and other carcinogens released into the air by ground and air traffic is not healthful.

Response:

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

PC03506-25

Comment:

WITHOUT EXPANSION EXPECT 10 MILLION MORE CARS AND TRUCKS ENTERING AND LEAVING THE AREA! WITH EXPANSION FAR MORE THAN DOUBLE THAT NUMBER. Traffic on the San Diego Freeway already comes to a stop frequently-imagine what health risk and time delays the additional traffic will add.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. The reference to 10 million more cars and trucks has no basis in the Draft EIS/EIR or the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC03506-26

Comment:

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

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

I oppose LAX expansion because it would:

- Increase air safety risks with more planes operating in close quarters.
- Dramatically worsen traffic congestion on I-405, I-105 and local arterials from thousands of passenger cars, vans, and cargo-carrying trucks.
- Result in greater air pollution, damaging local residents' health.
- Create more airport noise; impacting a larger population, causing stress, illness, and reduction of children's learning ability and degradation of property values.
- Aggravate environmental justice issues. A disproportionate share of low income and minority populations are subjected to increased health and safety impacts and/or displaced from their homes.
- Destroy local homes, schools, libraries, parks, and businesses to provide room for more airport support facilities.
- Divert attention and funds from the expansion of other airport facilities where future population growth is located.

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

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

Response:

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

PC03506-27

Comment:

What Should Be Done In Congress?

Sponsor Legislation to make the FAA lead, responsible agency for effects of noise on areas surrounding airports. Law must have teeth with penalties so that impact on communities is no longer "very low" priority below promulgation of aircraft industry. Must be equal to safety.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03506-28**Comment:**

Sponsor Legislation to study and upgrade FAA priorities related to health effects of living around airports (noise and chemicals).

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03506-29**Comment:**

Change method of determining "impacted" from the current 65 CNEL to include "number of events in an eight hour period" with lower standards for periods from 11 PM to 8 AM. Basis for noise impact should include instantaneous levels as well as average energy level. (See enclosed chart of noise monitoring data from Osage Area under siege which is not "impacted.")

Response:

The methods used for determining significant noise impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are consistent with standard practice as well as FAA requirements. It should be noted that this method applies a penalty for evening and nighttime noise (4.77 dB between 7 p.m. and 10 p.m. and 10 dB between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m., respectively). Instantaneous noise measurement (Lmax) measures the maximum energy associated with a noise event and only provides information for a very limited time period (which can be less than one second). Single event noise considers the noise levels associated with the entire duration of noise event, and is more meaningful. Single event noise was evaluated in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analysis provided in Appendix S-C. Also please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding differences between single event noise and CNEL.

PC03506-30**Comment:**

Sponsor Legislation to enable the FAA to specify limits in the number of scheduled landings at an airport facility. Set up a system that would enable carriers to "sell" landing slots similar to that used in the sale of "pollution credits."

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03507 Topek, Mary Jane None Provided

PC03507-1**Comment:**

It's me again! Attached you'll find a response to a letter I wrote to the "powers that be" at LAX. As you can see, when the people in the So. Bay complain about constant noise from the planes, flying over, near & taking off from LAX, we're not complaining about an occasional problem, but a constant problem. Please note the enclosed fly over pattern is for a half day 7:00 am - 3:00 pm. I've requested LAX send the rest of fly overs 3 - 12 midnight also August 11 & 12 & 23. These are days we could not sit outside, or have the windows open because of the barrage of noise from the planes.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are

3. Comments and Responses

provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC03011-7, regarding flight paths. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, Topical Response TR-LU-3 for additional information of filing noise complaints and LAWA's handling of noise complaints, Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC03507-2

Comment:

As you can see, we have far too many planes flying low over, near & around our home. - Help!

[SEE ORIGINAL FOR GRAPHIC INSERT]

The black square is our home. This pattern is for 1/2 day 7:00 am - 3:00 pm. I've put in a request for 3:00 pm to midnight.

Response:

Comment noted. Based on the graphic insert provided with the commentor's letter, there is little to no relationship between the aircraft that overfly the area where she resides and traffic departing LAX. It appears that her residence is overflowed by numerous aircraft flying along the VFR flyway along the coast and from other airports (Torrance) in the South Bay. A few flights may have been light aircraft departures that took off west from LAX, turning south along the coast, but these are not distinguishable from the exhibit provided. Further, loop overflights that had departed LAX appear to pass back over the area at high altitude from their climbs over the Santa Monica Bay. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 for additional information of filing noise complaints and LAWA's handling of noise complaints and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC03508 Bettencourt, Patricia None Provided

PC03508-1

Comment:

ATTACHED IS A COPY OF A LETTER I SENT TO THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADM. MR. KESSLER. I DON'T KNOW IF IT WILL HELP YOU BUT I HOPE SO FOR ALL OUR SAKES. THANK YOU FOR TRYING TO STOP THE MASTER PLAN. PERHAPS OUR ELECTED OFFICIALS DO LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE WHO GO OUT TO VOTE.

Response:

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

PC03508-2

Comment:

ABOUT TWO YEARS AGO, THE AIRPORT SAID OK WE ARE NOT TAKING ANY MORE HOMES, WE ARE GOING TO SOUNDPROOF YOUR HOME IF THE DECIMALS ARE OVER 63 TO 65 OR SO. WE THOUGHT GREAT, THEY WOULDN'T SPEND ALL THAT MONEY ON SOUNDPROOFING IF THEY WERE GOING TO TAKE OUR HOMES. WRONG, LAWA LIED AS USUAL THEY NOW WANT TO TAKE MY HOME AND 56 OTHERS PLUS 263 BUSINESSES FROM THE WESTCHESTER COMMUNITY, THAT THEY PROMISED THEY WOULD NOT TAKE. WHEN IS A LINE GOING TO BE DRAWN TO STOP THEM FROM DESTROYING A COMMUNITY AND CAUSING MORE POLLUTION, NOISE, CONJESTION AND A GREATER HEALTH HAZARD TO THOSE THAT ARE LEFT IF THEY ARE ALLOWED TO EXPAND.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC0649-1; please refer to Response to Comment PC00649-1.

PC03508-3**Comment:**

MOST OF THE HOMES THEY ARE GOING TO TAKE ARE OWNED BY SENIOR CITIZENS, WHO ARE RETIRED OR ARE GETTING READY TO RETIRE IN A COUPLE OF YEARS OR SO. THINKING WE WORKED ALL OUR LIVES LIKE MOST, NOW WE CAN ENJOY WHAT WE LOOKED FORWARD TO AND WORKED TOWARD ALL THOSE YEARS. THEN LAWA COMES ALONG AND SAYS TOO BAD, WE WANT IT, WE'RE TAKING IT. FIND SOMETHING ELSE. WELL WE DON'T WANT TO, THIS IS OUR HOME, WE ARE NOT AT AN AGE WHERE WE CAN START OVER AND WE SHOULD'T HAVE TO, JUST BECAUSE LAWA WANTS TO CAUSE MORE POLLUTION, NOISE, CONJESTION AND HEALTH HAZARDS.

Response:

This comment is identical to Comment PC00649-2. Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46. Please also see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues.

PC03508-4**Comment:**

REGARDLESS OF WHAT THEY SAY OR THE NUMBERS THEY PUT IN THEIR EIR REPORTS, THEY ARE EXPERTS AT LYING AND HIDING THE TRUTH.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03508-5**Comment:**

LOS ANGELES OWNS 4 OTHER AIRPORTS THAT THEY CAN BUILD UP, WITH NO HOMES, SCHOOLS OR BUSINESSES TAKEN. PALMDALE ALONE HAS 17,500 ACRES OF LAND. PLEASE DON'T LET THE ENVIRONMENT SUFFER ANYMORE THEN IT IS ALREADY AT LAX AND SO MANY SURROUNDING AREAS IF THEY ARE ALLOWED TO EXPAND BEYOND WHAT THEY ARE AT NOW. THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO READ THIS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00649-4.

PC03510 Hedderich, William None Provided

PC03510-1**Comment:**

I AM A PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER/MBA & EXPERT WITNESS. I AGREE WITH YOUR VIEWS ON AIRPORT EXPANSION 100%.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03510-2

Comment:

AS YOU PROBABLY ARE ALREADY AWARE. BOEING PLANS TO ANNOUNCE AN AIR-TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM. BASED ON GPS TECHNOLOGY, THAT COULD IMMEDIATELY INCREASE AIR TRAFFIC INTO LAX & ALL OTHER MAJOR AIRPORTS, BY 30%!

Response:

Under Alternatives A and B, airport facilities would be provided to meet projected demand. Under Alternatives C and D, airport facilities would limit the number of aircraft operations, irrespective of improvement to air traffic control systems. Also, please note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PC03511 White, Lynne None Provided

PC03511-1

Comment:

Please see attached.

I have lived in the South Bay area since 1977 and recently purchased a home in North Redondo Beach. The price of my property was almost \$400,000 - a real "bargain" for the beach area. Homes just north of me in Manhattan Beach are in the millions. Over the years, I have watched our little beachside community grow enormously - with more expensive homes being built, property being developed and families moving in. The reason? The South Bay is a beautiful and safe place to live. We have our own school systems, our own police departments, our own fire departments and our own city governments. We breathe fresh ocean air, swim and surf in clean waters and jog on white unpolluted beaches.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC03511-2

Comment:

However, the beauty of the area is slowly being ruined by the loud overhead noise of flying planes. I cannot tell you how many times recently I have been awakened in the middle of the night by loud airplane thunder. I look at the clock and it is 2am - 3am - 4am in the morning, and I say, "How can this be?" Is this allowed? Can planes land and take off at this hour? Is it a flyover? Outraged, I try to call the LAX noise hotline. Most of the time, I cannot even report the problem because the line is busy - presumably with other angry homeowners who have been awakened.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. There is no curfew on operations at LAX. However, there are special flight procedures in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. These procedures are not mandatory, but are generally used by air traffic controllers when practicable. For more information on this topic, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-5.1 description of over-ocean procedures, Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement, and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations. Also please see Responses to Comments PC00764-1 regarding the LAX complaint recording system and Comment PC01879-5.

PC03511-3**Comment:**

The once quiet skies of our beautiful and expensive beach community are gone. It is beyond comprehension that decisions are being made by the City of Los Angeles that we in this community cannot even vote on. We are the ones with the noise in our backyards. I am an outraged homeowner. I never remember even hearing plane noise and now it is constant. What is being done to solve this problem?

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC03511-4**Comment:**

This airport situation is out of control. A high profile airport the size of LAX just cannot be located in the middle of the city any longer. It is not just the noise and the pollutants. It is extremely dangerous. With the skies this crowded, there is a tragic accident waiting to happen. One day, one of those big noisy planes is going to drop out of the sky, killing those on board and many more on the ground. We remember Cerritos. And how does the LA mayor feel about that?

Response:

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

PC03512**Gates, Jim****None Provided****PC03512-1****Comment:**

I am so glad to see you support and advocate a REGIONAL plan for airports serving the Los Angeles area. I work for Boeing Satellite Systems in El Segundo and can see, first hand, how traffic-impacted that area has become. I frequently use the airport on business travel to the East coast and cannot overstate how bad the current situation is-- something you must be acutely aware of as you travel to and from Washington. I cannot fathom how it would be possible to add more travelers into that situation--even if the runways could support the increase.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03512-2

Comment:

I also want to bring to your attention the vitally important role that RELIEVER AIRPORTS play in mitigating the LAX situation. These airports (such as Torrance, Hawthorne, Santa Monica, Van Nuys, Compton, Fullerton, Camarillo and others) allow much of the general aviation business traffic to avoid LAX and thus reduce the crowding there. Furthermore, these general aviation airports, as vital on- and off-ramps of the national air transportation system, allow business travelers using general aviation aircraft to fly from an airport near their offices directly to airports close to their customers. For example, I can travel in my single engine piston-powered airplane from Torrance to the San Francisco area FASTER (from office to customer) than I can do so in a commercial jet. My "flights" leave the minute I am ready to go, my baggage never gets lost, and my rental car is waiting a few steps from the plane when I 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.

PC03512-3

Comment:

Please, don't forget the vital role that general aviation and our local airports play in solving the LAX and regional commercial airport problems. Help us to prevent their closure. Help us to remove unnecessary restrictions on general aviation activities at those airports. These are vital and irreplaceable transportation assets and they must be made part of the REGIONAL air transportation solution.

Response:

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

PC03513

**Tardiff, Robert &
Marilyn**

None Provided

7/13/2001

PC03513-1

Comment:

We live in El Segundo - two blocks from Imperial Way which is very close to the South runway (probably a total of 6-8 blocks from our house). We are impacted NOW by the noise, pollution and traffic. It will be just that much worse if they expand the airport.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, and Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the noise mitigation program. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03513-2**Comment:**

Even with our having "soundproofed" our home we can still hear the planes and are covered in dust! Having many more added flights may create so much noise that the soundproofing won't even be sufficient and we're right back to square one.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise mitigation, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03513-3**Comment:**

When you are outside it's difficult to carry on a conversation with a neighbor and with more flights going overhead it will be really impossible.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC03513-4**Comment:**

Needless to say, we are very much opposed to the airport expansion.

Response:

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

PC03513-5**Comment:**

If they want to increase the passenger load, why don't they then send all the freight out of another airport. Why does everything have to be centered in one location? Many businesses have different locations for different divisions of their companies. That seems to work even when they are bi-coastal. Why can't the airport do the same?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

3. Comments and Responses

PC03513-6

Comment:

We have tried never to complain about the airport because it was here before we arrived in 1967. However, we are speaking up now because the "ball game" has changed. This is getting to be excessive.

WE DO NOT WANT THE AIRPORT EXPANSION TO GO THROUGH

Response:

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

PC03514

Hui, Andy

None Provided

6/26/2001

PC03514-1

Comment:

Thank you for continuing to fight airport expansion, I have attached a copy of my email letter to the Los Angeles Times. Please feel free to include my comments regarding the LAX Master Plan and its impact on our community.

Response:

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

PC03514-2

Comment:

Re "No.1 in Airfield Close Calls, LAX finds solutions elusive," June 24:

Is it a surprise that LAX officials suggest that airport expansion will reduce future near-crash accidents? I doubt law enforcement officials would similarly argue that the only way to fight rising crime is to expand our jails. The solution to projected increases in air traffic will require a regional approach that shares the burden of airport-related impacts amongst all Southern California facilities.

Response:

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

PC03514-3

Comment:

A half-hearted attempt at exploring alternatives to LAX expansion is not only self-serving, but also a swipe at neighboring communities that will bear the brunt of increased noise, pollution and traffic.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The 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.

PC03514-4

Comment:

By the way, wouldn't fewer planes at LAX also reduce the number of near-crash incidents?

Response:

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

PC03515

Luke, Steve

None Provided

PC03515-1

Comment:

Have you ever tried to Drive the 405 freeway between Rosecrans and the 90 freeway? Any time during the day and into early evening it is bumper to bumper, going North or going South. Bring more traffic into the LAX area? Why?

Response:

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

PC03515-2

Comment:

Regional airports are the solution. I lived in Thousand Oaks three years ago. LAX is 45 miles away. It would make much more sense to have a regional airport in Ventura/Camarillo/Oxnard area. This would draw more passengers from the Conejo Valley, Simi Valley and the Western San Fernando Valley, as well as the immediate area. As it stands now, all these areas travel to LAX or Burbank. Both of which are brimming to capacity and near gridlock traffic at peak hours. Now add to that Orange County passengers heading to a bigger LAX. Why? Build another regional airport at El Toro.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03515-3

Comment:

We need you to be a forward-thinking, big picture leader with an eye towards the future and a long-term solution. We are paying the price from short-sided leadership from the 40' and 50's when mass transit for Los Angeles was ignored for short-term solutions. Please, as a leader for us today, do not make that mistake again.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC03516 Harris, John None Provided

PC03516-1

Comment:

I have lived at this location in Manhattan Beach for 31 years. Because of the take-off and landing patterns, the noise very rarely affects me. The pollution factor I do not know but I know it could not be healthy.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects.

PC03516-2

Comment:

North on Sepulveda is always bad, traffic wise, and probably will always be regardless of the changes now under construction.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC03516-3

Comment:

My major comment about LAX is that it should not be expanded. An International Jetport should be built in the Lancaster/Palmdale area as envisioned years ago and LAX should be downgraded to short haul small jets only. There has been study after study completed on Lancaster/Palmdale and it always results in not feasible because of the inability to get rapid transit into the LA Basin. I think this is false and only represents the ideology of the people in power that do not want it to happen. I spent over 20 years in the United States Air Force, and watched billions spent needlessly for weapon systems because of the ideology of the people in power. It was especially painful to watch Manned Orbiting Laboratory (MOL) and Space Shuttle facilities built at Vandenberg AFB and never used. Why can't we use the same resolve and money and build an International Jetport in Palmdale/Lancaster and the necessary high-speed rapid transit. If the LAX expansion is approved, and I expect it will, is there anyone with enough fortitude to demand that it be approved only if there is a light rail station also? It is absolutely ridiculous that Los Angeles, with all its resources, allow special interest individuals/groups to deny light rail to and from LAX. Even the City of Baltimore, MD with its poor tax base provides rail service from BWI to downtown Baltimore.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 which discusses high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03517	Hudson, Wally & Joan	None Provided	6/11/2001
----------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC03517-1**Comment:**

We live in Torrance California, we do travel to visit our family and often have family members visit us.

Whenever we we have to go to LAX the traffic is just terrible, and almost impossible to pick up someone, or even to find a parking space. It is so dangerous to drive with all this congestion and your odds are very high that you could have a accident no matter how good of a driver you are!

We do travel a lot now that we are retired, so we fly into many States and to several large air ports such as Orlando, Miami, and many other large air ports, None of them seem to have the problem we have at the Los Angeles Air Port!

It has been impossible for Cal-Trans. to build roads fast enough to handle the traffic surrounding LAX, How are they going to handle the added traffic if they expand?

Response:

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

PC03517-2**Comment:**

Shuttle buses and parking areas are very expensive and not the answer. We can not understand why they have not taken advantage of some of these military bases such as Norton Air Force Base. This base has potential, It has one of the finest landing strips around, It is just setting out there with weeds growing all around, with a freeway next to it.

There is also El Toro Air Base, also has great potential. Both are able to handle large aircraft, and lots of space to be able to handle traffic and are close to the freeway. We feel that using ether one of these bases would sure help our traffic problem that we have in the South Bay, West LA, and even the Valley.

Response:

Comment noted. Norton Air Force is now operating as San Bernardino International Airport. 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.

PC03517-3**Comment:**

Do we need to spend all this money in LAX to make our lives more miserable? We don't think so.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC03518

Delperdang, Clara

None Provided

6/8/2001

PC03518-1

Comment:

We moved from Inglewood to Torrance in 1956 to get away from LAX noise and traffic. It has been quiet until the last two years. We now have flights from LAX over our homes all day. The most annoying flights are 1AM--2 AM--4AM which have increased the last year. The planes are extremely large, very noisy and very low and still climbing. We are awakened and the whole house shakes. It sounds as if the planes are going to crash into our homes. We can't get back to sleep.

Response:

Living in Torrance, the commentor may be affected by easterly takeoffs circling back to the west on their departures to Asia. LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction to alleviate that situation by making over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. During a recent 18 month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. As noted by the noise abatement procedures delineated in Topical Response TR-N-7, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather of wind conditions require east traffic flow. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay and Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration.

PC03518-2

Comment:

The planes used to take off and land over the ocean. No more. They take off going east and make a sharp U turn and fly over Torrance. Torrance is not the flight path and never has been.

When we contact the FAA, LAX or Noise Abatement we are given the same stupid answers trying to deny what they are doing.

Example: One day before noon in a 30 minute time frame 6 airlines went over our house. When I called to complain that Torrance is not the flight path the man said due to the very bad weather and high winds the planes were not able to take off to the west. I asked him if he had been outside because it was a very sunny day with not a hint of a breeze. He said, Oh, paused, and then changed his story to the fact that LAX was no longer taking off west, just east, as they had changed the flight paths and we would have to live with it.

Response:

Due to the prevailing winds, aircraft at LAX normally approach and take off to the west. When weather conditions require, operations are reversed and aircraft takeoff to the east. Because aircraft taking off and climbing use more power than when approaching to land, the easterly operations are louder for those residing east of the airport, than are the usual approaches to land. The flight paths are more dispersed after takeoff than for landing as well. 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. This would reduce the opportunity for this aircraft to disturb people at night with departures over the South Bay. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

PC03518-3**Comment:**

Besides the noise LAX is a mess. The traffic, the crowds and the delays should be terminated. If LAX can only handle X amount of arrivals and departures in a safe, quiet and efficient manner and without all the noise then the airlines should only be allowed X amount of flights in or out of the airport daily.

Response:

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

PC03518-4**Comment:**

We just received your letter today and cannot attend the meeting on Saturday. Hope this complaint will help you with your goals to put a halt on any expansion of the airport.

Response:

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

PC03519**Westhoff, James****None Provided****6/6/2001****PC03519-1****Comment:**

The environmental impact of the LAX expansion cannot be over stated. The residents of this community have in most cases invested their lives working to develop a community that is safe for their families, healthy to live and retire in, and a wholesome town to walk the streets in safety. So much so, that it is now one of the most desirable areas in the LA area to raise a family. To ask us to quietly relinquish this to allow LAX to expand would be cheating our children of their future homes.

I would like to point out a few issues that I am not sure have been brought to the front but should be considered none the less.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC03519-2**Comment:**

1. The increase of traffic through our city will remove the quality of life that we are all working so hard to preserve. The proposed 105 extensions down Imperial Highway to Pershing will create a traffic snarl that will virtually remove the North Main Street Exit. This is a major thoroughfare for those of us that live on the west end of the city. The daily traffic jams on the 105 freeway that occur today, are just a

3. Comments and Responses

precursor to what will happen when the 105 is extended and the traffic increased three fold. At present, CHP and the Airport Police, are not able to control the people that consistently break the traffic laws trying to move to the front of the traffic jam and get to the airport in the most expedient manner, say nothing of the increased accident rate due to these traffic infractions. All the proposals will do is move this type of behavior and traffic directly into our community.

2. The traffic through El Segundo will increase down Imperial Highway and Highland to get to the West Terminal. This is because of the traffic diverting to get around the traffic jams. The removal of the Pershing access will also inhibit our movement through out our home area and the South Bay to the Marina. In order to move anywhere north of El Segundo it will require us to transit the Sepulveda Tunnel and to interact with the airport traffic. This virtually cuts El Segundo off from its northern neighbors.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Ring Road, including the section along El Segundo, would be designed to accommodate the future traffic at a good level of service. The road would be designed to avoid traffic snarls. It would also be designed to help avoid traffic spilling over into residential communities. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PC03519-3

Comment:

3. With the increased traffic, we can also, expect increased crime to move into our city. The immediate access to the 105 will only help to give quick access to a high speed though fare to evade the Police. This will also mean that our families will be subjected to an element that will place them in increased risk. The prospect of one of our children being killed by someone evading the police is a very real possibility. More in line with a certainty. Is the expansion of the airport worth the life of one of our family members? An example of what we face was recently brought to the forefront when local Police was chasing two men who had just gunned down an innocent high school student in a drive-by shooting in Culver City. The chase ended in front of the Southwest Terminal. One of the gunmen was shot to death in front of the terminal, and the other who recovered from his gunshot wounds was just sentenced to life without parole for his disregard for human life. This of course, was after one of the police was killed in the ensuing gunfire. With the extension of the 105 this is scenario a very real probability in our residential areas.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00378-2 regarding crime impacts. Furthermore, dedicated freeway access and the Green Line, as described for Alternatives A, B, and C, will alleviate airport-related traffic congestion, which will, in turn, support improved emergency response times. Please see the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Chapter 3, Alternatives, for information about traffic-related improvements proposed in conjunction with Alternative D.

PC03519-4

Comment:

4. An additional tax burden on the communities surrounding LAX will occur due to increased use of our infrastructure. This will mean that we will need more Police, increased Fire and Hospital capability, and an increase in the maintenance costs on our roads and streets. These entire costs will be born by those of us that least want the airport to expand. Yet we are being asked to shoulder that burden to an already heavy tax levy.

Response:

Project impacts on fire protection and law enforcement services were addressed in Section 4.26.1, Fire Protection, and Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The analyses conclude that no mitigation for significant adverse impacts is required. The cost of providing these and other public services are addressed by the City and County of Los Angeles each year. They are funded by a wide range of General Fund revenues, including tax revenues, special purpose revenues derived from State and federal sources, and other sources of funds.

PC03519-5

Comment:

5. The impact on our environmental situation goes far beyond our quality of life environment. It also moves to the quality of our air through the release of twice the pollutants that are now released by running aircraft, ground support equipment, automotive vehicles, and spilled hazardous materials.

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC03519-6

Comment:

In addition, the spills that will result from the aircraft operations will allow a variety of petroleum and other chemicals into our water table, thereby further polluting our now fresh water supply. These elements are released as a normal part of doing business. Machinery leaks and the leakage will seep into our ground and migrate into our homes, food and water chain. Again those of us who least benefit pays the largest price.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the potential for hazardous materials spills resulting from aircraft operations in Section 4.23, Hazardous Materials. In summary, regulatory standards are in place and are continually being modified to protect water resources. Stringent underground storage tank regulations required all tanks to be upgraded by the end of 1998 to meet requirements for construction standards, leak detection and spill and overfill protection. In addition, above ground storage tanks standards, enforced by the LAFD, require secondary containment for all tanks larger than 60 gallons containing combustible materials. Although there is no guarantee that spills from aircraft operation will not occur, preventive measures are in place to reduce the risk. In addition, regulatory framework is in place to remediate spills should they occur.

PC03519-7

Comment:

6. The increase of flights from 2100 flights daily to 2700+ and beyond will mean that there will be a significant increase in ground handling personnel. This increases the ground traffic on the Airport. This ground traffic interfaces with the aircraft and all of the other operational traffic. Many of the airport problems are due to the present congestion. LAX now has one of the highest runway incursion incident rates of any major airport in the US. So much so that all people driving on the AOA have to take a test to answer the FAA on what they are doing to increase incursion safety. This was only eyewash for the FAA, but in fact as had little impact on the number of incursions. Increasing the traffic via normal operations and trying to move the 2700+ flights a day will only exacerbate this problem. How would any of us like to be a passenger on any aircraft taking off with a tug, car, truck or anything else racing across the runway to make another flight takeoff on time? It will happen. In the rush to make the takeoff or landing window, the ground and flight personnel will take risks. Sooner or later just due to the sheer congestion an accident is going to occur. Lives will be lost, and families and public safety destroyed.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00543-1 and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC03519-8

Comment:

7. Additional runway incursions present another problem for us in El Segundo. With the southern most take off flyway boundary to be Acacia in El Segundo. What happens if an aircraft must divert its take off heading to miss something on the runway? Our homes are now at risk of not just parts coming off the aircraft, but of the aircraft actually impacting our homes, because it is now in an emergency situation outside of its normal operating window. I live outside the Acacia limit, yet it is nearly a daily occurrence for an aircraft to fly directly over my home. This is due to a pilot that is in a hurry to get to their next destination, tower diversions, or just plain disoriented pilots. Not to mention pilots that just chooses to ignore the "fly runway heading to the water" requirements. Anytime an aircraft flies over a home the possibility of parts or the aircraft in its entirety hitting our homes and families is an inevitability. This is an example of how the airport cannot control the current air and ground traffic. What will happen if the flights are increased 30+%?

Response:

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

PC03519-9

Comment:

Again the people of our community must endure the cost of the expansion with no impact or consideration on those trying to impose their will on us.

Response:

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

PC03519-10

Comment:

8. The noise from the airport is becoming unreasonable. I live in a 75db level area, and am held hostage to the dollars to quiet my home unless I sign a disclaimer releasing the airport from any further legal actions. They didn't ask me, the homeowner, if they could infringe on my home with their noise.

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.13 regarding aviation easements.

PC03519-11

Comment:

It can be so bad that I cannot even sit and listen to a television program.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Regarding high noise levels at the commentor's property, to qualify for soundproofing, properties must be exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels. As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S1 in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the 65 CNEL and greater noise contour does extend south into the City of El Segundo at the subject property under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions and therefore this property is eligible for sound insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP). See Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the ANMP. Also relative to single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening (as established by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour), the subject property is located within the 94 dBA SEL contour under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, as shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PC03519-12

Comment:

The noise impact on our schools is such that the quality of our children's education is impaired. The reasons our schools do so well is because of the parent's involvement in the quality education we have built.

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.

PC03519-13

Comment:

Stage three will not remove this problem as like all studies performed by the airport. It will be slanted to make the numbers look favorable to the desired outcome.

Response:

All of the information prepared for noise analysis in this Draft EIS/EIR is included in the appendices for review by the FAA, EPA, State and local agencies, and the General Public. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach.

PC03519-14

Comment:

Here again, we of El Segundo are asked to endure the expansion with no recourse.

Response:

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

PC03519-15

Comment:

9. The airport has been expanding for years and only now due to the questions from our Community has anything been brought to the front. The only reason El Segundo has brought suit is because of the

3. Comments and Responses

negative impact already done to our quality of life, which has been noticeable. Again, demonstration of the honesty of the Airport Officials and their concern for those communities around them. Their attitude is "If I can get it done without anyone knowing then lets do it and get away with it". An honest corporate citizen would truly try to find out what the impact of their business is on their neighbors before moving forward and then adversely affecting the community. What does that say for the Airport Management? Our air is dirtier, our water less pure, and our families less secure. Expansion will do nothing but rob us of our quality of life, our homes, and our safety. It is a criminal offense to take someone's possessions and livelihood. Don't make a criminal act legal.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, water quality in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, law enforcement in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement (CEQA), and property acquisition and relocation issues in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4 and 6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-4 and S-5 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03519-16

Comment:

10. The Airport Police Department are so relaxed with the laws of our community that they seem to be able to do whatever they prefer. They park in the middle of our streets with their lights on and impede traffic just so they can pick up their lunch. They park in our congested parking lots and take two spots so they can pick up their laundry. They run red traffic lights with no emergency call or emergency lights. This is not to levy slander, but to point out that we cannot trust the Airport Authority. They act as if they are above the laws they are to enforce. Instead they use their office for privilege.

Response:

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

PC03519-17

Comment:

11. The main proposal allows for extension of the four (4) current runways. That is because safely, this is all the area will support for major aircraft. LAX is considered to be one of the most dangerous airports in the US to fly into and out of by all of the airline pilots I have spoken with. This is because LAX is so congested with aircraft traffic. The inbound and outbound aircraft separation is already at its minimum and will be reduced when they try to bring 30% more flights per day into the airport. Passenger and ground personnel safety again is at risk. There is technology coming onto the market place that is going to reduce landing separation. Once this is in place, are the LAX officials going to increase the passenger load to 120 million per year so they can jam additional passengers into the terminals?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00543-1 and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC03519-18

Comment:

12. The present proposals remove all aircraft maintenance capability from the airport property with the exception of the United area, which they cannot remove due to their long range agreements to get United to bring in the number of aircraft needed to make LAX a hub for that airline. This is fine for United, but what about the rest of the airlines? What does this mean for us? Well, with no maintenance support other than light line and turn support, it means that more aircraft will be required to leave LAX,

flying over our homes, on "ferry tickets". This means that if the aircraft has a severe, non-airworthy deficiency, but can't be repaired on the airport, it must be flown to another location for maintenance. The requirements are a crew specially trained in emergencies, and no passengers or freight. Why? Because the aircraft is not airworthy. Again an increase in the possibility of an aircraft incident over our homes.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC03519-19

Comment:

13. In order for the FAA to make sure the aircraft are safe, additional surveillance will need to be done. Current inspectors will be diverted to airport operations and less on safety of our aircraft and the safety of the passengers. The FAA is already taxed as evidenced in the latest news reports on airport delays throughout the US and the significant increase in actual aircraft flying. To increase inspections will require more inspectors and again increased cost to the taxpayer while increasing the revenue to the airport. This is not to mention the increased number of already short air traffic controllers, which is an additional cost to the taxpayer.

Response:

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

PC03519-20

Comment:

14. The reason given by the Mayor of Los Angeles on why LAX must expand is "LAX needs to expand because we cannot control the fact that people just want to come to LAX." Well that is not entirely true. The reason most people fly into LAX is because the fares are lower than outlying airports. Flights into LAX are fuller because of the larger number of flights. If the outlying airports like El Toro were developed LAX would still be a viable and very active input to the LA Basin. But, with increased facilities at other airports the airlines would then increase the number of flights, which will lead to lower fares at those airports as well as the passenger loads increase. I cite John Wayne Airport as an example. Just a few years ago it was nothing more than a grass strip and a wooden hangar. It seems as if LAWA Management has lost sight of development of additional resources as LAX is full.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01583-10 and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding the role of airline economics in shifting operations to regional airports. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03519-21

Comment:

15. Moving air traffic to outlying airports will also remove flight delays due to ground congestion and landing and takeoff windows. Ground congestion will certainly be part of the increases proposed at LAX. You can only take off "X" number of aircraft from four (4) runways while allowing "X" number of aircraft to land. Also moving to outlying airports will allow for an increase well beyond the 80+ million-passenger numbers with more runways, more landing and takeoff slots, and safer operations in a more expanded area. It will also allow the passengers the ability to arrive and depart closer to their destinations. This will create for more hotels and business throughout the LA area. Resulting in an expanded tax base for those communities from the additional jobs. All of the communities will benefit from the increased revenue without asking a few surrounding communities to incur all of the costs and little of the benefit.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC03519-22

Comment:

16. It should be noted that the closest residence impact to El Toro is approximately 5 miles. And the distance to downtown Los Angeles is nearly the same as LAX. Within El Segundo the closest residence is just across Imperial Highway.

Response:

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

PC03519-23

Comment:

17. The removal of all of the maintenance support from LAX is also planned. This will mean the removal of in excess of 3000 highly skilled taxpayers and replace them with hundreds of unskilled workers to handle the ground needs of the increased passenger loads. What will happen with those quality taxpayers? With a shortage of this skill do we want it to leave our community?

Response:

To clarify, implementation of the LAX Master Plan would not result in the removal of all maintenance support facilities from the airport. Rather, as discussed in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR, ancillary facilities such as airline maintenance and ground handling uses would be consolidated in smaller land areas and/or relocated to new facilities so as to improve efficiency. Under baseline conditions, the use of substantial airport land for ancillary facilities no longer corresponds to the needs and demands of existing aviation activities. Please see Table 3-4, in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR, for the proposed acreage of ancillary facilities, and Appendix O to Chapter V of the LAX Master Plan for detailed floor area breakdowns of ancillary facility requirements.

PC03519-24

Comment:

LAX is considering only one thing. Increase dollars to the airport. The development of outlying airport facilities to spread the traffic to other areas makes good business sense. Just some of the benefits follow as I am sure there are many more:

1. Less centralized congestion at only one airport to LA
2. Safer operations around LAX for the outlying communities
3. Retention of the current quality of life for the outlying areas

4. Cleaner air and water for the South Bay
5. Will prevent the increase of Crime in any central area
6. Retains skilled labor in the work force for LAX
7. Insures safer operating aircraft due to proper maintenance before flight
8. Places passengers closer to their final destinations within the Basin
9. Expands business opportunities near the other Airports
10. Removes the stresses on our current infrastructure
11. The use of LAWA funds generated can be used to develop other LAWA areas like Ontario and Van Nuys airports
12. Genuinely reduces incursions on LAX and improves the Airport Safety
13. Safer and quieter community that is desirable to raise our families.
14. Increased total revenue into the LA Basin and the City of Los Angeles

Response:

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

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC03519-25

Comment:

LAX expansion is unsafe, and negatively impacts approximately 60+ communities in the LA Basin. It is shortsighted management to try to develop an already over developed resource and ignore the surrounding options which will actually benefit the Los Angeles Basin more. It has no positive aspects for the public safety and the future operations within the Basin.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 14a and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03519-26

Comment:

Our quality of life is valuable to us, as is our homes and our children. To deny the expansion will not negatively impact Los Angeles, as there are facilities in the Basin to develop without the negative public safety issues and the loss of current jobs. It would be a service to the residents of Los Angeles to deny the expansion and force LAWA management to develop its other resources for the good of the City. Would you like to live next to LAX if it were expanded any further?

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. Human health and safety were addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health and Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PC03520 Wilson, Jack None Provided

PC03520-1

Comment:

In your Executive summary of the Master Plan- 2nd paragraph - it states

"To ensure that Los Angeles' air transportation infrastructure continues to facilitate the region's economic needs over the next 15 years, Los Angeles World Airports (LA WA) is developing a new long-range strategic master plan; such a plan has not been updated since 1981. The last major improvements at LAX were completed prior to the 1984 Olympics..." LAX should not facilitate the region's economic needs. Th region should facilitate those needs. Here it appears to me that LAWA is once again playing with words when you say the last major improvement was completed prior to 1984. You must have had a great many minor improvements to allow this airport to grow from 40 MAP IN 1986 to 67.6 MAP IN 2000. PLEASE INFORM THE PUBLIC OF ALL THE IMPROVEMENTS THAT WERE MADE IN THE LAST FIFTEEN YEARS at LAX.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the mitigation of impacts to the community from activities at LAX.

PC03520-2

Comment:

One of your Guiding Principles, Goals and Objectives (on page 1) states

"Balance LAX modernization plans with local community concerns. In particular, potential environmental impacts such as aircraft noise." These are just words that in reality have little value. You are saying that more operations will not increase noise. Please keep in mind that LAX already has 100% compliance with the Airport Noise and Capacity Act. How are more operations going maintain or reduce the noise occurances?

Response:

Significant noise exposure is measured as a combination of the number of operations and the loudness of those operations. As the number of operations increase, if the loudness of each individual operation

decreases, the overall noise level may remain the same or even decline. For further information on this topic, please see Topical Response TR-N-6.

PC03520-3

Comment:

Another goal of yours is "Operate LAX in an environmentally sensitive, responsible manner." Please explain how you are going to operate LAX in an environmental sensitive and responsible manner when all aspects of noise and air pollution will increase with any and all proposals submitted in this report.

Response:

The comment is essentially the same as Comment PC01881-170; please see Response to Comment PC01881-170.

PC03520-4

Comment:

As you well know, the type of criticism I have brought forth in these two instances could be made many times throughout the Master Plan, EIS/EIR.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03521	O'Leary, Frank	None Provided	6/27/2001
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC03521-1

Comment:

Jon said look at London and Paris. Both of these cities have two (2) International airports located outside the inner city. My, what an ideal arrangement if only it were possible for Los Angeles.

Response:

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

PC03521-2

Comment:

I was invited and attended the opening of Congressman Mel Levine's office on Century Blvd several years ago. At that social I talked to a lady from New York City who was in LA doing a study on the number of LAX Take Off and Landings (TO&L) each day. I suggested she read the recent issue of Aviation Week, an aviation trade magazine, that stated LAX had at that time 1600 TO&L each day.

Currently, LAX is pushing 2200 to 2500 TO&L each day. The proposed LAX expansion hopes to boost this to 3,000 TO&L each day.

Quite obviously, something has to give! The South Bay cities cannot tolerate the general disintegration of the Quality of Life with 3,000 TO&L each day.

One suggested approach is to breakout LAX aircraft operations into four categories and address each category. These would be (a) LAX International daily flights, (b) National flights, (c) West Coast flights and (d) all LAX cargo flights.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00593-1 for further discussion on the activity levels associated with each of the Master Plan alternatives. The design day schedules of the Master Plan alternatives were developed considering the separate projected growth of certain types of operations such as international, domestic (further divided by time zone), Hawaii, commuter, cargo and general aviation operations. Please see Chapter V, Section 3.3.2, Table V-3.32 for a summary of activity of each Master Plan alternative broken out by category. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PC03521-3

Comment:

After obtaining the actual operational numbers, possible solutions in off-loading LAX flights could be determined. Certainly, all cargo flights are a prime candidate for relocation to the closed El Torro Marine Airfield. Then, after that, review the reduction of LAX flights. The goal being that the current 2500 TO&L per day be the max.

Response:

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

PC03521-4

Comment:

A matrix table should be created with the several options of the above four categories. Candidate air fields need to be identified, such as El Torro, Van Nuys air field, Long Beach airport, Orange County airport, etc.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC03521-5

Comment:

Then, a trade off study should be conducted. The underlying success depends on a high-speed ground transportation monorail system to interconnect the regional airports.

Response:

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

PC03521-6

Comment:

It becomes quite evident; this is not solely a Los Angeles City problem but rather a State/Federal decision/resolution.

Response:

Comment noted. However, it is important to re-state that decisions to further develop LAX are the responsibility of the City of Los Angeles, as the airport proprietor. The role of the FAA is to ensure the

safe and efficient use of navigable airspace no matter what development alternative or the No Action/No Project Alternative is selected by the City of Los Angeles to implement for LAX.

PC03521-7

Comment:

I hope these thoughts are helpful in sorting out this complex problem.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03522 Levinson, Florence None Provided 11/2/2001

PC03522-1

Comment:

I recently read about Mayor Hahn's proposal (Alternate 5) for expanding LAX.

I agree with capping the annual passengers at LAX to the current 78 MAP and cancellation of the Ring Road and Western Terminal. If removal of the parking lots in the Central Terminal Area and the construction of a new Check-in Facility will help with congestion and security, it would be a step in the right direction.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03522-2

Comment:

Why change the runway configuration and extend the North Runway over Sepulveda Blvd? Both would involve the removal of homes and businesses, as well as congesting Sepulveda Blvd. more than it is now. Beyond dispossessing families and some Westchester businesses, shutting down tax producing businesses vital to the economy and life of the Westchester Community will eliminate badly needed jobs provided by the newly established businesses and reduce the tax base that cannot be offset by short-term construction jobs.

Response:

As discussed in Chapter 2, Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action, of the Draft EIS/EIR, the runway improvements proposed as part of the Master Plan are necessary in order to accommodate the newest generation of large, widebody aircraft (popularly called "New Large Aircraft" or "NLA") that are being introduced into the fleet mix. Without airfield improvements, LAX would face operational restrictions to accommodate NLAs with increased delays and reduced levels of service. In addition, certain features of the existing airfield do not meet current design standards which have changed over time. Such conditions add to airfield congestion and consequently to aircraft delays and air pollution. The proposed improvements would increase safety and efficiency while meeting current FAA standards.

The potential loss of tax revenues resulting from the acquisition and relocation of local businesses was addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses (subsection 4.4.2.6), in the Draft EIS/EIR. As discussed therein, new tax revenues and employment generated over the life of the Master Plan would more than compensate for those potentially or initially lost as a result of acquisition. Additionally, since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a fourth Master Plan build alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was proposed and evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D would involve the acquisition of far fewer businesses than the other build alternatives, involving the potential loss of fewer tax revenues and jobs.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03522-3

Comment:

If LAX is overcrowded, let LAWA and FAA make a real effort to locate viable airport locations to serve the San Fernando Valley, Inland Empire and Orange County Communities. This would lessen traffic congestion on the freeways leading to LAX and reduce ground travel time.

Response:

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

PC03522-4

Comment:

It now takes 1 1/2 hours minimum during rush hours to travel from SFV to LAX. Add that to the 2-3 hours before departure for passengers to be at the airport and the passenger must spend almost 4 hours before take-off.

Response:

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

PC03523

Gordon, Bryan

None Provided

11/8/2001

PC03523-1

Comment:

Please accept this letter as my public comments in regards to Los Angeles World Airport's proposed Master Plan:

I would like to state that I am opposed to the LAX Master Plan and proposed expansion, I have provided the justification for my position below:

Response:

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

PC03523-2

Comment:

Figures 7, 9, and 11, corresponding to alternates A, B & C indicate that my home will be directly under departure track D6RW as well as approach tracks A6L7, A4R0, A4R1, A4R8. a4L0, A4L1, and A4L8. If the indicated departure tracks on the attached sheet are implemented as described in Appendix D, I

believe the aircraft noise in my community and at my house will be significant as the aircraft will have only reached an elevation of a few thousand feet.

Response:

At the commentor's location, the propeller aircraft would be at an estimated altitude of approximately 3,000 feet above sea level. Flight path D6RW is representative of a broader swath of the flight paths flown by a portion of the propeller driven aircraft that takeoff to the east on Runway 6R and turn to the north to exit the airport environs. It is projected to be used by 4 to 5 propeller aircraft per average day in 2015. The track is not projected for use by jet aircraft. Non-turbojet aircraft departing runway 6R are required to fly the runway heading until the departure end of the runway (Sepulveda Blvd/Lincoln Blvd). Once past the departure end the aircraft is instructed to turn to a northeast heading of 040 degrees. The aircraft remains on this heading until approximately five miles northeast of the airport. The aircraft is then routed north or northwest, passing through the commentor's area, to join Victor Airway 23 slightly south of the Van Nuys VOR near the 405 and 101 freeways. For information on Alternative D in addition to Alternatives A-C, please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03523-3

Comment:

If my house ultimately ends up being directly underneath a low elevation departure track, its market value will be significantly reduced as will the quality of life for the entire community.

Response:

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

PC03523-4

Comment:

In my opinion to reduce the value of my property, without a legal eminent domain proceeding and compensation, constitutes an unfair taking of private property.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.13 regarding aviation easements.

PC03523-5

Comment:

I am against any plan that places my home under a departure route. I am unwilling to agree to a plan under the assumption that aircraft will be quieter by the time the plan has been implemented.

Response:

Comment noted. The incidence of eastbound departures from LAX over the area where the commentor resides is extremely small, however, the departure track referenced in Comment PC03523-2 is used approximately 0.2 percent of the time by light and turboprop aircraft. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PC03523-6

Comment:

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

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

See Response to Comment PC02421-1, regarding use of Departure Track D6RW.

PC03523-7

Comment:

The reduction in air quality that will result from expanding air traffic is totally unacceptable for my wife, my children and me. The air quality of the Los Angeles basin has not yet attained a level of quality that could handle the burden of additional planes and cars.

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PC03523-8

Comment:

In fact, the EPA is particularly concerned with the projected NAAQS violations attributable to this project, lack of a detailed plan to avoid and/or mitigate disproportionately high, adverse impacts to minority and low-income populations, potential health effects, and the narrow range of alternatives that were fully evaluated. EPA believes there are serious deficiencies in the information presented in the DEIS/R, which leads to a high level of uncertainty about the magnitude of potential impacts associated with this project.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comment Letter AF00001 for responses to each of the concerns raised by EPA, including the air quality concerns indicated in the comment.

PC03523-9

Comment:

The findings and recommendations of LAWA's air quality and source apportionment study are especially relevant to FAA's decision-making, and merit careful consideration in this NEPA process.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-2 regarding the source apportionment study.

PC03523-10

Comment:

The FEIS/R should include FAA's general conformity determination and related mitigation commitments.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AF00001-4 regarding the general conformity determination.

PC03523-11

Comment:

No matter what alternative under NEPA is finally selected, including No Action, there are major regional air quality, environmental justice, and other issues needing resolution.

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

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

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

PC03523-12

Comment:

Because of the complexity of issues involved in avoiding and/or mitigating the projected NAAQS violations attributable to this project, it is important that such issues be addressed with the involvement and cooperation of all parties (e.g., the public, industry, and Federal, State, regional and local governments), utilizing existing regulatory processes to protect air quality in the South Coast Air Basin.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AF00001-14 regarding the general conformity determination.

PC03523-13

Comment:

EPA looks forward to working with FAA, LAWA, and Secretary Mineta's Task Force to find an effective, comprehensive approach to air transportation in the region and to address the issues raised by the DEIS/R and the public comment process.

Response:

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

PC03523-14

Comment:

For the reasons above, I am opposed to the LAX Master Plan and the proposal to increase the passenger and cargo capacity of Los Angeles World Airports. The costs for the proposed expansion will come in the form of an unfair burden to the quality of life to all tax paying Los Angeles residents. Simply put, the number of people incrementally injured or hurt by the LAX Expansion scheme will far outweigh the benefits to the tax base and to the added jobs generated by the Expansion.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PC03524 Marlin, Lisa None Provided 11/8/2001

PC03524-1

Comment:

I object to any new plan (entered as an adjunct or modification to the existing one) that is no where documented and has had no environmental or other impact studies done to assess it. (Playa Vista, etc.). Mayor Hahn's new ideas do not have the specificity to address my concerns over the fate of Nielsen field, where many of our children play soccer, softball, and baseball.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. A Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provides a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed parks and recreational facilities in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation. As indicated in subsection 4.26.3.6.1, under Alternative D, no changes to Carl E. Nielsen Youth Park would occur.

PC03524-2

Comment:

The extension of the northern runway, decimating true Westchester community, will also continue to dump more pollutants and noise ever closer to our children and at ever more unacceptable levels.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or any acquisition within the Westchester Business District.

PC03525 McKie, Jozette None Provided 11/7/2001

PC03525-1

Comment:

I oppose the dramatic expansion of both passenger and cargo activity at LAX. There are other airports in Southern California equipped to handle the expansion without the adverse effects on noise levels, air pollution and land use that will be felt if the proposed expansion of LAX goes through. The city of Los Angeles itself owns two key airports in the heart of the high growth areas of the region -Ontario and Palmdale airports. Rather than expand LAX, the smart thing would be to develop both of these airports and assist other airports in the region to do the same. Many of these other airports are fully capable of meeting our region's increasing demand for air travel. We do not need to expand LAX as proposed to maintain a vibrant Southern California economy.

Response:

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

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

PC03526 Stefanski, Andrew None Provided 11/5/2001

PC03526-1**Comment:**

Enclosed, please find copy of my letter to L.A. Times regarding airport safety. Basic points are as follows:

1) Safety should involve not only air passengers, but also hundreds of thousands of people living AROUND the airport.

Response:

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

PC03526-2**Comment:**

2) Airports are usually constructed outside big cities, not in the middle of densely populated areas. Reasons are too obvious to enumerate them.

Recently South Korea committed a new airport in Incheon 20 miles West of Seoul with capacity projected at 29 MAP first year.

Response:

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

PC03526-3**Comment:**

3) LAX is surrounded by many highly vulnerable targets. See letter enclosed.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-233. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03526-4

Comment:

4) Accidents may happen because of many reasons not only terrorists actions.

Response:

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

PC03526-5

Comment:

5) The more planes, the greater congestion, the higher the chance of an accident.

6) Increase safety by reducing congestion.

7) Develop promptly Ontario, Palmdale & El Toro to take extra traffic. This will increase safety at and around LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. As a result of the passage of local Measure W, in March 2002, Orange County has ceased pursuit of the former MCAS El Toro as an airport and the Department of the Navy decided to dispose of the former installation for non-aviation reuses. The city of Los Angeles does not have any authority to develop an airport at the former MCAS El Toro.

PC03527

Scott, Dawn

None Provided

11/6/2001

PC03527-1

Comment:

To move forward on any of the proposed alternatives in the Master Plan would create unbelievable negative affects to the community of Inglewood, LAX's immediate neighbor.

The risks, to which everyone who takes the time to write you will point out, are increased pollution, traffic, both by automobiles and trucks carrying the major increase in cargo and let's not forget the adverse affects of noise. The massive EIR/EIS address these issues but in many cases not well enough. My concerns are as follows:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC03527-2

Comment:

Pollution: The daily tonnage of pollution already created by current airport use is astounding. The black oily residue on my home and foliage cannot be a good thing, and most certainly is dangerous if breathed in its vaporous form. The increase of this by-product of commerce will take an even larger toll on the residents of Inglewood.

Response:

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

PC03527-3

Comment:

Traffic: Most certainly, the adage, "if you build it, they will come" would apply here. No matter how much you widen the major street corridors that flow into and around the airport, these so called improvements will not alleviate traffic. It shouldn't be lost on anyone who lives in the Los Angeles basin that there are far more cars/traffic than street capacity - no matter how many streets with extra lanes, there are just too many people driving. One answer here would be to require people to take mass transit of any form into and out of the airport. Off site parking could be provided. One could use Denver's DIA as an example for off site parking. This kind of parking situation could assist in your concern for security measures regarding unattended parked automobiles.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding improved mass transit options and remote parking facilities, the new Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, Alternative D, which was analyzed in detail in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, incorporates remote passenger parking with people mover systems, which eliminates the need for a Ring Road or a western passenger entrance from Pershing Drive. In addition, the Green Line is proposed to be extended north to provide access to LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the build it and they will come theory of regional passenger and cargo demands. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding mass transit access to LAX.

PC03527-4

Comment:

Arbor Vitae: By providing mass transit into the airport you remove the need for the multi-million dollar Arbor Vitae interchange and Airport Boulevard connector road projects. These two projects alone would dissect and destroy communities established long before LAX was created. Inglewood and Westchester would carry that burden.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 for a discussion of project impacts on the Community of Westchester. Also refer to Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR for a discussion of impacts from the LAX Expressway on Inglewood and Westchester. Please also see Topical Responses TR-ST-2 and TR-ST-4 regarding the need for the Arbor Vitae interchange.

PC03527-5

Comment:

Flight Trajectories: One of the more important items is the haphazard nature of aircraft flight trajectories flying over Inglewood since the September 11th disaster. Pre 9-11 there was some discernable order to incoming and outbound flights over Northwest Inglewood with the occasional variance from traditional flight paths. But since that date there are several flights a day from the north that turn over my home trying to catch the north runway by flying down La Brea Avenue or just east thereof.

That doesn't even count the number of flights that take off over the ocean and fly across my rooftop or use Slauson Avenue as a sight line to the east. Northwest Inglewood takes on this NEW burden.

Response:

There has not been a change in the air traffic control structure for arrivals or departures since September 11, 2001, but with the reduction of operations, there has been greater flexibility available in the airspace system. With the complexity of LAX's surrounding airspace, air traffic controllers work with pilots to ensure that there is proper separation between aircraft at all times meaning that all available airspace is used and on occasion, if possible, "non-traditional" approaches may be used. This may

3. Comments and Responses

have added flights over your particular location. However, the pilots are concentrating on landing their aircraft in accordance with controller directions and are using either instrument flight rules or visual flight rules to assist them in their approaches to LAX. They do not use streets as flight references to approach LAX

PC03527-6

Comment:

Security: Increased flights coupled with the appearance of non-controlled airspace over North Inglewood creates several questions on the subject of air safety. Since the Master Plan proposes to increase the number of flights, in turn, it will increase the likelihood of a catastrophic error over Inglewood. Again, Inglewood bears this burden.

Response:

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

PC03527-7

Comment:

Noise: Lengthening the north runway to the 405 freeway and moving it north to accommodate all the new flights would mean certain madness by noise. As it is now the noise from incoming jets flying over my rooftop can be deafening and I'm not even in the designated noise contour. The outbound jet noise is annoying. Another aspect of the noise is the run-ups and maintenance that takes place on the tarmac. This noise rattles my floors and windows, and as I've said, I live in Northwest Inglewood, a place fairly distant from LAX. These tympanic vibrations are disquieting to say the least. And who at LAWA can assure me that the constant vibration to the earth from current airport activity now and from the additional proposed flights would not do damage to my home?

Response:

The commentor is correct in identifying that the runway extension to 24R may increase noise impacts on his residence. At LAX Runway 24R in the north airfield complex is extended to the east under all three development alternatives (Alternative A-C) to provide comparable takeoff length for heavy aircraft that is currently available on the runways in the south airfield complex. The length of runway remaining west of the current runway end (between 9,050 and 9,350, dependent upon the alternative) is adequate for most narrow-body and many wide-body aircraft takeoffs. These aircraft could be assigned takeoffs from the existing runway end and aircraft requiring longer takeoff rolls could be assigned the full length, but this is not a formal recommended noise abatement measure. In no manner does this equate to the use of the runway by two departing aircraft at the same time - it merely reduces the taxi length for some aircraft that can safely depart short of the full runway length. This measure is more fully evaluated in Section 7.2, Alternative Specific Abatement Opportunities of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 3.1.6, Alternative D Noise Mitigation of Appendix S-C1 Supplement Aircraft Noise Technical Report. Each development alternative incorporates the construction of one or more Ground Run-up Enclosures (GRE) within which all run-up activity would be conducted. These facilities, when properly designed, achieve a reduction of approximately 20 decibels over run-ups conducted without enclosure. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.3 regarding night run-up activity. In addition, see Section 4.1 Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data and analyses in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report. Topical Response TR-N-8 addresses the potential for physical damage to the home as a result of noise vibrations.

PC03527-8

Comment:

Population base: Demographic projections show that the population, out of need or desire, are choosing to move to places other than Los Angeles. Riverside, San Bernardino and Orange Counties due to the burst of anticipated population growth within the next 15 years, need easier access to airports. Why is it

that the communities surrounding LAX have to pay such a severe price, take on an unprecedented burden to accommodate an airport facility that's day has passed it by? LAX is virtually locked into its present footprint, Why is it the powers that run this airport cannot and will not look forward to a truly regional plan? You at LAWA already own Ontario, have upgraded that facility but somehow you turn away from that airport's true potential, to serve the inland empire. LAWA will not acknowledge the possibilities of developing the Orange County El Toro airport. Perhaps a joint venture could be struck between Orange County and LAWA. It would appear that much money could be made at these two facilities if developed properly.

Response:

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

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PC03527-9

Comment:

Mr. Ritchie, before this plan or any semblance of the plan were to commence, I request that LAWA and the City of Los Angeles rethink this expansion. That you provide new realistic alternatives that incorporate the entirety of Southern California versus just Los Angeles commerce. And these alternatives need to consider LAX's neighbors more thoroughly and incorporate the reality of LAX being constrained to it's current footprint by the surrounding communities and not the other way around.

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.

PC03528

Crockett, Mary Lou

**Westchester Vitalization
Corporation**

11/7/2001

PC03528-1

Comment:

The Westchester Vitalization Corporation was founded in 1978 at the direction of Mayor Tom Bradley. Our original charter bears witness to the fact that the community of Westchester / Playa del Rey has been severely and negatively impacted by the expansion of facilities at LAX. Our mission, simply stated, is to do everything a community group can to mitigate the impact of LAX on one of Los Angeles' last true communities. We are proud of what we have accomplished despite the impact of LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

We strongly join the numerous groups and individuals who oppose the Master Plan and Draft EIR / EIS. For the reasons set forth below, we declare our belief that the LAWA has not studied the true alternatives and hence has failed to comply with California and federal law. Please note that this position is taken as the unanimous position of the Board of Directors, and that there is no reluctance, hesitation or lack of commitment in our action. Should it become necessary, we will join with other groups to compel LAWA to prepare a legally sufficient environmental document.

Response:

As indicated on page 3-1 in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR evaluates three build alternatives considered to be practical and feasible for achieving the overall purpose and most of the basic objectives of the project. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D is addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC03528-2

Comment:

LAWA'S PROPERLY ABANDONED ALTERNATIVES FOUND TO BE IMPRACTICAL, UNFEASIBLE AND UNAPPROVABLE ALTERNATIVES.

More than five years ago when LAWA undertook the process of creating a master plan, it made the effort to put every possible alternative on the table for study. This includes runways in the Santa Monica Bay, use of Hawthorne Municipal Airport for commuter flights and adding two additional runways at LAX.

Whether in hindsight it was worth the time and money it took to study these alternatives is not for this group to say. However, it must be noted that LAWA correctly recognized that each of these alternatives were so impractical and unapprovable that they could not possibly be implemented and therefore could not be considered true alternatives. These alternatives were therefore abandoned and not moved forward for further study. They do not appear as alternatives in the environmental documents put before the public for comment.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03528-3

Comment:

As stated in both the Master Plan and the Draft EIR / EIS, the consideration of alternatives is the heart of both the NEPA, the federal environmental rules, as well as CEQA, its California counterpart: Environmental documents that only go through the motions of considering alternatives, or which use false alternatives in order to gain approval of an alternative preferred by the developer will be struck down by the courts.

ADDING A FIFTH RUNWAY AT LAX IS NOT A TRUE ALTERNATIVE AND MUST BE ABANDONED.

The three alternatives carried forward from the study stage to the public comment stage would either add a fifth runway adjacent to El Segundo, add a fifth runway adjacent to Westchester, or add no new runways but build a "new airport" adjacent to the Coastal Dunes at the west end of airport property. A no-built alternative is also studied as required by law.

In the years leading up to release of the Master Plan, it was commonly heard that the first El Segundo Fifth Runway and then the Westchester Fifth Runway was the "favored" alternative of LAWA or certain elected officials. Each was met with overwhelming opposition when presented to the community most impacted. That representatives of each community would sue to prevent an additional runway on their side of the airport was unquestionable.

Largely as a result of this opposition, LAWA retreated to a position of including the two five-runway schemes in the environmental documents circulated for comment, but the alternative that would add no new runways became the agency's officially "preferred" alternative.

The Westchester Vitalization Corporation calls upon LAWA to abandon any alternative based on the addition of a fifth runway. The five runway scenarios are just as unrealistic, unapprovable and unbuildable as were the six-runway, Hawthorne Airport or runway-in-the-Bay alternatives. As a result, it is our position that the five-runway scenarios do not constitute a true alternative for NEPA / CEQA purposes, and that the environmental documents now in circulation are legally insufficient for lack of consideration of true alternatives.

LAWA MUST RESCOPE, STUDY AND RECIRCULATE FOR COMMENT NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS WHICH CONSIDER ONLY VARIATIONS OF A FOUR-RUNWAY CONFIGURATION.

Response:

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

PC03528-4

Comment:

As stated above, the Westchester Vitalization Corporation was founded by Mayor Bradley more than 20 years ago to seek solutions to the negative impacts of LAX expansion. As such, we have seen the homes of thousands of residents torn down for the benefit of LAX, and we have seen the resulting devastation to our business community.

In addition, we have seen that LAWA's statements regarding the "capacity" of any particular airport configurations are worthy of zero credibility. The current airport arrangement was said to be able to handle 40 million annual passengers, but at this time nearly 70 million annual passengers use the facility. General statements of intent by LAWA officials are worthless. Consideration can only be given to mitigation measures that are completely funded, explicitly required, specifically scheduled and that are legal prerequisites for subsequent projects.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the opportunities to alleviate impacts associated with past or present airport activities at LAX. Adopted mitigation measures will be fully enforceable pursuant to a mitigation monitoring and reporting program. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PC03528-5

Comment:

The following points are noted as both deficiencies in the Master Plan and Draft EIR / EIS, as well as starting points for consideration of various four-runway configurations.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC03528-6

Comment:

(1) Safety must be the primary concern. Recent articles in the media indicate that LAX leads the nation in near-misses. The Master Plan does not include a complete air traffic study for all of Southern California air space, and this must be done. LAWA must demonstrate that it can handle increased air traffic safely both while planes are in the air and on the ground. Spreading air traffic to other airports to increase margins of error may turn out to be the most persuasive reason to seek a regional solution.

Response:

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

PC03528-7

Comment:

(2) None of the final alternatives in the Master Plan consider options other than construction of terminals west of the Tom Bradley International Terminal. Other options that were not carried into the final study included terminals east of Sepulveda Boulevard. When LAWA is required to consider only four-runway configurations, then it will be quite obvious that terminals east of the existing terminals is the logical alternative to building an entire new airport adjacent to the Coastal Dunes.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D includes a new passenger facility east of Sepulveda Boulevard. Under this alternative, no terminal facilities would be constructed on the west side of the airport.

PC03528-8

Comment:

The negative impacts of 50 million people per year driving past an environmentally sensitive zone are numerous, and will undoubtedly be commented upon by groups specializing in this important topic. Damage to endangered species and traffic gridlock on roads serving public beaches come immediately to mind.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, impacts to endangered species in Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, and coastal access impacts in Section 4.14, Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Barriers, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix J and Technical Reports 2, 3 and 7 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-H and Technical Report S-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03528-9

Comment:

(3) None of the final alternatives in the Master Plan consider options other than construction of a massive, intrusive ring road through the Westchester / Playa del Rey community. It is access to this road that causes further devastation to the Westchester business district on Sepulveda Boulevard. The Westchester Vitalization Corporation stood as a lonely advocate for Westchester businesses for years and year. Now, with the first signs of commercial life being seen on Sepulveda, LAWA must consider every feasible alternative to a new round of negative impacts.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. Alternative D does not include construction of a ring road. Moreover, Alternative D does not include any acquisition within the Westchester business district.

PC03528-10

Comment:

(4) None of the final alternatives in the Master Plan consider options other than extending the in-board northern runway over Sepulveda Boulevard, and building a second tunnel. This tunnel will cut off access to a number of Westchester businesses and negatively impact an entire community. It will result in increased automobile speed through a neighborhood shopping district, and it will create additional massive structures where human scale buildings have been the norm since before the north runways were built.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02189-3 regarding Westchester.

PC03528-11

Comment:

The second tunnel is being proposed despite the fact that the Master Plan itself reveals it to be unnecessary. At pages IV-I .3 and IV-3.36 it is stated that only one runway of 12,000 feet is necessary to handle the relatively unusual situation of a fully loaded 747 taking off in foul weather. There is already a 12,000-foot runway on the south airfield. An obvious alternative to the negative impact of a second tunnel is to have all fully loaded 747's taking off in foul weather use the south airfield.

Response:

The runway length analysis in the Master Plan concludes that "a minimum of one 12,000 foot runway is recommended at LAX for takeoffs" in Chapter IV, Section 3.2.2. Currently a 12,000 foot runway is located on the south airfield and fully loaded Boeing 747s and alike depart from this runway regardless of their destination. The extension of the north airfield Runway 6R/24L to 12,000 feet is included in each of the Master Plan build alternatives to provide operation flexibility and enhance airfield efficiency. Alternative D would extend Runway 6L/24R to 11,700 feet and provide a 300 foot clearway for the application of Declared Distances and a Take-Off Distance Allowed of 12,000 feet. For a more detailed discussion on the need to extend Runway 6R/24L please see Response to Comment AL00022-188.

PC03528-12

Comment:

(5) None of the final alternatives in the Master Plan consider options that would take mass transit to the existing Central Terminal as the very first step in a program to improve ground access. Apparently, LAWA views gridlock like the weather: something to complain about, but as to which nothing can be done. The Westchester Vitalization Corporation begs to disagree. Community-generated plans have been discussed that would place a world-class intermodal transfer station at the corner of Imperial Highway and Aviation Boulevard which would conveniently connect the Green Line light rail to an Automated People Mover which would run roughly along Aviation and Century Boulevards to the Central Terminal. This system could be financed strictly with LAWA revenues and run on LAWA property. It would be flexible such that it could be modified at a later time to service new terminals either west or east of the existing terminals, should such terminals ever be built. Alternatives that begin, not conclude with connecting the regional transit system to the Central Terminals other than by use of automobiles must be studied and presented.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan. Alternative D is very similar to the commentor's suggestion. That alternative is presented in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03528-13

Comment:

(6) The Master Plan calls for the northernmost runway to be moved approximately 350 feet further north towards Westchester homes. This would have an extremely negative impact on thousands of Westchester residents. The Master Plan does not adequately consider alternatives to this move, and does not demonstrate that the same result cannot be achieved through other means that would have less negative impact on residents and businesses.

Response:

Under Alternative C, the northernmost runway (Runway 6L/24R) would be relocated 350 feet north. Under Alternative B, the runway would be moved 135 feet north. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option - Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan - was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Under Alternative D, Runway 6L/24R would not be relocated further north.

PC03528-14

Comment:

Far more examples than just these could be cited, but these stand as some of the most obvious failings of the Master Plan. As Mayor Hahn stated in his campaign, the Master Plan must be "scrapped." A regional solution to air traffic must be embraced. Safety must be extensively studied. The mass transit system must be taken to the Central Terminals. Only after these things have been accomplished (not just promised) can LAWA staff be permitted to further changes on LAX property, and then the alternatives studied must be limited to four-runway configurations.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00578-1 regarding the development of Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, which was developed at the direction of Mayor James Hahn. Please also note that Alternative D is specifically designed to enhance safety and security at LAX, includes an automated people mover systems that transport passengers between the Central Terminal Area and a proposed intermodal transportation center located adjacent to the MTA Greenline station, and is limited to a four-runway configuration. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PC03528-15

Comment:

LAWA MUST INCLUDE ITS INTENTIONS FOR THE "NORTHSIDE / SOUTHSIDE" IN ITS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS AND MASTER PLAN.

Just as the Westchester Vitalization Corporation has witnessed the damage to the Westchester residential and business community caused by LAX expansion for 20 years, so also it has followed LAWA twisting in the wind with its plan for the property owned by LAWA adjacent to Westchester Parkway that was once referred to as the "Northside" and now the "Southside."

LAWA administration has vacillated between favoring intense development, low-density development or deeding the entire property to the City and "getting rid" of it. While LAWA officials wil not admit it, the Southside has always been a step-child to the larger airport mission of moving passengers and freight.

The Westchester Vitalization Corporation has been lead to believe that LAWA is once again planning a grand scheme for the Southside that the community will "love." Once again, this planning is being done from behind blackout curtains with the community having no input. Soon a new genie will pop out of the

Southside bottle. Airport planners will proudly proclaim it to be wonderful for the community until local residents point out innumerable problems which LAWA did not think of. (Consider the current state of the linear part running from Vista del Mar to Pershing Avenue!)

LAWA staff might be invited to consider other major, privately built developments in the area that begin with meetings with community members and design charettes and workshops so that the local communities' superior local knowledge becomes a benefit and not a burden in the process.

Response:

The general nature and characteristics of the LAX Northside project, proposed under the No Action/No Project Alternative, and the Westchester Southside project, as proposed under Alternatives A, B, and C, were described in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public outreach efforts associated with the EIS/EIR.

PC03528-16

Comment:

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, the Westchester Vitalization Corporation declares its opposition to the Master Plan and Draft EIR / EIS. It urges Mayor Hahn and the Board of Airport Commissioners to cease any efforts to secure its approval, and to begin the active pursuit of a regional solution giving high importance to safety, mass transit and the use of all the region's airports to absorb air traffic growth.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety, and Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PC03529

White, Charles

March Joint Power Authority

11/8/2001

PC03529-1

Comment:

My name is Charles White, Councilman, City of Moreno Valley and Vice-Chairman of the March Joint Powers Authority.

The March Joint Powers Authority jurisdictions consists of the County of Riverside, and the cities of Perris, Riverside and Moreno Valley.

In March, 1997 the USAF & the March Joint Powers Authority signed a Joint Use Airport Agreement. Our cargo airport is now open and ready to accept cargo aircraft flights.

The reason for my being here this evening is to recommend that any expansion of LAX be postponed until such time as Inland regional airports are used to their fullest extent, particularly March Inland Cargo Port because it is a viable alternative to LAX expansion:

- We have the longest runway in California (13,000 feet) with clear airspace and no flight restrictions.
- We are installing a new instrument landing system that will allow aircraft to land in all weather conditions.
- We are a joint use airport. Our runway, air traffic control, fire fighting and rescue are maintained by the Air Force.
- We are adjacent to I215 and we are constructing an interchange leading directly into the airport.

3. Comments and Responses

- We have an adjacent railway and several thousand acres for development of air cargo, distribution or manufacturing buildings.
- We have a local population and employment base of approximately 500,000.
- There are several hundred trucks that pass by our airport every day on their way across our region to make deliveries to LAX. By using March Inland Cargo Airport, traffic and air pollution could be dramatically reduced in addition to providing much needed local employment.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand, 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.

PC03529-2

Comment:

In the opinion of the March Joint Powers Authority, the environmental document being provided for the expansion of LAX cannot be considered adequate until there is a complete review and discussion of the regional airport approach.

We therefore add our voice to the many other voices of the Inland Empire that believe it is time to think on a regional airport basis rather than on a one airport basis for the benefit of one locale.

In closing, the March Joint Powers Authority urges that the expansion of LAX be rethought; that the EIR/EIS be rewritten to address a regional airport approach and that consideration be given to sending air cargo carriers to March Inland Cargo Port.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Response to Comment PC00281-19 regarding relocating cargo operations. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR dealt only with the development of LAX. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. The commentator's recommendation that the FAA conduct a comprehensive analysis of various regional scenarios is beyond the scope of the subject EIS/EIR.

PC03531	Greenstein, Sami	None Provided	7/16/2001
----------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC03531-1

Comment:

Just wanted to let you know there were quite a few errors on the data entry - which is TOTALLY TOTALLY fine considering it was everyone's first project. But since the errors were consistent, I wanted to let you know what they were so they can be corrected.

1. If a person has an initial for a first name.

First, check and see if there is someone else with that initial and last name already entered in db with same address. It is safe to assume it is the same person. i.e. we can assume that D. Grandpre and Doug Grandpre at the same address are the same person and go from there.

Otherwise, in the "Salutation 1" field on the People record screen (gray screen where all info is entered) put "Friend" so the letter will say Dear Friend, instead of Dear L or whatever.

Also along those lines, names like McWhatever, need to be capitalized on the third letter.

2. A lot of incomplete addresses - no state, no city.

After entering street address, you should go to the zip code field and enter that. Then proceed to the ? button on the right, which will cause the complete address to pop up. If it is red you know there is an error, either a typo or something. If it is green, the address is correct, hit accept and the blanks will fill in themselves. This prevents spelling errors and ensures all the blanks are completed.

Otherwise, they were great and the corrections are all going out today- so thanks again. These are easy to correct and if you have any questions, please give me a call.

Response:

Comment noted. It is unclear as to what database the commentor is referring.

PC03532 Fredericks, Beverly None Provided 11/9/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to the first page of comment letter PC02596; please refer to Responses to Comments PC02596-1 through PC02596-5.

PC03533 Salmonson, Arthur None Provided 7/12/2001

PC03533-1

Comment:

I am a retired commercial airline pilot and also an experienced real estate consultant and believe that I could help you create a plan for a partial expansion of LAX that would be far less disruptive and costly than your alternative plan. While some air traffic should be routed to other regional airports, particularly Long Beach Airport (which I am aware you have no control over), there still needs to be a small expansion of LAX to handle more capacity. As a homeowner in the area who will be impacted by any expansion, I propose the following ideas:

1. Create an Arbor Vitae exit/entry in both directions off the 405 Freeway, however do not build a new freeway route to the proposed west terminal. Instead, widen Arbor Vitae and the Westchester Parkway from the 405 Freeway right through Westchester into the new west terminal. If necessary, build an upper roadway along this route with car pool and bus lanes. Do not destroy any businesses or take any substantial amounts of land in Westchester to accomplish this.

2. Definitely bring the light rail line into LAX and install a station where needed.

Response:

Comment noted. The analysis revealed that one of the reasons that airport traffic off-loads onto arterial streets from I-405 is that there is no convenient way to access the terminals from I-405, particularly since the CTA is located almost two miles from I-405, requiring motorists to exit for an extended period anyway even if they stay on I-405 all the way to say, Century Boulevard or Arbor Vitae Street. They might as well exit farther upstream and avoid some of the I-405 congestion. This circumstance would be compounded by a West Terminal that would be almost 3 miles from I-405. A method had to be developed that would provide higher speed access from I-405 directly to the terminal complexes in order to encourage airport motorists to stay on the freeway and not off-load into the Westchester community. Therefore, the LAX Expressway and ring road were developed to satisfy this need. A low-speed access route such as existing Arbor Vitae and Westchester Parkway, combined with a the distance of the West Terminal, would simply not provide the needed encouragement for people to stay on the freeways all the way to the airport. Also, please note that Alternative D, The Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been added since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR in light of the events of September 11, 2001, and is specifically designed to protect airport users and crucial airport infrastructure, and to incorporate federal security recommendations as they are developed to the greatest extent possible. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03533-2

Comment:

3. Extend runways 24 Left and 24 Right westward into the sand dunes across Pershing Drive. Flatten the sand dunes where necessary. Tunnel Pershing Drive underneath the extended runways. Do not extend these runways eastward.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00998-1 regarding extending the runways to the west over Pershing Drive into the El Segundo Sand Dunes and the El Segundo Blue Butterfly Habitat Restoration Area.

Following the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA developed a new alternative that, consistent with public comments calling for a regional approach alternative, is designed to accommodate passenger and cargo activity at LAX that would approximate those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, has fewer environmental impacts, and improves airport safety and security.

Alternative D does not propose to extend the LAX runways east.

PC03533-3

Comment:

4. Build the new west terminal and parking as proposed with people mover between terminals.

Response:

Alternatives A, B, and C all have an Automated People Mover (APM) which will connect the new West Terminal with satellite concourses and the existing Central Terminal Area.

Following the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA developed a new alternative that, consistent with public comments calling for a regional approach alternative, is designed to accommodate passenger and cargo activity at LAX that would approximate those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, has fewer environmental impacts, and improves airport safety and security.

Alternative D does not propose a west terminal as did the previously released build alternatives.

PC03533-4

Comment:

I believe my ideas could be supported by the Westchester and Playa del Rey communities since it would only be a partial disruption with fewer adverse impacts and it would add some additional capacity into LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03533-5

Comment:

I have extensive education into land use and studied this area while a graduate student at USC's Lusk Center for Real Estate Development. I have enclosed my resume and would be pleased to assist your team in developing these ideas as either an outside consultant or as an employed member of your staff.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03534 Hashimoto, Harriett None Provided 12/1/2001

PC03534-1

Comment:

I live up in the hills of Monterey Park. We moved here for the peace and solitude it offers. Now we have airplanes flying very low at times & it seems to get worse. They even disturb one's sleep at times.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PC03535 Hepler, Dennis None Provided 10/16/2001

PC03535-1

Comment:

We are writing to express our extreme displeasure at the recent action by the City of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles World Airport's (LAWA) Commissioners.

We are outraged the City's officials and the Los Angeles World Airport's (LAWA) Commissioners have decided to put an abrupt halt to the Manchester Square Property Acquisition/Relocation program. We own property in the Manchester Square area of Los Angeles. We were participating in the Los Angeles World Airport's Property Acquisition/Relocation program. The consequence of their decision has had a devastating effect on the property owners of this neighborhood.

Never have we experienced such blatant disregard by a government official's decision. Never have we been so severely and ruthlessly affected by such a decision. As a result of that edict, the property owners of the Manchester Square have been left with empty, vacant lots spread throughout the neighborhood negatively affecting property values. Adding insult to injury our tenants indicated they felt uncomfortable with the vacant lots and have relocated to another neighborhood. We are left with an unoccupied house with little prospect of finding suitable tenants. We are incensed that elected officials of the City of Los Angeles along with the LAWA Commission appointees felt our community so unimportant.

The LAWA offered to purchase property from homeowners in this community, and in good faith, the homeowners agreed to sell. What has happened to the integrity of government? Since when is a city allowed to invade a community, knock down houses then abruptly walk away without a word, leaving the remaining neighborhood in such a condition? This scenario is reminiscent of a third world country's government.

We as citizens of the United States have a responsibility to set a higher standard for other governments around the world. We realize the consequence of the World Trade Center has had a devastating effect on our Country. It has been a tremendous burden for all citizens of the United States and around the world. The results will be felt for years to come. It is important that our local government not contribute to an already appalling situation.

We believe that an effort by the City of Los Angeles and LAWA to honor the City's existing commitment to the community would be preferable to the current atmosphere of discontent and mistrust. We implore the City of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles World Airports to reconsider their position and reinstate the Acquisition Relocation Program. The only acceptable solution to this terrible situation is to resume immediately the LAWA Acquisition/Relocation Program.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The voluntary property acquisition program for Manchester Square, an action that LAWA initiated and took separate from the Master Plan, has not been halted and continues today. The program will continue on to completion regardless of whether or not the LAX Master Plan is approved.

PC03536

Stefanski, Andrew

None Provided

10/30/2001

PC03536-1

Comment:

Major Hahn and airport officials started recently stressing airport safety & security. Unfortunately, these considerations are pertaining mainly to air passengers and not to the hundreds of thousands of people living in the vicinity of the airport.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues. Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been added since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR in light of the events of September 11, 2001, and is specifically designed to protect airport users and crucial airport infrastructure, and to incorporate federal security recommendations as they are developed to the greatest extent possible.

PC03536-2

Comment:

LAX is surrounded by several highly vulnerable targets: over a dozen of schools, including four High Schools, Loyola University, Playa Vista Development, Major Chevron Refinery in El Segundo Los Angeles Water Works, Inglewood Forum and many others. Billions of Dollars in Investments, plus life of people in densely populated areas.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-233. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues.

PC03536-3

Comment:

A plane can depart from its path not only because of a terrorist act, but because of human error, mechanical defect, weather, earthquake and other causes. Most reasonable people can see that this is not a place for a Major Airport; there is too much at stake around. However, since we are stuck with it, we must make the best from a bad deal.

Response:

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

PC03536-4

Comment:

One of the best ways of improving safety is to lengthen the distances between landing and taking off planes. Congestion in the air causes accidents. Putting a fictitious cap upon the number of passengers, will do little good, unless alternative facilities, somewhere else are provided. Otherwise planes will still be coming if there is nowhere else to go.

Now is an excellent time to promptly develop and market Ontario, Palmdale and El Toro. Balanced uniformly distributed air traffic will automatically increase safety at and around LAX.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC03526-5.

PC03537 Coppin, Linda None Provided 11/9/2001

PC03537-1**Comment:**

In light of the terrorist attack's, we need additional international airports. Ontario, Palmdale and El Toro need to be developed. I live near LAX and I am concerned with safety.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC03537-2**Comment:**

Many of the problems associated with LAX will become much worse.

- extreme traffic congestion
- high noise pollution
- air pollution

NO LAX EXPANSION

Response:

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

PC03538 Heath, Mrs. Charles None Provided 7/31/2001

PC03538-1**Comment:**

Mayor Jim Hahn seems fair in requesting additional hearings regarding LAX airport expansion. But the locations chosen are close enough to enjoy a short drive to the airport and not be hurt by the foul air from traffic and airplanes. San Pedro, downtown Los Angeles and Monterey Park do not put up with gridlock on 405 near the LAX airport. Neighboring communities do not have soot on their homes, trees or in their lungs.

The impact of expansion at LAX airport will be borne by those already affected.

Let's have regional airports so all people need to travel less to catch a flight.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and

3. Comments and Responses

Technical Reports S-2, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, and Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the locations of the public hearings. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03539 Sheehan, Jeanine None Provided 11/8/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02599; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02599.

PC03540 No Author Identified, None Provided

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letters PC01975 and PC02283; please refer to the responses to comment letters PC01975 and PC02283.

PC03541 Farnum, Margaret None Provided 9/24/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02245; please refer to the response to comment letter PC02245.

PC03542 Hobart, John None Provided 11/6/2001

PC03542-1

Comment:

The following correspondence re. Sepulveda Blvd. Expansion has some key points about LAX expansion and problem alleviation as well (Shown in bold). Please factor them into your plans.

Response:

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

PC03542-2

Comment:

I heard the good response to the 1985-based DOT plan for Sepulveda expansion in Westchester last week. Hear are some key arguments that I didn't hear, plus several others. Please bring them up in the Council meeting this week.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PC03542-3

Comment:

(1) Expanding from 3 to 4 lanes each way will actually create gridlock. The current 3 lanes works well without left turn lights. All 4 lane roads use left turn lights exclusively, lowering the amount of green light time in both directions a lot. THIS IS KEY !

(2) The Sepulveda tunnel currently chokes traffic to 3 lanes each way. Four lanes can only serve to bring more traffic to the airport, not let more traffic go thru on Sepulveda. There is a better way to get traffic to the airport (see the following)

(3) The 405 and 105 freeways already meet nearby, Sepulveda doesn't connect them as DOT stated. Have the US DOT alleviate the problems by extending the 105 to dump off traffic near Pershing for entering the terminal from the west (no local access to mess up Manchester, etc.). Have them add a northbound lane at the bottleneck near La Tijera.

(4) If LA DOT wants to expand a street, the one that would help Sepulveda is actually widening La Cienega Blvd between the 405 and 10, the Santa Monica Freeway. This would relieve the need to increase Sepulveda traffic and would impact far fewer residents, plus helping alleviate traffic for 10 times more people.

Response:

Some of these suggestions have already been incorporated into the Ground Access Plan for LAX. For example, extending I-105 further west to connect with the new western terminal is already proposed. Also, there is no proposal within the LAX Master Plan to widen the Sepulveda Tunnel. Creating left-turn-only signal phases or adding a third through-lane is suggested only where the resulting intersection LOS is improved by the change. The suggestion to widen La Cienega Boulevard all the way to I-10 goes beyond the scope of the LAX Master Plan. This comment is being sent to the Westchester office of the Los Angeles Department of Transportation for consideration in its continuing transportation planning activities.

PC03542-4

Comment:

(5) Insist that dedicated cargo aircraft traffic be moved to the outlying airports near the shippers, mainly Ontario, Long Beach, Orange County and Burbank.

Response:

Comment noted. Neither the FAA nor LAWA have the authority to direct airlines to use one airport in favor of another airport. The Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, as amended, ended federal, state, and local governments role in determining the location for air service by airlines. Please see Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC03542-5

Comment:

(7) Recommend that the government mandate that any county with an International airport carry approximately its own air traffic, not send it to another county (Orange County vs. LA County).

Response:

Comment noted. In 2002, a bill with provisions similar to that proposed by the commentator was proposed in the State of California Legislature. This bill was not passed. The Airline Deregulation Act of 1978 prohibits the federal government from dictating to airlines where they can provide service.

PC03542-6

Comment:

(8) Currently, most busses and HOV's going to and from the airport are nearly empty. LA DOT is also sending busses by my side street in Westchester, even up to midnite on weekends, with 1 or 2 occupants, except when schools let out. No private business not spending our lavish sales tax dollars could ever run a business this way.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

LACMTA, LADOT, LAWA and other agencies are continuously implementing programs to encourage the use of buses and HOVs on the regional transportation system. LAWA is committed to assisting these agencies in any reasonable way to achieve the maximum shift of travel from automobiles to these modes, including direct connections to the Green Line and expansion of the FlyAway system. Yet, because of the uncertainty of the success of these programs, LAWA has chosen to use conservative assumptions about the number of airport trips that will be on busses or HOVs.

PC03542-7

Comment:

I live north of LAX and work just south of LAX. I wish the sidewalks were 3 feet wider so that I could travel Sepulveda to work. I wouldn't dream of sharing a high speed traffic lane with HOV's, busses, cabs and limos, even to go to a decimated Westchester shopping center. Has DOT even looked at the current race track of HOV's and cabs vying to beat each other to the Airport on side streets now? As the old adage says, Would they send their daughters on bicycles down Sepulveda? Let them cast the first stone (or bury their first heir).

Response:

This comment suggesting improvements to encourage bicycle travel has been submitted to the Westchester Office of the Los Angeles Department of Transportation.

PC03543

Burns, Barbara

None Provided

11/6/2001

PC03543-1

Comment:

The following comments are submitted to be included in the public record of the captioned proposals.

Although Alternative 5 is too nebulous to be seriously considered as a viable plan, the proposed extension of the North Runway is specifically unacceptable. This would make an entire residential neighborhood uninhabitable, and wipe out half of the shopping district of Westchester.

Now is the time to delete the referenced Los Angeles World Airports plan and all its options: Alternative A, B, C, 5 and No Action/No Project. LAWA needs to present a completely new plan that deals effectively and humanely with the realities of the 21st century.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district. Alternative D includes an extension, but not a relocation of Runway 6L/24R.

PC03544

Cidsinay, Martha

None Provided

PC03544-1

Comment:

I have lived here in Westchester since 1951. I have seen L.A LAX expand many times. Each time many homes have been removed. The land has not been used to solve the main problem. The main problem as I see it is that the design of LAX is bad creating a total bottleneck. You can't solve a problem by adding to the bottleneck. Buying land and not using it to the best advantage.

Why not totally rebuild the layout of LA LAX. You can do this without destroying a neighborhood.

My suggestion is to use La Cienega Blvd I could be the main street. A better choice is to widen it and extend it north. By putting the main entrest on the Southeast corner between 105 and 405 & La Ceaniga widden. You could have the entrest over people mover something like Los Vagas Parking could be here also with connection to main entrest cars could come off freeways by the many existing exit & entrest. This would take trafic totally out of this neighborhood. Creating also a direct rout to entrest leaveing room for more landing space. Also there would not need to change other streets. It would be something like this

[SEE GRAPHIC IN ORIGINAL]

It could be designed realy nice. A pleasant place to go to a proud place to live by.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02745-2.

PC03546 Mazza, Anthony None Provided 10/11/2001

PC03546-1

Comment:

As A long time resident of the ANtelope Valley and a Retired Postal Police officer That worked at Los ANgeles International Airport area durings its growth period from the 1970sthru 1980s. I always maintained that LaX. would do everything in its power to insure that no other decent sized airport be allowed to compete, simple as that.

I moved to Antelope Valley in 1978 and commuted to work at World Way Postal Center for years before the big Boom. I was told by someone that was in the know up here that we would never see a decent sized Airport up here for another (30) thirty yaers, and He was correct. There is always some reason to delay and this has been going on for over thirty years. All we get is political wind every once in a while and then it dies down to the next time and the next excuse.

Response:

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

PC03546-2

Comment:

From a logical standpoint due to the Security problems that will always haunt air service at LAX. it would seem logical to move some passenger service up here since access to the Public is far superior than crowded LAX. Also maintaining better Security would not only be cheaper but more efficient! But like I said this is not governed by logic, its politics that controls the situation and money!

Response:

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

PC03546-3

Comment:

The Postal Service used to have a Mail Service from LAX.to Palmdale years ago with private planes. This was eliminated and then we had a Sectional Center built in MOjave to expidite Mail so our mail then began to come a day later, NOW thats real efficiency?

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03546-4

Comment:

After almost twenty four years of hearing all the stories and arguments PRO and CON,I get the feeling its the same old whooeey the public gets from its commisions and Politicians all over again,Its the same LAX.doesnt want to loes any money to outlying areas if it can help it ,despite the logic of expanding outlying air ports.

Response:

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

PC03546-5

Comment:

The only way it seems that we will get some action up here is for the City of Palmdale to buy the Airport and whatever surrounding are belongs to L.A.W.A. and then there will be progress in this area any other way will bring the same old Hot air every so Often.

Response:

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

PC03547	Donaldson, James	North Westdale Neighborhood Association	9/23/2001
----------------	-------------------------	--	------------------

PC03547-1

Comment:

The North Westdale Neighborhood Association (NWN) is an Association that is made up of approximately 550 homes which are directly under the flight approach to Santa Monica Airport. Two schools in our community, Richland Elementary School and Daniel Webster Middle School, are also directly under the flight path.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03547-2

Comment:

The North Westdale Neighborhood Association's comments on the LAX Master Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report follow:

- The LAX DEIS/DEIR is inadequate and should be withdrawn. A new regional air transportation master plan should be developed to include the 11 other southern California commercial airports along with LAX.

- Population and job growth in southern California is projected to occur primarily in areas distant from LAX. Airport capacity in those areas should be expanded to meet local needs. This would have the added benefit of reducing the traffic and air pollution created by travelers and freight from all over southern California using already congested surface transportation to get to LAX. This must be addressed in the Final EIS/EIR.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR dealt only with the development of LAX. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. The recommendation that the FAA conduct a comprehensive analysis of various regional scenarios is beyond the scope of the subject EIS/EIR.

PC03547-3

Comment:

- The Master Plan and Final EIS/EIR must look at the combined effects of LAX expansion and development of the Playa Vista project.

Response:

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

PC03547-4

Comment:

- The LAX Master Plan is not consistent with the regional transportation plan developed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).

Response:

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

PC03547-5

Comment:

- The Final EIS/EIR must thoroughly study and address the effects of jet fumes (non-combusted and combusted) on the health of the people who are exposed to jet exhaust.

Response:

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

Human health impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 14a and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03547-6

Comment:

- The Final EIS/EIR must thoroughly address the effects of jet exhaust on the environment.

Response:

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

PC03547-7

Comment:

- Reliever Airports must be addressed in the LAX Master Plan. Comprehensive studies must be done on current air quality, noise levels, and safety in the communities and schools surrounding the reliever airports. Projections of the effects of implementation of the LAX Master Plan must be made to address the effects on these communities and schools. Mitigation measures must be proposed for negative impacts on these areas.

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.

PC03547-8

Comment:

NWNA requests that the Final LAX EIS/EIR look at the impact that Richland Elementary School and Daniel Webster Middle School would be exposed to in regards to safety, air pollution and noise pollution.

The NWNA also requests that adequate noise monitors be installed to more accurately compile data in order to give a true picture of the noise impact on the schools and homes in our community.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Safety impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.3, Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-4 regarding potential environmental impacts at surrounding other airports as a result of the LAX Master Plan.

PC03547-9

Comment:

- The four future LAX improvement concept plans (including the "No Project" alternative) currently being considered do not include the development and enhancement of general aviation Fixed Base Operator (FBO) Facilities at LAX. If Fixed Base Operator Facilities are diminished in the LAX Master Plan, SMO will experience an increase in corporate jet aircraft activity creating additional noise and pollution adversely affecting the neighbors living in West Los Angeles and Santa Monica. Corporate and business aircraft operators frustrated by the lack of facilities at LAX will search out alternative airports such as Santa Monica, Hawthorne and Torrance. Santa Monica Airport currently bears an unwarranted

burden of relocation jet traffic due to its proximity to downtown Los Angeles, Century City, and the West Side.

The LAX Master Plan needs to increase facilities and services for non-commercial small jets (private jets and business jets, including those under fractional ownership) and helicopters. We would like to see 3 fixed base operator facilities (FBO's) at LAX. Use of small jets is increasing at a dramatic rate. Without facilities at LAX to service these jets, they will be forced to use Santa Monica Airport and other surrounding airports.

The Los Angeles Department of Airports should include, maintain, and expand facilities for General Aviation aircraft (jets and helicopters) in addition to providing for expansion of full service Fixed Based Operator(s) in the LAX Master Plan. If that is not provided for, a full analysis must be made of the impact the exclusion of such facility enhancements would have on SMO and the surrounding general aviation airports and the surrounding communities, and appropriate mitigation measures recommended.

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.

PC03547-10

Comment:

- LAX should not be allowed to grow beyond the capacity of its existing facility.

Response:

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

PC03547-11

Comment:

- Due to the recent events in New York and Washington, DC, we strongly recommend that all general aviation business and private jets (including those under fractional ownership) use LAX and other airports which have adequate security procedures in place.

Response:

Comment noted. For security to be effective it must exist at all airports. The Transportation Security Administration has measures in place at not only major airports like LAX but also at general aviation (GA) airports. Capacity constraints would probably preclude bringing all GA into major airports. See also Response to Comment PC02284-17.

PC03547-12

Comment:

- Another important advantage to developing a truly regional airport expansion plan is the decentralization of airport facilities. With several airports in the region, disruption of services due to a catastrophic event at one will not have as devastating an affect on air transportation to the region.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03547-13

Comment:

- What is the IFR (Instrument Flight Rules) Clearance Capacity at the Reliever Airports of Santa Monica Airport (SMO), Hawthorne Airport (HHR), Torrance Airport, and Long Beach Airport?

Response:

The comment does not pertain to the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. As discussed in Topical Response TR-GEN-4, implementation of the proposed LAX Master Plan is not expected to have a significant effect on the operation levels and characteristics of other nearby airports. Should the commentor still desire information regarding IFR operations at the subject local airports, such information should be available from the respective airport operators.

PC03547-14

Comment:

- A full and complete analysis must be made of the impact on Visual Flight Rules (VFR) and Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) of aircraft arrivals and departures at Santa Monica Airport (SMO) as a result of the projected increase in flight operations that occur in the course of the full build out of LAX and appropriate mitigation measures to negate negative impacts must be recommended.

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.

PC03547-15

Comment:

- The residents who live in North Westdale and other areas surrounding Santa Monica Airport (SMO) believe that any increase in air traffic at LAX will lengthen delays of IFR and VFR operations at SMO due to an increase in air space congestion. These delays will adversely affect the residential areas of West Los Angeles and Santa Monica surrounding the airport by subjecting them to an inordinate amount of air and noise pollution, as aircraft await departure release.

Santa Monica Airport has already experienced a tremendous increase in IFR (instrument flight rules) departure delays as a direct result of the severely congested air space at LAX. These delays affect homes in WLA which are within one-half mile of the end of the runway on takeoffs. These residents and residents further to the east including the two previously mentioned schools are exposed to jet fumes on a daily basis. Some residents can not have their windows or doors open and can not even sit in their yards because of the noise and air pollution. These problems must be addressed in the Final EIS/EIR.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-4 regarding potential environmental impacts at surrounding other airports as a result of the LAX Master Plan and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC03547-16

Comment:

- The LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR analysis must fully explore the impact of developing El Toro Marine Corps Air Station in Orange County, and Point Magu Naval Air Station in Ventura County, into fully

operational air-carrier airports capable of serving domestic and international flights. The EIS/EIR must also justify why developing these valuable airports should or should not occur and quantify the impacts accordingly.

The development of Point Magu and El Toro will reduce traffic congestion on Los Angeles freeways, reduce air pollution and noise impact in and around LAX, reduce air traffic and improve air safety within the LAX airspace, and provide improved and expanded air service to the people living in Ventura and Orange County. Enhanced air carrier service at these airports will also diminish the need to expand LAX by developing capacity at airports within the region to accommodate the projected future growth in passenger activity.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PC03547-17

Comment:

- Any expansion of LAX will negatively affect the quality of life in our community, either directly or indirectly. The 405, 105 and the 10 freeways are near capacity and additional traffic will force people off the freeways and onto the surface streets, thereby severely impacting the surrounding communities. It is because of this that we request that these concerns be addressed in the Final EIS/EIR.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03547-18

Comment:

We also request that various types of transportation be looked at, such as a Monorail or Green Line for people to use when arriving or departing LAX instead of driving by car.

Response:

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

PC03547-19

Comment:

- The LAX Master Plan does not include funding or assurances for funding for infrastructure improvements (freeways, surface streets, etc.) that are required to transport passengers and freight to and from the expanded airport. Funding for these projects is not guaranteed. No airport expansion construction should begin until infrastructure improvements are completed.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding funding.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03548 Murata, Linda None Provided 10/28/2001

PC03548-1

Comment:

I am opposed to extending the North Runway over Sepulveda Boulevard. I am not directly affected by the proposal, however, I do not now see the need to continue with this plan.

If 78 million is LAX's current maximum capacity, there is no need to alter the runway to accommodate more aircraft landings and takeoffs.

I grew up in Inglewood during the '50' s and '60' s so I am aware of the attrition of housing and business in Westchester over the past 40 years. I have been living here in Westchester since 1974 and have seen housing removed during the late '70's to make way for a business/industrial complex between Sepulveda Westway and Emerson Avenue that never materialized.

The Westchester business district has been suffering an economic depression since the closing of J.C. Penney's in the '80s. Now that the area is finally being revitalized with a new Ralph's, Blockbuster, Petco and now a remodeled Trader Joe's and Sav-on's and a brand new Home Town Buffet, it would be another economic blow to take out some more businesses and doctor's offices.

If LAX cannot handle an increased passenger load, perhaps it is time to start expanding at John Wayne, Burbank and Ontario. People favor life going on, not being taken away.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments PC02203-41 and PC02231-5. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03549 Schneider, Denny None Provided 10/25/2001

PC03549-1

Comment:

Living in San Bernardino, I assume that you are not a native of this = area so I would like to provide a piece of history for your benefit. LAX = has been a part of our community for years. Each expansion removes = hundreds more homes and impacts thousands of lives. Our community is = already descimated by this overdevelopment but it is a condition that = exists--we will never turn back the clock and make our town "Mayberry." = Most of us accept that LAX is an important part of our community. We do = not oppose LAX, but it's time to spread the impact throughout Southern = California to the areas that need (and use) the service. =20

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed growth in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement), and residential and business relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses.

PC03549-2**Comment:**

There was a time when the Arbor Vitae interchange activities was = practical and maybe even desirable to mitigate local traffic. That time = is LONG PAST. The LAX situation is in total flux and I would venture to = say that NO ONE can state with any assurance what is in store for = us--even Mayor Hahn or the LAWA Airport Commissioners. =20

Response:

Comment noted. The proposed Arbor Vitae interchange is not a part of the LAX Master Plan and has had the federal funding withdrawn.

PC03549-3**Comment:**

The environmental (and social) impacts of concentrating the airport = activity is unprudent at best. A regional solution is essential! =20

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental impacts both adverse and beneficial in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences, and Mitigation Measures.

PC03549-4**Comment:**

WHO KNOWS HOW LAX WOULD LIKE TO DIVERT TRAFFIC UNDER ITS NEW "SAFETY" = THEME . . . IT APPEARS, HOWEVER, IT WANTS TO DIVERT SIGNIFICANT AMOUNTS = THROUGH OUR COMMUNITY. WE NEED YOUR HELP TO PRECLUDE IT.

Response:

Comment noted. Traffic patterns associated with Alternative D were addressed in Section 4.3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PC03549-5**Comment:**

The big argument in favor of this AV project was traffic mitigation of = the local streets in our area to justify LAX expansion. We are told = that LAX expansion plans are dead. The expansion master plan, however, = is still holding six hearings over the next two weeks! =20

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03549-6

Comment:

Long ago it was recognized that our streets are overburdened. Make no mistake --they still are! BUT the real constraint in the area is the San Diego Freeway and this activity DOES NOTHING TO HELP IT! It only works for future LAX expansion.

I am enclosing an analysis from the LAX North Side Development Project Final EIR Report. This already approved project is above and beyond the present Master Plan. =20

The attached EIR pages cast doubt in my mind as to the degree of traffic improvement (if any) on the San Diego Freeway that would be achieved by this project. Table 15 shows no anticipated improvement north of LaTiera where we presently endure almost constant bottlenecks. =20

The report also states "If the Arbor Vitae interchange is constructed, future use of the I-405 would be slightly increased by both project traffic and total traffic as noted in the table. In general, total future traffic demands on this important north-south regional transportation facility would be about 40 percent greater than existing traffic volumes. This section of the San Diego Freeway is operating presently in excess of design capacity during peak usage periods. The future site volumes will add incrementally to congestion to the north and south of this section but not in a significant manner..."

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. The LAX Northside development project is not above and beyond the proposed LAX Master Plan, but is replaced by a much smaller development project named Westchester Southside. The discussion in the comment regarding the previous EIR for LAX Northside is therefore out of context. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside traffic. FHWA has withdrawn its support for a half interchange at Arbor Vitae, and that the proposed half interchange is not part of the LAX Master Plan. FHWA policy is to only consider full proposed interchanges, not partial ones. Please see also Topical Response TR-ST-2 for information on the Arbor Vitae interchange.

PC03551	Dey, Patricia	None Provided	10/12/2001
----------------	----------------------	----------------------	-------------------

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

PC03552	Bobrow, Warren	None Provided	6/12/2001
----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02280; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02280.

PC03553	Mashburn, Lucille	None Provided	10/1/2001
----------------	--------------------------	----------------------	------------------

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC02500; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC02500.

PC03554 Fickenscher, Edgar None Provided 11/7/2001

PC03554-1

Comment:

We wish to reiterate our objection to the expansion of LAX. Not only would it destroy more of Westchester's business district and homes, but also the additional traffic and air pollution would affect the quality of life and health for Westchester residents.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any acquisition within the Westchester business district. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PC03554-2

Comment:

Since the terrible events of September 11, 2001 led to the closing of the airport and subsequent increased security needs, we feel "all the eggs should not be in one basket." Make better use of Palmdale and Ontario airports. We also believe Orange County should carry its share at El Toro perhaps, instead of adding to the traffic at LAX.

Our city has done its share already and we should not be expected to sacrifice more.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding the elimination of El Toro as a commercial airport and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the Master Plan's role in regional approach to meeting demand.

PC03555 Galanter, Ruth City of Los Angeles 9/20/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00106; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00106.

PC03556 Galanter, Ruth City of Los Angeles 11/9/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00106; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00106.

PC03557 Scott, Dawn None Provided 11/6/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC03527; please refer to the responses to comment letter PC03527.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03558 Galanter, Ruth City of Los Angeles 10/25/2001

The content of this comment letter is identical to comment letter PC00106; please refer to the response to comment letter PC00106.

PC03559 Leon, Paul City of Ontario 11/7/2001

PC03559-1

Comment:

Good evening. I'm Paul Leon an Ontario City Councilmember and the Airport Liaison for the Ontario City Council. I am here this evening to speak in support of Los Angeles Mayor James Hahn's recently articulated plan to upgrade security at LAX and to express appreciation for his statements and actions in support of a regional approach to the air passenger and cargo needs of Southern California. We are especially appreciative of his efforts to expand service at Ontario International Airport and his recent marketing trip to Mexico which resulted in daily Aeromexico flights between Ontario and Hermosillo beginning in January 2002. The City of Ontario values our partnership with the City of Los Angeles and LAWA and stand ready to work with the entire region to accommodate our share of Southern California air traffic at Ontario International Airport.

Response:

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

PC03560 Gordon, Mike City of El Segundo 11/7/2001

PC03560-1

Comment:

- Good evening. I'm Mike Gordon, Mayor of the City of El Segundo
- The City of El Segundo is pleased that Mayor Hahn has agreed to set aside the Riordan Master Plan for the expansion of LAX
- And is now committed to developing a new plan for LAX that limits growth at LAX to 78 million annual passengers
- For the first time since LAWA embarked on this Master Plan odyssey, the mayor of Los Angeles has committed to being a full partner with the region in developing a truly regional airport plan that serves the aviation needs of all of Southern California.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03560-2

Comment:

- Inland Empire airports need to be the first priority in the development of our regional system.
- Ontario International Airport is itself the most important component of the regional airport plan.
- We are pleased that Mayor Hahn recognized and embraces the role Ontario must play in the regional airport system and

- We applaud Mayor Hahn's successful negotiation with Aeromexico to bring more flights into Ontario.
- Ontario is ready today to play an enhanced role in our regional aviation system. - it has significant unused capacity
- Now the City of Los Angeles must make sure that this airport fulfills its role in the region.

Response:

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

PC03560-3

Comment:

- A well funded, comprehensive campaign as designed specifically to market Ontario Airport, locally as well as nationally and internationally, as a convenient alternative to LAX.
- But Ontario isn't the only regional airport opportunity in the Inland Empire.
- Former military bases at March, Norton and George are now available for commercial aviation
- Now called San Bernardino International, Southern California Logistics and March Inland Port these airports are planning their entry into the Southern California marketplace.
- Southern California Logistics is already operating commercially.
- All these airports have strong community support for further development.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport. Neither the FAA nor LAWA have the authority to direct airlines to use one airport in favor of another airport. The Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, as amended, ended federal, state, and local governments role in determining the location for air service by airlines.

PC03560-4

Comment:

- As specialty cargo airports, these airports can relieve much of the cargo burden at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC03560-3 above. Please also see Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03560-5

Comment:

- Perhaps more importantly, Inland Empire airports and others in the region are poised to play an increasingly critical role in post 9/11 security efforts
- You will recall, the Secretary of Transportation temporarily banned the carriage of mail and cargo on passenger planes following the events of 9/11

3. Comments and Responses

- Anthrax-tainted mail and cargo continue to be a weak links in aviation security

Response:

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

PC03560-6

Comment:

- As specialty cargo airports, San Bernardino International, Southern California Logistics or March Inland Port can easily facilitate the separation of mail and cargo from passengers should it be necessary to ensure the safety and security of the aviation system

Response:

Comment noted. Please see also Responses to Comments PC03560-3 and PC03560-4 above.

PC03560-7

Comment:

- Developing a truly regional airport system reduces vulnerability at LAX and reduces the vulnerability of our regional economy.
- It will reduce vulnerability in our airports system by adding regional airports in Southern California that can handle significant passengers and cargo - and create flexibility and redundancy in the region's aviation system.
- A truly regional plan will help to ensure that security will not take a back seat to passenger throughput.
- It will help to ensure that LAX receives only as much air traffic as it can safely handle.

Response:

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

PC03560-8

Comment:

- We are grateful to Mayor Hahn for setting aside the previous Riordan Master Plan alternatives for LAX expansion.
- We are pleased to offer this preliminary public input for the Mayor's new plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03561 Salk, Mike Councilmember Ruth Galanter's Office 11/1/2001

PC03561-1

Comment:

I am Mike Salk, District Deputy to Councilmember Ruth Galanter who chairs the Committee on Commerce, Energy, and Natural Resources, which oversees the airport.

Thank you very much for being here today. In light of the events of September 11th, the entire LAX master plan is most likely obsolete. The assaults on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon have demonstrated that airports must operate differently or they may not be able to operate at all.

Even before September 11th, trends within the airline industry have been unclear. While the LAWA proposed master plan includes in all its alternatives runways to accommodate planes carrying 600 passengers or more, airlines have in fact been flying (and buying) more 757's and 767's. Certainly, demand has fallen off the charts and the demand forecasts that the entire master plan is based on are no longer useful. In fact, the EIR is so flawed in its conception and current relevance, that the environmental assessment is inherently flawed as well.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, PC02131-5, and AL00033-253.

PC03561-2

Comment:

I am concerned that we are now being asked to comment on a fifth alternative that is conceptual at best, with no opportunities to inspect any analysis on its impacts on the surrounding communities, businesses and residents.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan Alternative, and was circulated for public review and comment.

PC03561-3

Comment:

I am concerned that as long as this EIR process is on the table, the door is still open for incremental expansion later in this decade.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03561-4

Comment:

Finally, I am concerned that nowhere in the existing master plan document or in the proposed fifth alternative is there an overarching plan to address projected aviation demand in the Southern California region using LAWA's other airports -Ontario and Palmdale.

3. Comments and Responses

I urge you to reject this planning process and begin anew with a true regional plan assessed with a new environmental document that adequately addresses impacts on a regional basis.

Response:

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

PC03562	Politeo, Tom	None Provided	11/1/2001
----------------	---------------------	----------------------	------------------

PC03562-1

Comment:

In the air and on the streets, in almost every corner of Southern California, we are facing a transportation crunch. To ensure that our cities are attractive to live in and our region is prosperous, to ensure that we aren't wasting our lives stuck in traffic and in long lines at the airports, we need to explore a comprehensive transportation solution.

With new technologies knocking on our door, and especially after the tragedy of September 11th, we need to look under every planning rock: security, convenience, diversity, competition, economics, technology, restructured management, redistricting, power-sharing, livable communities and the environment so that we find good answers that work locally and regionally.

We should scrap our current plans for LAX and take a deep breath. We need time after September 11th to develop perspective on important issues, so we can act with enough understanding to avoid overreaction or missing points that might not yet be obvious.

Hasty action may commit us to spending that doesn't pay off. Mayor Hahn has proposed facial-recognition systems be used at LAX. We should take time to explore major projects like this. England has been using such systems for years now, and not one terrorist has been caught. Two reasons are given. First, the systems are easily fooled by changing hair, dress and makeup. Second, the identity of most terrorists aren't known until after they commit a terrorist act.

We should look at diversity and good distribution as key planning points. For the sake of security, both against natural disasters and terrorist strikes, it makes sense to distribute our air travel use fairly evenly throughout Southern California. If we do this, travelers may find airports conveniently close to home or work. On the other hand, economies of scale for airlines may suggest greater service consolidation. Some airport neighborhoods may welcome expanded travel and others may reject it. We need to explore these issues to find optimal answers.

Response:

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

PC03562-2

Comment:

As part of our travel needs, we should explore a high-speed rail network that links San Diego, Los Angeles, Las Vegas, San Francisco and Sacramento. This could provide more diversity than air transit

alone, and hence more convenience and security. We cannot study our airports in a vacuum that does not consider this option.

Response:

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

PC03562-3

Comment:

Our planning should also be comprehensive. We should consider all of our air and sea ports as part of a transportation network that serves Southern California. Business passengers, vacationers, tourists and cargo should move easily between these facilities and major destinations.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03562-4

Comment:

We should look at an automated, electric-rail system for moving cargo between our air and sea ports and key industrial locations. Such a system could speed up cargo transit, improve security, help government inspections, improve street traffic and help clean up our air. It could be a vital cog in a powerful Southern California economic engine.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03562-5

Comment:

Exploring such an option will also impact how we plan individual ports.

We must also modernize planning authority over our ports. The City of Los Angeles is too small to be inclusive enough to be a good regional planning authority. And, it is too large and geographically disjointed to serve local need properly. The City of Los Angeles is not a good authority to manage such regionally-important facilities.

The City should transfer its land and sea ports to the County. The County should run them as part of a regional system in a framework with other Southern California counties. Each individual facility should be administered by a joint powers authority in which the County is one partner and local neighborhoods near the facility are another.

The quality of our lives, our prosperity and the environment depend on what we do here. Let's take the time and develop the leadership and vision to move us wisely into a future that will serve us well.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PC03563

Galanter, Ruth

City of Los Angeles

11/8/2001

PC03563-1

Comment:

Thank you very much for being here tonight. In light of the events of September 11th, the entire master plan is most likely obsolete. The assaults on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon have demonstrated that airports must operate differently or they may not be able to operate at all.

Even before September 11th, trends within the airline industry have been unclear. While the LAWA proposed master plan includes in all its alternatives runways to accommodate planes carrying 600 passengers or more, airlines have in fact been flying (and buying) more 757's and 767's. While the overall loss of life on September 11th, was beyond horror, it is a sign of some drastic changes in demand that the four hijacked planes carried fewer than 400 total passengers and crew. Certainly since then, demand has fallen off the charts and the demand forecasts that the entire master plan is based on are no longer useful. In fact, the EIR is so flawed in its conception and current relevance, that the environmental assessment is inherently flawed as well.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, PC02131-5, and AL00033-253.

PC03563-2

Comment:

I am concerned that we are now being asked to comment on a fifth alternative that is conceptual at best, with no opportunities to inspect any analysis on its impacts on the surrounding communities, businesses and residents.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan Alternative, and was circulated for public review and comment.

PC03563-3

Comment:

I am concerned that as long as this EIR process is on the table, the door is still open for incremental expansion later in this decade.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03563-4

Comment:

And I am concerned that nowhere in the existing master plan document or in the proposed fifth alternative is there an overarching plan to address projected aviation demand in the Southern California region using LAWA's other airports -Ontario and Palmdale.

I urge you to reject this planning process and begin anew with a true regional plan assessed with a new environmental document that adequately addresses impacts on a regional basis.

Response:

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

PC03564**Waters, Maxine****None Provided****11/8/2001****PC03564-1****Comment:**

Thank you for the opportunity to speak and submit a statement regarding the proposed Los Angeles International Airport Master Plan and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report.

As Congressmember of the 35th Congressional District, I represent over 600,000 constituents including residents, business owners, schools, and many more, located in cities such as South Los Angeles, Inglewood, Gardena, Hawthorne, Lennox, and portions of Westchester.

With the numerous phone calls, letters, and people whom I have spoken with directly, we are in agreement that there should not be any expansion of the Los Angeles International Airport.

While there has been over \$60 million wasted in preparing the draft EIS/EIR, the document is deeply flawed and contains numerous omissions, ambiguous or misleading information and a number of faulty assumptions.

Specifically, our objections to the plan proposed expansion hinges on the following:

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03564-2**Comment:**

1) The draft EIS/EIR states that the environmental, noise and health burdens of the airport's operations and expansion are, and will be, borne by low income and minority populations, yet it offers no commitments to recognize and address this imbalance;

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02203-2.

PC03564-3**Comment:**

2) Air quality is already horrible. The current operations at LAX already constitute the largest single source of air pollution in the nation's worst air quality region. Any proposed expansion will further decrease the air quality in the surrounding communities and the LA Basin;

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00070-1 regarding existing air quality. Also, please see Response to Comment AL00043-6 regarding LAX as a source of air pollution. Further, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03564-4

Comment:

3) In regard to traffic, LAX constitutes one of the largest single destinations for vehicular traffic in the Los Angeles region. The draft EIS/EIR concludes that construction activities from any of the proposed alternatives will result in increased traffic congestion, potentially affecting the local communities during the next fifteen years and beyond. It further states that these traffic impacts to citizens living and working in the communities surrounding the airport will be "significant and avoidable". Calculations show that with the increase in cargo volume alone will require over six semi trucks per hour, or one every ten minutes, to support this increase. This is not acceptable.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding traffic concerns pertaining to the cargo truck traffic plan and neighborhood impacts from trucks, please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding Cargo Truck Traffic. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding Airport Area Traffic Concerns. Regarding traffic measures to minimize neighborhood impacts, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding Neighborhood Traffic Impacts.

PC03564-5

Comment:

Given the events that took place on September 11th, there should be more of a focus on safety and security rather than expansion. However, we will not be fooled into expansion under the guise of "safety and security".

Response:

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

PC03564-6

Comment:

I strongly support a regional approach to air travel so that other airports such as Ontario and Palmdale begin to accept their fair share of air traffic.

Response:

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

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03565 Burr, Kathleen Los Angeles County Farm Bureau 11/5/2001

PC03565-1

Comment:

My name is Kathleen Burr and I am the executive manager of the Los Angeles County Farm Bureau. As you know Palmdale Regional Airport sits on approximately 17,000+ acres of land which according to the airport agriculture people - 8 to 10,000 acres could be potential agricultural leases. Even though our area is growing by leaps and bounds, we are still a rural community with a huge emphasis on agriculture. Agriculture jobs in Los Angeles County comprise jobs in production, transportation, processing, marketing, and the farmer and rancher. The State of California produces half of all the nations fruits and vegetables. Not to forget the best alfalfa in the United States is produced right here in the Antelope Valley. 78% of wildlife species occupy private lands with over 90% of all listed species relying partially on private lands for survival. And a vast majority of these private lands are owned by the farmers and ranchers. No one is more interested in maintaining the integrity of the land and health of our water resources then those who directly rely on these resources for their livelihoods! The farmers and ranchers - who in some cases are 2nd, 3rd, & 4th generation preserving this integrity for their children.

Maintaining an adequate water source is utmost on everyone's minds. But there are options that have been on the planning table for several years. It is a shame to let the potential income for not only the airport but the farmers and ranchers who provide a multitude of jobs, go to waste because those that make the decision may not fully comprehend the issues facing agriculture and/or the potential they hold in their hands. They do not realize the regulations that each grower must adhere to. They do not realize that just because it is cheaper to import a crop from another country - that country does not impose the same safe growing regulations that are imposed on us. They do not adhere to the same health standards we do. And I feel these are issues that need to be looked into and understood fully before a finger is always pointed at agriculture stating, "You are the problem". The loudest proponent is the one that does not fully understand the issue.

I can only see the potential for the agriculture leases. I would be happy to host the LAWA members to spend the day with me talking to the farmers and ranchers in the area. If there are issues, problems, or unknown financial factors - compromises can be reached, issues worked out, and problems solved. I think you would be surprised at the number of farmers/ranchers/agricultural related business in Los Angeles County. It is a shame not to promote agriculture and promote it here. Thank you for the time to speak and I look forward to hosting the airport board in the near future.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHPD00003-1.

PC03566 Holloway, Harvey Antelope Valley Chamber of Commerce 11/5/2001

PC03566-1

Comment:

The Antelope Valley Chamber of Commerce supports a regional approach to resolving the issue of increasing the air capacity in Southern California.

A Regional Airport approach that would include the utilization of this facility here in Palmdale, could better serve the flying public than any type of expansion of LAX.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

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

PC03566-2

Comment:

There is a legitimate concern that adding additional air traffic, arriving and departing from LAX, could infringe on the safety of those flights. No matter what changes are made on the ground, there is still a fixed amount of airspace available and by adding more traffic into this fixed area, the odds of a major catastrophe will increase.

Response:

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

PC03566-3

Comment:

Palmdale is capable of managing an increase in air traffic, without decreasing safety, and utilization of our airport could provide the airspace around LAX some much needed relief.

Palmdale Regional Airport features this newly refurbished 9,000 square foot terminal and is capable of handling up to 300,000 passengers annually. This facility could be used to establish a pattern of airline service into Palmdale and, as passenger traffic increases, Los Angeles World Airports already owns just under 18,000 acres of adjacent land that is available for development.

Response:

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

PC03566-4

Comment:

Palmdale Airport would serve a far greater geographic area than just the Antelope Valley. According to a study by the Los Angeles International Airport Expansion Task Force, using Palmdale Airport could save an average of 35 minutes for passengers that live an equal distance from Palmdale and LAX. Flight delays and airport closures due to fog would be virtually eliminated. Palmdale would quickly become the Airport of choice for the millions of people that reside within a proximity that would allow them to take advantage of our airport.

Response:

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

PC03566-5

Comment:

A regional approach that includes Palmdale Airport is vital to improving passenger and cargo movement in Southern California. If the Los Angeles World Airports continues to defer the utilization of their Palmdale Airport, we would urge their consideration of a "friendly takeover" of this facility by the Southern California Regional Airport Authority. This action could allow Palmdale Airport to become part of the solution rather than an idle asset.

Response:

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

PC03566-6**Comment:**

On behalf of the Antelope Valley Chambers of Commerce, and the millions of people that could utilize Palmdale Airport, I urge you to focus on a regional approach in resolving the need for increased air capacity in Southern California.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PC03567**Ziemer, Roger****None Provided****11/5/2001****PC03567-1****Comment:**

The Terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 had a profound impact on the airline industry and the flying public.

I understand the LAX expansion priorities have shifted from Expansion to Safety and Security elements as identified by Mayor Hahn.

However, caution needs to be exercised when considering any changes to the existing LAX - EIR proposing fundamental changes without public and professional input.

As a private citizen, I find it difficult to rally around any proposed changes to the changes proposed for the LAX expansion plan without first having an opportunity to review details of the proposed changes.

Without seeing details of the proposed changes to the LAX plan, there really is nothing much to discuss.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see the project web site at www.laxmasterplan.org.

PC03567-2**Comment:**

On the other hand, the option that includes the proposed Palmdale Regional Airport is a logical alternative and requires your serious consideration.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale for a discussion of multi-airport markets, airline economics and passenger choice.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03567-3

Comment:

The traffic getting to and from LAX using the 405 (San Diego Fwy.) awful say nothing about the difficulties of getting in and out of LAX itself.

As an example, I hosted a dinner at the Downtown LA Biltmore Hotel last month and one of my guests spent 1 1/2 hours just getting from Brentwood to Downtown LA. Another of my guests traveled from Encino using the 405 and had a similar horror story.

Traffic congestion on the 405 at any time of day or night requires that I consider other Airport location for my personal or business travel.

Response:

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

PC03567-4

Comment:

I believe the ever expanding borders of the San Fernando, Santa Clarita and Antelope Valley's would support a more conveniently located Regional Airport located in Palmdale.

Long term Major Airline lease agreements and a commitment toward future growth would be essential to the success of a Regional Airport

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale for a discussion of multi-airport markets, airline economics and passenger choice.

PC03567-5

Comment:

In addition, the FAA or appropriate Airport authority needs to make commitments to construct and operate a safe and modern airport facility.

I would recommend an aggressive advertising campaign promoting the benefits of traveling from the Palmdale Regional Airport vs. navigating the uncertain freeways leading to LAX.

The Antelope Valley with its available land and receptive communities would welcome and support Regional Airport.

With few exceptions, Los Angeles County has run out of available open space that qualifies for airport construction.

In conclusion:

Taking into account:

- The Lockheed-Martin JSF contract agreement
- The existing Enterprise Zone benefits
- The availability of an aerospace savvy labor force
- The expanded and improved I-14 (Antelope Valley Freeway)
- A receptive Community and Local Governments
- And the existence of the Plant 42 airport facilities at the proposed airport location site

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale for a discussion of multi-airport markets, airline economics and passenger choice.

PC03567-6**Comment:**

A decision to select Palmdale as the site for a Regional Airport will be in the public's interest relieving LAX congestion while supporting profitable and sustained future growth within Los Angeles County.

Any long or short-term plan targeting Southern California must not overlook the obvious geographic and other fundamental advantages the cities of Palmdale & Lancaster and the entire Antelope Valley offer as the site for a Regional Airport.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale for a discussion of multi-airport markets, airline economics and passenger choice.

PC03568**Hahn, James****City of Los Angeles****10/30/2001****PC03568-1****Comment:**

- Mr. Kessler, Mr. Ritchie. As the Mayor of the City of Los Angeles, I appear before you this evening to reaffirm my request that you fully develop a Fifth Alternative to the LAX Master Plan that focuses on increased safety and security at LAX.

- As you may know, I have historically supported a regional approach to accommodating growth in aviation demand. I favor expanding air service at Ontario and restarting service at Palmdale. In order for a regional plan to work, other airports in the region must also take their fair share of future traffic.

- However, the tragic events of September 11th have shown us that our nation's aviation system continues to be a vulnerable target. Those events have caused me to focus my attention, first and foremost, on the changes that must be undertaken immediately to ensure safe and secure operations at LAX.

- As the third busiest airport in the Country, LAX is a unique and vital asset for the Southern California region. Immediately following the terrorist attacks and the FAA mandate that our national aviation system be shut down, it became abundantly clear how important LAX is to the City of Los Angeles.

- More than 400,000 regional jobs have been associated with the airport and LAX has generated \$60 billion of economic activity annually. However, in the wake of September 11th, the shipment of goods and the course of business operations dependent on aviation services came to a stunning halt, placing the benefits of a strong LAX beyond our immediate grasp. Our travel and tourism industries were gravely impacted. Most importantly, hundreds of Angelenos found themselves out of work or in real danger of losing their jobs. Although I am sure all Angelenos had some sense of LAX's value to our City, the events of mid-September made clear that its contribution to our livelihoods can never be disputed.

- In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks - and after conferring with Federal authorities - we took some immediate steps to protect the safety of passengers and employees at LAX. We made a difficult decision to keep the Central Terminal Area and parking garages at LAX closed.

- That very necessary decision resulted in the loss of jobs for numerous airport workers. Thankfully, with new security guidelines, we have now relaxed some of the restrictions that were in place and many people have been able to return to work.

3. Comments and Responses

- But as airport employees return to their jobs, we must continue to remain diligent about protecting LAX. We can never allow the events of September 11th to be repeated, and I believe that the first line of defense for safe and secure airplanes is safe and secure airports.

- That is why a few weeks ago, I announced a new vision for LAX, one that would create safe and secure terminals as well as a safer airfield that would accommodate 78 million annual passengers. I would like to take this opportunity to outline some of that vision to protect LAX employees, passengers and neighboring airport communities.

- First, our terminals must be as safe and secure as we can possibly make them. My vision is to move all ticketing and baggage check-in facilities to a location away from the existing terminals. This facility would allow passengers to park, check their bags and then pass through security checkpoints away from LAX's central terminal area. Once passengers and their baggage are thoroughly checked, they would board secure transportation to the terminal areas. This separate facility will eliminate the need for cars inside the Central Terminal Area, providing maximum protection from the threat of explosives inside a car being near the terminals.

- Second, concerns of airport communities need to be addressed. To avoid disruptions to communities close to the airport, my vision would eliminate the need for a Ring Road around LAX. This costly project, part of the current Draft LAX Master Plan, would only serve to disrupt traffic patterns in these communities.

- Third, the LAX airfield needs to be reconfigured to increase safety. Airfield safety problems, that existed before September 11th, continue to plague LAX. My vision would seek to reduce so-called runway incursions and create safer conditions on the airfield. I am also hopeful that the new alternative to the Master Plan would not move any of the runways closer to the communities around the airport, thereby avoiding increased noise over our neighborhoods surrounding LAX.

- My intent is to help restore confidence to the flying public so that Los Angeles and LAX become, once again, a destination of choice for business and leisure travelers.

- Along with the public comments you receive about the LAX Master Plan, I would ask that you also consider my vision for a safe and secure LAX that would serve to grow our economy and create thousands of needed jobs in our region.

Response:

The comments of Mayor Jim Hahn are noted. At the direction of the Mayor, LAWA developed an additional alternative, Alternative D, that was designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, while making the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D moves the passenger intake facility away from the CTA, thereby eliminating public parking in the CTA. Alternative D includes improvement to the airfield that will enhance safety. The improvements would increase the separation between the two runways in the north airfield without moving the runways closer to the community. The alternative does not include a ring road.

PC03569

Gordon, Mike

City of El Segundo

10/30/2001

PC03569-1

Comment:

- Good evening. I'm Mike Gordon, Mayor of the City of El Segundo.

- The City of El Segundo is pleased that Mayor Hahn has agreed to set aside the current LAX Master Plan

- And is now committed to developing a new plan for LAX that

- Limits growth to 78 MAP

- Eliminates the airport ring road,

- the new west terminal, and

- the new cargo facilities.

- And focuses on security and safety at the airport

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03569-2

Comment:

- We agree that ensuring security and safety should be the highest priority in planning the future of LAX.
- truly regional system is the best way to secure these objectives.
- We know with certainty that LAX was a terrorist target even before the events of September 11.
- Common sense tells us that continuing to concentrate aviation activity at LAX will continue to provide an inviting target for terrorists.
- Developing a truly regional airport system reduces vulnerability at LAX and reduces the vulnerability of our regional economy.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00051-93, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5 regarding airport security. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PC03569-3

Comment:

- We also know with certainty that LAX has had more runway incursions than any other US airport for the last two years.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00543-1.

PC03569-4

Comment:

- Here, common sense tells us that preventing taxiing aircraft from crossing active runways by employing end-around taxiways will go a long way to reducing the incursion risk.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00037-16 regarding the end-around taxiway.

PC03569-5

Comment:

- Although we applaud Mayor Hahn's shift in focus, we have several key concerns
- First and foremost, the heavily impacted communities under and near the LAX flight path must be assured that the new plan will not permit LAX to grow beyond 78 MAP.
- Unfortunately, the new plan comes with few specifics and few assurances, particularly about runway modifications.
- Press reports indicate that LAWA may still plan to separate runways and may include extending a north side runway to 12,000 feet.

3. Comments and Responses

- Such runway modifications will create significant additional capacity at LAX and, therefore, are a cause for concern.

- Mayor Hahn cannot constrain LAX to 78 million passengers and also increase runway capacity. You cannot have it both ways.

Response:

Details regarding Alternative D were provided in the Draft Master Plan Addendum (published in July 2003), including information about runway modifications. Under Alternative D, the separation between runways in both the north and south airfields would be increased to allow for the construction of parallel center taxiways. In the north airfield, Runway 6L/24R would maintain its current location; however, it would be extended approximately 1,495 feet to the west for a total length of approximately 10,520 feet. Runway 6R/24L would be reconstructed approximately 340 feet south of the existing runway centerline and would be extended approximately 135 feet west and approximately 1,280 feet to the east for a total runway length of approximately 11,700 feet. In the south airfield, Runway 7L/25R would be reconstructed 50 feet south of its current location and a new center parallel taxiway would be constructed between the south pair of runways. Alternative D's design and operational characteristics, such as a reduction in the length of contact gate frontage and the requirement that all commercial passengers board through a contact gate, are designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, which is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels. Alternative D would make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient, and would have the fewest negative impacts to the local communities and the region.

PC03569-6

Comment:

- We also question the need to modify runways and gates to accommodate larger aircraft.

Response:

The Master Plan forecast projects that the fleet mix for each alternative will increase to reflect the predicted air service changes due to the capacity constraints. Please see Responses to Comments PC00599-7 and PC00593-1 for a discussion on the fleet mix assumptions used in the development of the alternatives.

The airfield improvements, including lengthening the runway, adding a center taxiway, upgrading existing facilities, and proposing construction of new facilities, were incorporated into each of the Master Plan build alternatives to provide sufficient runway length, taxiway clearness, and terminal gates for all aircraft types (existing and future) and enhance operation efficiency and safety. Please see Responses to Comments PC00022-188 and PC00563-4 for detailed discussion on the needs of airfield improvements. Without improvements to accommodate wider wingspan aircraft such as Boeing 747s in the current fleet and New Large Aircraft (NLA) anticipated in the future, operations of these aircraft would add airfield congestion and require time-consuming coordination due to less than standard taxiway separations, insufficient runway length, and small terminal gates; therefore, increased controller workload and reduced capacity would be expected.

PC03569-7

Comment:

- The events of September 11 have seriously affected airlines and aircraft manufacturers.

- Airlines are canceling orders for new aircraft and delaying delivery of new aircraft that have already been ordered.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02143-10 regarding economic conditions and the airlines' ability to replace their fleet.

PC03569-8**Comment:**

- New projections of fleet mix must reflect the financial down turn within the aviation industry
- which is poorly positioned to acquire larger aircraft,
- and unlikely to clamor for the next generation of Super Jumbo aircraft soon.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC02143-10 regarding economic conditions and the airlines' ability to replace their fleet.

PC03569-9**Comment:**

- This hearing is being held in the midst of some of the most heavily impacted communities under or near the LAX flight path.
- These and more than 100 cities, counties, transportation agencies and others in the region believe that a decentralized, truly regional airport plan that absolutely constrains LAX to 78 MAP is the right plan for Southern California.

Response:

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

PC03569-10**Comment:**

- More than 80% of the families living under the flight path are members of a minority community. Many are low income.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03569-11**Comment:**

- A truly regional airport plan improves environmental justice by reducing the share of the aviation burden borne by low income and minority communities in the region.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-EJ-3 regarding environmental justice and regional context.

PC03569-12**Comment:**

- We can have it both ways: A truly regional airport system with LAX constrained is both a more fair system, it is also a safer and more secure system.

3. Comments and Responses

- It will reduce vulnerability in our airports system by adding regional airports in Southern California that can handle significant passengers and cargo - and thereby create flexibility and redundancy in the region's aviation system.

Response:

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

PC03569-13

Comment:

- It will reduce our vulnerability by allowing greater opportunities to separate passengers from mail and cargo by using specialty cargo airports in the Inland Empire.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00599-54 regarding cargo activity.

PC03569-14

Comment:

- A truly regional plan will help to ensure that security will not take a back seat to passenger throughput.
- It will help to ensure that LAX receives only as much air traffic as it can safely handle.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC03569-12 above.

PC03569-15

Comment:

- We are grateful to Mayor Hahn for setting aside the previous four Master Plan alternatives for LAX expansion.
- We are pleased to offer this preliminary public input for the Mayor's new plan.
- But the public expects and deserves the opportunity to review the details of the new plan once completed, and the opportunity to comment on an entirely new environmental impact review that must be undertaken for this entirely new plan.
- We look forward to participating in future public hearings once the details of the new plan are drafted and LAWA completes the new EIR that must be undertaken.

Response:

Thank you for your comments. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PC03570

Wilson, Bernard

**Los Angeles International
Airport**

10/30/2001

PC03570-1

Comment:

- I'm Airport Police Chief Bernard Wilson. I've been chief for the last two and one half years and have 26 years of experience in law enforcement 22 years @ LAX employed in aviation since 16, licensed pilot since 17.
- I am not here to endorse any particular option of the LAX Master Plan under study.
- Am here to provide an update on major security steps we have taken at LAX and areas of concern for the future.
- I'm sure you are aware of the stepped up security measures that have been implemented since Sept. 11.
- There is increased scrutiny of carry-on baggage
- The ban on curbside check in continues to apply to private vehicles, though buses, shuttles, limos and taxis may unload passengers curb side.
- After a period of closure, we have reopened all but one of the parking structures inside the Central Terminal Area while keeping the open-air parking lots and one other parking structure closed.
- Private vehicles may only enter LAX from Century and Sepulveda Blvds.
- Commercial vehicles must use the 96th St. entrance where there is a security checkpoint.
- Random vehicle searches may be conducted.
- LAPD Police canine patrols capable of detecting explosives are deployed at LAX with additional canine units by airport police under review.
- California National Guard troops are monitoring baggage check in and have been requested to be used for patrol and other duties.
- There is an increase in the presence of LAPD officers beyond our normal complement in and around the airport.
- These steps and others have been taken to make LAX safe and secure for its passengers, employees and visitors. The leadership at LAWA is determined to do its part to make this airport the safest in America so passengers will again feel comfortable flying again.
- But we fully expect new federal regulations relating to safety and security to be issued in the coming weeks and months and much more needs to be done looking to the long term.
- We expect in the coming months to be working even more closely with federal agencies, including U.S. Customs, Immigration and Naturalization, U.S. Marshal Service and the FBI regarding possible new security procedures.
- Chief Parks has raised the issue of better technological surveillance of the perimeter of the LAX. And we are engaged in daily dialogue with LAPD.
- Mayor Hahn has asked LAWA to review removal of all the parking structures in the Central Terminal Area in the long term and a new terminal built east of the current facility that would serve as the check in point for all passengers and baggage.

3. Comments and Responses

- The Airport Police stands ready to work with all these agencies to make LAX the safest airport in America.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03571 Stanford, Dick City of Azusa 10/30/2001

PC03571-1

Comment:

Honorable Hearing Officers, my name is Dick Stanford. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Although I am a member of the Southern California Association of Governments' Regional Council and Transportation and Communications Committee, my testimony is presented solely in my capacity as a City Councilmember of the City of Azusa and for the City of Azusa.

Azusa is one of some 100 cities and other entities that respectfully request the City of Los Angeles to terminate plans for LAX expansion and concentrate, instead, on developing a truly regional airport system.

I hope I speak with some credibility. I helped build D/FW. I coordinated Friends of Mueller Airport in Austin, TX. I served on Ontario's Blue Ribbon Airport Committee,. And, I am a former Marine Corps fighter pilot.

In 1988, my friend, Don Ameche, now deceased, starred in a movie called "Things Change." In the movie, his life was changed drastically.

Well, since we last met, things have changed drastically in our own lives. Mayor Hahn, whom I believe is no friend of LAX expansion, has replaced Mayor Riordan, who championed LAX expansion.

The events of September 11, by extension, ended our trust in major hub airports. We are now well aware that grouping our air transportation assets makes its easier for terrorists to impact than if our air transportation system is regionalized into several airports.

Quite simply, if you put your eggs all in one basket and drop that basket, you are truly out of luck

The local example is overpowering. LAX is still trying to deal with security issues. Meanwhile, ONT almost overnight installed its hard and soft security measures and is now operating well.

That is one of the results almost all Southern California air travelers would be enjoying had regionalization of our airport system occurred long ago.

Response:

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

PC03571-2

Comment:

It was specifically because of the exclusion of the alternative of regionalization that the original draft EIR/EIS for the LAX expansion was inadequate. All alternatives are to be seriously addressed in an EIR; regionalization of the airport system was not.

Response:

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

PC03571-3

Comment:

Now, it is terribly disappointing that even though LAX expansion has been pronounced DOA, there are still projects which are part and parcel of expansion that keep popping up. Hydra is active right in Los Angeles. You cut off the LAX expansion head only to turn around and find another head that is Sepulveda widening, or another head that is changing rules to reinstate the Arbor Vitae intersection.

We respectfully ask Mayor Hahne to indicate to his many staffs that NO LAX EXPANSION means NO LAX EXPANSION...please ask the LAWA staff to quit trying to bring pieces of the expansion in via various and sundry back doors.

Response:

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

PC03571-4

Comment:

Remember, the Ontario Airport serves a population mass that would make that airport much more profitable for many more airline flights than presently operate there. Many more passengers would spend considerably less time on the freeway and concurrently less time fouling the air if their ground travel was to ONT instead of LAX.

Response:

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

PC03571-5

Comment:

But, the beautiful terminal there tends to be a ghost town because the flights are not there because the more convenient schedules are given to LAX, and because relative fare pricing deliberately forces passengers to use LAX.

LAWA, despite its protestations, can massively impact scheduling and which flights serve the Los Angeles area from which airport. We ask that they act accordingly.

Response:

Actually, the average fare for domestic flights from LAX is higher than for Burbank, Long Beach, Ontario, and Orange County. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale that discusses multi-airport markets, airline economics and passenger choice. Since passage of the federal Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, the airlines make the decision about which airports they will serve. As a general rule, airlines will choose to serve the airports near the highest concentrations of conveniently located customers. Within this general framework, however, airlines must make strategic decisions about air service to maximize their investments and gain competitive advantages. For instance, in regions with multiple airports, airlines tend to concentrate their air service at a single, well-located primary airport for reasons of economic efficiency. Concentrating service at a dominant airport also facilitates connecting service, which can significantly increase an

3. Comments and Responses

airline's market and allow even greater frequencies to more destinations. International service in particular relies on the availability of domestic connecting flights to a wide range of destinations. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning for discussions of airline deregulation and airport regulation.

PC03571-6

Comment:

Thus, we respectfully request that LAWA and the FAA join the many cities, Mayor Hahn, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, a number of Members of Congress, and the Southern California Association of Governments in supporting a truly regional system which would be more efficient and less polluting for air travel in the greater Los Angeles region.

Response:

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

PC03572	Rodine, Robert	Valley Industry and Commerce Association	10/30/2001
----------------	-----------------------	---	-------------------

PC03572-1

Comment:

Comments of Robert L. Rodine, Chairman, Aviation Committee, Valley Industry and Commerce Association ("VICA") at public hearing for LAX Master Plan before FAA and LAWA, October 30, 2001

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

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

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

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

and,

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

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

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

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

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03573 Norris, Merry Gateway to L.A., Inc. 10/30/2001

PC03573-1

Comment:

GOOD EVENING!

I am Merry Norris, Executive Director of GATEWAY TO L.A. which is a property-based Business Improvement District. Our offices are located at 6151 Century Boulevard, Los Angeles.

The GATEWAY TO L.A. BID is comprised of properties along Century Boulevard between the 405 Freeway and Sepulveda Boulevard at LAX, as well as several properties on Airport and Aviation Boulevards between Century and 98th Street.

GATEWAY TO L.A. is comprised of 13 hotels, 7,200 hotel rooms, several million square feet of office and commercial space and contains over 15,000 parking spaces

GATEWAY TO L.A.'s goal is to revitalize the properties and businesses within our borders and to create a meaningful and recognizable "GATEWAY" to the city of Los Angeles.

We have worked successfully with LAWA on improvements to the LAX Gateway area. I am sure you are aware of the beautiful enhancements including lighted pylons and majestic palm trees which have quickly become a dramatic landmark for Los Angeles.

Since well before September 11th, the GATEWAY BID has been working with the architecture firm of DMJM to develop a vibrant new vision for our area. We are hoping to partner with LAWA on these plans.

It is now very clearly time to take a different approach at LAX.

In considering a new approach, we all know that the assurance of safety and security is of paramount importance for all travelers

Any future changes are an opportunity for a win-win situation for businesses in and around LAX and for our neighbors- these opportunities would create new jobs, provide large scale entertainment, develop more parking and produce safer modes of transportation.

In collaboration with DMJM we have been developing BIG IDEAS which we call: AEROTROPOLIS - a gateway, a destination point which exemplifies and proliferates the brightness, the grandness and the bigness of the city in which we live: LOS ANGELES. We look forward to sharing our vision with you. Thank you for your time.

Response:

Comment noted. The FAA and LAWA look forward to an interactive dialogue with Gateway to L.A. Inc.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03574	Cabrales, Luis	California League of Conservation Voters Education Fund	10/30/2001
----------------	-----------------------	--	-------------------

PC03574-1

Comment:

Good evening ladies and gentlemen My name is Luis Cabrales, I am Assistant Director of Outreach at the California League of Conservation Voters Education Fund.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03574-2

Comment:

According to the Coalition for Clean Air, the Los Angeles International Airport is the second largest industrial smog source in the Los Angeles area.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01186-4.

PC03574-3

Comment:

For many years low income communities and communities of color located under the airport's flight path have endured this source of pollution. The proposed expansion, will intensify the airport's environmental impact in those communities.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00017-190 and PC02203-33.

PC03574-4

Comment:

I am also a resident of Pico Rivera, one of the many communities of color located under the proposed LAX expansion plan's path way. But I have also lived all my life in Southeast L.A. For many years I too, had to endure the noise and air pollution created by the airplanes that flew just above my home, school and parks where I lived, studied and played.

Response:

Comment noted.

PC03574-5

Comment:

The proposed expansion of LAX, which according to the environmental impact report, has significant impacts from aircraft noise and pollution on low income communities and communities of color, making it one of the most important issues the communities under the airport's flight path face.

Thus, it is time for L.A. officials to pay attention to the environmental justice implications that the LAX has had, and how its expansion will exacerbate the pollution rates of the communities of color under its path way.

Response:

Noise and air toxic effects on minority and low-income communities were addressed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Environmental Justice Program outlined in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Final EIS/EIR recognizes the potential disproportionate effects that the Master Plan would have on minority and low-income populations and goes beyond basic mitigation proposals to address the unique needs of these communities. With input gathered through environmental justice workshops and an extensive public outreach effort, the Environmental Justice Program represents a full and good faith effort to identify all possible means for avoiding, reducing or off-setting the impacts of the Master Plan in a manner that addresses the needs and preferences of affected minority and/or low-income communities in accordance with NEPA and CEQA requirements. Regarding fairness, with the orientation of the runways at LAX, it is inevitable that increases in aircraft activity and associated noise will have a greater burden communities to the east of LAX than those to the north and south. It should be noted however, that LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, has the least impacts of the Master Plan build alternatives and would limit operations at LAX to levels that would be similar to what would occur with existing facilities if the Master Plan were not approved. Please also see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities, Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits, and Topical Response TR-EJ-3 regarding environmental justice and regional context.

PC03574-6

Comment:

IT IS IMPORTANT TO MENTION THAT MANY OF THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN IMPACTED BY HEALTH PROBLEMS DUE TO POLLUTION ARE THE CHILDREN, SPOUSES & PARENTS OF UNION MEMBERS AND EVEN UNION MEMBERS THEMSELVES.

SO FAR THE JOBS & MONEY CREATED BY THE LAX HAVE NOT IMPROVED THE HEALTH STATUS OF THE LATINO & AFRICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITIES THAT SURROUND THE AIRPORT, AND THE INCREASE IN POLLUTION RATES THAT WILL RESULT FORM THE EXPANSION WILL ONLY EXACERBATE THOSE HEALTH PROBLEMS.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments AL00017-190 and PC02203-33.

PC03575

Chin, Kim

None Provided

1/4/2002

PC03575-1

Comment:

LAX has expanded flight operations over my city and home to intolerable levels. The noise is very disturbing to our quality of life and peace of mind. Stop this abuse of our homes and families.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00051-3 for a discussion of the overflights of Monterey Park and adjacent communities. For further information on the effect of these approaches, also see Topical Response TR-N-3, regarding aircraft flight procedures, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-3.5 regarding the effects of elevation on noise contours.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03576 Wang, Junce None Provided 1/4/2002

PC03576-1

Comment:

The noise is very disturbing to our quality of life. Please stop this abuse of our homes and families.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00051-3 for discussion of the overflights of Monterey Park and adjacent communities.

PC03577 Chiu, Holly & Robert None Provided 1/4/2002

PC03577-1

Comment:

Please stop the operations of flights over our city. This has becoming intolerable and causes stress to our daily life. The citizens or residents of Monterey Park should not have to put with this kind of abuse.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00051-3 for discussion of the overflights of Monterey Park and adjacent communities.

PC03578 Chien, James None Provided 1/4/2002

PC03578-1

Comment:

When aircrafts fly over Monterey Park area, the noise is too high and disturb the normal life of people live there. Stop fly over M/P area!

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00051-3 for discussion of the overflights of Monterey Park and adjacent communities.

PC03579 Kuruma, Carole None Provided 1/2/2002

PC03579-1

Comment:

I respectfully request that the air traffic over Monterey Park be re-routed to an industrial area where noise pollution is not a concern.

Response:

There is no pattern of noise compatible land uses leading into LAX that also provides for the safe and efficient movement of aircraft. All directions of approach from the east result in aircraft overflying populated areas. Also please see Response to Comment AL00051-3.

PC03579-2**Comment:**

Over-flights over Monterey Park are a nuisance and disturbance to our once quiet city. The noise from these aircraft drown out conversations and cause airwave interruptions. Local schools in the Monterey hills are also disrupted because of the loud noise.

Response:

As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Monterey Park is outside the current ANMP boundaries that define areas exposed to high noise levels (based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL or greater noise contours). As also shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased from 1992 conditions. As shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Monterey Park is also outside of areas exposed to high single event noise levels (as defined by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour). As analyzed in Section 4.1, Noise and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, no impacts on schools (based on new exposure to the 65 CNEL, an increase of 1.5 CNEL, or single event noise levels that result in classroom disruption) located in Monterey Park were identified. Therefore, based on these thresholds presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4), no significant noise impact from aircraft noise has been identified for the City of Monterey Park. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.5 regarding the effect of elevation on noise contours.

PC03580**Fujii, Mieko****None Provided****12/28/2001****PC03580-1****Comment:**

AIR TRAFFIC NOISE IS DISRUPTIVE TO OUR LIFE IN MONTEREY PARK, ESPECIALLY OVER THE HILLS IN OUR CITY. T.V. RECEPTION IS INTERRUPTED, AND CONVERSATIONS INSIDE AND OUTSIDE OUR HOME IS DROWN OUT.

Response:

As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Monterey Park is outside the current ANMP boundaries that define areas exposed to high noise levels (based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL or greater noise contours). As also shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased from 1992 conditions. As shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Monterey Park is also outside of areas exposed to high single event noise levels (as defined by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour). Therefore, based on the thresholds presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4), no significant noise impact from aircraft noise has been identified for the City of Monterey Park. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.5 regarding the effect of elevation on noise contours.

PC03580-2**Comment:**

PLEASE MOVE THE FLIGHT PATTERNS AWAY FROM OUR CITY.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC03579-1.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03581 Fujii, Glenn & Juue None Provided 12/28/2001

PC03581-1

Comment:

The noise from aircrafts are a nuisance to our neighborhood and disrupt conversations, television reception and concentration. Our homes, schools and offices were not designed to keep out such noise pollution.

Response:

As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Monterey Park is outside the current ANMP boundaries that define areas exposed to high noise levels (based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL or greater noise contours). As also shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased from 1992 conditions. As shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Monterey Park is also outside of areas exposed to high single event noise levels (as defined by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour). Therefore, based on the thresholds presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4), no significant noise impact from aircraft noise has been identified for the City of Monterey Park. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.5 regarding the effect of elevation on noise contours.

PC03581-2

Comment:

Perhaps air traffic should be re-routed to the industrial areas, only a mile away from our once quiet town.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC03579-1.

PC03582 No Author Identified, L.A. Fly Fishing Club 1/7/2002

PC03582-1

Comment:

Since 1995, LAX increased air traffic over my neighborhood.

Response:

The airlines have increased flights not just at LAX, but throughout the Southern California area as well as across the country. After recovery from the recent recession, airline service is forecasted to continue growing. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-6.2.

PC03582-2

Comment:

The noise from these aircraft drown out outdoor and indoor conversations, as well as telephonic and television reception.

The over flights are a nuisance and disturbance to a once quiet city.

Response:

As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Monterey Park is outside the current ANMP boundaries that define areas exposed to high noise levels (based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL or greater noise contours). As also shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S4.2-3 of the

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased from 1992 conditions. As shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Monterey Park is also outside of areas exposed to high single event noise levels (as defined by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour). Therefore, based on the thresholds presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4), no significant noise impact from aircraft noise has been identified for the City of Monterey Park. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.5 regarding the effect of elevation on noise contours.

PC03582-3

Comment:

I request that LAX consider an alternate route or decrease the air traffic in our area.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC03579-1 and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

PC03582-4

Comment:

Helicopters noise are also becoming a major noise problem in are city.

Response:

Monterey Park is located between the 10 and 60 freeways to the north and south and the 710 and 605 to the west and east. As a result media related "traffic watch" helicopter operations will occur on a daily basis. LAWA does not have any control over these operations nor does the FAA when the operators are flying under visual flight rules (VFR). Also please see Response to Comment PC02548-3.

PC03583

Kagawa, Nancy

None Provided

1/7/2002

PC03583-1

Comment:

The noise from aircrafts are a nuisance to our neighborhood and disrupt conversations, television reception and concentration. Our homes, schools, churches and offices were not designed to keep out the increased noise pollution.

Response:

As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Monterey Park is outside the current ANMP boundaries that define areas exposed to high noise levels (based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL or greater noise contours). As also shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased from 1992 conditions. As shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Monterey Park is also outside of areas exposed to high single event noise levels (as defined by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour). Therefore, based on the thresholds presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4), no significant noise impact from aircraft noise has been identified for the City of Monterey Park. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.5 regarding the effect of elevation on noise contours.

PC03583-2

Comment:

An alternate flight pattern is requested; perhaps air traffic should be re-routed to the industrial areas, only a mile away from our once quiet town.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC03579-1

PC03584

Kagawa, Hideo

None Provided

1/7/2002

PC03584-1

Comment:

As a parent and resident of Monterey Park, I am concerned about the noise and air pollution caused by the planes flying over our city.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00051-3 for discussion of the overflights of Monterey Park and adjacent communities. The 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.

PC03584-2

Comment:

Students in local schools are often interrupted by the increase in noise caused by the low-flying planes over the hills.

Conversations, as well as television reception is interrupted,

Response:

As shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Monterey Park is outside the current ANMP boundaries that define areas exposed to high noise levels (based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL or greater noise contours). As also shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased from 1992 conditions. As shown on Figure S4.2-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Monterey Park is also outside of areas exposed to high single event noise levels (as defined by the 94 dBA SEL noise contour). As analyzed in Section 4.1, Noise and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, no impacts on schools (based on new exposure to the 65 CNEL, an increase of 1.5 CNEL, or single event noise levels that result in classroom disruption) located in Monterey Park were identified. Therefore, based on these thresholds presented in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.4), no significant noise impact from aircraft noise has been identified for the City of Monterey Park. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.5 regarding the effect of elevation on noise contours.

PC03584-3

Comment:

And it seems that the traffic has greatly increased over the years. Please consider our concern and re-route the air traffic.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00051-3 for discussion of the overflights of Monterey Park and adjacent communities. Also, please see Response to Comment PC03579-1

PC03585 Chin, Kien & Vinnie None Provided 1/7/2002

PC03585-1

Comment:

The low-flying of airplanes is causing so much noise and pollution that disturbs the peace of of our quiet neighborhood.

We love our city and do not want to see such abuse and be taken advantage of. There must be another way.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00051-3 and AL00051-4 for discussion of the overflights of Monterey Park and adjacent communities.

PC03586 Pei, Terry & Danny None Provided 1/6/2002

PC03586-1

Comment:

The noise level from the low flying planes is getting out of hand. These planes should not be flying over residential areas which really disturb our peace of mind.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC03579-1, AL00051-3, and AL00051-4.

PC03586-2

Comment:

In addition, pollution from the engine exhaust falls right on top of our homes. Nobody wants it and nobody likes it either.

Response:

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

PC03617 Jensen, Richard None Provided 2/28/2001

PC03617-1

Comment:

I am concerned about the infrastructure of the county of Los Angeles.

At the present time I am focusing in on the expansion of LAX, but a full scale expansion of LAX may not be feasible financially or with the condemnation of certain homes and the related problems of passenger aircraft noise over the northern part of Inglewood.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PC03617-2

Comment:

What does make sense to me is to expand the freight terminal infrastructure of LAX westward along the southern end of LAX.

(2)

If such a project could be done for say about \$2.1 billion, there might be a good chance of having this phase of the LAX expansion effort approved in the Congress.

Does this idea make sense to you too?

Response:

Comment noted. During the concept development phase, a number of different airport configurations were considered. Some of the Master Plan alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS/EIR include passenger and ancillary facilities westward along the southern end of LAX. However, all developable land along the south border of LAX is constrained by the convergence of the southern property line and the alignment of the runways.

PFA00001 Roque, Ernestine OSAGE Neighbors Association 5/17/2001

PFA00001-1

Comment:

I oppose LAX expansion because it would:

Response:

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

PFA00001-2

Comment:

- Increase air pollution due to traffic (both air and cars/cargo-carrying trucks) would cause. The 5 identified major air pollutant species from this traffic and operations are volatile organic compounds (VOCs), nitrogen oxides (NOx), soot or particulate matter (PM), carbon monoxide (CO), and sulfur dioxide (SOx). These 5 air pollutants are present in airplane, automobile and truck exhaust gases.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollutant increase.

PFA00001-3

Comment:

- Increase air safety risks with more planes operating in close quarters.

Response:

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

PFA00001-4

Comment:

- Create more airport noise; impacting a larger population, causing stress, illness, reduction in children's learning ability and degradation in property values.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-52 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to school disruption associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PFA00001-5

Comment:

- Dramatically worsen traffic congestion on I-405, I-105 and local arterials from thousands of passenger cars, vans and cargo-carrying trucks.

Response:

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

PFA00001-6

Comment:

- Aggravate environmental justice issues. A disproportionate share of low income and minority populations are subjected to increased health and safety impacts and/or displaced from their homes.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-190.

PFA00001-7

Comment:

- Destroy local homes, schools, libraries, parks and businesses to provide room for more airport support facilities.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01487-7; please refer to Response to Comment PC01487-7.

PFA00001-8

Comment:

- Divert attention and funds from the expansion of other airport facilities where future population growth is located.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PFB00001

Kerns, Georgia

None Provided

6/8/2001

PFB00001-1

Comment:

We are a concerned Westchester family. The expansion of LAX into our neighborhood would drastically effect our lives.

Response:

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

PFB00001-2

Comment:

As it is we deal with the increased traffic from the airport shuttles,

Response:

The primary surface transportation components of the alternatives, such as the Ring Road and LAX Expressway, would benefit commercial vehicles by encouraging them to use the primary freeways and arterial routes and stay off local streets. Combined with the locations for the two commercial vehicle staging areas, it is anticipated that most commercial vehicles would find it beneficial to use these new facilities, rather than off-load onto surface streets. In Alternative D, most commercial vehicles would use a staging area south of Arbor Vitae, which would be near I-405. This location should encourage many commercial vehicle drivers to stay on I-405 and not off-load onto adjacent surface streets.

PFB00001-3

Comment:

hear the flights that come in late at night and others that fly at times when they are not to be flying.

Response:

Comment noted. There is not, nor ever has been, a nighttime curfew in effect at LAX. However, there are special operating rules for night flight activity and ground run-ups. For discussion of night noise and LAWA regulations please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, particularly night run-up activity, and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement. In addition, please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for single events on nighttime awakenings.

PFB00001-4

Comment:

If the need for more space is in question I do not understand why Lancaster/Palmdale or even El Toro are not be considered more seriously. It seems to me that the expansion of LAX into this neighborhood is only a temporary solution for a problem that demands a more permanent solution. Before you take much more time debating about expanding LAX, don't you need to think more long-term growth to make a better decision?

Response:

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

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

PFC00001 Deyden, Mary & Paul None Provided

6/8/2001

PFC00001-1

Comment:

I would like to express my concerns about the proposed expansion of LAX. The surrounding family communities have continually had to bear the increased traffic, noise and air pollution that the airport currently brings into our community. The surrounding communities are at their wits end putting up with these dangerous circumstances. By expanding the airport it will increase all factors mentioned and will make the surrounding communities even more miserable.

Response:

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

PFC00001-2

Comment:

I actually do not understand why the expansion at LAX is being considered. I thought there were plans for an airport in the Lancaster/Palmdale area. What about the El Toro Air Force Base? It already has the space, not to mention the runways. It seems to me that expanding LAX into the surrounding communities is a temporary solution for a much larger problem. How long will it be before LAX needs to

3. Comments and Responses

expand again? Shouldn't a more permanent solution be considered before much more time and money is wasted and the quality of lives if the community members is brought to a deplorable level?

Response:

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

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PFD00001 No Author Identified, None Provided

PFD00001-1

Comment:

After months of delay, Los Angeles International Airport officials have finally submitted their plan for the expansion of the airport. We are in the public comment phase of this proposed expansion. I fought to force LAX to expand the comment period from the normal 45 days to an unprecedented 180 days. As your Congresswoman, I intend to submit comments and want to be sure that your opinions are included. The voice of our community must be heard. To do this, I need your help. Please fill out the following questionnaire and return it to my district office right away.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Congresswoman Maxine Waters

1) Are you currently aware of the plans for the expansion of LAX?

Yes No

2) How did you find out about the plans for the expansion of LAX?

- Radio reports
- Information from Congresswoman Waters
- Attended community/neighborhood meetings put on by the airport
- Read local newspaper
- TV news/shows
- Other (please explain)

3) Have you done anything to learn more about the expansion plans?

Yes No

As you may know, LAWA (the organization which operates LAX) plans to expand the airport so they can increase the number of flights per day that can land at the airport. Along with increasing the number of flights, LAWA is planning construction, which includes a ring road from the 405 freeway and expanded warehouse space.

4) Do you feel the expansion of LAX will have a positive, negative, or no effect on the following?

- Your health
Positive Negative No effect

-Your children
Positive Negative No effect

- Your quality of life
Positive Negative No effect

- Traffic in your neighborhood
Positive Negative No effect

- Your community overall
Positive Negative No effect

5) Using a scale of one to ten, where one is never and ten is very frequently, how often do you or anyone in your household hear airplane noise in an average day? (Please circle number)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

6) Do you believe the expansion of LAX will worsen, lessen or have no effect on the current level of airplane noise?

Worsen Lessen No effect

7) How often, if ever, are you or is anyone in your household awoken by airplanes?

- Never
- A few times a year
- Monthly
- More than once a month
- Weekly
- More than once a week
- Nightly
- Several times a night

8) Do you believe the proposed expansion of LAX will increase, decrease or have no effect on the number of times you are awoken by airplanes?

Increase Decrease No effect

9) Does airplane noise inhibit you and/or your family from enjoying outside activities?

Yes No

10) Do you feel the expansion of LAX will negatively, positively or have no impact on your future enjoyment of outside activities?

Negatively Positively No impact

11) Do you notice airport traffic (i.e. large trucks, airport shuttles, etc.) in your neighborhood?

Yes No

12) Do you feel this traffic will increase, decrease or stay the same after the expansion of the airport?

Increase Decrease Stay the same

13) Has your home ever been retrofitted with sound insulation?

Yes No

14) If yes, would you say these improvements have helped or had no effect?

Helped Had no effect

3. Comments and Responses

15) Do you or does anyone in your household have any of the following medical conditions?

Asthma

Other respiratory problems Please explain

Cardiovascular problems Please explain

16) How many people live in your home?

1 2 3 4 or more

17) How many are children under the age of ten?

1 2 3 4 or more

18) Do you or anyone in your household currently work for LAX or associated businesses (i.e. freight forwarders, warehouses, local car rental agencies, local hotels, importers/exporters, etc)?

Yes No

19) How often, if at all, do you or does anyone in your household use LAX for travel?

Never times per year month week

(please circle appropriate time frame)

20) What is your zip code?

Response:

The various issues related to LAX included in the survey questionnaire were addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with further clarification provided in various topical responses provided in this Final EIS/EIR. Specifically: impacts to human health were addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and discussed in Topical Responses TR-HRA-1, TR-HRA-2 and TR-HRA-3; quality of life issues were discussed in Topical Response TR-LU-1; both on- and off-airport traffic impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR; noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR; the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakenings in homes were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR; impacts related to outdoor noise levels were addressed in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and discussed in Topical Response TR-LU-4; airport-related traffic impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with cargo truck traffic discussed in Topical Response TR-ST-1; the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) was discussed in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and in Topical Response TR-LU-3; and, employment was addressed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PFE00001

Chou, Hsiu-Mei

None Provided

7/15/2001

PFE00001-1

Comment:

I am against any Plans to end or curtail services for General Aviation at LAX. LAX must continue to provide runways, terminals and services to support all small aircraft, both small jets and propeller planes. To reduce these services which are currently available at LAX will put an unfair burden upon all the communities at other airports in the Los Angeles area.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01496-1 regarding general aviation activity and facilities at LAX.

PFE00001-2

Comment:

Forcing General Aviation to airports other than LAX will impact the surrounding communities with excesses of noise and pollution, threatening resident's health and safety. Increased air traffic will adversely effect automobile traffic in these areas. The noise and sight of the jets roaring low overhead will impair the learning of children in schools near these airports. The natural environments of theses communities must be protected, too. Shifting any LAX air traffic to neighboring Los Angeles airports is disruptive and is not an acceptable consequence of the Plan.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-4 regarding potential environmental impacts at surrounding other airports as a result of the LAX Master Plan.

PFE00001-3

Comment:

LAX should remain the central point for ALL TYPES of air traffic in the Los Angeles area. I believe three, or more, FBO (fixed base operator) facilities at LAX to service non-commercial small private and business jets and propeller planes are necessary to support General Aviation at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01496-1 regarding general aviation activity and facilities at LAX. Currently there are two FBOs at LAX and it is the decision of individual FBO companies to initiate service at LAX. LAWA does not have control over the addition of another FBO.

PFE00001-4

Comment:

As for the large commercial jets, the LAX Master Plan should continue to view LAX as the central focus of commercial air traffic for the Los Angeles area and should be responsibly improved or expanded as necessary to accommodate increased traffic demands. LAX is good for the city economy and improvements have been made to mitigate the problems the airport creates.

Response:

Comment noted.

PFE00001-5

Comment:

Meanwhile Ontario, Palmdale and El Toro can be expanded to efficiently spread the air traffic around Southern California in ways that enhance the lives, environment and economies of these other communities.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

3. Comments and Responses

PFF00001 Cervin, Jacqueline Friends of Sunset Park 7/21/2001
Neighborhood Assoc., Ocean
Park Community Organization &
Other Residents of Santa
Monica, Venice, Mar Vista &
West Los Angeles

PFF00001-1

Comment:

Subject: Endorsement of Santa Monica City Council's Position on the LAX Master Plan Alternatives

We the undersigned endorse the following points approved by the Santa Monica City Council on July 10, 2001:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PFF00001-2

Comment:

1. Opposition to all of the LAX Master Plan Alternatives, as currently proposed, due to the significant and unavoidable environmental impacts associated therewith;

Response:

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

PFF00001-3

Comment:

2. Opposition unless the DEIR (Draft Environmental Impact Report) fully analyzes the environmental consequences of the Master Plan and provides acceptable mitigation for impacts on Santa Monica;

3. Opposition unless the Master Plan provides for guaranteed infrastructure, facilities, and airside acreage to fully support transient business aircraft and fixed-base business operations, including a minimum of three fixed-base operations for business jets and an exclusive runway for small to mid-size jets;

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.

PFF00001-4

Comment:

4. Opposition unless the Master Plan phasing provides for surface transportation enhancements to coincide with or precede any air transportation enhancements; and

Response:

The intent is get the transportation improvements in place as soon as possible. Therefore, most major transportation improvements for Alternatives A, B, and C would be in place in Phase I, including the majority of the Ring Road. The LAX Expressway would be started in Phase I, but may not be completed until Phase II. The Green Line extension would be completed after 2010. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included construction phasing information for Alternative D. Note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road.

PFF00001-5**Comment:**

5. Opposition unless the relocation and expansion of the LAX Transit Center is included as a Master Plan commitment at a location that will promote the use of transit.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D would include an Intermodal Transportation Center conveniently located on the airport's east side with direct people mover access to the terminals. This alternative was detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan for more information.

PFF00001-6**Comment:**

As residents directly impacted by an increase of jet traffic at the Santa Monica Airport, we are particularly concerned about the proposed LAX Master Plan Alternatives 62% REDUCTION in acreage dedicated to General Aviation Operations. In the last three years, Jet Operations have doubled at Santa Monica Airport. Our local airport was never intended to accommodate the type of jet aircraft currently using its facilities. There is NO Safety Zone at the ends of the runways. Only the width of a street separates residences from both ends of the runway. The closest home is only 220ft from the runway terminus. Two gas stations are across the street from the east side of the runway. Aircraft control hours end at 9:00pm even though aircraft are allowed to depart until 11:00pm and arrive 24 hours a day.

Diverting additional Business Jet Operations to small general aviation Airports on the Westside, including Santa Monica, Torrance, and Hawthorne is NOT a solution to LAX's overcrowded runways if the ramifications of this option is to create safety hazards and additional problems at other airports.

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.

PFG00001 Press, Jay & Buffy None Provided 7/12/2001

PFG00001-1**Comment:**

I am opposed to any expansion of the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). My home is located between Lincoln Blvd., Manchester Ave., Pershing Dr. and Westchester Parkway.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PFG00001-2

Comment:

Due to the proximity of my home to LAX, any expansion of LAX would have dramatic impact on my neighborhood and on the value of my property.

Response:

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

PFG00001-3

Comment:

Your web site (www.lax2015.org) lists several alternatives to developing LAX. All of the alternatives include a proposal to develop the vacant land bordering Westchester Parkway. The interactive map on your web site refers to this area as "Westchester Southside". The "Westchester Southside" proposal includes building offices, retail spaces, restaurants, recreational areas, industrial and commercial areas. This proposal places these types of businesses and services behind my home! I feel that developing this portion of vacant land is unnecessary. Our community does not need anymore retail space, restaurants, or office space.

To the south of my neighborhood, the development of Playa Vista continues. The Playa Vista development includes 3,000 residential units, low-income housing, 3.2 million square feet of office space, retail areas, schools, and is expected to generate 57,000 new jobs. To the east of my neighborhood is the Howard Hughes Center. This development includes offices, retail, restaurants, and a movie theater. Based on this information, I feel that our community has more than enough retail space, restaurants, and office space available. We do not need any development in "Westchester Southside".

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01030-3; please refer to Response to Comment PC01030-3.

PFG00001-4

Comment:

Your proposal to expand LAX would generate 425,000 new jobs. Combine this with the 57,000 new jobs in Playa Vista and this means that 482,000 people will be in my neighborhood every day.

Response:

This comment is identical to Comment PC01030-4; please see Response to Comment PC01030-4.

PFG00001-5

Comment:

Your proposal includes building new roads and expanding the Green Line. However, you cannot build enough roads to accommodate the daily traffic generated by 482,000 people. This doesn't even include airline passengers!

Response:

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

PFG00001-6**Comment:**

Our neighborhood already has enough traffic problems. Lincoln and Sepulveda Boulevards are the main arteries in and out of Westchester. These roads are already overburdened. Any expansion of LAX, including developing "Westchester Southside" would make it impossible to get in and out of Westchester.

Response:

Please see Topical Responses TR-ST-4 and TR-LU-2 regarding impacts on Westchester.

PFG00001-7**Comment:**

I urge you to not expand LAX and the "Westchester Southside" area. In closing, thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion about the proposed expansion of LAX.

Response:

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

PFH00001 Hemesa, Jose None Provided

PFH00001-1**Comment:**

Suggested Areas for Input/Comentarios, sugerencias o ideas

1. Air Quality/Calidad Ambiental
2. Beautification of Neighborhoods/Business Districts/Embellcimiento de Vecindarios/Distritos de Negocios
3. Business Assistance Center/Centro de Ayuda a Negocios
4. Business Empowerment Zone/Zona de Autorización para Negocios
5. Car Wash/Detailing Vouchers /Vales de Lavado de Autos/Detalles
6. Construction of a High School/Construcción de una Escuela Secundaria
7. Contracting Opportunities/Oportunidades de Contratación
8. Educational Facilities/Facilidades Educativas
9. Educational Programs/Programas Educativos
10. Employment Training/Entrenamiento de Empleo
11. Flight Schedules/Horario de Vuelos
12. Health Programs/Programas de Salud y Bienestar
13. Home Improvements/Mejoras del Hogar
14. Noise Reduction/Reducción de Ruido
15. Recreational Facilities/Facilidades Recreativas
16. Road and Sidewalk Improvements/Mejoras de Caminos y Aceras
17. Shuttle/Vanpool (Neighborhood)/Transportación Colectiva/Vecindarios
18. Sound Wall Along 405 Freeway/Pared de Contra Sonidos por el Fwy 405
19. Sound-Proofing / Contra Sonidos
20. Traffic Congestion/Congestión de Tráfico
21. Widening of Streets/Ensanche de las Calles
22. Youth Programs/Programas Juveniles

Response:

As stated on page 4-337, in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA received a substantial number of recommendations for mitigation measures and other benefits relating to environmental justice concerns from environmental justice workshops, comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR, and subsequent community outreach. All recommendations were

3. Comments and Responses

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, which incorporates a number of these recommendations, 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.

PFI00001 Rivas, Jose L.U.L.A.C.

PFI00001-1

Comment:

We, the Latino residents and business owners of Lennox, Inglewood and South Central endorse this Petition that identifies our issues and needs as a direct result of our close proximity to the Los Angeles World Airport. We have chosen to address our concerns by means of this Petition in order to contribute to the planning process in a constructive and proactive manner and to ensure that Latinos are explicitly included in any and all actions considered or taken by the Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA).

[1. Jose Rivas]
Community Clinics
Homeless Outreach Centers

[2. Ruby Rivas]
1) Large library 2) with more Spanish books.
Construction of a High School.
3) Senior Citizen Center

[3. Manuel Hernandez]
More High Schools for Lennox School District.

[4. Imelda Hernandez]
Childcare centers & after school programs.

[5. Laura Hernandez]
Youth Programs for Middle Schools in Lenox

[6. Crystal Hernandez]
After school programs & more high schools, skate parks

[7. Brenda Garcia]
Youth programs, reading programs, High School Diploma programs

[8. Ruben Garcia]
Libraries, Senior Citizen programs
Youth programs, Crime Prevention Prog.

[9. Bulfino Bautista]

Senior Citizen Centers, Free Clinics,
Meals for Senior Citizens

[10. Abigail Bautista]

English classes at community parks and more Senior Citizen activities.

[11. Silvia Vargas]

Sports programs, Employment training
Skate Parks, Childcare programs

[12. Juan Carlos Vargas, Jr.]

Skate Parks, Afterschool sports
Library books & Programs

[13. Silvia Rodriguez]

Noise Reduction

[14. Miguel Going]

Nose Reduction

[15. Robert Villegas]

Air Quality

[16. Jose Gomez]

Youth Programs

[17. Hector (Unreadable)]

Education options.

[18. (Unreadable Unreadable)]

Flight scheduning

[19. Cassandra Bethley]

Noise Reduction

[20. Ambrosio (Unreadable)]

TRAFFIC CONGESTION

[21. Santa (Unreadable)]

Educational Programs

[22. Hilda Gallo]

1. Programas Juveniles/1. Youth Programs
2. Sound-proofing
3. Entrenamiento de Empleo./3. Employment Training.
4. Programas de Salud y Bienestar/4. Health Programs

[23. Esperanza Camacho]

- 1) Job training center
- 2) After school education programs

[24. Mayra Jerez]

Programas de Trabajo/Work and Education Programs

[25. Sandra Sanchez]

Mas eventos a la comonidad /More events for the community to be more united
Para que estemos mas unidos

[26. Felipe Hernandez]

3. Comments and Responses

Educacion, Programas de trabajo y Segunda a la comunidad/Education, Work Programs and Community Safety

[27. Ana M. Herrera]

Programas de trabajo y Programas de Educacion favor juvenes y Adultos./Job Programs and Education Programs for Youths and Adults.

[28. David Hernandez]

Educacion Bilingue/Bilingual Education

Escuelor de appendizoje para trabajos/Job Training Schools

[29. Elvia Gonzalez]

Educacion para Adultos/Education for Adults

[30. Claudia Damian]

Programas de trabajo y Educacion/Work and Education Programs

[31. Esperanza Cigarroa]

Programas de trabajo y Educacion/Work and Education Programs

[32. Teresa Cruz]

[No Text]

[33. Eddy Oteda]

Traffic congestion

[34. Ruben Goussen]

More recreational facilities (Parks)

Money for compensation

[35. Lorena Navarro]

Sound proof / car washes

Money for compensation

[36. Walter Garcia]

Facilidades educaciones/Educational Facilities

[37. Victor Alvarado]

Mas boses/More buses

[38. William Ramierz]

15

[39. Saul Zepeda]

[No text]

[40. Refugio Almodor]

[No Text]

[41. Alonsa Calderon]

[No Text]

[42. Elena Medina]

[No Text]

[43. Vitolino Alvarez]

[No Text]

[44. Migeul Argel Torres]

7 - 10 - 12 - 17

[45. Maria Diaz]

[No Text]

[46. Vicente Chevez]
7

[47. Sonia Lopez]
[No Text]

[48. Concepcion Ruiz]
[No Text]

[49. (Unreadable Unreadable)]
[No Text]

[50. Javier Jimenez]
[No Text]

[51. (Unreadable Unreadable)]
[No Text]

[52. Josefina Munoz]
[No Text]

[53. Emiliana Lopez]
[No Text]

[54. (Unreadable Unreadable)]
[No Text]

[55. Joaquin Merino]
[No Text]

[56. Rosa (Unreadable)]
[No Text]

[57. (Unreadable Unreadable)]
[No Text]

[58. (Unreadable Unreadable)]
[No Text]

[59. Romio (Unreadable)]
[No Text]

[60. (Unreadable) Ponce]
[No Text]

[61. Sonia Rosales]
Mejores beneficios a la comunidad/More benefits for the community

[62. (Unreadable Unreadable)]
Salud y bienestar/Health and well being

[63. Barron Luis]
Entrenamiento para empleos/Employment Training

[64. Maria Miranda]
[No text]

[65. Dara Delgado]
[No text]

3. Comments and Responses

[66. Roberto (Unreadable)]
[No text]

[67. (Unreadable) Velasquez]
[No text]

[68. (Unreadable) Ayola]
[No text]

[69. Maria Garcia]
[No text]

[70. Maria Ruano]
[No text]

[71. Nicolas Marquez]
[No text]

[72. Maria Aguirre]
[No text]

[73. Elvio Gonzales]
18

[74. Xlapoleon Pasparko]
[No text]

[75. Seferina (Unreadable)]
[No text]

[76. Mirna (Unreadable)]
[No text]

[77. Jose Canales]
[No text]

[78. Leticia (Unreadable)]
12

[79. Franciso Rodriguez]
[No text]

[80. Margarita (Unreadable)]
[No text]

[81. (Unreadable Unreadable)]
[No text]

[82. Jose Rherrera]
10

[83. Silvia Ortega]
[No text]

[84. Frank (Unreadable)]
[No text]

[85. (Unreadable Unreadable)]
[No text]

[86. Rosa E. Diaz]
[No text]

[87. Jose (Unreadable)]
[No text]

[88. Rosalina Cabuela]
Y aceras mejoras de caminos/Better pavement of roads

[89. Victoria Gutierrez]
Programas de entrenamiento/Training Programs

[90. Rosa Ramirez]
Programas de entrenamiento/Training Programs

[91. Maria Sotelo]
Programas de entrenamiento/Training Programs

[92. Maria Franco]
Mejores beneficios/Better Benefits

[93. Maria Mendoza]
Mejuras en todos los aspectos/Improvement in all aspects

[94. Enrique Mendoza]
Mejores beneficios/Better benefits

[95. Jesus Medina]
Mejores beneficios/Better benefits

[96. Norberto Villa]
Limpiar calles de la ciudad/Clean the streets of the city

[97. Ma Angelica Chamagua]
Programas juveniles/Youth Programs

[98. Maria C. (Unreadable)]
[No text]

[99. Ameliz Rodriguez]
[No text]

[100. Maria (Unreadable)]
[No text]

[101. Dinoro E (unreadable)]
[No text]

[102. Mario Garcia]
[No text]

[103. (Unreadable) Garcia]
[No text]

[104. Boris O. Garcia]
[No text]

[105. (Unreadable) Rosales]
[No text]

[106. Angelica Ortega]
[No text]

[107. Sidrario (Unreadable)]

3. Comments and Responses

[No text]

[108. Gabriel del Campo]
[No text]

[109. Adolfo Arevalo]
[No text]

[110. Elmer Vasquez]
[No text]

[111. Concepcion (Unreadable)]
[No text]

[112. Vitolino Alvarez]
[No text]

[113. Alvaro Ayala]
[No text]

[114. Blanca L Cruz]
[No text]

[115. Silena Ponce]
[No text]

[116. Maria C (Unreadable)]
[No text]

[117. Javier Gonzalez]
[No text]

[118. Jose Morales]
[No text]

[119. Mario Hernandez]
[No text]

[120. Vicente Ponce]
[No text]

[121. Franklin Carrera]
[No text]

[122. Artoro Alvarez]
[No text]

[123. Abraham Gutierrez]
[No text]

[124. Edwin Dominguez]
[No text]

[125. Luisa (Unreadable)]
[No text]

[126. Leopoldo Cruz]
[No text]

[127. (Unreadable Unreadable)]
[No text]

[128. (Unreadable Unreadable)]
[No text]

[129. Jose Ferman]
7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 17, 22

[130. Simon Martinez]
7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 17, 22

[131. Freddy Hernandez]
6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17

[132. Maria Hernandez]
[No text]

[133. Rosa Rodriguez]
[No text]

[134. Modesta Morales]
[No text]

[135. Alicia Solis]
[No text]

[136. Jose A Medina]
[No text]

[137. Blanca (Unreadable)]
[No text]

[138. Antonio Paz]
[No text]

[139. Olga Salazar]
[No text]

[140. Angel Caballemo]
Air Quality, Education Program

[141. Felipe Escalante]
Eduacional programa/Educational Program

[142. Filibarto Garcia]
Air quality

[143. (Unreadable) Silva]
Noise Reduction

[144. Elsa Sanchez]
Beautification of Neighborhoods

[145. (Unreadable) Vera]
"

[146. Patricia Avendano]
"

[147. Esmeralda Mendoza]
"

[148. Tania Amezquita]
"

3. Comments and Responses

[149. (Unreadable) R. Balau]
"

[150. Ana M. Gonzalez]
"

[151. Evelia Vaca]
"

[152. Jose Wisneros]
[No text]

[153. Antonio Gomez]
[No text]

[154. Silvia Lesso]
Air Quality, Noise reduction

[155. Saenz]
Scholarships

[156. (Unreadable)]
Senior Housing

[157. A. (Unreadable)]
Educational Programs
Employment Training

[158. Rebecca (Unreadable)]
Jobs

[159. (Unreadable Unreadable)]
Procurement Contract/ Building Trade

[160. (Unreadable)]
Leadership Training Partner

[161. Federico (Unreadable)]
We need the high school for Lennox

[162. Martha (Unreadable)]
We need windows for the noise the airplanes

[163. Jose Guterrez]
We need more schools

[164. Pedro Gonzalez]
We need protections for the noise the airplanes

[165. Luis Garcia]
High School for Lennox

[166. Lupe Aguiniga]
Home Improvements

[167. Alicia Arevalo]
Business Assistance Center

[168. Lurdes De Anda]
We need a high school and more after school programs

[169. Teresa Leon]
Business Attendance Center

[170. Elpidio Guzman]
We need a high school more programs aFter school.

[171. Azuccna Goussen]
One out of ten jobs to go to Lennox Residents

[172. Susan Muratalla]
High School for our students so our Lennox students don't have to go out of the city.

[173. Marta Giuliani]
One out of 10 jobs to go to Lennox residents.

[174. Otto Aspencio]
Educational Programs

[175. Cindy (Unreadable)]
Noise Reduction

[176. Ericka Giuliani]
[No text]

[177. Elba Garcia]
Air Quality (allergic Problems)

[178. Juan Vega]
Sound Proof Homes
Beautification of Neighborhoods & Buss.

[179. Beatriz Vega]
"

[180. Patricia Guzman]
"

[181. Elisa Diaz de Leon]
Sound-Proofing

[182. Ignacio Carrillo]
Air Quality

[183. Juan Isais]
Education Programs

[184. (Unreadable Unreadable)]
Education programs

[185. (Unreadable Unreadable)]
Air Quality

[186. (Unreadable Unreadable)]
Beautification - Neighborhoods - Busines

[187. Roberto Covarrobias]
Educational programs

[188. (Unreadable Unreadable)]
Noise Reduction

[189. Irene (Unreadable)]

3. Comments and Responses

Lennox, Hawthorne, S. Los Angeles, needs street widening, job placement and youth services.

[190. Esther Espinoza]
Jobs, youth services, job training, streetwidening

[191. Brenda Muse]
job training for youth, sound (proofing) more traffic control

[192. Nellie Sanchez]
Widening streets, youth programs,
Road & sidewalk improvements

[193. Jackie Luna]
Street widening, sound proofing
Youth Programs

[194. Renee Maravel]
TRAFFIC CONGESTION, WIDENING STREETS
EMPLOYMENT TRAINING, YOUTH PROGRAMS

[195. (Unreadable Unreadable)]
Traffic congestion, widening streets
Employment training, youth programs

Response:

As stated on page 4-337, in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA received a substantial number of recommendations for mitigation measures and other benefits relating to environmental justice concerns from environmental justice workshops, comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR, and subsequent community outreach. All recommendations were thoroughly evaluated with consideration of benefit provided relative to cost, whether the recommendation had a nexus or connection with the environmental effects of the proposed LAX Master Plan, or whether it would be feasible for the FAA and/or LAWA to fund and implement. Those recommendations that best met the criteria were instrumental in defining the Environmental Justice Program included in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice (subsection 4.4.7), 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 feasibly funded and implemented to help off-set disproportionately high and adverse environmental effects on minority and low-income communities. The final Environmental Justice Program, which incorporates a number of these recommendations, 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.

PFJ00001	Guerrero, Elyse	None Provided	7/23/2001
-----------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PFJ00001-1

Comment:

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

I am requesting that the ANo Action/ No Project Alternative@ for LAX Master Plan be approved.

Response:

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

PFJ00001-2

Comment:

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

Response:

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

PFJ00001-3

Comment:

I am requesting that the ARing Road@, AArbor Vitae Interchange@, and the AAirport Boulevard Connector Road@ which are development plans for the LAX expansion be terminated.

Response:

It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D does not include the ring road or LAX Expressway. The proposed Arbor Vitae interchange is not a part of the LAX Master Plan and has had the federal funding withdrawn.

PFJ00001-4

Comment:

The development of the ARing Road@, AArbor Vitae Interchange@, and the AAirport Boulevard Connector Road@ will not solve nor adequately mitigate any of the issues that the LAX draft EIS/EIR proposes.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed surface transportation impacts in Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation. Subsequent to the publication of the 2001 Draft EIS/EIR, the FHWA withdrew its support for a half interchange at Arbor Vitae. The interchange is not part of the LAX Master Plan. FHWA policy is to consider only full interchanges, not partial ones. Please also see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the Arbor Vitae interchange. Note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road.

3. Comments and Responses

PFJ00001-5

Comment:

The development of the ARing Road@, AArbor Vitae Interchange@, and the AAirport Boulevard Connector Road@ will destroy the residential communities of Westport Heights, Westchester, and Inglewood.

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as Comment PC02168-4; please refer to Response to Comment PC02168-4.

PFJ00001-6

Comment:

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

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PFJ00001-7

Comment:

1. The EIR does not adequately address nor mitigate traffic congestion. Traffic congestion on the 405 Fwy, 105 Fwy, 10 Fwy and the 101 Fwy have not and can not be mitigated. The freeways have become parking lots due to the excess LAX passengers and the cargo. For example, the EIR states that traffic congestion on the 405 Fwy exists between 7 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. to 7 p.m. These statements are false. The traffic congestion on the 405 Fwy exists from 6:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. and from 2:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. The 405 Fwy is bumper to bumper with traffic congestion all day long due to the excess 27 million passengers and the 1.4 million tons of cargo that exceed the capacity that LAX was built to handle back in 1966.

Response:

The I-405, I-105, I-10, and I-101 freeways accommodate much more traffic than just airport trips. In fact, the percent of airport traffic on these freeways is generally less than 20 percent, even adjacent to the airport. This percentage quickly diminishes farther from the airport. Section 4.3.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a discussion of the Congestion Management Program, which is where analysis of freeways beyond the immediate study area is located. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PFJ00001-8

Comment:

LAX was built to handle 40 million passengers and 1 million tons of cargo per year. Currently, 67 million passengers and 2.4 million tons of cargo pass through LAX per year. All the freeways are becoming parking lots for LAX traffic.

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

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand and Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Please refer to Response to Comment PC02168-8 for a discussion of LAX's ability to accommodate 98 million annual passengers and 4.2 million tons of cargo. Also, please note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PFJ00001-9**Comment:**

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

Response:

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

PFJ00001-10**Comment:**

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

Anyone that lives within 10 miles of the LAX airport has potential legal causes of action to sue for cancer and respiratory ailments.

Response:

This comment is the same as PC02437-11; please see Response to Comment PC02437-11.

PFJ00001-11**Comment:**

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

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

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PFJ00001-12

Comment:

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

Response:

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

PFJ00001-13

Comment:

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

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed geologic hazards, including earthquake-induced hazards, in Section 4.22, Earth/Geology, with supporting technical data and analysis provided in Technical Report 12 of the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PFJ00001-14

Comment:

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

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Regarding Ballona Creek, it is believed that the commentor is referring to the Playa Vista project. The Playa Vista project, Howard Hughes Center, and Marina del Rey development were accounted for in the cumulative impacts analysis of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Mitigation is proposed for all significant project-specific and cumulative impacts.

PFJ00001-15

Comment:

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

Response:

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

PFJ00001-16

Comment:

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

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PFJ00001-17

Comment:

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

Response:

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

PFJ00001-18

Comment:

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

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PFK00001 No Author Identified, Family Christian Cathedral

7/25/2001

PFK00001-1

Comment:

I am writing to you upon the request of Assemblyman Jerome Horton, 51st District and on behalf of Dr. Jynona Norwood of the Family Christian Cathedral. I am submitting to your office the original copies of the petition, which opposes the expansion of the Los Angeles Airport into the City of Inglewood.

As stated in Assemblyman Horton's letter dated June 29th of this year, "this expansion project will have a negative impact on our community". It fails to expose the economic and/or moral impact of the would be "displaced residents" as a result of this expansion project.

On behalf of myself and all the members of the Family Christian Cathedral, we say NO to this expansion project as it is of no benefit to our church or our community.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land use impacts in Section 4.2, Land Use, economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socioeconomic, and relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix F, Technical Reports 1 and 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and in Appendix S-D and Technical Reports S-1 and S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PFL00001 Watts, Mary

None Provided

7/23/2001

PFL00001-1

Comment:

Based on the belief that the proposed LAX expansion will cause 1) an increase in auto and air traffic, 2) increased noise and air pollution; 3) increase and aggravate existing health effects, i.e., asthma, hearing loss, sleep deprivation, etc.; and 4) a loss of personal comfort and property values due to the aggravation of existing nuisances, the following comments are submitted in opposition: In reviewing the draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact report (dEIS/EIR) pm the Expansion Master Plan (the Plan), the following is evident:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the following items identified in the comment as follows: Traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise in Section 4.1, Noise; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and health effects in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment and Section 4.24.2, Health Effects of Noise. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. Also, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings in homes associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1.

PFL00001-2

Comment:

1. The dEIS/EIR fails to satisfy federal policy concerning environmental justice and state law because:

a. It does not consider alternatives and other locations that would shift or distribute burdens of expansion more equitably and reduce risks to human health; and

Response:

All LAX Master Plan alternatives were selected in accordance with the requirements identified in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regulations, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Please see Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a detailed discussion of the alternative selection process. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

See pages 1-3 of Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a discussion of regional environmental justice issues as analyzed in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Aviation Plan, including issues associated with airport improvement projects and LAX. These documents indicate that limiting expansion at LAX is the best possible outcome from an environmental justice perspective given the high concentration of minority and low-income populations in the LAX vicinity. Alternative D was added to the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR as a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) activity comparable to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX, and instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

Also please see Topical Response TR-EJ-3 regarding environmental justice and regional context, Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, and Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities.

PFL00001-3

Comment:

b. It unfairly and disproportionately burdens minority and low-income communities that lie directly under the primary arrival flight path with significant impacts of noise and toxic air emission. (i.e. 25% of incoming flights occur directly over the city of Inglewood.)

Response:

Noise and air toxic effects on minority and low-income communities were addressed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

The Environmental Justice Program outlined in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Final EIS/EIR, recognizes the potential disproportionate effects that the Master Plan would have on minority and low-income populations and goes beyond basic mitigation proposals to address the unique needs of these communities. With input gathered through environmental justice workshops and an extensive public outreach effort, the Environmental Justice Program represents a full and good faith effort to identify all possible means for avoiding, reducing, or off-setting the impacts of the Master Plan in a manner that addresses the needs and preferences of affected minority and/or low-income communities in accordance with NEPA and CEQA requirements.

Regarding fairness, with the orientation of the runways at LAX, it is inevitable that increases in aircraft activity and associated noise will have a greater burden on communities to the east of LAX than those to the north and south. It should be noted, however, that LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, has the least impacts of the Master Plan build alternatives and would limit operations at LAX to levels that would be similar to what would occur with existing facilities if the Master Plan were not approved.

3. Comments and Responses

PFL00001-4

Comment:

2. The dEIS/EIR fails to satisfy state and federal law because:
 - a. It fails to disclose the economic gain of the Airport as a result of the expansion at the expense of the surrounding low income populations;

Response:

LAX is a public use airport. Rates and charges are imposed to cover the cost of maintaining and upgrading the facility for public use. LAX is a public entity not a "for profit" entity. It is an agency of the City and any "economic gain" in the form of increased revenue must be utilized for airport purposes.

Although benefits may be taken into account in making findings regarding a projects potential for disproportionately high and adverse environmental and health effects pursuant to U.S. Department of Transportation Order 5610.2, there is no legal requirement under NEPA or CEQA for economic benefits, or for benefits to be proportionate to environmental burdens. The primary focus of the EIS/EIR under NEPA and CEQA is to disclose and mitigate physical impacts on the environment.

PFL00001-5

Comment:

- b. It fails to create jobs in a manner beneficial to the impacted neighborhoods; and

Response:

LAWA has and will continue to take reasonable steps to ensure that economic benefits associated with LAX accrue to all communities. See Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As stated in subsection 4.4.3.3, since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR and in response to new security priorities, 2,900 Transportation Security Administration staff were hired at LAX, a 76 percent minority workforce. Also see the benefits outlined under "Jobs Outreach Center" in subsection 4.4.3.7 and Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits. Also see Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and note the much more modest economic benefits of Alternative D as compared to the other Master Plan build alternatives.

PFL00001-6

Comment:

- c. It fails to balance the economic benefits with the negative impact on surrounding neighborhoods.

Response:

LAX is a public use airport. Rates and charges are imposed to cover the cost of maintaining and upgrading the facility for public use. LAX is a public entity not a "for profit" entity. It is an agency of the City and any "economic gain" in the form of increased revenue must be utilized for airport purposes.

Although benefits may be taken into account in making findings regarding a 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.

PFL00001-7

Comment:

3. The dEIS/EIR fails to satisfy existing law because alternatives to expansion have not been adequately explored or considered.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Under this alternative, there would be no expansion of facilities at LAX beyond minor projects that would be reasonably foreseeable in the absence of the Master Plan. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the Master Plan. Alternative D has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment.

PFL00001-8

Comment:

4. The dEIS/EIR does not measure environmental impacts properly because it fails to use the current negative impact as a starting point.

Response:

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

PFL00001-9

Comment:

5. The dEIS/EIR fails to comply with Federal air quality regulations because it does not properly measure nor study toxic air pollutants or air emissions as required by law.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AF00001-38. Human health impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address criteria pollutants in Section 4.6, Air Quality, separate from the analysis of toxic air pollutants presented in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment.

PFL00001-10

Comment:

6. The dEIS/EIR and Plan does not consider or factor time as a variable when assessing the added health risks, which result from increased passenger travel and traffic patterns.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health risks in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety (CEQA), and Technical Report 14a, Health Risk Assessment. Exposure factors involving time, such as exposure frequency (days exposed per year) and exposure duration (years of exposure), are factored into the risk equations. Assumptions used for these variables are presented in Table 4 of Technical Report 14a of the Draft EIS/EIR. The risk assessment characterized risks for adult and child residents, school children, and on-airport workers. For example, risk calculations were based on the assumption that adult residents were exposed to the maximum estimated chemical concentrations in air for the year 2015 for a subsequent exposure duration of 30 years or 70 years. The longer exposure duration was used in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR in response to comments from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). School children and child residents were assumed to be exposed to the maximum chemical concentrations in air estimated for the year 2015 for an exposure duration of 6 years.

3. Comments and Responses

PFL00001-11

Comment:

7. The dEIS/EIR fails to have specific criteria when determining the specific health risks involved in the expansion.

Response:

The criteria used to evaluate the impacts of health risks for each of the alternatives were discussed in Section 4.24.1 (subsection 4.24.1.4, Thresholds of Significance) of the Draft EIS/EIR. These thresholds are based on South Coast Air Quality Management District policies.

PFL00001-12

Comment:

8. The dEIS/EIR fails to assess and consider the impact of air and noise emissions mitigation measures on surrounding neighborhoods.

Response:

Air quality and noise impacts were addressed 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.

PFL00001-13

Comment:

9. The dEIS/EIR fails to address the negative impact of current air traffic and the recurring damages caused by the Airport's failure to expeditiously mitigate the current negative impacts. With this in mind, the dEIS/EIR should have taken into consideration the cumulative affect of increasing existing negative impacts.

Response:

The CEQA impacts analysis within the Draft EIS/EIR identified environmental baseline conditions as they existed at LAX in 1996/1997, and evaluates the nature and significance of impacts from increased airport activity in the future, due to each alternative, as added to those baseline conditions. Mitigation measure are recommended for significant impacts occurring within the context of those future conditions (i.e., combination of existing conditions plus the additional project-related increment). The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included an evaluation of changes, if any, in the existing conditions that may have occurred between 1996 and 2000.

PFL00001-14

Comment:

10. The dEIS/EIR fails to properly analyze the traffic impact and propose an adequate mitigation plan, e.g., standing traffic on the surrounding freeways.

Response:

Comment noted. The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PFL00001-15

Comment:

11. The dEIS/EIR fails to consider the economic impact on property and housing values as a result of the added noise; especially, the decrease in recreational value of local parks and residential back yards; plus the reluctance of certain businesses to locate within the flight pattern. It should be noted that while property values of homes under the flight path have increased, arguably, the marginal increase of home values in this area continue to suffer. This has a negative impact of construction of additional housing stock within the area and accordingly limits the growth of these communities. Additionally, the negative impact of the Airport limits the type, quantity and quality of homes that can be built in the area. This will serve to impede local communities' ability to comply with Federal Housing Regulations that require replacing housing.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. Please note that the LAWA relocation program will conform to federal and state requirements to provide for a comparable replacement dwelling for persons displaced from their homes.

PFL00001-16

Comment:

12. Finally, the dEIS/EIR fails to consider the negative impact of increased noise and flights over local schools under the flight path, including interruptions of instructional and recreational periods.

Response:

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 Alternatives 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.

PFM00001	Latham, John	Carlton Square Homeowners Association	7/17/2001
-----------------	---------------------	--	------------------

PFM00001-1

Comment:

The Board of Directors of Carlton Square Homeowners Association along with its members, has passed the following resolution that is submitted in connection with the above referenced matter.

WHEREAS, Carlton Square, a residential development consisting of 470 residences located at 8700 Carlton Drive, within the City of Inglewood, California, and

WHEREAS, the residences of the Carlton Square Homeowners Association community are situated directly beneath the existing flight path of the Los Angeles Airport, and

WHEREAS, the Carlton Square Homeowners and its Board of Directors are committed to bringing about civic betterment and social improvements by providing for preservation, management, maintenance and care of the architecture and appearance of the Carlton Square community, and

WHEREAS, there currently exists excessive noise air pollution, resulting from the continuous air traffic into and out of the Los Angeles Airport, and

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting

3. Comments and Responses

technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PFM00001-2

Comment:

WHEREAS, there are numerous violations the restrictions regarding the hours of take-off and landings by small and large aircraft, and

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and TR-GEN-3 regarding legal limitations on LAWA's ability to control the nature and hours of aircraft activity.

PFM00001-3

Comment:

WHEREAS, expansion of Los Angeles Airport would significantly increase (1) the number of take-offs and landing, (2) noise exposure, (3) ground traffic throughout, (4) air pollution, (5) health risk, and (6) a decrease in property values, and.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PFM00001-4

Comment:

WHEREAS, the homeowners and residents of the Carlton Square community, evidenced by the attached list of signatures recognize the severe negative impact the proposed expansion will have on their daily lives and on the community.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Carlton Square Homeowners Association's Board of Directors, who are charged with the responsibility of preservation of property and the enjoyment thereof for the benefit of all homeowners and residents of the Carlton Square community, strongly oppose the expansion plans for Los Angeles Airport.

Resolution Adopted this 12 day of July, 2001.

Response:

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

PFN00001 Goff, Morty None Provided 9/24/2001

PFN00001-1

Comment:

We the undersigned support the acquisition of the West Bluff of the Ballona wetland ecosystem as mitigation for any loss of habitat for the endangered Riverside Fairy Shrimp recently found at LAX. It is our understanding that the United States Fish and Wildlife Service has approved this mitigation.

The West Bluff has what is probably the very last vernal pool left in the City of Los Angeles. It is shown on the historical maps, and in recent photographs. It is also a critical component of the last large coastal wetland system left in Los Angeles County.

In signing this petition, we are not supporting the expansion of LAX. We are supporting the acquisition of the West Bluff in regards to the impacts of the current operations of LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ET-2 regarding the definition and evaluation of wetlands/vernal pools for further discussion of Riverside fairy shrimp mitigation. The West Bluff of the Ballona wetland ecosystem was eliminated for relocation of the Riverside fairy shrimp cysts due to the significantly high cost associated with acquiring the properties for purposes of relocating the embedded cysts.

PFN00001-2

Comment:

Please include this petition in the EIS/EIR. Thank you very much.

Response:

Comment noted.

PFO00001 Shneider, Steve Playa Serena Homeowners Association 7/18/2001

PFO00001-1

Comment:

We need your help.

The planned expansion of Los Angeles International Airport, including the construction of a new International Terminal, the access to which would be from Pershing Drive, will significantly and adversely affect the residents of this community. If the new terminal is constructed, the airport authorities intend to close Pershing Drive (south of the Westchester Parkway) to vehicular traffic other than that specifically going to LAX.

Consequently, construction of a new International Terminal has the potential of making an already undesirable situation intolerable. Over the past four decades, airport authorities have substituted their prerogatives over the will of the people. Rather than seek more constructive and less destructive alternatives, they have condemned hundreds of local homes through writ of eminent domain. Rather than seek ways and means to lessen the air and vehicular congestion around LAX, they have acted to increase it. Apparently, they intend to again do so.

The attached petition, signed by the residents of this condominium complex, requests your assistance in halting the proposed LAX expansion. In our opinion, it is time for the LAX authorities to behave as good citizens!

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment below. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please refer to Response to Comment AL00018-30 for a discussion of Pershing Drive. Alternative D would not alter the existing Pershing Drive, nor would it result in any residential acquisition.

PFO00001-2

Comment:

We, the residents of the Playa Serena condominiums, located at 8828 Pershing Drive in Playa del Rey, California 90293, hereby petition our elected officials and request them to act on our behalf to halt the announced Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) plan to build a large new International Terminal, the access to which would be from Pershing Drive. An integral part of the LAX expansion plan is to close Pershing Drive (south of the Westchester Parkway) to vehicular traffic other than that specifically going to LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. As proposed, all of the LAX Master Plan build alternatives, with the exception of Alternative D, include improvements to provide access to the West Terminal Area along the Pershing Drive corridor. None of the build alternatives would result in the closure of Pershing Drive. However, with construction of the ring road under Alternatives A, B, and C, Pershing Drive would no longer provide southbound access to Imperial Highway. Alternate southbound access to Imperial Highway would be available along Vista del Mar (please refer to page 4-441 in Section 4.4.4., Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns, of the Draft EIS/EIR, and page 4-345 in Section 4.4.4., Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR). Alternative D does not include the ring road.

PFO00001-3

Comment:

If this expansion is approved, it will adversely affect the quality of life of everyone in this community.

Response:

Comment noted. Land use impacts were addressed in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting documentation provided in Technical Reports 1 and S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PFO00001-4

Comment:

The residents of Playa Serena - and indeed all Playa del Rey - will be inundated with traffic at all hours of the day and night. Going to and from work, school, shopping, religious services, and other essential activities will be much more difficult.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in

the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. Regarding traffic measures to minimize neighborhood impacts, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PFO00001-5

Comment:

Air and noise pollution will rise and property values could decrease significantly.

Response:

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

PFO00001-6

Comment:

LAX is one of the world's busiest and most dangerous airports.

Response:

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

PFO00001-7

Comment:

Vehicular access into and egress from LAX already is difficult and makes commuting in this area very arduous.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PFO00001-8

Comment:

Rather than seeking to route some of the air traffic to less congested facilities such as the airports in Ontario and Palmdale, California, the LAX authorities have ignored the will of the people and have pushed ahead with expansion plans.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PFO00001-9

Comment:

If these plans are adopted, they will exacerbate what is already an almost intolerable situation for local residents.

3. Comments and Responses

Please stop the planned LAX expansion! Make the LAX authorities responsive to the will of the people!

Response:

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

PFP00001 Mulligan, Anne None Provided 5/20/2001

PFP00001-1

Comment:

Halt All Airport Expansion

Halt All Airport Expansion!

To: President of the United States
U.S. Senate Majority and Minority Leader
U.S. House Speaker, Majority and Minority Leader

Due Date: August 31, 2000

WE URGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE HALTING OF AIRPORT EXPANSION UNTIL THE FULL HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF AIRPORTS ARE KNOWN AND PROPERLY MITIGATED.

As many as 180 million Americans are affected by aviation-related pollution. This includes aircraft air emissions (including hazardous and toxic emissions), noise, de-icing fluid runoff, and many others. Recent studies have identified serious health problems for people living and working even many miles away from airports, and the Environmental Protection Agency predicts that aviation-related pollution will double, or perhaps triple, within the next decade.

Far more information is needed to determine the full extent of these threats. Existing environmental and public health safeguards do not work.

Please support the halting of airport expansion AND of additional landings and take-offs until comprehensive, objective health and environmental studies are complete. Show your support by opposing the Air Transportation Improvement Act (S.82-John McCain) and FAA Re-Authorization Bill (HR.1000-Bud Schuster).

This petition is sponsored by US-Citizens Aviation Watch Association, which advocates a sustainable, equitable and accountable aviation industry in the U.S. and abroad.

(Update: HS.82 and H.R1000 have now passed Congress. The president has signed The Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment & Reform Act for the 21st Century (AIR-21) [HR1000] on April 5, 2000, it became Public Law No: 106-181. Your support of this petition is needed now!)

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed health and safety impacts in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, hazardous material in Section 4.23, Hazardous Materials, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and water quality impacts in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 6, 13, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, S-5, S-8, and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-2 regarding toxic air pollutants, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PFQ00001 Williamsom, Sandra None Provided

PFQ00001-1

Comment:

I am writing this letter to support the acquisition of the West Bluff of the Ballona wetland ecosystem as mitigation for any loss of habitat for the endangered Riverside Fairy Shrimp recently found at LAX. It is my understanding that the United States Fish and Wildlife Service has approved this mitigation.

The West Bluff has what is probably the very last vernal pool left in the City of Los Angeles. It is shown on the historical maps, and in recent photographs. It is also a critical component of the last large coastal wetland system left in Los Angeles County.

In writing this letter, I am not supporting the expansion of LAX. I am supporting the acquisition of the West Bluff in regards to the impacts of the current operations of LAX

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ET-2 regarding the definition and evaluation of wetlands/vernal pools for further discussion of Riverside fairy shrimp mitigation. The West Bluff of the Ballona wetland ecosystem was eliminated for relocation of the Riverside fairy shrimp cysts due to the significantly high cost associated with acquiring the properties for purposes of relocating the embedded cysts.

PFR00001 Park, Paul Hoduri-USA 9/12/2001

PFR00001-1

Comment:

The Los Angeles region's economic health depends on LAX's ability to accommodate international traffic. The LAX Master Plan will ensure the continuation of Southern California's economic growth as well as Los Angeles' reputation as a world class city.

We are extremely excited to see the ways the Master Plan will benefit local communities as well as improve safety and LAX's ability to provide travel service both locally and abroad. We strongly support the LAX Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

PFS00001 Gunstream, Gary None Provided

PFS00001-1

Comment:

The Los Angeles region's economic health depends on LAX's ability to accommodate international traffic. The LAX Master Plan will ensure the continuation of Southern California's economic growth as well as Los Angeles' reputation as a world class city. I strongly support the LAX Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PFS00002 Wong, Dennis None Provided

PFS00002-1

Comment:

The Los Angeles region's economic health depends on LAX's ability to accommodate international traffic. The LAX Master Plan will ensure the continuation of Southern California's economic growth as well as Los Angeles' reputation as a world class city. I strongly support the LAX Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00001 Galanter, Ruth City of Los Angeles 6/9/2001

PHF00001-1

Comment:

I AM THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL AND ALSO THE COUNCIL MEMBER FOR THIS PARTICULAR DISTRICT. MOST OF THESE ARE MY CONSTITUENTS. I AM DELIGHTED TO SEE YOU HERE. SOME OF THEM ARE MY CONSTITUENTS IN SPIRIT ONLY BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, BUT ALL OF US ARE EQUALLY CONCERNED ABOUT THE PROPOSED MASTER PLAN AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AND REPORT THAT GOES WITH IT. ACTUALLY, HOWEVER, THE MOST IMPORTANT DOCUMENT THAT IS HERE TODAY IS THE ONE ON THE WALL OVER THERE. AS YOU KNOW, THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES IS IN THE MIDST OF A POLITICAL TRANSFORMATION, A TRANSITION PERIOD, IN WHICH WE ARE ABOUT TO WELCOME A NEW MAYOR, A NEW CITY ATTORNEY AND CITY CONTROLLER AND EIGHT NEW COUNCIL MEMBERS OUT OF 15 OVER THE COURSE OF THE NEXT ROUGHLY SIX MONTHS. WE ARE LOOKING AT A DIFFERENT WORLD THAN WE LOOKED AT BEFORE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00001-2

Comment:

POLITICALLY HERE AT HOME, ALSO WITH RESPECT TO THE AVIATION INDUSTRY. WHEN LAX STARTED THIS MASTER PLAN EVERYBODY SAID THAT CARGO WAS GOING TO FLY ONLY IN THE BELLY OF PASSENGER PLANES, THERE WOULDN'T BE ANY CARGO FLIGHTS ANY MORE. THAT HAS TURNED AROUND. EVERYTHING THAT WE HAVE TALKED ABOUT, MASSIVE GROWTH IN CARGO FLIGHTS, NOT JUST IN CARGO THAT IS SHIPPED BUT IN ALL CARGO FLIGHTS, WHICH MEANS WE ARE DEALING WITH A DIFFERENT CONTEXT THAN WE WERE BEFORE.

Response:

Approximately 46 percent of air cargo is currently transported in the belly of passenger airplanes. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand.

PHF00001-3

Comment:

WE ARE ALSO SEEING ON THE ONE HAND A PROPOSAL WHICH IS LOOKED AT IN THIS EIR TO ACCOMMODATE, TO LENGTHEN RUNWAYS IN ORDER TO ACCOMMODATE LARGER AND LARGER PASSENGER PLANES AND YET THE WALL STREET JOURNAL AND THE AVIATION MAGAZINES

ALL SHOW THAT THERE'S AN INCREASING TREND TOWARD SMALLER PLANES. I AM GOING TO RUN OUT OF TIME IN A MINUTE -- LESS THAN A MINUTE.

Response:

Comment noted. A larger aircraft fleet mix is predicted for each of the Master Plan alternatives to reflect the predicted responses from airlines to the capacity constraints at LAX and a focus on international markets, especially trans-pacific routes. Please see Responses to Comments PC00599-7 and PC00593-1 for a discussion on the fleet mix assumptions used in the development of the alternatives.

PHF00001-4

Comment:

I JUST WANT TO POINT OUT THAT IN THE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT REVIEW FOR THE FIRST ISSUE OF 2001, THE DIRECTOR OF THE AIRPORTS COUNCIL INTERNATIONAL SAYS THERE ARE SEVERAL LESS GLAMAROUS BUT ALSO LESS COSTLY STEPS WHICH CAN BE TAKEN TO RELIEVE CONGESTION. FIRST IS THE USE OF ALTERNATIVE AIRPORTS, WHICH WE BELIEVE ARE NOT ADEQUATELY STUDIED IN THIS EIR. MY TIME, PLEASE GUYS.

Response:

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

PHF00001-5

Comment:

THE SECOND ONE, ANOTHER OPTION IS TO SUBSTITUTE HIGH-SPEED RAIL FOR SHORT-HAUL AIR SERVICE. THIS HAS BEEN USED EFFECTIVELY ELSEWHERE. IT IS NOT ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED HERE.

Response:

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

PHF00001-6

Comment:

THE THIRD ONE, ALTHOUGH IT BE FAR MORE CONTROVERSIAL, IS THE USE OF SLOT ALLEGATION COMBINED WITH MARKET PRICING.

Response:

The High Density Rule (HDR), issued by the FAA in 1969, was a measure to reduce delays and congestion at five select airports including New York's LaGuardia, JFK International and Newark International, Washington-Reagan National and Chicago O'Hare International. The HDR provided for hourly arrival and departure caps for both commercial airline and general aviation operators for certain hours of the day. Contrary to public perception, the slot controls were not established to regulate capacity or for noise abatement. The implementation of certain improvements in technology has improved the efficiency of the airspace system and allowed the slot requirements to be phased out.

3. Comments and Responses

The HDR was suspended indefinitely at Newark and eliminated effective July 2, 2002 at O'Hare. The HDR has been amended on several occasions, most recently in the AIR 21 legislation passed by the U.S. Congress in 2000 that eliminates slot restrictions at JFK and LaGuardia on January 1, 2007. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning.

PHF00001-7

Comment:

I BELIEVE, AND I BELIEVE MY COLLEAGUES ARE GOING TO JOIN ME IN SAYING THAT THE EIR IS FLAWED BECAUSE IT DOES NOT ADDRESS THE ALTERNATIVE OF TAKING THE ANTICIPATED GROWTH AT OTHER AIRPORTS. AND L.A. HAPPENS TO HAVE THE ABILITY TO DO THAT BECAUSE WE OWN A COUPLE OF OTHER AIRPORTS.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Response to Comment AF00001-56 regarding the Draft EIS/EIR assumptions pertaining to Ontario International and Palmdale Regional airports. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PHF00001-8

Comment:

FINALLY I JUST WANT TO EXERCISE A MOMENT OF PRIVILEGE HERE.

IN ANNOUNCING THIS HEARING IT WAS ANNOUNCED A FEW MINUTES AGO AS JOINTLY SPONSORED BY THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES AND THE FAA. AS YOU KNOW, THE L. A. WORLD AIRPORTS IS ONE OF OUR NON-COUNCIL CONTROLLED DEPARTMENTS, MUCH TO MY REGRET. BUT THIS IS A HEARING THAT IS REQUIRED BY FEDERAL AND STATE LAW AND IT IS BEING RUN BY THE L.A. WORLD AIRPORTS, WHICH IS A PIECE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, BUT THIS IS NOT SOMETHING SPONSORED BY THE MAYOR AND THE COUNCIL.

WE BELIEVE THAT MR. HAHN'S PLEDGE AND THE INCREASING CONCERN EXHIBITED BY OUR CONSTITUENTS AND OUR NEIGHBORS DICTATES THAT WE MOVE IN A DIFFERENT DIRECTION. THANK YOU FOR STOPPING THE CLOCK. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND I WILL BE SUBMITTING WRITTEN COMMENTS AS WELL.

Response:

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

PHF00002

Stanford, Dick

City of Azusa

6/9/2001

PHF00002-1

Comment:

HELLO, HEARING OFFICERS. MY NAME IS DICK STANFORD. THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY TODAY. ALTHOUGH I AM A MEMBER OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS REGIONAL COUNCIL AND SCAG TRANSPORTATION COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE, MY TESTIMONY IS PRESENTED SOLELY IN MY CAPACITY AS A CITY COUNCIL MEMBER OF THE CITY OF AZUSA AND FOR THE CITY OF AZUSA.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00002-2

Comment:

AZUSA IS ONE OF SOME HUNDRED CITIES AND OTHER ENTITIES THAT RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES TO TERMINATION PLANS FOR LAX EXPANSION AND CONCENTRATE ON DEVELOPING A TRULY REGIONAL SYSTEM. IT IS BECAUSE OF THE EXCLUSION OF THIS ALTERNATIVE THAT THE EIR/EIS IS INADEQUATE. THERE'S A BASIC TENANT THAT EIRS AND EISS ADDRESS ALL ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION. THE DRAFT EIS/EIS FOR THE PROPOSED EXPANSION OF LAX ONLY ADDRESSES THREE SLIGHT VARIATIONS OF THE SAME ALTERNATIVE.

Response:

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

PHF00002-3

Comment:

I HAVE HEARD THE EXCUSE THAT REGIONALIZATION IS NOT IN THE EIR/EIS BECAUSE THE AIRPORT OWNER CANNOT IMPACT AIRLINE DECISIONS ON WHICH FLIGHTS WILL OPERATE FROM WHICH AIRPORT IN A REGION.

AS ONE OF THE EARLIEST EMPLOYEES TO THE DALLAS FORT WORTH AIRPORT, AS A FORMER COORDINATOR OF FRIENDS OF AUSTIN, TEXAS MUELLER AIRPORT, AS A FORMER MEMBER OF THE CITY OF ONTARIO'S BLUE RIBBON AIRPORT COMMISSION AND AS FORMER MARINE CORPS FIGHTER PILOT WHO FLEW IN AND OUT OF EL TORO I KNOW THAT EXCUSE IS WITHOUT MERIT.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02302-27 and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PHF00002-4

Comment:

THE ONTARIO AIRPORT SERVES A POPULATION MASS THAT WOULD MAKE THAT AIRPORT MUCH MORE PROFITABLE FOR MANY MORE AIRLINE FLIGHTS THAN PRESENTLY OPERATE FROM THERE. MANY MORE PASSENGERS WOULD SPEND CONSIDERABLY LESS TIME ON THE FREEWAY AND CONCURRENTLY LESS TIME FOWLING THE AIR IF THE GROUND TRAVEL WAS TO ONT INSTEAD OF LAX. THE BEAUTIFUL TERMINAL THERE WHICH TOOK ENTIRELY TOO LONG TO BECOME A REALITY IS PRESENTLY A GHOSTTOWN BECAUSE THE FLIGHTS ARE NOT THERE.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PHF00002-5

Comment:

BECAUSE THE MOST CONVENIENT SCHEDULES ARE GIVEN TO LAX AND BECAUSE RELATIVE FARE PRICING DELIBERATELY FORCES PASSENGERS TO USE LAX.

Response:

Actually, the average fare for domestic flights from LAX is higher than for Burbank, Long Beach, Ontario, and Orange County. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PHF00002-6

Comment:

BURBANK, LONG BEACH AND JOHN WAYNE ARE NOT AT NEAR THE SOME CAPACITY AS LAX AND PROPOSALS RELATING TO PALMDALE, EL TORO, AND OTHER EXISTING AIRPORTS ALL PROVIDE THE BASIS FOR PLANNING A TRULY REGIONAL AIRPORT SYSTEM. WE RESPECTFULLY RESPECT THAT LAWA AND THE FAA JOIN THE MANY CITIES, MAYOR HAHN, LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, A NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS IN SUPPORTING A TRULY REGIONAL SYSTEM THAT BE MORE EFFICIENT AND LESS POLLUTING FOR AIR TRAVEL IN THE GREATER LOS ANGELES REGION.

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to Response to Comment PC02339-2. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PHF00002-7

Comment:

I AM PICKING UP SOME FRIENDS COMING IN FROM LONDON IN A FEW MINUTES AND I REGRET I WILL NOT BE ABLE TO BE HERE PHYSICALLY TO SUPPORT MY COLLEAGUES IN EXPRESSING THEIR FEELINGS, BUT CERTAINLY I AM HERE IN SPIRIT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00003

McDowell, Kelly

City of El Segundo

6/9/2001

PHF00003-1

Comment:

KELLY MCDOWELL FROM THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL. I WANT TO JOIN RUTH GALANTER IN DRAWING ATTENTION TO MR. HAHN'S PLEDGE OPPOSING LAX'S EXPANSION. WE ARE LOOKING FORWARD, MY CITY AND THE COALITION OF ALMOST HUNDRED CITIES, THAT WE LEAD AGAINST LAX EXPANSION ARE LOOKING FORWARD TO WORKING WITH THE NEW MAYOR OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES TO OPPOSE THIS EFFORT

Response:

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

PHF00003-2

Comment:

BECAUSE, GENTLEMAN, FIRST OF ALL, THIS PROCESS IS FATALLY FLAWED. ONE PUBLIC HEARING HELD SIMULTANEOUSLY IN THREE DIFFERENT PLACES ON ONE DAY IS NOT AN ADEQUATE OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PUBLIC TO BE HEARD ON THESE ISSUES.

VIRTUALLY EVERY ELECTED OFFICIAL IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA HAS REQUESTED THAT THE COMMENT PERIOD TO FILE COMMENTS ON THE EIR BE EXTENDED PAST JULY 25. THAT HAS BEEN REFUSED. THIS IS A 12,000-PAGE DOCUMENT. PEOPLE NEED TIME TO ANALYZE IT. YOU GUYS TOOK FIVE YEARS TO PREPARE IT. GIVE US A FEW MORE MONTHS TO COMMENT ON IT.

Response:

A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PHF00003-3

Comment:

THIS PROPOSED EXPANSION WOULD GENERATE FAR MORE THAN THE 98 MILLION PASSENGERS THE AIRPORT CLAIMS IN ITS EIR. THE CURRENT AIRPORT UNDER ITS CURRENT CONFIGURATION WAS PROJECTED TO HANDLE 40 MILLION PASSENGERS AND NOW SERVES 67 MILLION.

Response:

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

PHF00003-4

Comment:

THE EIR LACKS REQUIRED MITIGATION MEASURES IN MONITORING PROGRAMS THAT ARE NECESSARY WITH THE PROPOSED EXPANSION. WE MAINTAIN THE ENVIRONMENT OF SOCIAL IMPACTS. THIS PROPOSED EXPANSION WHICH BRING TO THIS AREA CAN'T BE MITIGATED.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AR00003-63 regarding the mitigation monitoring and reporting program.

PHF00003-5

Comment:

THERE IS NO ANALYSIS OF A WORST-CASE SCENARIO IN THIS EIR. THE POTENTIAL IMPACTS ARE CONSISTENTLY UNDERESTIMATED.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00003-6

Comment:

PROPOSED GROUND IMPROVEMENTS, EVEN UNDER THE NO NEW RUNWAY ALTERNATIVE, WOULD LAY THE FOUNDATION FOR FUTURE RUNWAY EXPANSION, AND THAT'S NOT ACCEPTABLE TO THE CITIES NEAR THE AIRPORT.

Response:

The Master Plan and Draft EIS/EIR did not look beyond the year 2015 - please see Response to Comment PC00287-3 regarding the planning horizons for these studies. Please also note that the new Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, Alternative D, analyzed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Chapter 3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided extensive information on the formulation of this alternative and its consistency with the SCAG 2001 RTP.

PHF00003-7

Comment:

MOST IMPORTANT THE EIR NEVER SERIOUSLY CONSIDERS THE DEVELOPMENT OF A TRULY REGIONAL AIRPORT PLAN TO HANDLE THE NEEDS OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. LET'S DEVELOP AIRPORTS WHERE PEOPLE ARE GOING AND JOBS ARE GOING. LET'S DEVELOP AIRPORTS TO THE NORTH AND TO THE EAST OF LAX WHERE THE JOBS WILL BE AND THE MANUFACTURES OF GOODS THAT WILL BE SHIPPED BY AIR WILL BE PRODUCED.

THERE IS NO SUPPORT PUBLICLY FOR EXPANSION OF LAX. WE SAY CONSTRAIN THIS AIRPORT TO ITS EXISTING FOOTPRINT. EXPAND THE 12 OTHER AIRPORTS IN THIS REGION FROM EL TORO TO PALM SPRINGS TO HANDLE THE AVIATION NEEDS OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. THAT'S WHERE THE JOBS ARE GOING TO BE. THAT'S WHERE THE PEOPLE ARE GOING TO BE. COME AROUND WITH THE REST OF US AND SUPPORT A TRULY REGIONAL AIRPORT PLAN FOR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PHF00004 Tearell, Debra None Provided 6/9/2001

PHF00004-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS DEBRA LYNN TEARELL AND I LIVE AT 340 FALLEN STREET IN PLAYA DEL REY. I WAS ABSOLUTELY INCENSED AND IN REVIEWING THE EIR BECAUSE THERE IS NO MENTION OF IMPACT OF THE MASSIVE PLAYA VISTA DEVELOPMENT. WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE COMBINED IMPACT OF TRAFFIC, POLLUTION AND METHANE MIGRATION, THE SITUATION IS ABSOLUTELY INTOLERABLE.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Potential safety hazards, if any, associated with methane occurring at the Playa Vista project site are impact specific to that project, and cannot be considered in cumulative terms relative to the LAX Master Plan project.

PHF00005 Duong, Rathar City of Montebello 6/9/2001

PHF00005-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON, MY NAME IS RATHAR DUONG. I AM A PLANNER WITH THE CITY OF MONTEBELLO, 1600 WEST BEVERLY. I AM SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF MONTEBELLO COUNCILWOMAN NORMA PETRIE, MEMBER OF THE AIRPORT NOISE COMMUNITY ROUND TABLE, THE CITY AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY WHO HAVE EXPRESSED CONCERNS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00005-2

Comment:

THE RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF MONTEBELLO HAVE LEGITIMATE CONCERNS OVER THE PROPOSED EXPANSION OF LAX. THE PRIMARY CONCERN EFFECTING OUR COMMUNITY IS THE OVERFLIGHT ARRIVALS INTO LOS ANGELES. AT THE AIRPORT CURRENT OPERATION MONTEBELLO RESIDENTS AS WELL AS SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES ARE SEVERELY IMPACTED BY THE NOISE OF THESE LOW-OVERFLIGHT AIRCRAFT. THE EXPANSION OF LAX WOULD COMPOUND EXISTING NOISE PROBLEMS WE ARE EXPERIENCING. MOREOVER, THE EIS/EIR NEGLECTS TO ADDRESS AND ANALYZE THE OVERFLIGHT PROBLEM OF OUR CITY OF MONTEBELLO, AS WELL AS OUR NEIGHBORING COMMUNITIES, INCLUDING MONTEREY PARK, ROSEMEAD AND ALHAMBRA.

THE MASTER PLAN IS FLAWED IN THAT ALL NOISE CONCERNS OCCUR OVER THE OCCASION. IN FACT, CITY OF MONTEBELLO CITY COUNCIL AND STAFF RECEIVE NOISE AND SAFETY RELATED COMPLAINT REGARDING LOW-FLIGHT AIRCRAFT ON AN ONGOING BASIS. THE PLAN TO EXPAND LAX WILL ONLY AMPLIFY THE EXISTING CONDITIONS.

Response:

The commentor's concern is acknowledged and will be considered by federal and local decision makers in the evaluative process. The commentor is affected by the base leg (perpendicular) segment of the westerly approaches to the airport. This approach is used by all traffic arriving from west coast, Pacific and European origins. Under heavy traffic conditions, the base leg moves eastward over Monterey Park to better increase the separations between arriving aircraft and to safely sequence them into the

3. Comments and Responses

arrival flows coming directly from the east. This eastward extension of the base leg approach results in the conditions described by the commentor. Air Traffic Control management has evaluated modifications of the approaches to the north and south runway complexes to increase aircraft altitude over Monterey Park, resulting in noise level decreases of several decibels. It is not likely that the procedures can be changed to remove the traffic entirely from over the area. Any modifications to the base leg approach to reduce the impacts of flights over communities under them beyond the 65 CNEL contour will be undertaken independent of the Draft EIS/EIR process (see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.5). For further information on the effect of these approaches, also see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.5 regarding the effects of elevation on noise contours and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PHF00005-3

Comment:

IN ADDITION, THE DRAFT EIS/EIR AND THE DRAFT MASTER PLAN DID NOT CONSIDER THE REGIONAL AIRPORT APPROACH TO INCREASING THE NUMBER OF PASSENGER FLIGHTS AND CARGO LOADS.

MOREOVER IN AUGUST, 2000 THE MONTEBELLO CITY COUNCIL ADOPTED A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING A REGIONAL AIRPORT PLAN. INSTEAD THE DRAFT DOCUMENT DEEMED THE REGIONAL PLAN AS ECONOMICALLY UNSOUND AND UNFEASIBLE.

Response:

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

PHF00005-4

Comment:

IT IS THESE ISSUES AND OTHERS WHICH MAKE THE MASTER PLAN AND RELATED DRAFT DOCUMENT INCONCLUSIVE AND SEVERELY FLAWED. THE CITY OF MONTEBELLO WILL CONTINUE TO REMAIN STEADFAST IN VOICING OUR CONCERNS, SUBMIT WRITTEN COMMENTS AND OPPOSED TO PROJECT ALL TOGETHER.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00006

Gaines, John

City of El Segundo

6/9/2001

PHF00006-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. I AM JOHN GAINES FOR THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO. THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO, LIKE MANY COMMUNITIES REPRESENTED HERE TODAY, WILL SUBMIT DETAILED

AND EXPANSIVE COMMENTS TO THE EIR. I WANT TO TAKE A FEW MINUTES TO HIGHLIGHT A FEW OF OUR OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED EXPANSION.

FIRST, THE REPORT HAS NOT CONSIDERED A REASONABLE RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE EXPANSION OF LAX.

Response:

The comment letter submitted by the City of El Segundo is identified as Comment Letter AL00033. Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00006-2

Comment:

TWO, THE NUMBER OF ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED IS UNUSUALLY LIMITED.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00006-3

Comment:

THREE, THIS REPORT NEVER SERIOUSLY CONSIDERS APPROPRIATE USE OF THE AVAILABLE AIRPORTS IN THE REGION.

Response:

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

PHF00006-4

Comment:

FOUR, THIS REPORT DOES NOT CONSIDER ALTERNATIVES THAT WOULD RESULT IN IMPACTS LESS SEVERE THAN THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE C.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC01094-4; please see Response to Comment PC01094-4.

PHF00006-5

Comment:

FIVE, NO REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF AIR QUALITY IMPACT IS PROVIDED.

Response:

This comment is essentially the same as Comment PC01956-5. Please see Response to Comment PC01956-5.

PHF00006-6

Comment:

SIX, THERE ARE NO NOISES MITIGATION MEASURES IN THE REPORT.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise mitigation.

PHF00006-7

Comment:

SEVEN, THE REPORT CONCLUDES THAT INCREASED TRAFFIC AND ACTIVITIES LEVELS WILL RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT INCREASED TOXIC AIR EMISSIONS IN ALL EXPANSION SCENARIOS. HOWEVER, THE REPORT FAILS TO DESCRIBE HOW THE HUGE INCREASE IN TOXIC EMISSIONS WILL BE ADEQUATELY MITIGATED.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00006-8

Comment:

EIGHT, THROUGHOUT THIS REPORT BASELINES HAVE BEEN INCONSISTENT AND INAPPROPRIATE.

Response:

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

PHF00006-9

Comment:

SELECTED ALTERNATIVES HAVE NOT MET WITH CEQA AND/OR NEPA MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS AND THE DEPTH OF THE ANALYSIS HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENT TO SUPPORT THE ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED MASTER PLAN.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00006-10

Comment:

NINE, THE PROJECT'S STATED OBJECTIVES HAVE NOT BEEN MET TO THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE AND BIASES OF THE PROPONENTS OF LAX EXPANSION ARE BLATANTLY EVIDENT.

Response:

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

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

PHF00006-11

Comment:

ONE OF THE FUNDAMENTAL REQUIREMENTS OF THIS PROCESS IS FOR THE LEAD AGENCY TO PURSUE ALTERNATIVES THAT WOULD AVOID OR SUBSTANTIALLY LESSEN THE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT. THIS REQUIREMENT HAS NOT BEEN MET. THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO EXPECTS YOU TO ISSUE AN ENTIRELY NEW EIS/EIR THAT PROPERLY AND EFFECTIVELY EXPLORES VIABLE ALTERNATIVES AND IDENTIFIES APPROPRIATE MITIGATION MEASURES TO LESSEN THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PHF00006-10 above. Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00006-12

Comment:

BEFORE YIELDING THE PODIUM TO MY COLLEAGUES, LET ME EXPRESS MY OUTRAGE WITH LAWA AND THE FAA FOR THE UNDERHANDED, ADVERSARIAL AND COUNTERPRODUCTIVE MANNER IN WHICH THESE HEARINGS ARE BEING CONDUCTED. IT IS LITTLE WONDER THAT CITIZENS IN OUR COMMUNITIES LIKE CITIZENS ACROSS THIS LAND HARBOR SUCH DISTRUST AND DISLIKE FOR BUREAUCRACIES LIKE YOURS THAT HIDE BEHIND AND DISTORT GOVERNMENTAL PROCESS TO ACCOMPLISH SELF-SERVING OBJECTIVES.

Response:

The FAA and LAWA have conducted several hearings on both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 for a listing of all public hearings. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PHF00006-13

Comment:

THOUSANDS OF PR CONSULTANTS COSTING THE TAXPAYERS TENS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, PERSONAL ATTACKS ON LOCAL OFFICIALS, BUREAUCRATIC OBFUSCATION AND LEGAL SHENANIGANS SHALL NOT MAKE THIS EXPANSION ACCEPTABLE TO US. REST ASSURED, I WANT TO MAKE THIS CLEAR, EL SEGUNDO AND OVER A HUNDRED CALIFORNIA CITIES AND AGENCIES COVERING FIVE COUNTIES HAVE JOINED US IN FIGHTING THIS EXPANSION, WILL USE EVERY ADMINISTRATIVE LEGAL AND POLITICAL MEANS AT OUR DISPOSAL TO INSURE THE EXPANSION DESCRIBED IN THIS MISERABLE PLAN NEVER TAKES PLACE.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00007 Khouri, Gus

**Assemblymember George
NiKano's Office**

6/9/2001

PHF00007-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS GUS KHOURI. I AM A LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT FOR ASSEMBLY MEMBER GEORGE NIKANO UP IN THE SACRAMENTO OFFICE. AS YOU MAY KNOW, THERE ARE THREE HEARINGS TAKING PLACE TODAY AND THE ASSEMBLY MEMBER IS AT THE MANHATTAN BEACH AREA. HE ASKED ME TO READ THE PREPARED STATEMENT THAT HE IS CONCURRENTLY READING OVER THERE.

AS SOMEONE WHO HAS BEEN ACTIVELY INVOLVED IN REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION ISSUES FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS, FIRST AS A COUNCIL MEMBER AND NOW AS A MEMBER OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE ASSEMBLY, THIS ENR AND THE ENTIRE PROPOSAL TO EXPAND LAX ARE TROUBLING. FRANKLY, THE ENR IS SEVERELY FLAWED, EITHER THROUGH DELIBERATE ACTION OR INCOMPETENCE. THE BASE LINE USED IN THIS STUDY IS 1996 PRIOR TO THE YEAR THE NOISIEST PLANES WERE PHASED OUT, THUS ON PAPER APPEARING TO REDUCE THE IMPACT OF PROPOSED GROWTH.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues, Subtopical Response TR-N-1.3 regarding noise modeling and baseline issues, and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.3 regarding the phase out of Stage 2 aircraft.

PHF00007-2

Comment:

FURTHERMORE THE ENR LACKS ANY ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF NOISES FROM FLYOVERS FROM THE SOUTHERN HALF OF THE SOUTH BAY FROM THE PALOS VERDES PENINSULA.

Response:

Under NEPA and CEQA thresholds of significance, the South Bay communities and the Palos Verdes Peninsula communities are not significantly impacted by aircraft noise. Furthermore, the Master Plan alternatives will not result in a modification of the locations where aircraft fly in the area. Therefore, detailed evaluations of changes in noise levels and effects are not warranted for the purposes of this EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1.

PHF00007-3

Comment:

THE DOCUMENT PAYS NO ATTENTION TO THE NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED EXPANSION ON SURFACE TRAFFIC CONGESTION SOUTH OF ROSECRANS BOULEVARD. THE COMMUNITIES OF MANHATTAN BEACH, HERMOSA BEACH, REDONDO BEACH AND TORRANCE WILL BECOME GRIDLOCKED ON AN ALREADY OVERCROWDED ARTERIOLES JAMMED WITH LAX TRAFFIC.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2.1 regarding surface

transportation analysis methodology and Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PHF00007-4

Comment:

MORE IMPORTANTLY, THIS WHOLE PROCESS IS OPERATED OFF THE ASSUMPTION THAT LAX IS THE ONLY OPTION IN MEETING THE GROWING DEMANDS OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S AIR TRAFFIC NEEDS. NOTHING COULD BE FURTHER FROM THE TRUTH. TRYING TO CRAM ALL OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S AIR TRANSPORT DEMANDS INTO L.A. IS MISGUIDED, SHORT-SIDED AND ULTIMATELY INEFFECTIVE, GIVEN THE OTHER RESOURCES AVAILABLE.

Response:

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

PHF00007-5

Comment:

PALMDALE AIRPORT CAN HANDLE PASSENGER DEMANDS FROM THE WESTERN SAN FERNANDO VALLEY AND VENTURA COUNTY AND THE CITIZENS OF THE ANTELOPE VALLEY WANT THE AIRPORT TO GROW. ONTARIO AIRPORT HAS THE CAPACITY TO HANDLE AN INCREASE IN PASSENGERS AS WELL.

Response:

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

PHF00007-6

Comment:

MARCH AIR FORCE BASE HAS AN EXISTING RUNWAY WELL-SUITED FOR CARGO.

Response:

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

PHF00007-7

Comment:

ANOTHER KEY POINT TO REMEMBER IS THAT ANY REGIONAL PLAN MUST ADDRESS THE FACT THAT SIGNIFICANT PORTION OF THE PASSENGER TRAFFIC AND 20 PERCENT OF THE CARGO INTO AND OUT OF LAX COMES FROM ORANGE COUNTY. THAT IS LIKELY TO DOUBLE IN THE NEXT 10 TO 15 YEARS.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand.

PHF00007-8

Comment:

FINALLY, IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA THERE ARE THREE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORTS. THAT'S SAN JOSE, SAN FRANCISCO AND OAKLAND. THERE IS ONLY ONE IN ALL OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. THESE ARE COMPONENTS OF A TRULY REGIONAL AIRPORT PLAN. AND A REGIONAL AIRPORT PLAN THAT DISBURSES SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S DEMANDS THROUGHOUT ALL OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA IS THE ONLY VIABLE SOLUTION TO THIS EQUATION.

Response:

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

PHF00007-9

Comment:

I LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH MY COLLEAGUES AT THE STATE, LOCAL AND FEDERAL LEVELS, OUR NEIGHBORS THROUGHOUT THE SOUTH BAY THE FAA AND LAWA TOWARD THIS GOAL. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00008

Slawson, Richard

**Los Angeles Building &
Construction Trades Council**

6/9/2001

PHF00008-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. MY NAME IS RICHARD SLAWSON. I AM THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE 130,000 MEMBER BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL REPRESENTING CRAFTWORKERS THROUGHOUT LOS ANGELES AND ORANGE COUNTY. OUR OFFICE IS LOCATED AT 1626 BEVERLY BOULEVARD IN LOS ANGELES. I MYSELF LIVE IN TORRANCE. GREW UP IN HAWTHORNE AND AM VERY FAMILIAR WITH THE ISSUES INVOLVED WITH LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

I AM HERE TODAY TO TELL YOU THAT WE ALSO BELIEVE THAT THERE IS A REGIONAL SOLUTION TO THE ISSUES SURROUNDING AIRPORT CONSTRUCTION, AIRPORT EXPANSION THROUGHOUT THIS ENTIRE REGION. BUT, AS YOU KNOW, IN ORANGE COUNTY THE FOLKS THAT LIVE AROUND EL TORO MARINE BASE OPPOSE AN AIRPORT THERE, WHICH EFFECTS THE ABILITY OF ANY AIRPORT EXPANSION TO REASONABLY BE ACCOMPLISHED TO HANDLE THE INCREASES IN POPULATION CARGO TRAFFIC THAT WE WILL SEE COMING WITH THE

INCREASE IN POPULATION AND BUSINESS THROUGHOUT THIS AREA. FOR THAT REASON WE ALSO SUPPORT MODERNIZATION OF LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

MODERNIZATION OF LAX IS NOT A JOBS PROGRAM BUT IT MEANS JOBS TO MANY PEOPLE THROUGHOUT THE AREA. THE JOBS THAT PROVIDE LIVELIHOOD FOR THE FAMILY -- I SHOULD SAY I'VE ATTENDED MANY OTHER HEARINGS, PROBABLY 15 OVER THE LAST FIVE YEARS ABOUT LAX, AND WHEN IT IS OVER ON THE WEST SIDE THE PEOPLE THAT LIVE IN THIS AREA SHOULD BE CONCERNED ABOUT EFFECTS ON THEIR AREA. WE DON'T DENY THAT. I LIVE IN THIS AREA AS WELL. I HAVE A REFINERY THAT IS WITHIN A MILE FROM WHERE I LIVE. THERE ARE ALL KINDS OF ISSUES THAT ARE EFFECTED. WE HAVE AT LEAST SAME ISSUES COMING UP WITH THE INCREASE IN CONSTRUCTION OF NEW POWER HOUSES TO PROVIDE ELECTRICITY FOR ALL THE PEOPLE IN THE AREA.

BUT THIS IS AN ISSUE THAT IS TALKING ABOUT THE ECONOMIC CONDITIONS THAT WE WILL SEE IN THE FUTURE IN THIS ENTIRE REGION AND WE THINK IT IS AN IMPORTANT ONE FOR LAX. WE THINK IT IS IMPORTANT THAT IT BE EXPANDED AND MODERNIZED. PEOPLE OF LOS ANGELES HAVE A CHOICE TO MAKE ABOUT LAX. IF WE DO NOTHING DELAYS WILL INCREASE. THE RUNWAYS WILL BECOME LESS SAFE. AIRLINE TRAFFIC WILL CONTINUE TO INCREASE AND WE WILL LOSE JOBS TO OTHER REGIONS WHO ARE MORE WILLING AND READY TO ACT. THESE ARE INDISPUTABLE FACTS OF OUR SITUATION AND THESE FACTS WILL NOT BE ALTERED BY FANTASIZING ABOUT QUICK-FIX SOLUTIONS OR PIE-IN-THE-SKY IDEAS ABOUT HOW WE WILL UNILATERALLY DEMAND AIRPORT CARRIERS TO FLY TO OTHER AIRPORTS.

WE CAN'T CONTROL ALL OF THE ECONOMIC DECISIONS IN THE AIRLINE INDUSTRY BUT WE CAN CONTROL PLANNING OR CREATIVITY IN SOLVING PROBLEMS AND OUR VISION IS TO WHAT LAX CAN BE FOR EVERYONE. I AM FINISHING HERE, SO GET READY. BUT THAT SOLUTION WILL NOT OCCUR WITHOUT LAX TAKING ITS FAIR SHARE OF THE BURDEN.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00009 Benner, Mark National Air Traffic Controllers 6/9/2001
Association

PHF00009-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS MARK BENNER. I AM HERE ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS ASSOCIATION FOR LOS ANGELES TERRA. THE CONTROLLERS AT LOS ANGELES TOWER ARE NOT HERE TO SUPPORT ANY PARTICULAR PLAN THUS FAR PUT FORTH. WE ARE HERE TO DISCUSS THE SAFETY AND DELAY PROBLEMS THAT EXIST TODAY. LAX WAS BUILT TO HANDLE AIRCRAFT THAT NO LONGER UTILIZE OUR AIRPORT. THESE AIRCRAFT WERE SMALLER, SLOWER AND FAR FEWER OF THEM. THE AIRCRAFT OF TODAY SIMPLY DO NOT FIT ON THIS AIRPORT. SEVERAL TYPES DO NOT FIT IN BETWEEN OUR RUNWAYS WHILE SOME ARE SO LONG THAT THEIR TAILS STICK OUT TO THE TAXIWAYS. SEVERAL AIRCRAFT HAVE ACTUALLY HIT ON YOUR TAXIWAYS BECAUSE OF INSUFFICIENT TAXIWAYS WIDTH.

THE NEXT GENERATION OF AIRCRAFT WILL NOT BE ABLE TO TAXI ON THIS AIRPORT. THIS DAY IS COMING SOON. LAST YEAR 24 HOUR AIRCRAFT CROSSED RUNWAYS WHEN THEY WERE NOT SUPPOSED TO. OF THESE ONLY EIGHT WERE TERMED RUNWAY INCURSIONS. THE FACT IS THAT EVERYTIME AN AIRCRAFT CROSSES WHEN THEY SHOULD NOT HAVE, IT IS A POTENTIAL ACCIDENT. LUCK WILL DETERMINE HOW MANY OF THESE INCIDENTS WILL BECOME RUNWAY INCURSIONS AND INEVITABLY ACCIDENTS. LAST YEAR WE WERE LUCKY. SO FAR THIS YEAR THE INCURSION RATE IS MUCH HIGHER. HOW MUCH LONGER CAN WE BE AT OR NEAR THE TOP OF RUNWAY INCURSIONS AND CONTINUE TO BE LUCKY.

3. Comments and Responses

THERE ARE MANY PROBLEMS WITH THE AIRPORT CONFIGURATIONS THAT LEAD TO SAFETY PROBLEMS. THE RUNWAYS AND TAXIWAYS ARE TOO CLOSE TOGETHER. WE HAVE FAR TOO MANY GATES TO ACCOMMODATE THE TRAFFIC. LOS ANGELES HAS ALLEYS THAT FORCES ONE AIRCRAFT TO BLOCK THE ACCESS OF TEN WHEN THEY ARE TRYING TO GET TO THE GATES. IT BECOMES A PROBLEM WHEN WE TRY TO CLEAR THE RUNWAYS. THE PROBLEMS ARE TOO NUMEROUS AT THIS POINT TO DISCUSS THEM ALL.

THE CONTROLLERS AT LOS ANGELES TOWER UNDERSTAND THIS THERE ARE MANY POTENTIAL PROBLEMS AND COMPLAINTS WITH EXPANSION. WE ARE NOT SAYING THAT YOU MUST BUILD MORE RUNWAYS. THAT IS A CAPACITY ISSUE AND AS LONG AS THE PEOPLE AT LOS ANGELES ARE WILLING TO LIVE WITH THE EVERMOUNTING DELAYS, IT IS NOT LIFE-THREATENING. NOT MODERNIZING THIS AIRPORT, HOWEVER, IS NOT AN OPTION. THE AIRPORT MUST BE MADE SAFE. HISTORY AND STATISTICS ARE AGAINST US IF WE DON'T.

Response:

As indicated in Topical Response TR-SAF-1, under each of the Master Plan build alternatives, changes to the taxiway system configuration would be implemented to reduce the potential for runway incursions and to enhance the safety of aircraft operations at LAX. The specific changes to the taxiway system configuration under Alternatives A, B, and C were described and illustrated in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR. The specific changes to the taxiway system configuration under Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan were described and illustrated in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

**PHF00010 Bridle, Tom Congresswoman Jane Harman's 6/9/2001
Office**

PHF00010-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS TOM BRIDLE. I AM SENIOR POLICY ADVISOR IN THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSWOMAN JANE HARMON. MY NAME IS TOM BRIDLE. SENIOR POLICY ADVISOR IN THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSWOMAN JANE HARMON. THANK YOU. CAN I FIRST SUGGEST THAT MAYBE IT MIGHT BE A DIVISION OF LABOR IF SOMEONE OTHER THAN JIM RITCHIE HANDLES THE CLOCK WHO SHOULD PROBABLY BE PAYING ATTENTION TO THE COMMENTS RATHER THAN TRYING TO FIGURE OUT HOW THAT WORKS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00010-2

Comment:

THE CONGRESSWOMAN HAS SUBMITTED WRITTEN TESTIMONY TO THOSE PROCEEDINGS AND I HAVE COPIES OF THAT TIME IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE IT. IT IS ALSO AVAILABLE ON OUR WEBSITE, WHICH IS WWW.HOUSE.GOV/HARMON. YOU CAN SUBMIT COMMENTS WHICH WE WILL BE SUBMITTING TO LAWA AND THE FAA ON JULY 25TH OF THIS YEAR. CONGRESSWOMAN COULD NOT BE HERE IN PERSON BUT HAS ASKED ME TO SUBMIT THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT WHICH SUMMARIZES HER TESTIMONY.

I APPRECIATE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT MY VIEWS. THESE VIEWS REFLECT E-MAILS, LETTERS, PHONE CALLS AND CONVERSATIONS WITH DISTRICT RESIDENTS WHO ARE PASSIONATELY CONCERNED ABOUT WHAT LAX EXPANSION WILL DO TO THEIR COMMUNITIES. THE DECISION WE MAKE HERE TODAY WILL COST BILLIONS OF DOLLARS, EFFECT MILLIONS OF RESIDENTS, TRAVELERS AND BUSINESSES. IT IS CRITICAL NOT ONLY THAT WE MAKE THE RIGHT CHOICES BUT ALSO THAT THE PROCESS BY WHICH THOSE DECISIONS ARE REACHED ARE THOUGHTFUL, INCLUSIVE, FAIR AND COMPREHENSIVE.

HEARINGS LIKE THIS ARE A GOOD START, HOWEVER, THREE HEARINGS ON ONE DAY DOES NOT REFLECT A REAL COMMITMENT TO ACTIVE COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION.

ASSEMBLYMAN LUCANO, STATE SENATOR DEBORAH BOWEN AND CONGRESSWOMAN HARMON WROTE A LETTER TO LAWA ASKING THAT MORE HEARINGS BE HELD. WE DID NOT RECEIVE A RESPONSE.

Response:

Comment noted. Additional public review and hearings were conducted for the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PHF00010-3

Comment:

I AM OPPOSED TO THE MASTER PLAN AND SUPPORT A TRULY REGIONAL APPROACH TO AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. MY EFFORTS HAVE BEEN AND WILL CONTINUE TO BE FOCUSED ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVE TO THE EXPANSION AT LAX.

A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLE SIGNED BY MYSELF AND 12 OTHER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FROM ACROSS SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND ACROSS THE POLITICAL SPECTRUM OFFERS OUR SUPPORT FOR A PLAN DEVELOPED BY CONSENSUS ACROSS THE REGION FAIRLY ALLOCATES BENEFITS AND BURDENS OF AIR TRANSPORTATION, EXPANDS AIRPORTS WITH UNDERUTILIZED CAPACITY, DOES NOT FORCE GROWTH IN OVERBURDENED AIRPORTS AND APPROVES APPROPRIATE GROUND TRANSPORTATION.

THE MASTER PLAN IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THESE PRINCIPLES. IT DOES NOT REFLECT A REGIONAL CONSENSUS. IT MAKES LITTLE OR NO EFFORT TO DISTRIBUTE AIR TRAFFIC IN UNDERUTILIZED AIRPORTS. IT MAKES NO COMPARISONS TO REGIONAL APPROACHES TAKEN BY OTHER U. S. CITIES. THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE PROJECTS 89 MAP AT LAX BUT FAILS TO PROVIDE ANY CONVINCING EVIDENCE THAT LAX WILL NOT BE FORCED TO HANDLE MUCH MORE CAPACITY.

Response:

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

PHF00010-4

Comment:

IT DOES NOT TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION PUBLIC INVESTMENT IN MILITARY BASES AT PALMDALE AND ELSEWHERE IN THE REGION.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PHF00010-5

Comment:

IT MAKES LITTLE OR NO EFFORT TO COMPARE THE COST OF LAX EXPANSION OTHER THAN LAX. IT DOES NOT CONSIDER SCAG'S RECENT DECISION TO BASE ITS REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN ON A SCENARIO WHICH DOES NOT INCLUDE NEW FACILITIES AT LAX,

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC00010-3.

PHF00010-6

Comment:

AND IT DOES NOT CONSIDER THE POTENTIAL ROLE OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL AUTHORITY IN DEVELOPMENT OF EXPANSION AT LAX.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PHM00001-6.

PHF00010-7

Comment:

I LOOK FORWARD TO HEARING HOW LAWA AND THE FAA RESPOND TO THESE CONCERNS AND TO OTHER COMMENTS MADE TODAY. I WILL SHARE THOSE RESPONSES WITH MY CONSTITUENTS AND I WILL CONTINUE TO PLAY AN ACTIVE ROLE IN SUPPORTING A TRULY REGIONAL APPROACH TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AIRPORT NEEDS.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PHF00010-1 through PHF00010-6 above and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PHF00011 Sheehan, Lari

**County Supervisor Michael
Antonovich's office**

6/9/2001

PHF00011-1

Comment:

THANK YOU. MY NAME IS LARI SHEEHAN, ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER WITH THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES. I ALSO HAVE THE PLEASURE AT THE PRESENT TIME OF SERVING AS THE INTERIM EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY. I AM HERE TODAY REPRESENTING SUPERVISOR MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH, WHO APOLOGIZES FOR THE FACT THAT HE COULD NOT BE HERE. WE HAVE SUBMITTED WRITTEN COMMENTS ON HIS BEHALF.

THE SUPERVISOR WOULD LIKE TO INDICATE THAT HE UNDERSTANDS THE IMPORTANCE OF LAX TO THE ECONOMY OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGION. HE ALSO FEELS THAT THE LAX NEEDS TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT IT HAS A VERY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE COMMUNITIES THAT SURROUND THE AIRPORT AND THAT L. A. WORLD AIRPORTS OWNS THREE AIRPORTS. LAX IS NOT THE ONLY AIRPORT IT OWNS. IT OWNS AN AIRPORT IN PALMDALE AND ALSO ONTARIO AND WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE LAWA FOCUS ON A REGIONAL APPROACH TO AIRPORTS FOR THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGION.

Response:

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

PHF00011-2

Comment:

I WOULD LIKE TO MENTION IF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WHEN WE HAVE CROWDS LIKE THIS WE ASK THEM TO RAISE THEIR HANDS. IT GIVES THE SAME IMPACT AND IT DOESN'T INTERRUPT AND IT IS A LOT EASIER FOR PEOPLE WHO ARE TRYING TO RECORD THIS. I SUGGEST THAT YOU DO THAT INSTEAD OF CLAPPING.

WE WOULD ALSO LIKE TO COMMENT THAT WE FEEL YOUR PUBLIC OUTREACH PROGRAM IS FLAWED. ONE HEARING AT THREE DIFFERENT LOCATIONS ON THE SAME DAY IS NOT FOSTERING WHAT YOU HAD SAID WAS YOUR INTENT WHICH WAS TO GET THE BROADEST POSSIBLE PARTICIPATION PROCESS.

Response:

The intent of the one hearing at three locations was to maximize the number of persons that could provide input and provide more access to the most convenient hearing site. A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood information packets, public workshops, and a web site (www.laxmasterplan.org) in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PHF00011-3

Comment:

THE COUNTY, WE HAVE TWO LADIES WHO ARE GOING TO BE FOLLOWING ME, MS. SANDRA BAUER AND HOLLY GROZA.

THEY ARE CONSULTANTS FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES AND THEY HAVE COMPLETED WITH A TEAM OF CONSULTANTS HEADED BY A.C. LADEREDO AND ASSOCIATES A REVIEW OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT AND IMPACT. THEY HAVE FOUND AND PRESENTED THEIR PRELIMINARY FINDINGS ON THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. THE BOTTOM LINE FINDING IS THE DOCUMENTS ARE FATALLY FLAWED AND THAT THE PROBLEMS WITH THE DOCUMENTS ARE SO PERVASIVE AND SYSTEMIC THAT THE ONLY PRACTICAL REMEDY IS TO START OVER.

SPECIFICALLY THE SUPERVISOR WOULD LIKE TO CALL OUT THE FOLLOWING PROBLEMS WITH DOCUMENTS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00011-4

Comment:

FIRST OF ALL SCOPING, AS HAS ALREADY BEEN MENTIONED, LAWA INDICATES THAT THEY ARE SERVING THE ENTIRE REGION, AND YET THERE WAS NO CONTACT THAT WE CAN FIND WITH THE COUNTIES OF ORANGE, RIVERSIDE, SAN BERNARDINO AND VENTURA WHO ARE PART OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGION.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00007-1 regarding the scoping undertaken for the LAX Master Plan.

PHF00011-5

Comment:

THE EIS/EIR CONCLUDES THAT THE REGIONAL AIRPORT SYSTEM IS NOT FEASIBLE, AND YET AS I HAVE MENTIONED, L.A. AIRPORTS OWNS THREE AIRPORTS, AND IF IT IS NOT FEASIBLE, WHY DID THE EIS/EIR CONCLUDE THAT A CERTAIN LEVEL OF DEMAND IS GOING TO HAVE TO BE ABSORBED AT OTHER AIRPORTS OTHER THAN LAX.

Response:

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

PHF00011-6

Comment:

FINALLY, WE HAVE COMMISSIONED THAT THE COUNTY STUDY AT PALMDALE AND FOUND THAT PALMDALE AIRPORT TODAY COULD SUPPORT IN EXCESS OF ONE MILLION PASSENGERS A YEAR. I WOULD LIKE TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT JIM RITCHIE, THE DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF LAWA MET WITH THE PALMDALE CITY MANAGER AND MYSELF THIS TUESDAY. THEY HAVE AGREED TO PARTICIPATE IN FURTHER MARKETING ACTIVITIES TO BRING AND REACTIVATE AIR SERVICE AT PALMDALE.

Response:

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

PHF00012 Bauer, Sandra County of Los Angeles 6/9/2001

PHF00012-1

Comment:

I AM SANDRA BAUER AND I AM SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. I WOULD LIKE TO TOUCH BRIEFLY ON SCOPING ON THE NOISE ANALYSIS AND ON THE AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS. THE DRAFT EIS/EIR MAKES A STATEMENT THAT THE OBJECTIVE OF THE PROJECT IS TO PROVIDE 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. IT DEFINES THIS REGION AS A FIVE-COUNTY AREA THAT INCLUDES NOT ONLY LOS ANGELES COUNTY BUT ALSO ORANGE AND VENTURA AND SAN BERNARDINO AND RIVERSIDE COUNTIES.

IN THIS CONTEXT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WONDERS WHY DID THE SCOPING EFFORT FOR THIS EIS/EIR NOT INCLUDE A SINGLE AGENCY FROM THE MUNICIPAL OR COUNTY GOVERNMENTS OF SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, OF ORANGE COUNTY, RIVERSIDE COUNTY OR VENTURA COUNTY. WHY DID THE SCOPING NOT INCLUDE A SINGLE AIRPORT IN ANY OF THESE COUNTIES. IT DID NOT INCLUDE BURBANK, JOHN WAYNE. IT DID NOT INCLUDE THE REGIONAL PLAN, THE AIRPORT PLANNING AUTHORITIES IN THOSE COUNTIES OR LONG BEACH OR OXNARD.

MANY OF THESE ENTITIES WOULD HAVE HAD A VITAL INTEREST IN PARTICIPATING AND SCOPING FOR THIS PROJECT AND THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN VERY HELPFUL, I THINK, IN FORMULATING THE ALTERNATIVES THAT YOU EXAMINED AND THE IMPACTS THAT SHOULD BE STUDIED IN THE EIS/EIR.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00007-1 regarding the scoping undertaken for the LAX Master Plan.

PHF00012-2

Comment:

THE NOISE ANALYSIS INDICATES THAT THERE ARE 49,000 PEOPLE LIVING WITHIN THE 65 CNEL LINE. HOWEVER, LAWA'S OWN 1966 FOURTH-QUARTER REPORT INDICATES THAT THERE ARE IN THAT SAME 65 CNEL JUST UNDER 86,000 PEOPLE. WE WONDER WHY IS THIS DISCREPANCY, WHICH IS A DIFFERENCE OF ALMOST 37,000 PEOPLE, NOT EXPLAINED OR EVEN PRESENTED IN THE EIS/EIR.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor is correct in identifying the discrepancy between modeled INM contours and the measured noise levels identified in LAWA's Quarterly Reports to the State of California. For more information about these differences, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-1.1 regarding INM calculated noise levels compared to noise levels measured in the field and Subtopical Response TR-N-1.2 regarding modeled vs. measured baseline year noise levels.

PHF00012-3

Comment:

THE NOISE TECHNICAL REPORT CONTAINS A GENERALIZED DISCUSSION OF THE EFFECTS OF NOISE ON PEOPLE, CONCLUDING WITH A STATEMENT THAT IT IS ASSUMED THAT COMPLIANCE WITH THE COMPATABILITY CRITERIA IS SUFFICIENT TO PROTECT HUMAN HEALTH. WHY IS IT THAT THE EIS/EIR FAILED TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE EIR IS NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH THOSE COMPATABILITY CRITERIA AND WHY DOES THE EIR/EIS OFFER NO FURTHER ANALYSIS OF THIS ISSUE.

Response:

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

PHF00012-4

Comment:

WE NOTE THAT THERE WERE A NUMBER OF EXCELLENT MITIGATION MEASURES THAT WERE IDENTIFIED AND DISCUSSED IN THE EIS/EIR BUT NOT RECOMMENDED. WE WONDER WHY YOU ARE NOT PROPOSING TO SHORTEN THE DOWNWIND-LEG APPROACH TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF FLIGHTS OVER THE COMMUNITIES OR REASSESS LIMITING THE OUTBOARD RUNWAYS OR EXPANDING THE SOUND INSULATION PROGRAM TO INCLUDE THE 60 CNEL OR ELIMINATING THE EARLY TURNS OVER EL SEGUNDO.

Response:

Limiting the outboard runways as suggested, are already used primarily for landings, while the inboard runways are used principally for takeoffs, although there is an exception rate of approximately 10 percent. Consequently, the loudest operations already occur primarily on the inboard runways and further modifications would result in little additional noise reduction benefit in the neighboring communities. The use of the runways is governed by the rate of arrivals into the LAX airspace and departures from the airport, combined with the requirement to separate different aircraft types for safety purposes. As described in Section 7.1 Potential Noise Abatement Measures of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR the implementation of these measures would provide little to no practical reduction in significant noise level impacts, but would substantially increase the cost of operation at the airport. Please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences and in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-2.3 regarding the evaluation of impacts should extend beyond the 65 CNEL contour to all sensitive areas under flight tracks. Additionally, please see

3. Comments and Responses

Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding Aircraft Flight Procedures and in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX.

PHF00012-5

Comment:

I AM RUNNING OUT OF TIME, SO LET ME SAY THAT THE COUNTY URGES LAWA TO BEGIN ANEW AND TO DO SO WITH A COMPREHENSIVE SCOPING EFFORT TO LOOK AT APPROPRIATE ALTERNATIVES AND A MORE AGGRESSIVE MITIGATION PROGRAM.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL0000-7-1 regarding the scoping undertaken for the LAX Master Plan.

PHF00013 Groza, Holly

County of Los Angeles

6/9/2001

PHF00013-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS HOLLY GROZA. I AM HERE TO REPRESENT THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. AFTER A CAREFUL REVIEW OF THE DRAFT EIS/EIR, WE HAVE CONCLUDED THAT THE ERRORS, OMISSIONS AND INACCURATE ASSUMPTIONS IN THE DOCUMENTS ARE SO PERVASIVE THAT ITS VALIDITY IS WHOLLY COMPROMISED. I AM GOING TO TOUCH ON JUST A FEW ISSUES AT THIS POINT.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00013-2

Comment:

REGARDING A REGIONAL ALTERNATIVE, THE DOCUMENT REPEATEDLY ACKNOWLEDGES THAT LAX IS PART OF A REGIONAL SYSTEM BUT CONCLUDES THAT THE DEVELOPMENT OF A REGIONAL ALTERNATIVE IS UNREASONABLE. THIS CONCLUSION IS PROVIDED WITHOUT ANY JUSTIFICATION AND IT DOES NOT MEET THE STATED PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES. THE EIS/EIR ALSO CONCLUDED THAT SHORT-DISTANCE FLIGHTS WOULD GO TO OUTLYING AIRPORTS, BUT THERE IS NO COMMITMENT TO ENSURE THIS HAPPENS. THE DOCUMENT NEEDS TO EXPLORE THE IMPACT OF THESE FLIGHTS REMAINING AT LAX, THE WORST-CASE SCENARIO, AND NEEDS TO INCLUDE AN ALTERNATIVE THAT PROPERLY IDENTIFIES A PLAN FOR A REGIONAL SOLUTION.

Response:

Comment noted. Justification for the conclusion was provided in Section 1.2.2, Allocation of Air Service Among Regional Airports, of the Draft EIS/EIR, beginning on page 1-13. It is not possible for LAWA or FAA to make commitments regarding the distribution of flights. Neither the FAA nor LAWA have the authority to direct airlines to use one airport in favor of another airport. The Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, as amended, ended federal, state, and local governments role in determining the location for air service by airlines. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided an assessment of project impacts based on state-of-the-practice planning methods as described in in the LAX Master Plan and Chapter 1.0 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than

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

PHF00013-3

Comment:

REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, THE ENVIRONMENT JUSTICE DISCUSSION SIMPLY FAILS TO MEET NEPA REQUIREMENTS AND THE REVIEW DEMANDS ARE MORE RIGOROUS ANALYSIS THAN IS CURRENTLY PROVIDED IN THE EIS/EIR. THE ANALYSIS FAILS TO COMPLY WITH NEPA IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS. PROJECT IMPACTS ARE NOT QUANTIFIED OR ANALYZED.

Response:

The analyses contained in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided extensive information (over 125 pages of narrative, maps and tabular data) pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, and consistent with Executive Order 12898 and DOT Order 5610.2, that is more than sufficient to support informed decision making. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should also be noted, as was indicated in subsection 4.4.3.5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, that the environmental justice analysis focuses on those issues with potential for disproportionate effects on minority or low-income communities and also draws on extensive quantitative analyses contained in the other technical sections of these documents. 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.

PHF00013-4

Comment:

NO MITIGATION MEASURES ARE DISCLOSED, AND THE DOCUMENT ASSERTS THAT INFORMATION IS NOT AVAILABLE, WHICH IS NOT ACCEPTABLE.

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

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PHF00013-5

Comment:

THE DOCUMENT FAILS TO PROVIDE A RELOCATION PLAN FOR THOSE AFFECTED BY THE EXPANSION, MANY OF WHICH ARE MINORITIES.

Response:

As was stated in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR, a relocation plan is provided in Appendix P to Chapter V of the Master Plan. As was stated in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, a relocation plan is provided in Chapters 2.7 and 2.8 of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum.

PHF00013-6

Comment:

IN ADDITION, THE REPORT DOES NOT QUANTIFY THE PLAN'S EFFECTS ON MINORITY NEIGHBORHOODS WHO TAKE EXCEPTION TO THE STATEMENT THAT THESE FIGURES ARE NOT AVAILABLE.

Response:

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, provided demographic information concerning the minority and low-income composition of the census tract within which residential properties are proposed for acquisition under Alternatives A, B and C. This census tract, tract 2780, and its demographic characteristics were described on pages 4-427 and 4-428 of the Draft EIS/EIR.

Public information on the demographics of business ownership and employment is limited. As a result, and based on issues related to privacy rights and the difficulty of completing a survey within the study area, this information was not included in the Draft EIS/EIR or the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. However, the potential for relocation effects on minority businesses or residents was identified on pages 4-428, 4-430, and 4-432 of the Draft EIS/EIR and on pages 4-336, 4-337, and 4-339 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As stated in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, relocation would be undertaken in compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act and pursuant to a LAWA Relocation Plan that would include special provisions to assist minority owned businesses or residents to the extent necessary. Although relocation impacts are less than significant, to the extent that there could be disproportionate effects on minority businesses or residents, they would be addressed through LAWA's Relocation Plan and the Environmental Justice Program described in subsection 4.4.3.7 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and this Final EIS/EIR, including Mitigation Measure MM-RBR-2 and the job related provisions for disadvantaged business enterprises described under the environmental justice benefit "Job Outreach Center." As demonstrated above, the lack of greater specificity on demographics has not compromised the environmental justice analyses or the adequacy of LAWA's Environmental Justice Program, mitigation measures, or Master Plan commitments that address and offset potential disproportionate effects on minority and/or low-income populations.

PHF00013-7**Comment:**

REGARDING TRAFFIC, THE IMPACT AND FEASIBILITY OF THE EXTENSIVE CONGESTIVE RELIEF PACKET AND PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES ARE IN NEED OF FURTHER ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology for a discussion of this issue.

PHF00013-8**Comment:**

THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT SECTION DOES NOT INCLUDE THE NO PROJECT, NO ACTION PROJECT FOR COMPARISON.

Response:

The comment is similar to Comment AL00022-25; please see Response to Comment AL00022-25.

PHF00013-9**Comment:**

FINALLY, NOT A SINGLE INTERSECTION IN THE COUNTY UNINCORPORATED AREA WAS ANALYZED. THIS IS ABSOLUTELY UNACCEPTABLE CONSIDERING THERE ARE SEVEN SUCH AREAS WITHIN ONE MILE OF THE AIRPORT.

Response:

The analysis included four intersections on the boundary of Playa Del Rey, 13 intersections (including six original intersections plus four more intersection in the refined analysis of Alternative C) are on the boundary of Lennox, two intersections are on the boundary of Del Aire, four links within or on the boundary of the unincorporated area comprising Ladera Heights, Baldwin Hills and Windsor Hills, and one link adjacent to Del Aire. The CMP analysis further analyzes the entire CMP system of arterial streets and freeways throughout all of Los Angeles County. The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00014**Goldheim, Ralph****None Provided****6/9/2001****PHF00014-1****Comment:**

MY NAME IS RALPH GOLDHEIM. I AM A RESIDENT OF WESTCHESTER 8707 LILIENTHAL AVENUE. WESTCHESTER CALIFORNIA, AS A NEARBY LAX RESIDENT I AM PARTICULARLY CONCERNED ABOUT THE NEW FAA REVISION OF THE NOISE ABATEMENT POLICY AND EIR DRAFT AND MASTER PLAN. THE NOISE OF OVERHEAD AIRCRAFT IN MY HOME IS DISRUPTIVE AND DRAMATICALLY IMPACTS MY FAMILY QUALITY OF LIFE AND THE PROPERTY VALUE OF OUR HOME. AVATION NOISE IS A SERIOUS PROBLEM AT LAX AND IN PARTICULAR THE FAA NEEDS TO DO MORE TO MITIGATE THE EXISTING SITUATION AND NOT ALLOW THINGS TO GET WORSE.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 and Topical Response TR-N-4 for a discussion of mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, and Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values. As was stated in Section 4.2.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, mitigation measure MM-LU-1 would accelerate the fulfillment of existing commitments to owners wishing to participate within the current ANMP boundaries prior to proceeding with newly eligible properties. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PHF00014-2

Comment:

UNFORTUNATELY THE TRACK HISTORY OF WHAT LAX HAS DONE SUCCESSFULLY IS TO ALIENATE EVERYONE IN WESTCHESTER AS THEIR NEIGHBOR. UNLESS THEY, LAX MANAGEMENT, ARE FORCED TO REDUCE NOISE THEY WILL, AS THEY HAVE SHOWN TO DATE, CONTINUE TO REPRESENT ONLY THE AIRLINES INTEREST IN THEIR DESIRE TO EXPAND THAT PASSENGER AND FREIGHT TRAFFIC. I BELIEVE THIS PROBLEM IS SIMPLY THE SYSTEM OF A BROKEN REGULATORY SYSTEM INVOLVING AIRPORT MANAGEMENT IN GENERAL AND I DON'T BELIEVE UNITED AIRLINES AND LOCAL AIRPORT MANAGEMENT SHOULD BE MAKING DECISIONS AND IMPLEMENTING PLANS IN DIRECT OPPOSITION TO LOCAL RESIDENTS. WE LIVE HERE AND THEY DON'T.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels.

PHF00014-3

Comment:

SPECIFICALLY, THE EIR DRAFT IS A SERIOUSLY FLAWED STUDY AND SHOULD NOT BE USED TO DECIDE ON ANY LAX EXPANSION, SPECIFICALLY ON NOISE. THE DATA ON THE CNEL NOISE CONTOURING AND HOW IT WILL CHANGE FROM THE 1996 BASE LINE CNEL MAP TO THE PROJECTED 2015 CNEL MAP IS INCONCLUSIVE AT BEST. THE CNEL STANDARD OF AVERAGE NOISE MEASUREMENT DOES NOT TAKE INTO EFFECT SINGLE NOISE EVENTS AND THEIR IMPACT.

IN OTHER WORDS, A VERY LOUD 747 LANDING OR TAKING OFF IS SIMPLY AVERAGED INTO NORMAL TRAFFIC AND NEIGHBORHOOD NOISE. CNEL OR SINGLE TRACKING WOULD MUCH MORE CLOSELY MEASURE IMPACT ON OUR QUALITY OF LIFE AND HEALTH ISSUES.

Response:

Please see Appendix S-C, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-2.1.

PHF00014-4

Comment:

A REGIONAL MASTER PLAN IS THE ONLY WAY TO GO.

Response:

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

PHF00015 Walker, Daniel

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00015-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. DANIEL WALKER. I LIVE AT 7416 WEST 82ND STREET, WHICH IS ABOUT SIX BLOCKS NORTH OF THE AIRPORT. LIVED IN L. A. FOR ABOUT 37 YEARS AND RECENTLY MOVED FROM INGLEWOOD TO THE PLAYA DEL REY AREA. A MEMBER OF SIERRA CLUB, SO I CERTAINLY WANT TO SEE CLEAN AIR, TRAFFIC CONGESTION REDUCED.

Response:

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

PHF00015-2

Comment:

PERSONALLY HOW I GET AROUND PAST LAX, I DRIVE MY BIKE FROM PLAYA ALONG PERSHING TO HUGHES. OF COURSE, NOW IT IS BOUGHT BY BOEING. I HOPE IN THE CONSIDERATION OF THE MASTER PLAN YOU ALLOW BIKE USE TO PASS THROUGH THE AREA.

Response:

Bicycle access to/from the west terminals would be provided, via bike lanes along Westchester Parkway, Imperial Highway, and Pershing Drive.

PHF00015-3

Comment:

I THINK THE REGIONAL APPROACH IS PROBABLY THE RIGHT WAY TO GO. IT SOUNDS LIKE FOR MY BELIEFS AND SIERRA CLUB, WE SHOULD CERTAINLY TRY TO HAVE PEOPLE THAT LIVE IN THE INLAND EMPIRE USE AN AIRPORT FACILITY THAT IS CLOSER TO THEM. SAME THING FOR PEOPLE OF ORANGE COUNTY.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00015-4

Comment:

PEOPLE IN LAX AREA, WE WANT TO BE ABLE TO GET TO OUR AIRPORT EASIER. THERE ARE SOME PARTS OF THE MASTER PLAN THAT I THINK ARE GOOD IDEAS. FOR EXAMPLE, THE GREEN LINE. IF WE CAN GET THE GREEN LINE AT LEAST INTO THE OLD PART OF LAX THAT WOULD CERTAINLY ALLEVIATE A LOT OF CONGESTION ON OUR CURRENT STREETS. PEOPLE IN OUR GROUPS THAT I WORK WITH CERTAINLY SUPPORT GETTING THE GREEN LINE EXTENDED TO LAX IN SOME FASHION.

Response:

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

PHF00015-5

Comment:

IN SUMMARY, I THINK THERE ARE SOME GOOD PARTS OF THIS AND THERE ARE SOME PARTS THAT WE HAVE CONCERN WITH. I JUST HOPE THAT WE ARE ABLE TO PULL OUT THE GOOD PARTS AND GET FUNDING FOR THAT AND DISBURSE THE TRAFFIC SO THAT THE OVERALL POLLUTION FOR THE LOS ANGELES WHOLE BASIN IS MINIMIZED AND THE TRAFFIC FOR THE WHOLE BASIN IS MINIMIZED SO THAT THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT, WHICH INCLUDES NOISE, IS SPREAD OUT AND DONE IN THE MOST ENVIRONMENTALLY CONSCIOUS WAY.

Response:

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

PHF00016	Schumacher, Don	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	------------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHF00016-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS DON SCHUMACHER. I AM A NATIVE OF LOS ANGELES AND I GREW UP IN MAR VISTA AND NOW LIVE IN WESTCHESTER. I LIVE AT 8758 CRAYDON. THE FAA IS DOING A HUGE DISSERVICE TO THIS COMMUNITY. THERE'S AN AIRPORT RIGHT HERE THAT IS ONLY SUPPOSED TO HANDLE 40 MILLION PASSENGERS A YEAR, BUT THEY ALLOW 64 PLUS MILLION TO USE THESE FACILITIES. FORGIVE ME IF I THINK YOU LACK CREDIBILITY WHEN YOU SAY THAT THIS EXPANSION IS GOING TO HANDLE 89 MILLION PASSENGERS WHEN WE ALL KNOW IT IS PROBABLY GOING TO BE MORE LIKE 120 MILLION.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHF00016-2**Comment:**

ANOTHER THING IS THAT SAN FRANCISCO, WHICH WAS STATED EARLIER, AS WELL AS NEW YORK CITY, ALL HAVE THREE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORTS IN THEIR AREA. WE NEED TO AT LEAST DO THE SAME THING HERE. I COULD CARE LESS WHAT THREE THEY ARE. I AM PROUD OF THE ECONOMIC GROWTH HERE IN LOS ANGELES. IT IS FANTASTIC. BUT WE NEED TO HAVE MORE AIRPORTS. WE CAN'T FUNNEL ALL THE POPULATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ALL INTO ONE AIRPORT. IT IS RIDICULOUS.

Response:

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

PHF00016-3**Comment:**

THE OTHER THING IS I LIVE OVER BY WILEY POST WHERE THIS ARBOR VITAE/RING ROAD IS GOING TO BE CONSTRUCTED AND THE HOUSE IS BEING TAKEN OUT. WHAT THE RESIDENTS IN THAT AREA MAY NOT REALIZE, WE ARE TRADING IN A BASEBALL FIELD FOR A CARGO TERMINAL.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land acquisition for each of the build alternatives in Chapter 3 and Section 4.2, Land Use. See Topical Response TR-LU-2 concerning impacts to the Community of Westchester. As was described in Section 4.2.6.5 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative) does not propose any residential acquisition nor a ring road. As described in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Neilson Park (which includes the baseball field referenced by the commentor) would be expanded under Alternatives A, B, and C, and would not be affected under Alternative D.

PHF00016-4**Comment:**

WHEN YOU TELL US THAT WE ARE GOING TO HAVE REDUCED TRAFFIC AND REDUCED POLLUTION, WE WILL HAVE INCREASED TRAFFIC AND POLLUTION BECAUSE NOW WE ARE GOING TO HAVE SEMIS AND ALL THESE HIGH-POLLUTING DIESEL ENGINE VEHICLES COMING IN OUR AREA 24/7 TO USE THIS AREA. THIS IS NOT GOING TO MAKE THINGS LESS. IT IS GOING TO MAKE THEM WORSE.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic (see Section 5, Truck Diesel Pollution/Air Quality) for more information. Alternative D, which is addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not increase cargo handling facilities at LAX. As was indicated in Table S3-2 (page 3-23) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, cargo operations are projected to increase to about

3. Comments and Responses

3,120,000 tons/year at LAX by 2015 under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D. The traffic impacts of this level of cargo activity were described in Section 4.3.2.6.1 (beginning on page 4-293) of the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00016-5

Comment:

I THINK I COVERED BASICALLY EVERYTHING ON MY NOTES HERE, SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ALSO I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST YOU DO PAY ATTENTION TO SCAG'S RECOMMENDATIONS AND USE THAT AS A BASIS FOR THIS REGIONAL PLAN.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifts the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. 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).

PHF00017	Brant, Thomas	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHF00017-1

Comment:

I WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS SAFETY FIRST. HOW MANY PEOPLE IN HERE REMEMBER THE CERRITOS ACCIDENT? THE AIR SPACE IN LOS ANGELES IS ALREADY OVERSATURATED. ANY EXPANSION HERE IS SIMPLY GOING TO MAKE THAT WORSE. WE NEED TO MITIGATE EXISTING SAFETY HAZARDS, NOT MAKE IT WORSE. AIRPLANE CRASHES ARE EQUAL-OPPORTUNITY KILLERS, BOTH PASSENGERS AND THOSE ON THE GROUND, REGARDLESS OF WHAT PART OF TOWN GETS DEVISTATED.

Response:

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

PHF00017-2

Comment:

NOISE, THERE APPEARS TO BE A DISCREPANCY IN THE LOCATION OF THE EASTERN END OF THE 65DB NOISE CONTOUR LINE. THE MULTI-VOLUME DRAFT IN THE PUBLIC LIBRARY SHOWS THE 1996 LINE ABOUT A MILE SHORT OF THE HARBOR FREEWAY WHILE THE GENERAL PLAN REVISION DATED SEPTEMBER, 1998 SHOWS THE 65 EXTENDING EAST OF THE HARBOR FREEWAY. IS THIS HOW MUCH IT INCREASED DURING TWO YEARS OR IS THAT MERELY A DISCREPANCY. AS TRAFFIC INCREASES IN LAX, BOTH THE AIR TRAFFIC AND THE NOISE IS GOING TO INCREASE ALL OVER TOWN, NOT JUST IN THIS VICINITY.

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to comment PC00171-3; please refer to Response to Comment PC00171-3. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PHF00017-3

Comment:

GROUND TRANSPORTATION. I HAVE RECENTLY BEEN DRIVING TO CLAREMONT ABOUT ONCE A WEEK IN THE MORNING AND EVERYTIME I SEE THE TRAFFIC HEADING WEST ON THE I-105 AND I-210, I AM GLAD I AM HEADING EAST. THAT'S ONLY GOING TO GET WORSE IF WE TRY TO JAM ALL THAT TRAFFIC INTO LAX. THAT'S NOT JUST IN THIS VICINITY. THAT'S ALL OVER TOWN.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PHF00017-4

Comment:

THE IDEA OF THE EXPANSION FOR LAX WILL BE GOOD FOR BUSINESS IS A MYTH. THE EXISTING GRIDLOCK WILL SEND BUSINESS ELSEWHERE PROBABLY RESULTING IN A JOB LOSS FOR THE AREA. HOW MANY BUSINESSES ARE GOING TO BE DISPLACED BY LAX ACQUIRING ADDITIONAL REAL ESTATE. THAT'S MORE JOB LOSS. HOWEVER, AT PALMDALE JOBS ARE JUST AS IMPORTANT AS THEY ARE AT LAX AND THE POTENTIAL FOR GROWTH IS MUCH GREATER.

Response:

Residential and business relocations resulting from LAX Master Plan alternatives were discussed in Section 4.4.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00017-5

Comment:

I AM NOT GOING TO HAVE TIME FOR EVERYTHING HERE, BUT I WANT TO ADDRESS THE ALTERNATIVE MYTH OR FARCE. DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PHASE, EVEN THE CURRENT LAX CAPACITY WILL BE REDUCED DURING THAT CONSTRUCTION. HOW MUCH MORE SAFETY PROBLEM IS THAT GOING TO CAUSE. THAT'S NOT ADDRESSED IN THE EIR EITHER.

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to Comment PC00171-10. Please see Response to Comment PC00171-10.

PHF00017-6

Comment:

TO SUMMARIZE THE IDEA OF FURTHER EXPANSION FOR LAX IS EXPENSIVE, DANGEROUS AND TEMPORARY. EVEN THE LAX MASTER PLAN SAYS THAT IT IS GOOD FOR UP TO 2015. WHAT IS THAT? PALMDALE? WHY DON'T THEY DO IT RIGHT THE FIRST TIME.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00018 Sexton, Kathy None Provided 6/9/2001

PHF00018-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS KATHY SEXTON. I LIVE AT 8101 NAYLOR AVENUE IN LOS ANGELES. I AM NOT AN ENVIRONMENTALIST. I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY HOW ALL THESE FIGURES IMPACT US EXACTLY, BUT I DO KNOW WHEN I AM TOLD THAT THE LEVELS IN THIS AREA ARE EXTREME TODAY. I AM TOLD THAT BY THE YEAR 2015 WITH THE AIRPORT EXPANSION, THEY WILL HAVE NO FURTHER ADVERSE EFFECT, I KNOW IT IS A LIE. YOU DON'T HAVE TO BE AN ENVIRONMENTALIST TO KNOW THAT THAT DOES NOT ADD UP.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00018-2

Comment:

THE EIS/EIS HAS NEVER CONSIDERED A PLAN FOR REGIONAL AIR TRANSPORT.

Response:

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

PHF00018-3

Comment:

THERE IS NO MENTION OF THE PLAYA VISTA DEVELOPMENT.

Response:

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

PHF00018-4

Comment:

THE PLAN NEEDS TO ADDRESS HOW TO LESSEN THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ON OUR AREA. I AM CONCERNED ABOUT MY HEALTH, THE HEALTH OF MY FAMILY, THE HEALTH OF MY NEIGHBORS.

MR. RITCHIE WHO LIVES IN MISSION VIEJO, I WOULD BE CONCERNED ABOUT YOUR HEALTH FOR THE NUMBER OF HOURS THAT YOU NEED TO SPEND IN THIS AREA AS WELL.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00019 Barry, Bill**None Provided****6/9/2001****PHF00019-1****Comment:**

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS BILL BARRY. I AM A RESIDENT OF WESTCHESTER. I LIVE ON 90TH STREET. I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COUPLE OF POINTS. ONE AS A GENERAL OVERVIEW OVERARCHING COMMENT, AN IMPRESSION ABOUT THE MASTER PLAN AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT. IN READING IT I AM STRUCK BY THE FACT THAT IT IS WRITTEN TO JUSTIFY EXPANSION, NOT TO ANALYZE THE RISKS OF EXPANSION. I THINK THAT'S BECAUSE THE LAWA AND DEPARTMENT OF AIRPORT HAVE A BUILT-IN CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN THE WHOLE APPROACH.

THE DEPARTMENT OF AIRPORTS IS A PROFIT CENTER FOR THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES AND IT HAS EVERY INCENTIVE IN THE WORLD TO MAKE SURE THE EXPANSION HAPPENS IN LAX AND NOT SOMEWHERE ELSE IN THE REGION. THAT IS WHY THE WHOLE REPORT IS FLAWED. IT REALLY ISN'T A FAIR ANALYSIS OF THE REGION BECAUSE THEY DON'T WANT IT TO BE A REGIONAL SOLUTION, THEY WANT IT TO BE AN LAX SOLUTION

Response:

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

PHF00019-2**Comment:**

THERE ARE A COUPLE OF POINTS IN READING A SUMMARY OF THE EIR. A NUMBER OF THE MITIGATION FACTORS ARE PROPOSED FOR THINGS THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF AIRPORTS HAS NO CONTROL OVER. YOU ARE NOT GOING TO CONTROL WHETHER THE GREEN LINE GOES TO THE AIRPORT. YOU ARE NOT GOING TO CONTROL WHETHER FREEWAYS ARE IMPROVED. AS IT EXISTS NOW THE STATE BUDGET IS ALMOST ALL GONE AND THE GOVERNOR IS TALKING ABOUT TRANSFER OF FUNDS FROM THE HIGHWAY FUND TO THE GENERAL FUND. ANY MONEY THAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN THERE FOR FREEWAY EXPANSION IS PROBABLY GONE FOREVER.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01018-59 regarding funding of mitigation measures. Section 2.8, Funding, of the Draft EIS/EIR, describes the types of funding sources that would be used for the implementation of the Master Plan, including implementation of the required mitigation measures. 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00019-3

Comment:

THE EIR REPORT, I THINK, DOES NOT ADDRESS THE HEALTH RISKS FOR PEOPLE WHO ARE CLOSEST TO THE AIRPORT WHERE THE EXPANSION IS REALLY GOING TO IMPACT. I THINK IT'S A GOOD IDEA TO MITIGATE HEALTH RISKS OVER ON HARBOR FREEWAY. I'M A LITTLE MORE CONCERNED ABOUT 90TH STREET. I THINK THAT'S WHERE PROBLEMS ARE GOING TO OCCUR, NOT FAR AWAY.

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment PC01145-4; please refer to Response to Comment PC01145-4.

PHF00019-4

Comment:

THE WHOLE ANALYSIS OF JOBS AND BUSINESS I THINK IT FLAWED BECAUSE THE REGIONAL EXPANSION IS GOING TO OCCUR SOMEWHERE. THE GENTLEMAN WHO WAS TALKING ABOUT THE UNION JOBS, THEY WILL OCCUR SOMEWHERE. THEY DON'T CARE. THEY ALL DRIVE TO THE CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ANYWAY. AND THE BUSINESS IS GOING TO WORK WHEREVER THEY CAN WORK. THE JOBS WILL BE WHEREVER THE AIRPORTS EXPAND. THE WHOLE ANALYSIS FOR WHY L.A. SHOULD BE EXPANDED FOR JOBS AND BUSINESS IS FALSE. THAT ASPECT OF THE PLAN WILL BE TRUE NO MATTER WHERE THE EXPANSION OCCURS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-113 regarding changed circumstances to the region's system of airports since SCAG's 2001 Regional Transportation Plan was adopted.

PHF00019-5

Comment:

FINALLY, I OBJECT TO THE WHOLE ANALYSIS THAT WE HAVE CREATED AN IMPOSSIBLE SITUATION THEREFORE WE SHOULD EXPAND TO FIX IT. IN MY VIEW, LAX ON THE WESTERNMOST PART OF THE REGION IS NOT BEST POSITIONED, AS THE SUMMARY SAYS. NOT BEST POSITIONED FOR THE TRANSPORTATION. PROBABLY WORSE POSITIONED AS FAR AS THE TRAFFIC FLOW IN THE CITY GOES.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PHF00019-6

Comment:

THE NO-ACTION RISKS ARE OVERSTATED. AIRPLANES AND CARS AND POLLUTION RISKS ARE IMPROVING WITH TIME. SO IF NOTHING HAPPENS AT LAX ONE WOULD ASSUME THAT THE HEALTH RISKS WOULD GO DOWN. I HAVE LIVED IN THIS AREA FOR A LONG TIME ANTICIPATING LESS NOISE AND LESS POLLUTION FROM THE AIRCRAFT AND NOW IT LOOKS LIKE THAT IS GOING TO OCCUR, YOU ARE GOING TO EXPAND AND MAKE IT WORSE.

Response:

Comment noted. Improvements to vehicle emissions technology in the future were assumed for all of the alternatives, including the No Project/No Action Alternative. As was presented in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, future (2015) conditions under the No Action/No Project Alternative would result in greater (worse) impacts for several environmental issue

areas including, but not limited to, air quality, traffic, and human health risk. Future growth in activity level that will occur at LAX will result in airfield and surface transportation systems congestion and inefficiencies that increase environmental impacts unless certain improvements to those systems occur, as in the case of the build alternatives. It should be noted that subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. This new option - Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. A Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provides a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment.

PHF00019-7

Comment:

LASTLY, IT IS AN INSULT TO THE COMMUNITY TO HAVE A VEILED THREAT THAT MITIGATION EFFORTS WILL NOT OCCUR UNLESS THERE'S AN EXPANSION.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00020

Stephan, David

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00020-1

Comment:

I AM DAVID STEPHAN. I LIVE IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES. TWO SUBSTANTIVE MATTERS, ONE PROCEDURAL. THIS CRETINOUS PLAN WOULD NOT BE SO DANGEROUS IF IT WERE MERELY COMPRISED BY THE FOOLS WHO MADE IT UP. HOWEVER, SUBSTANTIVELY IT IS FAR WORSE BECAUSE IT IS OBVIOUSLY MADE UP BY NAVES. THEY ARE FAR MORE DANGEROUS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00020-2

Comment:

FOOLISHLY IN ONE OF THE MOST THINLY POPULATED AREAS WITH THE VERY LOW AVERAGE POPULATION DENSITY, THIS IS AN ATTEMPT TO CONCENTRATE TRAFFIC AT ONE POINT IN AN AREA. THERE ARE PLACES RANGING FROM POINT MUGU, GEORGE AIR FORCE BASE, NORTON AIR FORCE BASE, MARSH AIR FORCE BASE, EL TORO MARINE STATION THAT COULD BE DEVELOPED AS AIRPORTS THAT WOULD SPREAD AND DISBURSE THE TRAFFIC.

LOOK AT WHAT LAX PROPOSES TO DO. PASSENGER TRAFFIC MAY GO UP CONSIDERABLY MORE THAN HUNDRED PERCENT. FREIGHT TRAFFIC WOULD GO UP BY MANY MULTIPLES. THAT WOULD RESULT IN INCREASED TRAFFIC OF TRUCKS, INCREASED POLLUTION, AND A GREAT CONCENTRATION OF THAT TRAFFIC IN ONE AREA.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is

3. Comments and Responses

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

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

PHF00020-3

Comment:

THE INLAND EMPIRE, VENTURA COUNTY, THE HIGH DESERT, THESE ARE AREAS THAT ARE EXPANDING WHERE FREIGHT COULD BE DISBURSED AND TRUCKED FROM THERE. IT WOULD BE CLOSER. IT WOULD NOT CONCENTRATE TRAFFIC IN ONE AREA.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PHF00020-2. Also, please see Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity.

PHF00020-4

Comment:

PASSENGER TRAFFIC SIMILARLY. PEOPLE ARE MOVING TO THE INLAND EMPIRE AND VENTURA COUNTY AND THE HIGH DESERT. PEOPLE CAN FLY IN AND OUT OF THOSE AREAS AND GO QUICKLY TO AND FROM THEIR DESTINATION. THIS IS A MEASURE THAT IS OVERALL DESIGNED TO CONCENTRATE IN AN AREA THAT CRIES FOR DISBURSAL. ON ITS FACE IT IS FOOLISH. BENEATH THAT IT IS DRAWN UP BY NAVES.

Response:

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

PHF00020-5

Comment:

HOWEVER, ONE FINAL MATTER. WHEN I CAME HERE TODAY I CAME PREPARED TO SPEAK AGAINST THIS PRESSURE. WHEN I LISTEN TO THIS AUDIENCE OF BROWN SHIRT BULLY BOYS BULLYING OF THOSE PEOPLE WHO OPPOSED THEM I THINK OF KRISTAL NACHT. I THINK IF YOU GET THIS SHOVED UP YOUR NOSES IT WILL BE BECAUSE OF THE WAY YOU

3. Comments and Responses

TREATED PEOPLE AND YOU GET WHAT YOU DESERVE. YOU ARE AN UNRULY MOB WHO SHOWS NO RESPECT TO THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH TO THOSE WHO OPPOSE YOU.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00021 Vertucci, Michele None Provided 6/9/2001

PHF00021-1

Comment:

I AM MICHELE VERTUCCI. I LIVE AT 5891 WEST 77TH PLACE HERE IN WESTCHESTER. I AM AGAINST THE LAX MASTER PLAN. I THINK THE EIR IS A FLAWED REPORT. I DON'T THINK LAWA HAS TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION HOW THE ENVIRONMENT WOULD BE IMPACTED BY THE AIRPORT EXPANSION OR AIRPORT IMPROVEMENTS.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

PHF00021-2

Comment:

I FEEL WHAT THE LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORTS REALLY WANTS IS MONEY AND MORE MONEY. IT IS A SHAME THAT THEY WOULD PUT MONEY OVER COMMUNITIES AND THE ENVIRONMENT. SO LET'S SUPPORT A REGIONAL AIRPORT PLAN.

Response:

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

PHF00022 Velasco, Valerie Alliance for Regional Solution to 6/9/2001
Airport Congestion

PHF00022-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. I AM A RESIDENT AND I LIVE AND WORK IN PLAYA DEL REY. I AM PRESIDENT OF THE ALLIANCE FOR REGIONAL SOLUTION TO AIRPORT CONGESTION. I WANT TO THANK YOU FOR COMING OUT THIS AFTERNOON TO LISTEN TO OUR CONCERNS AND DESCRIBE TO YOU THE INADEQUACIES OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT. THE PURPOSE OF AN EIR IS TO DISCLOSE IMPACTS. THE EIR PRODUCED BY LAX AS PART OF ITS MASTER PLAN IS INADEQUATE AS IT TRIES TO MASK THE REAL IMPACTS OF AIRPORT EXPANSION ON THIS COMMUNITY AND OTHER COMMUNITIES.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00022-2

Comment:

THE EIR UTILIZES THREE SEPARATE AND DISTINCT BASE LINES FOR THE IMPACT OF THE PROJECT. EACH IS EMPLOYED SELECTIVELY WHERE IT WILL SERVE TO MINIMIZE THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ISSUE RATHER THAN BEING USED CONSISTENTLY, THE SAME BASE LINE TO OBTAIN TRUE MEASUREMENT. THIS BECOMES A DISTORTION OF THE EIR.

Response:

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

PHF00022-3

Comment:

AN EIR IS SUPPOSED TO CONSIDER A REGIONAL RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT. BUT THIS EIR NEVER CONSIDERS THE USE OF AVAILABLE AIRPORTS IN THE REGION AND NEVER CONSIDERS THE ALTERNATIVES THAT WOULD RESULT IN LESS SEVERE IMPACTS IN THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE SCENE.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00022-3 regarding the number and severity of impacts associated with the build alternatives and Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and shifts the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

PHF00022-4

Comment:

THE EIR DOES NOT PROVIDE ANALYSIS OF WORSE-CASE SCENARIOS WHICH EXPANSION WILL SURELY PRODUCE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00022-5

Comment:

ACCORDING TO LAWA'S OWN PROJECTIONS ALTERNATIVES SEE AN INCREASE OF 31.6 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS OVER CURRENT OPERATIONS OF 67 MAP. THAT'S A 54 AND-A-HALF PERCENT INCREASE OVER CURRENT AIRPORT OPERATIONS. LAWA SAYS THAT TO ACCOMMODATE THIS 54 AND-A-HALF PERCENT INCREASE THERE WILL BE AN INCREASE OF ONLY 44 TAKEOFFS AND LANDINGS PER DAY, AN AVERAGE OF TWO ADDITIONAL OPERATIONS PER HOUR. THESE PROJECTIONS ARE ARTIFICIALLY LOW BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT FLEET MIX. LAWA BASES THEIR NUMBERS ON PURE SPECULATION OF USING BIGGER PLANES WHICH MAY NOT EVEN BE BUILT IN THE FUTURE.

Response:

Activity levels in 2000 at LAX (67.3 MAP) are projected to increase by 33 percent in Alternative C (to 89.6 MAP) and by 45 percent in Alternatives A and B (to 97.9 MAP). Alternative C would include an additional 44 operations per day and Alternatives A and B would include an additional 444 operations. Please see Response to Comments PC00599-7 and PC00593-1 for a discussion on the fleet mix assumptions. The only new aircraft in the LAX fleet that is not currently in operation (at LAX or other airports) is the Airbus 380 (the New Large Aircraft or NLA). Please see Response to Comment

AL00017-153 for a discussion on the NLA assumptions for LAX. Please see the Draft LAX Master Plan Chapter IV, Section 2.2 for a discussion of the methodology used to develop the forecast fleet mix and Chapter V, Section 3.3.2 for more information on the activity levels projected for the Master Plan alternatives. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PHF00022-6

Comment:

THERE ALSO ARE PROBLEMS WITH THE ALREADY HIGH NOX EMISSIONS. THE AIRPORT WILL GENERATE MORE TRUCK TRAFFIC. IT WILL GENERATE 56,881 18-WHEELER HEAVY DUTY TRUCKS PER YEAR, AN AVERAGE OF 156 TRUCKS PER DAY. HEALTH EFFECTS ARE GOING TO BE ASTRONOMICAL.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR address air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Please also see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. In addition, please refer to Response to Comment AL00040-134.

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. Diesel emissions were included in the human health risk assessment, as discussed in Section 4-24 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The No Project/No Action Alternative assumes that no substantial changes are made to current LAX facilities, and is based on projections of growth in airport activity between 1996 and horizon year 2015. Airport congestion during this time is expected to grow worse without additional capital improvement. In all cases, build alternatives are expected to relieve current and predicted future congestion by making airport operations, particularly aircraft operations, more efficient.

After implementation of mitigation measures, the build alternatives would reduce predicted impacts to human health compared with the No Project/No Action Alternative. Implementation of any of the build alternatives is therefore anticipated to reduce future health impacts for most people living, working or going to school near the airport. However, as was indicated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, predicted chronic non-cancer human health impacts for maximally exposed residents under Alternatives B and C are slightly higher for some areas than those predicted with the No Project/No Action Alternative. Alternative D was added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. As stated in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment (subsection 4.24.1.7.3) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAX emissions under Alternative D would reduce cumulative cancer risks for all areas near the airport relative to the other future year alternatives, including the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHF00022-7

Comment:

WE NEED TO HAVE CURRENT AND TRUE HEALTH STUDIES TO DETERMINE WHAT THE TRUE IMPACTS ARE, EVEN OF THE AIRPORT AS IT IS TODAY.

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

A complete human health risk assessment for the LAX Master Plan has been performed and was presented in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Cancer risks were evaluated based on modeled emissions associated with proposed alternatives, and were calculated using conservative (protective) exposure assumptions, consistent with standard practice defined by regulatory agencies charged with protection of human health. A detailed discussion of the human health risk assessment process was provided in the Draft EIS/EIR in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and Technical Report 14a, Human Health Risk Assessment, and current estimates of possible risks and hazards were presented in Section 4.24 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00022-8

Comment:

ALSO, THERE ARE EFFECTS OF WATER USAGE WHICH NO ONE HAS ADDRESSED. THE EIR HAS A LETTER FROM DWP WHICH SAYS WE WILL PROVIDE MORE WATER FOR THE AIRPORT IF IT EXPANDS. WE DON'T KNOW WHERE THE SOURCE OF THAT WATER IS COMING FROM.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01222-11 for discussion of LADWP's disclosure of water sources for LAX and the entire LADWP water service area.

PHF00022-9

Comment:

WE THINK IT IS GOING TO BE TOILET TO TAP THAT WILL COME FROM THE VALLEY. I THINK THE VALLEY WILL NOT BE VERY HAPPY ABOUT THAT.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01222-11 regarding sources of water supply.

PHF00022-10

Comment:

I URGE YOU IN AN AREA IN A STATE WHERE WE ONLY HAVE ONE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT FROM HERE TO THE MEXICAN BORDER, YOU MUST CONSTRAIN LAX TO ITS CURRENT CAPACITY AND DEVELOP A TRULY REGIONAL APPROACH. WE INTEND TO HOLD MAYOR-ELECT HAHN TO THE PLEDGE HE SIGNED AGAINST AIRPORT EXPANSION.

Response:

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

PHF00023	Hobart, Jack	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	---------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHF00023-1

Comment:

HI. I AM JACK HOBART. I AM A SCIENTIST AND LONG-TIME WESTCHESTER RESIDENT. A LOT OF PEOPLE HAVE STOLEN MY THUNDER ABOUT THE REGIONAL APPROACH. I JUST WANT TO SAY, IT SEEMS LIKE SORT OF A DIVIDE-AND-CONCUR MENTALITY TO FOCUS ON LAX WITH NO GUARANTEES OF ORANGE COUNTY PARTICIPATION AND NO OVERALL APPROACH. I AM CONCERNED IN ADDITION TO NOT USING 40 MILLION AS A BASE LINE, I AM CONCERNED WITH SOME OF THE PAST ENGINEERING ACTIVITY THAT HAS GONE ON LIKE YOU SEE IN THEIR PLAN.

Response:

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

PHF00023-2

Comment:

IT HAS GOT HOLLYWOOD WELL WITHIN THE 60-MINUTE RING OF COMMUTE HERE, BUT THE GREEN LINE IS SCHEDULED TO TAKE 90 MINUTES TO GO FROM HOLLYWOOD TO HERE. I TRIED TO USE IT TO PICK UP MY BOY FROM WHERE HE WORKS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00023-3

Comment:

ALSO, EVERYBODY IS FAMILIAR WITH THE FIASCO AT THE END OF THE 105 FREEWAY WHERE IT TOOK A CARNAGE OF CAR WRECKS WHERE THEY AT LEAST PAINTED TWO LANES IN AT THE OFFRAMP. IT SHOWS THEY PURPOSELY NARROWED IT DOWN TO ONE LANE FOR LORD KNOWS WHAT REASON.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC01838-1. Please see Response to Comment PC01838-1. Further, the off-ramp from westbound I-105 to northbound Sepulveda Boulevard was never "narrowed." It was originally designed as a one-lane ramp. The second lane was added after operational problems surfaced on the single-lane ramp.

PHF00023-4

Comment:

IT SEEMS LIKE THE PLAN IS REALLY SORT OF LET'S COMPETE WITH ALL THE OTHER REGIONAL CENTERS AND BE THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA FOCUS OF EVERYTHING AND DENVER AND DALLAS, THEY ARE NOT USING INNERCITY AIRPORTS, THEY ARE EXPANDING ON VERY LARGE OUTSIDE REGIONS. SAME WITH NEW YORK AND WASHINGTON.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Also, please see Response to Comment PHF00023-1.

PHF00023-5

Comment:

AS FAR AS PRODUCING JOBS, WE DON'T WANT TO HAVE A MANHATTAN ISLAND WITHOUT THE SUBWAYS WHERE EVERYBODY IS LOCKED IN. WE ARE NOT RECOGNIZING THE FACT

3. Comments and Responses

THAT IT TAKES JUST A FEW PERCENT INCREASE IN TRAFFIC TO SUDDENLY CHANGE FROM FLOW TO TOTAL GRIDLOCK. THAT IS NOT REPRESENTED THERE.

Response:

Comment noted. The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PHF00023-6

Comment:

AS FAR AS SOLUTIONS GO, ONE PART OF THE PLAN THAT I THINK REALLY HAS TO BE FOLLOWED, THAT IS THAT WE SHOULD ENCOURAGE THE USE OF THE HIGH CAPACITY JETS AND WE SHOULD MAKE THE WAITING A LITTLE SAFER. I WAS TOLD BEFORE THE MEETING BY A STAFF MEMBER THAT WITH DEREGULATION EXPANSION IS INEVITABLE. ALL YOU CAN DO IS INFLUENCE THE PROCESS. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT WE HAVE SEEN THAT DEREGULATION DOES NOT WORK FOR BANKS AND ELECTRICITY. MAYBE WE NEED A LITTLE BIT MORE REGULATIONS TO ALLOW THE AIRLINES TO GET TOGETHER AND BROADEN THEIR SCHEDULES, FORCE THE USE OF ORANGE COUNTY AIRPORTS FOR ORANGE COUNTY PEOPLE. FOR AIRLINES TO BE ABLE TO MOVE THEIR SCHEDULE AROUND WITHOUT LOSING THE PERCENTAGE OF AIRLINE TRAFFIC THAT THEY CAN CARRY.

Response:

Expansion was not caused by deregulation, but reflected the increased passenger demand that resulted from increased competition and lower fares. LAX is a public facility and is supported by grants from the FAA. The statutory role of the FAA, as directed by the U.S. Congress, is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace in the United States.

PHF00023-7

Comment:

AND WHY NOT ALLOW CARGO TO BE SHARED WITH PLANES USING THE AIRPORT BUT TOTALLY ELIMINATE THE DEDICATED CARGO FLIGHTS HERE.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Neither the FAA nor LAWA have the legal authority to restrict the use of public use airports such as LAX. Please see Response to Comment PC00599-54 for more information about cargo activity.

PHF00023-8

Comment:

LET THE LONG BEACH AIRPORT HANDLE THE HARBOR TRAFFIC. ALL OF THE GROUND INFRASTRUCTURES OUT AT ONTARIO. LET ONTARIO HANDLE THE DOWNTOWN AND EAST L.A. CARGO TRAFFIC. THIS HUGE COST OF EXPANSION.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PHF00023-1. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PHF00023-9**Comment:**

WHY NOT JUST USE A SMALL PORTION OF IT TO HAVE A LOW-COST RAIL SYSTEM TO PALMDALE AND A SHUTTLE INFRASTRUCTURE THERE. THAT WOULD BOTH ALLEVIATE GROUND TRANSPORTATION AND ENCOURAGE THE USE OF THE PALMDALE AIRPORT.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PHF00023-10**Comment:**

AND REGULATION WOULD ALLOW MORE FAVORABLE COST INCENTIVE TO MAKE THE COST OF FLYING TO THESE OTHER AIRPORTS A LOT MORE AGREEABLE TO EVERYBODY.

Response:

Actually, one of the reasons deregulation become a necessity was to allow the airlines to take advantage of the competitive nature that was already present within the industry. Deregulation made it easier for the airlines to have competitive pricing which was and is passed on to the consumers (traveling public). Competition between airlines has driven the ticket costs down at airports such as LAX. Travelers will use the cost of the ticket as part of the decision making process along with the convenience of the airport when making a decision to purchase an airline ticket.

PHF00024 Zane, Dennis**None Provided****6/9/2001****PHF00024-1****Comment:**

MY NAME IS DENNIS ZANE. I WANT TO SAY I HAD A GREAT TIME TODAY WORKING WITH ALL OF YOU HERE, MARCHING FOR JUSTICE IN WESTCHESTER. I AM A FORMER MAYOR OF SANTA MONICA. I KNOW THAT I AM SPEAKING HERE FOR MY COMMUNITY WHEN I ADDRESS THIS ISSUE. I AM ALSO A CONSULTANT TO THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO AND TO ARSAC. I HAVE BEEN WORKING ON THE ISSUE OF REGIONAL ALTERNATIVES TO EXPANSION FOR QUITE SOME TIME. I FEEL THAT THERE ARE ISSUES RAISED EARLIER BY OTHER SPEAKERS I WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS, SO I AM GOING TO SIMPLY SUBMIT MY WRITTEN REMARKS IN WRITTEN FORM AND TRY TO ADDRESS THESE OTHER ISSUES.

Response:

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

PHF00024-2**Comment:**

IT WAS SUGGESTED EARLIER THAT RESISTANCE TO DEVELOPMENT OF AN AIRPORT AT EL TORO MIGHT FORCE US TO ACCEPT AN EXPANSION AT LAX. I FIND THAT ASSESSMENT WHOLLY UNANALYTICAL AND RATHER INSULTING. IT FAILS TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT 15 TO 20 PERCENT OF THE TRAFFIC AT LAX ARISE FROM OR IS HEADED TO ORANGE COUNTY. IT FAILS TO RECOGNIZE THAT RESIDENTS AROUND LAX HAVE ALREADY DONE THERE FAIR SHARE AND THEN SOME. AND IT IMAGINES THAT THE WILL TO RESIST IN ORANGE COUNTY

3. Comments and Responses

IS GREATER THAN THE WILL TO RESIST AROUND LAX. I CAN TELL YOU THAT IS A FALSE ASSUMPTION.

Response:

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

PHF00024-3

Comment:

ANOTHER SPEAKER SPOKE ABOUT SAFETY AT LAX, WHICH TRULY IS A PROBLEM, THE PROBLEM THAT HE SPOKE OF. HOWEVER, A MASSIVE 16-YEAR CONSTRUCTION PROJECT A PERIOD DURING WHICH AIRPORT CONGESTION ON AND OFF THE AIRPORT WILL BE VERY, VERY SEVERE, DURING WHICH RUNWAYS WILL HAVE TO BE TAKEN OUT OF COMMISSION IN ORDER TO BE LENGTHENED AND ALTERED ONLY WILL WORSEN THE SAFETY PROBLEMS HERE.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00171-10 regarding management of air traffic congestion during construction.

PHF00024-4

Comment:

THIS IS A PROBLEM THAT NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED NOW, NOT OVER A 16-YEAR PERIOD DURING WHICH THE PROBLEM GETS WORSE. WE NEED TO BEGIN NOW TO DIVERT AIR TRAFFIC TO ONTARIO AND THE OTHER REGIONAL AIRPORTS THAT ARE ANXIOUS TO PLAY A SIGNIFICANT ROLE IN THIS REGION'S AIR COMMERCE ECONOMY. WE HAVE NO RIGHT TO ASSUME THAT LAX SHOULD BE THE MONSTER HUB FOR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. WE HAVE BETTER ALTERNATIVES.

Response:

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

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

PHF00024-5

Comment:

I ALSO WOULD LIKE TO SAY THAT THE CREDIBILITY OF THE EIR IS CERTAINLY AN IMPORTANT CONCERN. IT IS FAR MORE IMPORTANT THAT WE ASSURE THE CREDIBILITY OF THIS PLEDGE. I WOULD LIKE TO READ IT TO YOU.

"I, JAMES K. HAHN, ASSERT THAT THE MASTER PLAN PROPOSED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT SHOULD NOT BE APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORTS AND SHOULD NOT BE SUBMITTED NOR APPROVED BY THE

CITY OF LOS ANGELES. LAX SHOULD BE CONSTRAINED TO OPERATE SAFELY WITHIN THE CAPACITY OF ITS EXISTING FACILITIES. LOS ANGELES MUST TAKE IMMEDIATE STEPS TO ENSURE SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASED UTILIZATION OF THE UNDER-UTILIZED CAPACITY AT ONTARIO AIRPORT AND PALMDALE, WHICH L. A. OWNS. THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, INCLUDING LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORTS, SHOULD WORK TOGETHER WITH THE COMMUNITIES AND COUNTIES OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND THE FAA TO DEVELOP A TRULY REGIONAL AIRPORT PLAN FOR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA THAT DEVELOPS BOTH THE PASSENGER AND CARGO CAPABILITY OF THE OTHER COMMERCIAL AIRPORTS IN THE REGION SO THAT THEY MIGHT HELP THE NEEDS OF OUR GROWING AIR COMMERCE MARKET PLACE."

THAT IS THE PLEDGE OF THE MAYOR-ELECT. THAT IS THE PLEDGE WE EXPECT HIM TO LIVE BY. WE BELIEVE THE MAN IS AN HONEST MAN. WE BELIEVE THAT THE NEW MAYOR WILL LIVE BY THIS PLEDGE, AND WE HOPE THAT YOUR DELIBERATIONS WILL LIVE ON THAT EFFECT AS WELL.

Response:

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

PHF00025 Schneider, Dennis None Provided 6/9/2001

PHF00025-1

Comment:

I'M DENNIS SCHNEIDER. I'VE BEEN A RESIDENT HERE IN THE WESTCHESTER AREA FOR MANY YEARS SINCE THE EARLY 70'S. I'M GOING TO SUBMIT EXTENSIVE WRITTEN COMMENTS, AND I JUST WANT TO SUMMARIZE VERY QUICKLY THE TWO PORTIONS OF CONCERNS.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PHF00025-2

Comment:

ONE HAS TO DO WITH OUR COMMUNITY ITSELF. ANOTHER EXPANSION WOULD BE DEVASTATING TO THIS COMMUNITY. IN TERMS OF THE FACT THAT EVEN THE L.A. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE -- I'M SORRY -- THE WESTCHESTER/PLAYA DEL REY NEIGHBOR -- THE COMMERCE, THE LAX/WESTCHESTER/MARINA DEL REY/PLAYA DEL REY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HAS COME OUT AGAINST THIS MASTER PLAN BECAUSE IT IS DEVASTATING TO OUR COMMUNITY. IT REMOVES ONE-THIRD OF OUR BUSINESS DISTRICT, AND IT WILL EVEN REMOVE THE ONLY MAJOR GROCERY STORE THAT WE HAVE SERVING THE WEST -- THE EASTERN PORTION OF WESTCHESTER.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided additional discussion beyond that presented in the Draft EIS/EIR of potential acquisition effects on the Westchester Business District. As was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsections 4.2.6.2 through 4.2.6.4), acquisition within the Westchester Business District would be about 16 acres or 31 percent of the District under Alternative A, about 11 acres or 21 percent under Alternative B, or approximately 13 acres or 26 percent of the District under Alternative C. No shopping centers are proposed for acquisition and Ralph's Supermarket is not proposed for acquisition under any of the build alternatives. Alternative A would include acquisition of Longs Drugstore and Office Depot. Office Depot would also be acquired under Alternative C. Longs Drugstore would not be acquired under Alternatives B or C. Alternative A would also acquire the Mayfair Square Shopping area. Under Alternatives A through C, relocation opportunities would be available for some uses nearby within Westchester Southside. Also, many of the uses being acquired are airport related and a number of the community related uses that would be acquired (a bank, an office supply

3. Comments and Responses

store, a bar and beauty shop) would remain available through other similar businesses located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District.

Also, as was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PHF00025-3

Comment:

I STARTED INTO THIS CAMPAIGN TO SLOW THIS EXPANSION DOWN AND TO ELIMINATE IT TWO YEARS AGO IN OUR LOCAL AREA WHEN MANY OF US OBSERVED THAT THINGS WERE FALLING OFF THE WALLS FROM PLANES GOING OVERHEAD, AND WE'RE NOT EVEN IN THE IMPACTED AREA. WE'RE CLOSE, BUT NOT QUITE.

Response:

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

PHF00025-4

Comment:

WHEN I CONTINUED TO GO INTO THIS, I FOUND OUT THAT THE IMPACT IS EVEN GREATER THAN JUST OUR LOCAL AREA, AND THE CONCERN IS FOR THE ENTIRE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA BASIN. WE REALLY NEED A TRULY REGIONAL SOLUTION. THAT SOLUTION SHOULD INCLUDE ALL THE OTHER AIRPORTS. WE UNDERSTAND THAT BECAUSE OF THE DEREGULATION YOU CANNOT CAP THIS AIRPORT. SO MODERNIZATION, ALTHOUGH SOME OF THE PROJECTS SOUND VERY GOOD, EQUALS EXPANSION RIGHT NOW, AND UNTIL THAT HAPPENS WHERE WE CAN'T ACTUALLY STOP AND CAP THAT, WE REALLY CANNOT AFFORD MORE.

Response:

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

PHF00025-5**Comment:**

TRAFFIC IS ONE OF THE MAJOR CONCERNS HERE. POLLUTION IS A CONCERN FOR THE ENTIRE BASIN. IF YOU DO THE CALCULATIONS, YOU'LL FIND THAT WE HAVE AN EXPECTATION OF OVER 10 MILLION MORE CARS EVEN WITHOUT THE EXPANSION. THE FREEWAY ALREADY COMES TO A DEAD STOP AT MANCHESTER AND BEYOND. WE -- AND EVEN ON WEEKENDS SOMETIMES. SO WE CANNOT AFFORD MORE TRAFFIC IN THIS AREA.

Response:

Comment noted. The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. Air pollution from traffic is addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 4.

PHF00025-6**Comment:**

THE POLLUTION IS TERRIBLE. WE ALL KNOW THAT. IT'S GOING TO GET WORSE.

Response:

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

PHF00025-7**Comment:**

SO I IMPORE YOU TO TAKE A LOOK AT SOME OF THESE THINGS AND CHECK SOME OF THE NUMBERS AS WE -- AS SEVERAL OF US HAVE FOUND, FOR INSTANCE, THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN THE IMPACTED AREA. THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PHF00025-2 through PHF00025-6 above.

PHF00026**Lawless, Joe****None Provided****6/9/2001****PHF00026-1****Comment:**

MY NAME IS JOE LAWLESS. I'VE BEEN THROUGH THIS IN THE EARLY 60'S, AND I LIVE IN WILEY POST IN WESTCHESTER. THAT'S L.A. AND IT IS THE SAME STORY BEFORE AS NOW, AND THERE'S A LOT OF GOOD SPEAKERS TODAY, AND I THINK IF YOU'RE STUPID, YOU SHOULD BE -- UNDERSTAND NOW THAT THEY'VE GOT A STUPID IDEA, THE PLAN IS. SO TO MAKE IT SHORT AND SWEET, THEY SAY THAT LAX IS ONE OF THE SMALLEST, IF NOT THE SMALLEST, INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT IN THE WORLD, IF NOT IN THIS COUNTRY, AND SO LIKE SOMEBODY SAID, IF IT DON'T FIT, YOU GOT TO QUIT.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PHF00027

Stefanski, Andrew

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00027-1

Comment:

ANDREW STEFANSKI, ENGINEER AND REALTOR, 7296 WEST 85TH STREET, L.A. 45.

I RECOMMEND THAT PLAN AS WRITTEN BE SET ASIDE FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS. THE BASICS AND CONCEPTS ARE FAULTY, UNACCEPTABLE, AND NOT IN THE BEST INTEREST OF PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA. THEY DO NOT GIVE THE PUBLIC FULL DISCLOSURES OF MATERIAL FACTS, COSTS, AND LIABILITIES.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00027-2

Comment:

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WITH ALMOST 20 MILLION POPULATION AND 160 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS PROJECTED NEEDS AT LEAST THREE OR FOUR MAJOR AIRPORTS CONVENIENTLY SPACED THROUGHOUT THE AREA ACCORDING TO A REGIONAL MASTER PLAN. SUCH PLAN HAS BEEN NOT PRESENTED. WITHOUT IT YOUR PRESENT PROPOSALS ARE ONLY SHORT-TERM, STOP-GAP PRESENTATIONS, NOT THE TRUE LONG-RANGE MASTER PLAN. JUST CROWD MILLIONS OF PEOPLE INTO SMALL CONGESTED LAX AT STAGGERING AND ECONOMICAL COSTS. IT IS BAD TO BUILD A MAJOR AIRPORT INSIDE THE DENSELY POPULATED AREA, BUT IS IT EVEN WORSE TO KEEP EXPANDING IT?

Response:

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

PHF00027-3

Comment:

HERE ARE SOME FACTS CONCERNING LAX IMPACT ON HOUSING. RECENTLY "LOS ANGELES TIMES" PUBLISHED AN ARTICLE INDICATING THAT AIRPORT ALREADY TOOK THOUSANDS OF HOMES AND DISPLACED SOME 20,000 PEOPLE. THIS INCLUDES THE CONDEMNATIONS IN EARLY 1970'S AND PRESENT VOLUNTARY ACQUISITION IN EAST WESTCHESTER.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing. It should be noted

that the Master Plan is considered separate from growth and expansion that has occurred at LAX in the past.

PHF00027-4

Comment:

THIS IS NOT THE END. AIRPORT WANTS TO TAKE MORE. CALTRANS IS PRESENTLY PREPARING WIDENING OF SAN DIEGO FREEWAY TO PROVIDE BETTER ACCESS TO LAX. IT WILL TAKE MORE HOMES AND BUSINESSES.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC00278-6; please refer to Response to Comment PC00278-6.

PHF00027-5

Comment:

THE WHOLE AREA EAST OF LAX AT THE HARBOR FREEWAY AND BEYOND IS HEAVILY IMPACTED AND DEPRESSED BY NOISE AND FUMES. IT AFFECTS PROPERTY VALUES, DISCOURAGES DEVELOPMENT,

Response:

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

PHF00027-6

Comment:

CREATES HEALTH HAZARDS, AND CAUSES LOSS OF CITY TAXES WHILE INCREASING COUNTY COSTS OF TREATING PEOPLE IN PUBLIC HOSPITALS AT TAXPAYERS' EXPENSE. MANY OF THE PEOPLE RESIDING IN THE AREA OUT OF THE 500,000 PEOPLE LIVING THERE DO NOT EVEN HAVE MEDICAL INSURANCE.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed socio-economic and human health impacts in Sections 4.4, Social Impacts, and 4.24, Human Health and Safety. New tax revenues generated over the life of the Master Plan would more than compensate for those potentially or initially lost as a result of property acquisition. Also, please see Response to Comment PC02399-22 regarding fiscal effects to local municipalities neighboring the airport.

PHF00027-7

Comment:

AS TIME GOES BY, SOME MORE PEOPLE WILL REQUEST THAT THEIR PROPERTIES BE TAKEN AND THEY BE RELIEVED FROM NUISANCE. YOUR DRAFT DOES NOT DISCLOSE THIS PROBLEMS AND COSTS. THEY FAR EXCEED THE BENEFITS.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing. The costs associated with the acquisition and relocation of existing residences and businesses are considered construction costs/impacts, discussed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, of the Draft EIS/EIR and in more detail in the accompanying Technical

3. Comments and Responses

Report 5, Economic Impacts of Los Angeles International Airport and the LAX Master Plan Alternatives on the Los Angeles Regional Economy.

PHF00027-8

Comment:

IT IS BAD TO BUILD A MAJOR AIRPORT INSIDE THE DENSELY POPULATED AREA. IS IT EVEN WORSE TO CONTINUE EXPANDING IT?

Response:

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

PHF00028 Evans, Erna

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00028-1

Comment:

ERNA EVANS, 201 WATERVIEW STREET, PLAYA DEL REY. I MOVED FROM THIS AREA ABOUT 20 YEARS AGO, AND I COULDN'T WAIT TO RETURN A YEAR AND A HALF AGO. THERE ARE MANY DAYS THAT I WISH I HADN'T. I HAD NO IDEA THE IMPACT THAT THE PRIOR EXPANSION HAD ON THIS AREA. THE GENTLEMAN FROM ORANGE COUNTY WON'T BE ABLE TO RELATE TO SOME OF THESE ITEMS BECAUSE HIS AIRPORT DOWN THERE HAS VERY STRICT NOISE RESTRICTIONS. THEIR AIRPLANES MUST EVEN TAKE OFF IN A CERTAIN MANNER TO MITIGATE THAT NOISE FOR THE RESIDENTS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00028-2

Comment:

I RAN HOME A LITTLE WHILE AGO BECAUSE THE GENTLEMAN WE'RE SUPPOSED TO GET OUR ANSWERS OUT THERE FROM THE STAFF AND WHAT APPALLS ME THE MOST FROM ALL OF THIS LITERATURE IS NOT WHAT IT SAYS, BUT WHAT IT DOESN'T SAY. I DON'T CARE THAT THEY'RE USING GRAFFITI-RESISTANT PAINT IN THE TUNNEL. I DON'T CARE THAT THEY'RE USING CERTAIN KINDS OF FUEL IN THE VEHICLES ON THE AIRPORT GROUNDS.

Response:

The FAA and LAWA are providing a full spectrum of information out for public review and consideration. The use of alternative fuel, the utilization of techniques to minimize maintenance are all part of understanding the full scope of the alternatives proposed for consideration. In addition, there has been a comprehensive look at the environmental impacts associated with the project and alternatives.

PHF00028-3

Comment:

WHAT I'M CONCERNED ABOUT -- AND I ASKED HIM WHERE I COULD FIND IT IN THE REPORT; THEY COULDN'T TELL ME -- WAS WHAT THIS IS DOING TO ME. THE GENTLEMAN TOLD ME -- I RAN HOME AT 2:00 O'CLOCK. I'M A FASTIDIOUS HOUSEKEEPER. IF I WERE IN A COURT, I WOULD SWEAR ON A BIBLE. I CLEAN MY WOOD FLOORS SEVERAL TIMES A WEEK. I HAVE COMPANY COMING. WHEN I LEAVE MY WINDOWS OPEN, THIS IS WHAT I CLEAN UP FROM MY WINDOW SILLS AND FROM MY HARDWOOD FLOORS EVERY DAY. HE TOLD ME THE REASON IT WASN'T ADDRESSED WAS BECAUSE THEY COULDN'T TELL WHAT WAS COMING FROM JET

FUEL AND WHAT WAS COMING FROM AUTO EMISSIONS. I TOLD HIM IT DIDN'T TAKE A GENIUS FOR SOMEONE WHO HAD JUST RETURNED TO THIS AREA AND WHO CLEANED HER HOUSE EVERY DAY AT HER OTHER HOUSE OUT OF THE AREA TO KNOW THAT THIS WAS NOT COMING FROM AUTOMOBILES.

Response:

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

PHF00028-4

Comment:

I LIVE A BLOCK FROM THE BEACH. I CAN'T OPEN MY WINDOWS. I CANNOT SIT ON MY DECKS. I CANNOT ENJOY THE SOUND OF THE OCEAN. I AM A PRISONER IN MY HOME. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT THIS IS DOING TO ME, TO MY NEIGHBORS.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impact on quality of life.

PHF00028-5

Comment:

I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT THE NOISE THAT WAKES ME UP AT 2:00 A.M., 3:00 A.M., 5:00 A.M. IS DOING TO OUR HEALTH.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings in homes associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. The analysis of sleep disturbance in Section 4.24.2, Health Effects of Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR was superseded by the information and analysis presented in Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00028-6

Comment:

I READ IN HERE THAT THE GENTLEMAN FROM THE FAA AND FROM THE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLER SPOKE OF SAFETY. NOWHERE CAN I GET AN ANSWER AS TO HOW MANY FLYOVERS ARE APPROVED EVERY DAY FROM ANY OF THESE PEOPLE. HE TALKED ABOUT SAFETY. IF THEY CANNOT HANDLE THE CAPACITY OR THE SIZE, THEN THAT SIZE SHOULD NOT BE FLYING OUT OF A HUGE POPULATED METROPOLITAN AREA.

Response:

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

PHF00028-7

Comment:

I KNOW OF NOWHERE ELSE IN THE WORLD WHERE AN AIRPORT OF THIS SIZE IS LOCATED WITHIN THE CITY LIMITS. PEOPLE SHOULD EXPECT TO DRIVE 20 TO 30 MINUTES OUTSIDE OF THE CITY LIMITS TO TAKE THEIR FLIGHTS.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00028-8

Comment:

AND THE NOISE LEVELS ARE INTOLERABLE. THERE WERE SO MANY OTHER THINGS I WANTED TO SAY, BUT IN THREE MINUTES YOU REALLY CAN'T. BUT MY NEIGHBORS KNOW WHAT I MEAN, AND I URGE YOU -- THIS WAS A GREAT TURNOUT, BUT BASED ON THEIR CONSULTANTS, THEIR LITERATURE, THEY'VE GOT A LOT OF MONEY BEHIND THEM. WE DON'T. YOU NEED TO GET OUT AND GET YOUR NEIGHBORS TO START A MASS CAMPAIGN TO GET -- YOU DIDN'T WIN THE LAST TIME WHEN IT WAS 40 MILLION, WHICH WAS NEVER 40 MILLION.

Response:

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

PHF00028-9

Comment:

THE OTHER THING IS THAT THIS SAYS WHAT THE CAPACITY IS. IT DOESN'T -- IT DOESN'T PROVIDE FOR LIMITATIONS. IT DOESN'T PROVIDE FOR ENFORCEMENT.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels and legal restrictions on the ability to limit activity levels at commercial airports.

PHF00029

Booth, Mary

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00029-1

Comment:

I APPRECIATE THE RIGHT TO ASSEMBLE. THAT'S ONE OF THE FIVE -- SPEECH, RELIGION, PETITION, PRESS, AND ASSEMBLY -- UNDER ARTICLE I OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS. I BELIEVE IN AN ASSEMBLY RIGHT, AND I BELIEVE THAT EVERYONE SHOULD BE HEARD WITH NO BOOS OR ANY OTHER COMMENTS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00029-2

Comment:

I LIVE ON THE FIRST STREET IN SANTA MONICA, OZONE. AS YOU GO NORTH ALONG THE STATE HIGHWAY, LINCOLN BOULEVARD, IT'S THE FIRST STREET ON YOUR RIGHT AS YOU'RE GOING NORTH, AND THIS STREET IS IMPACTED. SOMETIMES I CAN'T EVEN GET TO MY HOUSE BECAUSE OF THE TRAFFIC ON LINCOLN BOULEVARD, AND MY CITY HAS NO CONTROL OVER THE TRAFFIC. IT'S A STATE HIGHWAY. NOW, HOW DO YOU THINK THAT THE AIRPORT'S GOING TO HAVE ANY CONTROL ON LINCOLN BOULEVARD?

I COME EVERY SATURDAY NIGHT TO SERVE AS A TRAVELER'S AIDE AT TERMINAL ONE, AND WHEN I COME DOWN LINCOLN BOULEVARD, COMING SOUTH AT 3:30 AND 4:00 O'CLOCK ON

SATURDAY AFTERNOON, I USED TO MAKE IT IN 19 OR 20 MINUTES. NOW IT TAKES ME 29 TO 31 MINUTES ONLY BECAUSE OF THE BOTTLENECK AT JEFFERSON AND LINCOLN,

Response:

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

PHF00029-3

Comment:

WHICH IS BEING AFFECTED BY THE PLAYA DEL VISTA PROJECT, AND PLAYA VISTA PROJECT IS NOT CONSIDERED IN THE EIR/EIS FOR THE AIRPORT.

Response:

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

PHF00029-4

Comment:

THE SANTA MONICA AIRPORT RUNWAY IS THE HIGHEST SINGLE-USE RUNWAY IN THE UNITED STATES. I LIVE ON THE TAKEOFF PATTERN, AND THE JETS DO NOT HAVE TO CIRCLE OVER THE PIN MARKED-OFF COURSE. THEY HAVE THE PRIVILEGE OF COMING IN RIGHT OVER MY HOUSE. THIS AFFECTS THE NOISE PROGRAM. WE HAVE A VERY GOOD NOISE PROGRAM IN SANTA MONICA, ONE OF THE BEST, AND IT ABIDES UNDER A 1984 AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF SANTA MONICA AND THE FAA, BUT THESE EXECUTIVE JETS SHOULD HAVE LANDING ENCOURAGED AT LAX, AND THEY DON'T. SO LAX IS PUSHING THE JETS INTO MY COMMUNITY.

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.

PHF00029-5

Comment:

NOW I KNOW I'M ONLY ONE OF 88 CITIES IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, BUT HAVE ALL 88 CITIES BEEN INVITED TO THE TABLE TO DISCUSS THIS WITH LAWA? I DON'T THINK SO.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL0000-7-1 regarding the scoping undertaken for the LAX Master Plan.

PHF00029-6

Comment:

AND LAST WEEK I TOURED THE HYPERION SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT, AND ALL OF YOU KNOW WHERE THOSE TWO RED AND WHITE SMOKESTACKS ARE. THAT IS THE PLANT. NOW, THIS SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT CANNOT EXPAND IN THE SOUTHERLY DIRECTION IN CASE -- THIS IS A FACT I LEARNED -- BECAUSE IN CASE OF AN AIRLINE CRASH. NOW, WHERE ARE THEY GOING TO GO? HOW ARE THEY GOING TO EXPAND WHEN YOU BUILD THINGS LIKE PLAYA VISTA RIGHT UNDER THEIR NOSE? THE SEWAGE HAS TO GO THERE, AND IF THEY CAN'T EXPAND BECAUSE OF THE AIRPORT, WHAT ARE WE ALL GOING TO DO? HAVE IT BACK UP IN OUR YARDS? WE DON'T HAVE SEPTIC TANKS ANYMORE. AND IT'S VERY IMPORTANT FOR THE HYPERION SEWAGE PLANT TO BE INCREASED. TO BE UNDERSTOOD, THE VOLUME IS INCREASING BY LEAPS AND BOUNDS.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

As was stated on page 4-1147 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of Los Angeles Integrated Plan for Wastewater Program (IPWP) has determined that the wastewater treatment demands will exceed the capacity of the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP) by 2020 with or without any of the build alternatives. All four build alternatives would generate less wastewater than the No Action/No Project Alternative. Options that the City of Los Angeles is considering for meeting its projected wastewater treatment shortfall by 2020 include combinations of increasing capacity at HTP, building new reclamation capacity upstream of HTP, conservation of potable water, and infiltration/inflow reduction (page 4-1150 of the Draft EIS/EIR). The analysis of these options is in progress. The specific improvements and expansions to the HTP will be determined by the Bureau of Sanitation at such time that system components are upgraded per the IPWP, based on projected growth in the region. A mitigation measure to address this cumulative wastewater treatment impact is included in the Final EIS/EIR (Mitigation Measure MM-WW-1).

PHF00029-7

Comment:

AND I THANK YOU FOR HAVING THE RIGHT TO ASSEMBLE UNDER THE CONSTITUTION, BILL OF RIGHTS, ARTICLE I.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00030

Marlin, Lisa

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00030-1

Comment:

IT'S MARLIN. YES, I LIVE AT 8900 LILIENTHAL AVENUE, RIGHT UNDER THE AIRPLANES, AND I'D LIKE TO TALK ABOUT THREE THINGS TODAY, THE FIRST BEING SOCCER. THERE'S A LOVELY LITTLE FIELD CALLED THE NEILSEN FIELD, AND IT'S RIGHT THERE UNDER THE FLIGHT PATH. AND THOSE OF YOU WHO HAVE LOOKED THROUGH THIS LITERATURE KNOW THAT AS A RESULT OF THESE THREE -- THANK YOU -- AS A RESULT OF THESE THREE EXPANSION PLANS, THEY'RE GOING TO EXPAND THE NEILSEN FIELD FROM 5 ACRES TO 12 ACRES, BUT THEY'RE NOT GOING TO MOVE IT. SO ALL OF THE PLANES ARE GOING TO BE THAT MUCH CLOSER TO ALL OUR BOYS AND GIRLS WHO ARE OUT THERE PLAYING SOCCER AND OUT THERE PLAYING BASEBALL AND OUT THERE PLAYING SOFTBALL.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01778-1. The commentor is correct that Alternative A (Added Runway North), Alternative B (Added Runway South), and Alternative C (No Additional Runway) involve shifts in the northern runways to varying extents that would place aircraft activity closer to Carl E. Neilson Youth Park. Concerning noise, under 1996 baseline conditions a portion of the park is exposed to 65 dB CNEL noise levels. With implementation of Alternatives A, B, and C the park would be expanded and the analyses presented in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.8, Department of Transportation Section 4(f) of the Draft EIS/EIR show that noise levels at the park would increase. However, noise levels at the park are expected to remain below 70 dB CNEL, which would not be incompatible with athletic field use pursuant to FAR Part 150 Guidelines. Under Alternatives A, B, and C, the park would be subject to significant operational and construction related air quality impacts as further described in Section 4.6.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Under LAWA Staff's new preferred Alternative D (Enhanced Safety and Security Plan), no expansion of Carl E. Neilson Youth Park is proposed, in keeping with the limited extent of improvements under the alternative. Alternative D would not result in a northern shift of the north runways, in fact Runway 6R/24L would be located further south to accommodate the proposed parallel taxiway between the two runways in the north complex. As a result, there would be no increased exposure to aircraft activity at the park due to closer runway proximity. As further described in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the

Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and in Topical Response TR-LU-2, under Alternative D noise levels in the community of Westchester would generally remain similar or reduced compared to existing conditions. This same circumstance of similar or reduced noise compared to existing conditions would apply to Carl E. Neilson Youth Park.

Regarding air quality, as described in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and in Topical Response TR-LU-2, under Alternative D, ambient concentrations from airport operations, when combined with background (non-airport) concentrations indicate that the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) would not be exceeded in the Westchester area. California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) would also be met for all criteria pollutants except PM10. Ambient concentrations of PM10 currently exceed the CAAQS, and are not expected to be attained by 2010, according to the 2003 Draft Air Quality Management Plan prepared by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Regarding construction emission effects on air quality in Westchester, under Alternative D, the NAAQS for all pollutants, as well as the CAAQS for all pollutants except PM10, would be met.

PHF00030-2

Comment:

I READ IN PART OF THE LITERATURE THAT IN THE NONEXPANSION PLAN THEY SAY THEY DON'T HAVE TO EXPAND THE NEILSEN FACILITIES BECAUSE THEY ARE EXPECTING A DECREASE IN PARK USE BECAUSE THEY'LL BE TAKING THE MANCHESTER SQUARE AND THOSE OTHER PROPERTIES AWAY AS PART OF THE VOLUNTARY BUYOUT PLAN, BUT I THINK ANYONE WHO'S TRIED TO SCHEDULE SOCCER MATCHES OR TRIED TO GO OVER TO WESTCHESTER PARK FOR ANY KIND OF AN ACTIVITY KNOWS THAT WE WOULD NEED MORE PARK SPACE, IF ANYTHING, NOT LESS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01014-3 regarding expansion of Carl E. Nielson Youth Park. While it is noted that there is a need for more park space and that a high level and perhaps increasing level of demand for soccer fields exists, this circumstance is independent of the LAX Master Plan proposals and LAWA's in-process acquisition program for Manchester Square. As was indicated in Section 4.26.3, Parks and Recreation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the No Action/No Project Alternative and the LAX Master Plan build alternatives are not expected to significantly increase demand for parks and recreation, and any increase in demand would be off-set locally due to either proposed acquisition and/or increases in parkland being proposed by the project. While no expansion of Carl E. Neilson Youth Park would occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative or under Alternative D, recreational amenities, including a potential park, would be provided in Westchester under these alternatives as part of the LAX Northside Project. Also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PHF00030-3

Comment:

SO I DON'T THINK IT'S A GOOD PLAN TO CONTINUE TO HAVE OUR CHILDREN PLAY EVEN CLOSER UNDERNEATH THE FLIGHT PATH OF THE AIRPLANES.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PHF00030-1.

PHF00030-4

Comment:

AND THE SECOND THING I'D LIKE TO SPEAK ABOUT IS THE QUALITY-OF-LIFE ISSUES THAT HAVE TO GO ALONG WITH THE NOISE. I HAVE LOOKED AT THE MAPS, AND I SEE THAT THEY'RE NOT GOING TO TAKE MY HOUSE. THEY'RE GOING TO TAKE SOME SLIGHTLY TO THE RIGHT OF IT, BUT ON THE OTHER HAND, RIGHT NOW I'M PART OF THE NOISE MITIGATION

3. Comments and Responses

PACKAGE WHERE YOU CAN GET THESE REALLY UGLY WINDOWS AND REALLY UGLY DOORS, AND THEY'LL TRAP ALL THE DUST AND THE GERMS INSIDE YOUR HOUSE SO THAT YOU WON'T HEAR THE AIRPLANES.

Response:

A discussion of proposed areas of acquisition under Alternatives A, B, and C was provided in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix P of the LAX Master Plan. Acquisition areas proposed under Alternative D were presented in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Chapter 2 of the LAX Master Plan Addendum. Under Alternative D, no residential acquisition is proposed. A description of the noise mitigation package (or the ANMP) is provided in Topical Response TR-LU-3. Under the ANMP a variety of window and door selections are available. Residential sound insulation often includes alterations to existing ventilation systems or a new system to maintain fresh air circulation.

PHF00030-5

Comment:

HOWEVER, THAT DOESN'T MEAN THAT YOU WON'T BE ABLE TO STEP OUTSIDE YOUR HOME AND HEAR THEM AS WELL. AND I DON'T KNOW HOW THEY'RE GOING TO PUT A LITTLE BUBBLE OVER MY HOME TO PREVENT ME FROM HAVING THOSE KIND OF PARTICULATE MATTER AND NOISE IN MY BACKYARD.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. See Section 4.6, Air Quality (subsection 4.6.3), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding particulate matter under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions.

PHF00030-6

Comment:

AND THE THIRD THING I'D LIKE TO TALK ABOUT IS THE OLD WESTCHESTER PRIOR TO THE OTHER EXPANSION. I HAVE LIVED IN THE COMMUNITY FOR A REALLY LONG TIME, AND I REMEMBER WHEN OUR CHURCHES WERE A LOT BIGGER AND YOU COULD DRIVE RIGHT DOWN SEPULVEDA AND SEE J.C. PENNEY'S AND BROADWAY AND ALL THOSE WONDERFUL STORES. AND WHAT DO YOU THINK HAPPENED WHEN THEY TOOK AWAY ALL THOSE HOMES? ALL THOSE PEOPLE WENT ELSEWHERE, AND THOSE BUSINESSES DIED. SO I DON'T THINK IT'S A VERY GOOD MODEL TO SAY THAT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE MORE JOBS.

Response:

The LAX Master Plan currently under consideration has been proposed to respond to growing local and regional demand for air transportation as well as demand generated by international trade. The Master Plan is considered separate from past 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 PC00018-1. 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. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PHF00030-7

Comment:

I BET YOU THAT WESTCHESTER WILL ATROPHY, AND THERE'S A LACK OF QUALITY HOUSING, AFFORDABLE HOUSING RIGHT NOW, AND IF YOU THINK THAT TAKING THOSE HOMES AWAY IS GOING TO INCREASE THE QUALITY OF LIFE, WHERE ARE THOSE PEOPLE SUPPOSED TO GO? WHERE ARE THEY GOING TO AFFORD TO BUY HOMES? EVEN IF YOU GAVE THEM 50

PERCENT ABOVE THEIR PROPERTY VALUES, THEY WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO RELOCATE IN A SIMILAR COMMUNITY ANYWHERE ON THE WEST SIDE.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00040-46. Please also see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues, including affordable housing. Additionally, refer to Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PHF00031 Weis, Ellen

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00031-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS ELLEN WEIS, AND I'M A RESIDENT OF WESTCHESTER, AND I HEAR ALSO THAT THERE'S GOING TO BE MORE JOBS. SO THIS IS REALLY EXCITING. WE'RE GOING TO HAVE MORE EMPLOYEES AND MORE TRAVELERS PARKING IN WESTCHESTER STREETS THAN WE ALREADY HAVE. THE EIR DOES NOT ACCOUNT FOR THAT. EMPLOYEES AND TRAVELERS PARKING IN OUR NEIGHBORHOODS NOW BECAUSE THEY DON'T WANT TO PAY THE PRICE. EMPLOYEES ARE ON MY STREET EVERY DAY. OKAY. SO GREAT. WE'RE GOING TO HAVE MORE. OH, THAT'S OF COURSE, AGAIN, IF WE HAVE ANY HOMES LEFT.

Response:

The impacts to neighborhoods surrounding LAX are addressed in Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PHF00031-2

Comment:

EARLY TURNS OVER PLAYA DEL REY, EL SEGUNDO, MANHATTAN BEACH, TORRANCE. I WORK WITH THESE PEOPLE. THEY COMPLAIN. THEY SAY THEY CALL THE PHONE NUMBER THAT'S GIVEN. THEY CALL THE FAA TO COMPLAIN, AND THEY SAY, "OH, WE DON'T SEE ANY PLANES ON OUR RADAR SCREEN." THE PLANES ARE THERE. THESE PEOPLE ARE NOT PSYCHO. OKAY. SO I WOULD HOPE THAT THE FAA COULD AT LEAST GET SOME EQUIPMENT TO KNOW WHERE THEIR PLANES ARE TODAY BEFORE THEY START ADDING MORE PLANES INTO THE AREA.

Response:

LAWA has recently installed a PASSUR system to assist the community in tracking aircraft operations. By going to the LAWA website www.lawa.org and entering the Noise Management section community members can specifically identify LAX operations that cross their community. New procedures were recently implemented that rerouted take off traffic southwest of the airport to reduce the exposure of South Bay communities to noise from jet overflights. The mitigation actions for each alternative includes a measure to assure takeoffs reach the coastline prior to initiating turns from centerline. This mitigation action would require two things. First, controllers would no longer have the flexibility to turn the slower aircraft out of the way of faster aircraft before reaching the coastline in order to increase the departure capacity of the runway. Second, pilot compliance with the procedure would have to be improved through better instrumentation. For further information regarding aircraft operations and mitigation suggestions please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-4.1 regarding additional mitigation measures; Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. Also please see Responses to Comments PC02328-1 and PC03223-3 regarding early turns over El Segundo and the PASSUR system to identify aircraft operations over communities.

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00031-3

Comment:

THE FUNDAMENTAL FLAW BESIDES EVERYTHING ELSE WE'VE HEARD TODAY WITH THE LAX MASTER PLAN, THE ARBOR VITAE OFFRAMP, THE LAX EXPRESSWAY IS THIS: PEOPLE AREN'T MOVING ON THE 405 ANY TIME OF THE DAY. TRY TO GO NORTH. TRY TO -- YEAH, YOU CAN GO SOUTH AT 6:00 IN THE MORNING, BUT TRY TO COME NORTH FROM ORANGE COUNTY IN THE MORNING. YOU KNOW, I WORK WITH PEOPLE WHO ARE TRAVELING FROM ONTARIO, ORANGE COUNTY, DOWN TOWARDS SAN DIEGO. YOU KNOW THEY'RE COMMUTING TWO TO THREE HOURS A DAY. SO WE'RE GOING TO ADD 50 MILLION MORE PASSENGERS AND INCREASE THE TRUCK TRAFFIC BY 300 PERCENT, THE CARGO? THAT WILL GET TRAFFIC MOVING. AND SO LET'S ADD, YOU KNOW, FIVE MORE LANES TO THE 405, AND IT WILL TAKE A COUPLE OF MONTHS TO FILL THAT BABY BACK UP.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology, regarding the Congestion Management Program and the Arbor Vitae off-ramp.

PHF00031-4

Comment:

YOU KNOW, YOU CAN BUILD YOUR MODELS, AND JUST LIKE STATISTICS, YOU CAN MAKE YOUR OUTCOME LOOK ANY WAY YOU WANT. YOU JUST MODEL IT SO IT LOOKS TO YOUR ADVANTAGE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00031-5

Comment:

PEOPLE WANT TO FLY OUT CLOSER TO HOME. RATHER THAN TAKING THE PREMISE THAT LAX MUST EXPAND, TAKE THE PREMISE THAT WHAT IF LAX WASN'T HERE, WHAT WE DO? WE WOULD HAVE A REGIONAL APPROACH. IT WOULD GREATLY -- A REGIONAL APPROACH WOULD GREATLY REDUCE ALL THE MITIGATION THAT WE HEAR OVER IN THAT CONFERENCE ROOM OVER THERE.

Response:

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

PHF00031-6**Comment:**

IN TERMS OF PUBLIC OUTREACH, I THINK IT'S THE BEST-KEPT SECRET, THIS LAX EXPANSION. YOU KNOW, YOU HAVE TO FIGHT TO GET INFORMATION. IT'S A GREAT INCONVENIENCE TO GO TO THE LIBRARY. YOU GET TO CHARGE US \$140 FOR PAPER REPORTS, \$61.00 FOR A CD TO FIND OUT HOW YOU'RE GOING TO RUIN OUR COMMUNITY.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PHF00031-7**Comment:**

AND THEN THE REPORTS -- I'M ALMOST DONE. THE REPORTS OF THE POLLUTION REDUCTION, AS YOU SAW FROM THE CLOTH, IT'S AMAZING THAT THE REPORTS -- AGAIN, I GUESS THIS GETS BACK TO YOUR MODELS AND YOU CAN MAKE STATISTICS AND DATA LOOK ANY WAY YOU WANT. I'VE SEEN IT HAPPEN.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00031-8**Comment:**

AND THE FACT IS WE'RE CLEANING MORE AND MORE SOOT OFF, AND MORE INCREASE IN TRAFFIC IS NOT GOING TO MAKE THAT RAG ANY CLEANER.

Response:

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

PHF00032**Brown, David****Westchester Vitalization
Corporation****6/9/2001****PHF00032-1****Comment:**

HI, MY NAME IS DAVID BROWN. I LIVE AT 8021 CAMPION DRIVE IN WESTCHESTER. I'VE LIVED IN WESTCHESTER FOR OVER 30 YEARS. I WENT TO ORVILLE WRIGHT JUNIOR HIGH, WESTCHESTER HIGH SCHOOL. I'M CURRENTLY SECRETARY FOR WESTCHESTER VITALIZATION CORPORATION, AND I'VE LIVED IN WESTCHESTER DURING THE LAST MAJOR EXPANSION OF LAX DURING THE 70'S, WHEN THOUSANDS OF RESIDENCES AND BUSINESSES WERE DISPLACED TO ACCOMMODATE THE GROWTH OF LAX. I SUBMITTED AN EXTENSIVE COMMENT TODAY, AND I'LL TRY AND SUMMARIZE THIS AS BEST I CAN. I NEED TO READ, THOUGH, BECAUSE IT'S HARD TO STAY FOCUSED. THERE'S SO MANY COMMENTS THAT I'D LIKE TO MAKE.

I AM STRONGLY OPPOSED TO ALL CURRENTLY PROPOSED CONCEPTS AND BELIEVE THAT THE DRAFT EIR/EIS DRAMATICALLY UNDERSTATES THE IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED EXPANSION PLANS.

THE PROPOSED CONCEPTS ARE WELL THOUGHT OUT -- ARE NOT WELL THOUGHT OUT AND WILL HAVE A DEVASTATING IMPACT ON ALL AREAS AROUND THE AIRPORT.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

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

PHF00032-2

Comment:

LAWA AND LAX OFFICIALS HAVE A LONG HISTORY OF IGNORING SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES AND CONTINUING TO BUILD AND EXPAND THEIR FACILITIES WITH OR WITHOUT APPROVED MASTER PLAN. MANY OF THE MITIGATION EFFORTS CALLED FOR IN THIS ROUND OF EXPANSION PLANS ARE THE SAME MITIGATION OFFERED FOR PREVIOUS EXPANSIONS BUT HAVE NEVER BEEN IMPLEMENTED.

Response:

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

PHF00032-3

Comment:

THE MITIGATION -- THE GROUND TRANSPORTATION MITIGATION PROPOSALS ARE COMPLETELY INADEQUATE AND MAY NEVER BE COMPLETED. THE PROPOSED MITIGATION CONCEPTS OF THE RING ROAD, THE PEOPLEMOVER, THE GREEN LINE SERVICE TO THE TERMINALS WERE ALL INCLUDED IN THE TRAFFIC MITIGATION PLANS FOR THE MASTER PLAN APPROVED BACK IN 1980. THE RING ROAD CONCEPT, IN FACT, WAS DEVELOPED BACK IN THE 70'S. WHAT IS NOW WESTCHESTER PARKWAY WAS THEN THE 170/LAUREL CANYON FREEWAY, AND PERSHING DRIVE WAS PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY. NOW LAWLA IS PROPOSING THE SAME MITIGATION FOR THIS ROUND OF EXPANSION.

Response:

The improvements identified are actually part of the project, not mitigation measures as the commentor implies. The mitigation packages identified in Section 4.3.1.9 and 4.3.2.9 were shown to be effective to mitigate most of the significant impacts. The mitigated levels of service were shown in Sections 4.3.1.10 and 4.3.2.10.

PHF00032-4

Comment:

THE MASTER PLAN OFFERS NO FUNDING SOURCE FOR THE PROPOSED INTERCHANGE AT ARBOR VITAE AND THE 405 OR FOR THE PROPOSED LAX EXPRESSWAY AND ANY OF THE OTHER OR ANY OF THE OFF-AIRPORT IMPROVEMENTS. THEY'RE EXPECTING CALTRANS TO PICK THIS UP. LAWLA IS NOW -- EXCUSE ME. LAWLA IS NOT ALLOWED TO SPEND FEDERAL DOLLARS FOR OFF-AIRPORT IMPROVEMENTS, AND RECENTLY SCAG HAS WITHDRAWN SUPPORT FOR BOTH ARBOR VITAE INTERCHANGE AND LAWLA EXPRESSWAY IN THEIR TRANSPORTATION PLAN. WITHOUT THOSE PROJECTS ALL TRAFFIC AROUND LAX IT WILL BECOME GRIDLOCKED.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding funding. Also, as the Arbor Vitae interchange is not part of the Master Plan project, funding for that project would be the responsibility of others.

PHF00032-5

Comment:

I'M NOT GOING TO HAVE TIME HERE. I ALSO WANTED TO TALK ABOUT PARKING WHICH IS TOTALLY INADEQUATE IN THE MASTER PLAN,

Response:

The parking forecasts and impacts for each of the master plan alternatives were discussed in Sections 4.3.1.6 of the LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00032-6

Comment:

AND THE OPERATIONS PER DAY ARE JUST A JOKE IN THE MASTER PLAN BECAUSE THEY TALK ABOUT SOMETHING LIKE 2,279 OPERATIONS GOING ONLY -- INCREASING ONLY 40 OPERATIONS A DAY ON AVERAGE. THIS IS A JOKE. WE'VE BEEN HERE BEFORE. WE'VE SEEN THE MASTER PLANS CALL FOR 40 MILLION. TO BELIEVE THAT IT'S GOING TO STOP AT 89 MILLION IS TOTALLY UNREASONABLE. THERE IS NO ENFORCEMENT. THERE IS NOTHING THAT MAKES LAWA STOP GROWING OR DEVELOP THESE MITIGATIONS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments PC00599-7 and PC00593-1 for a discussion on the fleet mix assumptions. Please also see Response to Comment AL00008-12 for a discussion on growth beyond the predicted capacity limits. Please see Response to Comment PC03076-4. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PHF00033

Bowen, Debra

California State Senate

6/9/2001

PHF00033-1

Comment:

SENATOR DEBRA BOWEN, 28TH STATE SENATE DISTRICT. I'VE COME HERE FROM MANHATTAN BEACH. I'D BE REMISS IF DIDN'T SAY THAT I'M VERY DISAPPOINTED THAT YOU'VE CHOSEN TO HOLD THIS MEETING IN THREE VENUES SIMULTANEOUSLY. IT MAKES -- IT MAKES IT MUCH MORE DIFFICULT FOR COMMUNITY MEMBERS TO KNOW WHAT MEMBERS OF OTHER ADJACENT COMMUNITIES ARE SAYING ABOUT THE POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF THIS PLAN AND THE FAILINGS OF THE EIR/EIS. IT ALSO MAKES IT MORE DIFFICULT FOR THE PRESS WHO CANNOT BE IN THREE PLACES SIMULTANEOUSLY. AND EVEN IF YOU'RE NOT HIDING ANYTHING, YOU CREATE THE APPEARANCE THAT YOU ARE.

Response:

The intent of the one hearing at three locations was to maximize the number of persons that could provide input and provide more access to the most convenient hearing site. A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site (www.laxmasterplan.org) in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00033-2

Comment:

SECOND, WITH REGARD TO THE SCOPING, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT YOU IMMEDIATELY ASK FOR A REFUND FOR THE SCOPING WORK SINCE YOU DID NOT INCLUDE ANY OUTREACH TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY OR THE PUBLIC AT LARGE REGARDING PREFERRED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE C NOR DID THE SCOPING INCLUDE A SINGLE AGENCY WITHIN SAN BERNARDINO, ORANGE, RIVERSIDE, OR VENTURA COUNTIES. MANY OF THESE AREAS WANT AN AIRPORT IN THEIR COMMUNITIES TO SERVE THEIR GROWING ECONOMIC NEEDS.

Response:

The mailing list for the agency scoping coordination letter includes four Los Angeles County agencies: Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Community Development Commission, Department of Public Works, and Sanitation. Moreover, written comment letters were received from Los Angeles County Supervisor Don Knabe and two county agencies, the West Vector Control Division and the Department of Public Works. The mailing list and copies of scoping letters received are provided in Appendix A of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Response to Comment AL00007-1 regarding the adequacy of the scoping process.

PHF00033-3

Comment:

I REJECT THE NOTION THAT THE PEOPLE HERE DON'T CARE ABOUT ECONOMIC GROWTH IN THE LOS ANGELES BASIN, BUT WE ARE WELL AWARE OF WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE SILICON VALLEY, AND WE DON'T WANT TO CHOKER OUR ECONOMIC GROWTH ON OUR OWN TRAFFIC. LOOK AT THE CENSUS NUMBERS THAT HAVE JUST COME OUT. IN THE FIVE-COUNTY REGION THE POPULATION IS GROWING NOT IN THE COASTAL AREAS, BUT IN BAKERSFIELD, RIVERSIDE, CORONA, ORANGE COUNTY, AND THE INLAND EMPIRE.

I SUBMIT THAT YOU DO NOT NEED 12,000 PAGES OF ANALYSIS TO FIGURE OUT THAT IT MAKES NO SENSE TO BRING ALL OF THOSE PEOPLE ACROSS THE ENTIRE LOS ANGELES BASIN TO GET TO AN AIRPORT. IT MAKES NO SENSE TO CHOKER THE 405 FREEWAY, THE 10, THE 60, THE 5 FREEWAY WITH THE PASSENGER AND CARGO TRAFFIC THAT WILL BE NEEDED NOT ONLY TO TAKE THE CURRENT 27 MILLION EXTRA PEOPLE INTO LAX, BUT ANOTHER 60 MILLION THAT MAY WELL RESULT FROM THIS PROPOSED EXPANSION OF LAX. AIR FACILITIES SHOULD BE SITED WHERE THE CARGO, THE BUSINESSES, AND THE PEOPLE WHO WILL USE THE FACILITIES ARE LOCATED.

Response:

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

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

PHF00033-4**Comment:**

THE STRUCTURE, THE TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE WILL BE LARGELY PAID FOR BY CITY AND STATE GOVERNMENTS. IF AIRPORT LANDING AND LEASE FEES HAD TO PAY FOR THE DOUBLE DECKING OF ALL THESE FREEWAYS TO ACCOMMODATE THIS TRAFFIC, YOU WOULD ABANDON THIS PROJECT TOMORROW BECAUSE IT WOULD NOT BE ECONOMICALLY FEASIBLE.

Response:

Comment noted. As was discussed in Section 2.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the proposed funding includes a combination of FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, airline fees, and other state/federal grants.

PHF00033-5**Comment:**

I REJECT THE NOTION THAT THE ONLY WAY THE NECESSARY TRAFFIC CAN BE ACCOMMODATED IS THROUGH LAX GROWTH, THE ONLY JOBS THAT WILL BE CREATED BY CONTINUING TO GROW TRAFFIC AND THE AIRPORT HERE ARE JOBS FOR BOOKS-ON-TAPE READERS FOR ALL OF US STUCK IN TRAFFIC,

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PHF00033-6**Comment:**

AND IF YOU PERSIST IN AN LAX-ONLY STRATEGY RATHER THAN THE MORE SENSIBLE REGIONAL ALTERNATIVE, YOU WILL ASSURE JOBS ONLY FOR LAWYERS, PARALEGALS, AND COURT REPORTERS. I REJECT THE ASSERTION THAT THE REGIONAL ALTERNATIVE IS UNREASONABLE. THAT CONCLUSION BY ITSELF IS UNREASONABLE.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PHF00033-3.

PHF00034**Lyon, Irving****None Provided****6/9/2001****PHF00034-1****Comment:**

MY NAME IS IRVING LYON. I LIVE ON THE 8200 BLOCK OF GONZAGA AVENUE IN WESTCHESTER. IN 1989 I RETIRED AFTER 50 YEARS OF BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH AND TEACHING, AND SINCE THAT TIME, I'VE BEEN ACTIVELY INVOLVED IN ISSUES AND CONCERNS REGARDING AIR POLLUTION, AIR QUALITY, WATER QUALITY, AND THE QUALITY OF OUR FOOD SUPPLY.

AFTER WADING THROUGH REEMS OF PROEXPANSION PROPAGANDA, MY SON DAVID LYON AND I WISH TO EMPHASIZE THE FOLLOWING CONCERNS AND ISSUES.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00034-2

Comment:

THE RESIDENTS OF WESTCHESTER AND THE SURROUNDING AREAS CAN SMELL THE UNBURNED JET FUEL AND SEE EVIDENCE FOR ITS PRESENCE ON OUR HOUSES. UNBURNED PARTICLES OF FUEL INCLUDING JET ENGINE FUELS HAVE BEEN PROVEN TO CAUSE SEVERE HEALTH IMPAIRMENTS INCLUDING THE FORMATION OF CANCERS. WE KNOW THAT THIS IS NOT ONLY DANGEROUS BUT DEADLY FOR MANY PEOPLE. WHEN WILL LAX AND FAA AGREE TO ENFORCE STOPPING A FUEL TANK DUMPING OF RAW FUELS OVER POPULATED AREAS IMMEDIATELY ADJACENT TO AND SURROUNDING LAX?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition. Please also see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding fumes.

PHF00034-3

Comment:

REGIONALIZATION OF OUR AIRPORT SYSTEM WILL HELP TO PREVENT LOCALIZED INCREASES IN THE BURDENS OF AIR POLLUTANTS, ESPECIALLY OF CARBON MONOXIDE, UNBURNED HYDROCARBONS, AND NITROGEN OXIDES. THE LATTER TWO ARE VERY INVOLVED WITH SUNLIGHT IN THE PRODUCTION OF PHOTOCHEMICAL SMOG, WHICH ITSELF WILL ENTRAIN AND HOLD ADDITIONAL AIR POLLUTANTS.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PHF00034-4

Comment:

OMISSION FROM THE EIS/EIR OF CONSIDERATION OF THE CUMULATIVE IMPACT TO PLAYA VISTA AND THE PROPOSED CONVERSION OF SEWAGE WATER TO DRINKING WATER ON BOTH AIR AND WATER QUALITY IS SCANDALOUS.

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. Neither the LAX Master Plan project or the Playa Vista project propose a system for the conversion of sewage to drinking water. Although the Playa Vista First Phase project contemplated the development of an onsite wastewater treatment plant to serve onsite uses, the construction and operation of such a plant was later determined to be unnecessary and infeasible. The subject wastewater treatment plant would have provided only reclaimed water suitable for irrigation - not drinking water.

PHF00034-5

Comment:

WHY SHOULD ANYONE ENDORSE OR VOTE FOR AIRPORT-RELATED MITIGATION OR EXPANSION IF THE DUMPING OF UNBURNED FUELS OVER POPULATED AREAS IS NOT STOPPED? WE LOOK FORWARD TO YOUR ANSWERS.

Response:

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

PHF00035

O'Neal, Virginia

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00035-1

Comment:

I'M NOT A SPEAKER. SO FORGIVE ME IF I FLUB. MY NAME IS VIRGINIA O'NEAL. I LIVE AT 8811 WILEY POST AVENUE, WESTCHESTER. I OBJECT ABSOLUTELY TO EXPANSION OF LAX AND SUPPORT A REGIONAL APPROACH TO SERVE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AREA. I INCORPORATE ALL PREVIOUSLY VOICED OBJECTIONS THERETO THE PLAN AND THE ENVIRONMENT IMPACT. WE AREN'T GIVEN THE CONSIDERATION THAT IS GRANTED TO THE SPOTTED OWL, BLUE BUTTERFLY, AND OTHER SPECIES. IT'S TIME THAT PEOPLE COME FIRST.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to endangered species in Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices J and S-H and Technical Report 7. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHF00036

Selvin, Hillary

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00036-1

Comment:

MY NAME'S HILLARY SELVIN. I LIVE AT 6248 WEST 85TH PLACE IN WESTCHESTER, THE WEST PORT HEIGHTS AREA.

WHY IS IT CALLED THE LAX MASTER PLAN INSTEAD OF A REGIONAL MASTER PLAN? LET'S NOT MAKE THE PROBLEM WORSE. THE EIS/EIR IS FLAWED BECAUSE IT DOES NOT ADDRESS A REGIONAL SOLUTION AND THEN CAN ONLY CONCLUDE THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT IS TREMENDOUS. EXPANDING LAX IS IRRESPONSIBLE.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR dealt only with the development of LAX. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. The recommendation that the FAA conduct a comprehensive analysis of various regional scenarios is beyond the scope of the subject EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00036-2

Comment:

ALSO TO STATE THAT THE LAX EXPRESSWAY WILL MITIGATE TRAFFIC CONGESTION IS NOT REALISTIC. WE KNOW THAT THE 10 PERCENT OF THE PEOPLE THAT ARE ON THE 405 IN THAT AREA, BY DOING AN LAX EXPRESSWAY IT'S NOT GOING TO CHANGE, ESPECIALLY IF YOU EXPAND LAX. IT WILL ONLY INCREASE TRAFFIC.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00036-3

Comment:

MOST MAJOR CITIES ADDRESS THE ISSUES OF OVERLOADED AIRPORTS BY FINDING REGIONAL SOLUTIONS. WHY CAN WE NOT DO THE SAME?

Response:

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

PHF00036-4

Comment:

WE CANNOT CAP THE AIRLINES, BUT LAX DOES HAVE A LIMIT THAT MUST BE ENFORCED. THE FAA IS THE SAFETY ARM OF THE AVIATION INDUSTRY. WHY ARE NOT THEY ENFORCING LIMITS THAT THE AIRPORTS HAVE FOR FLIGHTS? THESE ARE SAFETY ISSUES. AS THE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLER SAID EARLIER, HE HAS SAFETY CONCERNS. THESE ARE THINGS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED BY THE FAA.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC00543-1.

PHF00036-5

Comment:

A REGIONAL SOLUTION WOULD COME SOONER IF THESE THINGS WERE REINFORCED. ORANGE COUNTY SHOULD ALSO PROVIDE FOR THEMSELVES. I THINK IT'S UNFAIR OF LAWA TO THINK THAT LAX SHOULD BE THE ONLY SOLUTION. IF EL TORO CANNOT BE BUILT, THIS CERTAINLY SHOULD NOT BE EXPANDED.

Response:

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

PHF00036-6

Comment:

IT ALSO CONFOUNDS ME THAT THE FAA AND LAWA THOUGHT THAT ONE DAY OF PUBLIC HEARINGS WAS ACCEPTABLE. WE'RE ALSO ENTITLED TO DUE PROCESS. WE DEMAND THAT YOU PROVIDE DUE AND FAIR PROCESS, AND WE WILL NOT BE SILENT UNTIL YOU DO. IT IS UP TO EACH OF US TO MAKE SURE OUR NEWLY ELECTED MAYOR, JAMES HAHN -- WHO I HAVE NOT HEARD ANY OF HIS REPRESENTATIVES HERE TODAY. SO THAT CONCERNS ME AS WELL -- AND OUR CITY COUNCIL DEMAND A REGIONAL SOLUTION.

Response:

The intent of the one hearing at three locations was to maximize the number of persons that could provide input and provide more access to the most convenient hearing site. A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PHF00037 Hobson, Lyn

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00037-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS LYN HOBSON. I LIVE AT 8630 STANMOOR DRIVE. I CAME TO WESTCHESTER IN 1947 WHEN I WAS TWO. THAT'S WHY IT CONCERNED ME WHEN 40 ROUNDS OF AMMUNITION FROM MACHINE GUNS WERE SHOT OFF IN FRONT OF MY HOUSE, WHICH DIDN'T SEEM TO BOTHER ANYBODY WHEN I LOOKED INTO THE MATTER AND OTHER VIOLENT ACTIVITY AROUND WESTCHESTER.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00037-2

Comment:

I'M A GRADUATE FROM UCLA, NOT THAT THAT MATTERS ANY, BUT I DO DO RESEARCH, AND IN THIS MAP YOU CAN SEE WHERE THE HOMES WERE TAKEN, AND IT'S WHERE THE MOST GANG ACTIVITY IN TERMS OF AROUND WESTCHESTER HIGH, ST. BERNARDS, YOU HAVE THE GANG SHOOTINGS. THERE'S BEEN ONE PERSON KILLED, TWO INJURED, AND THEN OVER HERE EAST OF LAX IN THE AVIATION/AIRPORT/LA CIENEGA/ARBOR VITAE/ CENTURY BOULEVARD AREA, AN AREA WHICH WAS ISOLATED FROM THE REST OF WESTCHESTER, THERE HAS BEEN A TOTAL OF EIGHT PEOPLE KILLED AND SIX WOUNDED IN GANG SHOOTINGS. I'M CONCERNED TOO, AND I THINK THE AIRPORT SHOULD BE, THAT IN DOING MY RESEARCH, THERE ARE SOME 10,000 GANG MEMBERS IN INGLEWOOD OUT OF 100,000 POPULATION, WHICH BORDERS THE AIRPORT. THERE ARE 3,000 GANG MEMBERS ACCORDING TO LENNOX SHERIFF'S STATION WHICH IS JUST THE OTHER SIDE OF CENTURY AND LA CIENEGA, AND THERE ARE 6,000 OR SO GANG MEMBERS IN HAWTHORNE. AND WHEN I TALKED TO THE HEAD OF THE SECURITY AT THE AIRPORT AND I SAID, "WHAT IS THE THING YOU'RE MOST CONCERNED ABOUT, YOU KNOW, INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM OR WHATEVER. YOU KNOW, WHAT IS THE WORST THING THAT'S HAPPENED?" AND HE SAID WHEN THIS INGLEWOOD 13 GANG MEMBER ABOUT TWO YEARS SHOT AND KILLED AN LAPD OFFICER AND THEN WENT INTO THE AIRPORT, AND IT WAS A THANKSGIVING WEEKEND.

SO WHAT I'M ASKING FOR BECAUSE I REGISTERED OVER 30 GANGS AT THE HIGH SCHOOL, THIS IS A BULLET SHOT IN FRONT OF MY HOUSE, AND GOD PROTECTED US BECAUSE NO ONE WAS HURT, ABOUT FIVE DIFFERENT SHOOTINGS. BUT MY CONCERN TOO IS IN

3. Comments and Responses

STUDYING THE -- BECAUSE EVERYBODY SAID "WELL, WESTCHESTER IS SUCH A VIOLENT PLACE," AND I GO TALKING TO PEOPLE, AND THEY DON'T HAVE -- THEY DON'T SPEND HOURS DEALING WITH GANGS AND DRIVE-BY SHOOTINGS AND ALL THE STUFF.

SO I GOT THE STATISTICS FROM LAPD, AND IN A FOUR-YEAR PERIOD, THERE WERE 20 MURDERS BETWEEN '93 AND '96 IN WESTCHESTER. NOW, TWO-THIRDS OF THEM WERE ALONG THE AIRPORT. THEY WERE EITHER AT THE AIRPORT, THE HOTELS, IN THE ABANDONED AREAS. AND THE ALONG THE BEACH HERE, THERE WERE ANOTHER THREE, AND THEN WE HAD TWO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE. SO, YOU KNOW, WE'RE NOT A GANG AREA, BUT THOSE OF US WHO ARE RESIDENTS HERE HAVE TO DEAL WITH IT. PART OF IT'S THE AIRPORT, PART OF IT'S Busing, PART OF IT'S HUD.

AND WE WOULD LIKE AT LEAST TWO GANG JUVENILE OFFICERS TO DEAL WITH THESE PROBLEMS. IT'S NOT OUR JOB AS RESIDENTS TO DEAL WITH PROBLEMS THAT ORIGINALLY THE AIRPORT TOOK THESE HOMES, LEFT THESE VACANCIES. THEY WERE FILLED IN EVENTUALLY BY EITHER Busing OR SECTION VIII AND HAS BROUGHT IN THIS KIND OF GANG VIOLENCE, AND I WOULD LIKE A STUDY TO BE DONE, AN ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY AS TO THE CRIME THAT HAS BEEN PRODUCED.

AND IN ANY PART OF THE COUNTRY, YOU KNOW, WHEN AN AIRPORT TAKES OVER OR THEY MOVE HOUSES FOR WHATEVER PURPOSE, IT DISRUPTS THE LIFE OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD, AND WE HAVE NO WAY TO DEAL WITH THESE KINDS OF PROBLEMS. AND UNFORTUNATELY, WITH WESTCHESTER, LIKE IF YOU TALK TO LAPD OR TO A CITY COUNCIL EVEN, WHEN ALL THESE SHOOTINGS STARTED AND WHEN WE TALKED TO THE SCHOOL DISTRICT, THEY GO, "WELL, THIS IS L.A. THIS IS THE 90'S." AND I GO, "WELL, I LIVE IN WESTCHESTER, YOU KNOW. WE DON'T HAVE THIS KIND OF THING GOING ON." SO I HAD TO PROVE TO PEOPLE.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00378-2. There is no known apparent correlation at LAX between gang activity and increases in airport activity. Furthermore, LAPD routinely evaluates crime statistics and other factors influencing demand for off-airport law enforcement services and responds when warranted with increases in staffing and facilities that support maintenance of adequate service levels.

PHF00037-3

Comment:

AND WE HAVE 50 CHURCHES ACROSS THE UNITED STATES, INCLUDING THE CHAPLAIN OF THE U.S. SENATE PRAYING FOR THIS AREA, FOR THE SAFETY OF ALL OF US WHO LIVE HERE UNTIL THESE PROBLEMS CAN BE SOLVED. AND I APPRECIATE NOT HAVING A LETTER RESPONSE SAYING "WELL, THE POLICE WILL TAKE CARE OF IT." WELL, THEY CAN'T. OR THAT "WELL, IT'S UP TO THE COMMUNITY TO DEAL WITH IT." WELL, IT ISN'T. IT'S NOT MY JOB TO DEAL WITH PROBLEMS THAT ARE COMING IN FROM ALL OVER BECAUSE WE JUST CAN'T DO IT, AND I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD HAVE TO ANYMORE.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed safety issues in Section 4.24.3, Safety (CEQA), and law enforcement concerns in Section 4.26.2, Law Enforcement (CEQA).

PHF00038

Abram, Paul

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00038-1

Comment:

PAUL ABRAM. 8000 OSAGE AVENUE, WESTCHESTER. I'VE BEEN A RESIDENT OF LOS ANGELES FOR 37 YEARS, SEVEN RIGHT HERE IN WESTCHESTER, AND I OPPOSE THE EXPANSION PLAN BECAUSE I FEEL THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR ME AND MY NEIGHBORS WILL

BE ADVERSELY AFFECTED. THE INCREASED AIR TRAFFIC OVER THE CITY IS A REAL DANGER TO ALL OF US, AND AUTO AND TRUCK TRAFFIC ON THE 405 AND 105, MOST IMPORTANTLY TO OUR NEIGHBORHOOD STREETS WOULD INCREASE CAUSING GREATER GRIDLOCK, MORE POLLUTION, AFFECTING ALL OF US.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding quality of life, Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts, and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety.

PHF00038-2

Comment:

THE INCREASED NOISE HAS AN ADVERSE EFFECT TO OUR STUDENTS AT WESTCHESTER HIGH AND OTHER ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, DAY CARE, AND EVEN OUR UNIVERSITY RIGHT HERE IN WESTCHESTER. EDUCATION IS SPOKEN AS A PRIME CONCERN BY MANY OF TODAY'S POLITICAL LEADERS. STOPPING THE LAX EXPANSION WOULD SHOW TO US THAT THESE LEADERS MEAN WHAT THEY SAY ABOUT EDUCATION FOR OUR YOUNG PEOPLE.

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.

PHF00038-3

Comment:

IT HAS BEEN SHOWN THERE'S A SHORTAGE OF HOUSING HERE IN THE LOS ANGELES AREA, AND MOVING ENTIRE NEIGHBORHOODS WOULD ONLY INCREASE OUR CITY'S HOUSING PROBLEMS.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation issues.

PHF00038-4

Comment:

HERE IN WESTCHESTER WE USED TO RECEIVE A BUSINESS DISTRICT, SUPERMARKETS, DRUG STORES, BANKS, RESTAURANTS, OFFICE SUPPLY STORES, AND THE OTHER GREATLY NEEDED SERVICES IN THE COMMUNITY. ALL OF THESE BUSINESSES WILL BE ADVERSELY AFFECTED IF THE LAX EXPANSION PROJECT WAS TO GO FORTH.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided additional discussion beyond that presented in the Draft EIS/EIR of potential acquisition effects on the Westchester Business District. As was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsections 4.2.6.2 through 4.2.6.4), acquisition within the Westchester Business District would be about 16 acres or 31 percent of the District under Alternative A, about 11 acres or 21 percent under Alternative B, or approximately 13 acres or 26 percent of the District under Alternative C. No shopping centers are proposed for acquisition and Ralph's Supermarket is not proposed for acquisition under any of the build alternatives. Alternative A would include acquisition of Longs Drugstore and Office Depot. Office Depot would also be acquired under Alternative C. Longs Drugstore would not be acquired under Alternatives B or C. Alternative A would also acquire the Mayfair

3. Comments and Responses

Square Shopping area. Under Alternatives A through C, relocation opportunities would be available for some uses nearby within Westchester Southside. Also, many of the uses being acquired are airport related and a number of the community related uses that would be acquired (a bank, an office supply store, a bar and beauty shop) would remain available through other similar businesses located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District.

Also, as was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PHF00038-5

Comment:

L.A. EXPANSION PLAN WOULD INHIBIT GROWTH OF OTHER REGIONAL AIRPORTS. IT IS ONLY FAIR THAT ORANGE COUNTY AND THE INLAND EMPIRE SHARE IN ALLEVIATING AIR TRAFFIC.

Response:

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

PHF00038-6

Comment:

AS A LONG TIME RESIDENT AND EMPLOYEE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES RIGHT HERE AT THE WATER & POWER, I ASK THAT YOU LISTEN TO THE CONCERNS BY MYSELF AND MY NEIGHBORS AND STOP THE LAX EXPANSION.

Response:

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

PHF00039

Cunningham, Joe

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00039-1

Comment:

HELLO. MY NAME IS JOE CUNNINGHAM. I LIVE ON WEST 76TH STREET HERE IN WESTCHESTER. SURPRISE. I'M OPPOSED TO LAX EXPANSION AS WELL FOR THE VERY SAME REASONS THAT EVERYONE ELSE HAS MENTIONED, PEOPLE THAT UNDERSTAND THEM AND CAN DISCUSS THEM MUCH BETTER THAN I, BUT I'M EVEN MORE DISGUSTED WITH THE EXPANSION PROCESS EMPLOYED TO GROW THE AIRPORT AND SAFEGUARDS THE AREA AROUND IT.

27 YEARS AGO I FIRST BOUGHT A HOME IN WESTCHESTER WHEN THE AIRPORT WAS OPERATING ON A MASTER PLAN THAT CAPPED AT 40 MILLION PASSENGER MILES. TODAY LAX IS AT -- WELL, ACCORDING TO THEIR CHART, 59. ACCORDING TO WHAT OTHER PEOPLE ARE SAYING, 67 MILLION. SO I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE NUMBER IS, BUT THEY'RE DOING THAT WITHOUT A MASTER PLAN, AND WE ARE HERE TODAY TO COMMENT ON A NEW PROPOSED MASTER PLAN TO INCREASE THE TRAFFIC TO 97 MILLION BY THE YEAR 2015.

WHAT MASTER PLAN TOOK LAX IN FROM A CAP OF 40 MILLION TO THE EXISTING 59 OR 67 MILLION? NONE. I'M TOLD WHEN YOU OUTGROW A PLAN, IT JUST FAILS TO EXIST, THAT IT'S JUST A PLAN. IT'S NOT A MANDATE. SO WHATEVER WE'RE DISCUSSING TODAY IS JUST A PLAN SUBJECT TO WHATEVER WHIMS OR WHATEVER HAPPENS IN THE FUTURE. WELL, IF WE WERE AT 40 MILLION, A PLAN OF 40 MILLION, AND THEY'RE AN 59 WITH NEXT TO NOTHING, THAT MEANS THAT THIS 98 PLAN IS PROBABLY CAPABLE OF DOING, WHAT, 150 MILLION PASSENGER MILES?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels. It should be noted that Alternative D, added subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, provides for a level of future (2015) activity at LAX comparable to that of No Action/No Project.

PHF00039-2

Comment:

SO -- I'M SORRY. THERE'S SO MANY THINGS I WANTED TO SAY. THERE'S NOT ENOUGH TIME.

WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN IN THE YEAR 2030 WHEN THEY WANT TO RAISE THE PLAN TO 250 MILLION? WHAT WILL IT BE AT? 150 THEN? AT WHAT POINT IN TIME DO WE BITE THE BULLET AND THE BUILD AN AIRPORT WHERE WE HAVE THE SPACE TO GROW IT INTO A WORLD-CLASS FACILITY?

TODAY, TODAY WE'LL SPEND MILLIONS MORE AND SEVERELY NEGATE THE -- NEGATIVELY IMPACT THE LIVES OF THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE OR DO WE TAKE THE INITIATIVE AND DRAW A LINE AND SAY NO, THAT IT'S TIME TO MOVE TO A REGIONAL PLAN?

Response:

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

PHF00039-3

Comment:

WHO REALLY DOES CONTROL THE LAX EXPANSION? TODAY REPEATEDLY I WAS TOLD BY LAWYER REPRESENTATIVES THAT THEY HAVE LITTLE CONTROL OVER EXPANSION AND THAT THEY ARE JUST TRYING TO MITIGATE THE PROBLEMS THAT WILL BE RESULTING FROM THE INEVITABLE AND UNSTOPPABLE EXPANSION.

IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT THE CITY OF L.A. IS THE LANDLORD, AND THAT MEANS THAT THEY CAN AFFECT THE ECONOMIC VIABILITY BY WHAT THEY BUILD OR CHOOSE NOT TO BUILD. I THINK IT'S TIME THAT WE FIND OUT WHO REALLY IS -- MAKES THE FINAL DISCUSSION. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW THAT. IS IT LAWYER? IS IT THE FAA? OR IS IT THE CITY OF L.A.?

Response:

The City of Los Angeles owns and operates LAX and is responsible for improvements to the airport. FAA also has decision-making power over the approval of improvements to LAX. However, neither

3. Comments and Responses

airport operators--such as LAWA--nor the FAA have the authority to limit activity at airports, such as setting the number or frequency of flights. These decisions are made by the airlines themselves, based on passenger demand. Nevertheless, the airlines are forced to operate within the physical facility constraints associated with individual airports. Without improvements to LAX, which would require approval by LAWA and FAA, the future capacity of the airport will be constrained. It should be noted that the improvements associated with Alternative D would not provide additional capacity beyond that already associated with the existing facilities.

PHF00039-4

Comment:

NOT A SINGLE PERSON HERE HAS OPPOSED -- EXCUSE ME -- HAS SUPPORTED THIS EXPANSION TODAY. SO WHO'S DOING THIS? WHY ARE WE HAVING THIS MEETING? EVERYONE HERE HAS SAID NO. I DON'T UNDERSTAND THE MEANING OF THIS MEETING. AND SO I JUST -- I THINK WE NEED TO PUT THE PRESSURE ON THE PEOPLE THAT HAVE THE ABILITY TO MAKE THE DECISION TO STOP THE PROCESS. THAT'S ALL.

Response:

The hearing was one of 21 conducted by the FAA and LAWA to inform the public on project alternatives and to receive public input.

PHF00040 Aurthur, Jonathan Ballona Wetlands Land Trust 6/9/2001

PHF00040-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS JONATHAN AURTHUR. I LIVE IN SANTA MONICA. I'M REPRESENTING THE BALLONA WETLANDS LAND TRUST, WHICH IS AN ORGANIZATION THAT'S TRYING TO SAVE ALL OF THE BALLONA WETLANDS FOR A NATURE PARK AND RESERVE. WE ARE HERE -- WE ARE HERE IN SOLIDARITY WITH THE ANTI-LAX EXPANSION FORCES BECAUSE WE BELIEVE THAT THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE LAX EXPANSION AND THE STRUGGLE TO PRESERVE THE 3 PERCENT OF THE REMAINING WETLANDS IN THIS PART OF L.A. COUNTY ARE PART OF THE SAME STRUGGLE AGAINST UNREGULATED DEVELOPMENT AND AGAINST THE DOMINATION OF PEOPLE AND INTERESTS THAT ARE NOT IN CONSORT AT ALL WITH THE NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY.

I THINK THAT THE PREVIOUS SPEAKER HAS SPOKEN TO THE FACT THAT REALLY THERE IS NO PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR THIS LAX EXPANSION, JUST AS THERE'S NO PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR UNREGULATED DEVELOPMENT IN THE BALLONA WETLANDS AND THAT THE DEVELOPERS AND THE PEOPLE BEHIND THESE PROJECTS HAVE TO MANUFACTURE A KIND OF ASTROTURF SUPPORT IN ORDER TO BE ABLE TO GIVE THE ILLUSION THAT THERE IS, YOU KNOW, A PUBLIC NEED FOR THIS KIND OF DEVELOPMENT.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed wetlands impacts in Section 4.12, Wetlands.

PHF00040-2

Comment:

LIKE PLAYA VISTA THE LAX EXPANSION IS A SUPPLY-SIDE, DEVELOPER, MANDATED PROJECT. THERE IS NO REAL DEMAND ON THE PART OF THE PUBLIC FOR THIS PROJECT AS WE'VE HEARD TODAY. THERE ARE REGIONAL SOLUTIONS TO THE NEEDS OF THE AIR TRAVELING PUBLIC. LIKE PLAYA VISTA THE LAX EXPANSION FORCES USE THE KIND OF PHONY "JOBS VERSUS DEVELOPMENT" ARGUMENT THAT REALLY DOES A DISSERVICE TO

THE PUBLIC INTEREST. THE IDEA THAT IF YOU'RE AGAINST THE LAX EXPANSION, YOU ARE TAKING JOBS AWAY FROM PEOPLE I THINK IS AN INSULTING ARGUMENT AND REALLY NEEDS TO BE DEMOLISHED ONCE AND FOR ALL.

I DON'T KNOW -- IF PEOPLE WHO CAME HERE AT NOON OR SO SAW THE KIND OF ASTROTURF DEMONSTRATION THAT WAS GOING ON OUTSIDE BY PEOPLE TALKING ABOUT JOBS AND EQUITY AND SO FORTH AS IF ANYBODY WHO'S AGAINST LAX EXPANSION IS AGAINST THE WORKING CLASS, I JUST THINK IS RIDICULOUS AND INSULTING TO ALL OF US.

Response:

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

PHF00040-3

Comment:

LIKE PLAYA VISTA LAX EXPANSION WILL LEAD TO FURTHER POLLUTION, FURTHER GRIDLOCK, AND ALL, YOU KNOW, THE ILLS THAT WE HAVE SEEN IN THE HISTORY OF LOS ANGELES WITH NONREGIONALLY ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT. WE ARE HAVING IN THE MARINA DEL REY, VENICE, PLAYA DEL REY AREA FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE MARINA, THE LAX EXPANSION, PLAYA VISTA, AND DEVELOPMENT IN CULVER CITY THAT ARE BEING NOT REGULATED AT ALL, BUT BEING ALLOWED TO HAPPEN BY FOUR SEPARATE BODIES -- THE COUNTY, THE CITY OF L.A., THE CITY OF CULVER CITY, AND THE LAX COMMISSION.

WE'VE SEEN THE RESULTS OF THIS KIND OF UNREGULATED DEVELOPMENT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF L.A. THAT WE ARE THE MOST GRIDLOCKED AND MOST AIR-POLLUTED CITY IN THE COUNTRY. WE DON'T NEED ANYMORE OF THIS KIND OF UNREGULATED DEVELOPMENT.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 for details on how the future traffic demand from the Playa Vista development was incorporated in the Draft EIS/EIR, and Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding cumulative impacts. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHF00041

Poyourow, Joanne

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00041-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS JOANNE POYOUROW, AND I LIVE AT 83RD AND STEWART IN WESTCHESTER.

THIS LAX PLAN IS A FLAWED PLAN. I'M NOT AGAINST MODERNIZATION. PROGRESS NEEDS TO HAPPEN, BUT NOT THIS PLAN. I'M A CPA BY TRAINING AND ACTIVE NOW TO BE A MOM, AND I HAVE SPENT CONSIDERABLE TIME ANALYZING THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT. THIS PLAN CONTAINS ERRORS. IT IS BUILT UPON HYPOTHETICALS, AND THE UNDERLYING STATISTICS ARE NOT SOUND.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

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

PHF00041-2

Comment:

FOR EXAMPLE, ON BASELINE NOISE, IT'S ALL BUILT ON COMPUTER MODELS. THERE WAS NO REAL AIRCRAFT NOISE MONITORING, ONLY ROAD NOISE FOR ROUTE 1.

THE EIR IS BUILT UPON A NOISE PRESUMPTION OF A WEST FLOW OF LAX. 95 TO 98 PERCENT OF THE TIME. THIS IS ABSOLUTELY LAUGHABLE. I CAN SIT AND COUNT PLANES THAT GO OFF BACKWARDS IN THE SUMMERTIME. WE CANNOT TRUST NOISE PROJECTIONS WHEN THEY'RE BUILT UPON SUCH LOUSY BASELINE DATA.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-1.1. The operational data used to determine the percentage of directional operations was taken directly off of LAWA's ARTS data used in its noise monitoring system. This information is also explained in detail in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. .

PHF00041-3

Comment:

THE 60-MINUTE ACCESS ZONE HAS WAY TOO MUCH GEOGRAPHY CLAIMED BY LAWA AS THE SOURCE OF THEIR USERS. A DIAGRAM OF THE 60-MINUTE ACCESS ZONE WITH 2015 PROJECTED TRAFFIC SPEED CITED BY LAWA THEMSELVES, IT WILL TAKE TWO AND A HALF HOURS FOR MANY OF THESE PASSENGERS TO GET TO LAX. I'VE DONE THE CALCULATIONS HARDLY WITHIN THE 60-MINUTE ACCESS ZONE OF LAX, PLUS MANY AREAS CLAIMED BY LAX AS THEIR TERRITORY ARE ALSO SHOWN FOR OTHER AIRPORTS -- BURBANK, LONG BEACH, ONTARIO. AS L.A. BASIN TRAFFIC FREEWAY TRAFFIC WORSENS, THE DEMANDS FOR LAX WILL BE NOWHERE NEAR WHERE LAWA IS CLAIMING. PEOPLE WON'T BE ABLE TO GET HERE.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00250-1

PHF00041-4

Comment:

THIS PLAN INTENTIONALLY DISTORTS STATISTICS TO FALSELY MISLEAD THE PUBLIC. THE P-6 PARKING GARAGE, I COULD DRIVE OVER THERE RIGHT NOW AND PARK IN IT TODAY. YET IT IS DELETED FROM THE NO ACTION/NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE. WHY? TO MAKE THEIR ALTERNATIVES A, B, C LOOK GOOD. REALITY IS ALTERNATIVES A, B, C WILL HAVE EVEN LESS AIRPORT PARKING THAN TODAY, AND THE NUMBER OF VEHICLES WILL BE INCREASING GOING INTO THAT PLACE. THIS IS JUST ONE EXAMPLE OF LAWA'S FALSIFICATIONS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC0248-3.

PHF00041-5

Comment:

WE CANNOT TRUST THE STATISTICS IN THIS PLAN UNTIL THERE HAS BEEN A FULL AUDIT OF ALL STATISTICS IN THIS EIR. THE EIR CONTAINS POSITIONING TO MISLEAD THE PUBLIC.

Response:

Comment noted. The EIS/EIR was prepared by a large number of independent consultants and experts. While there is no reason to question the overall accuracy of the statistics in the report, the public review period required under NEPA and CEQA affords agencies, interested parties, and the general public the opportunity to review, and question if desired, the assumptions, calculations, and conclusions of the analyses. In the case of the LAX Master Plan, a 295-day review period was provided for the Draft EIS/EIR and a 120-day review period was provided for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00041-6

Comment:

THE TRAFFIC ANALYSIS ZONES THAT UNDERLIE THE TRAFFIC STUDIES ARE FAULTY. THIS PLAN WILL CAUSE GRIDLOCK THROUGHOUT THE GREATER LOS ANGELES AREA. THE PLAN CONCEALS ITS TRUE IMPACT ON THE 405 NORTH OF THE 90 AND THE 405 SOUTH OF THE 105. IT CONCEALS THE TRUE IMPACT ON THE 105 EAST OF HAWTHORNE. THESE AREAS WERE CITED AS LEVEL OF SERVICE F IN THE EIR, AND THEY ARE CITED AS THEY ARE SLATED TO RECEIVE INCREASED AIRPORT TRAFFIC. THAT IS THE EXTENT OF WHAT THE EIR WILL SAY THAT THEY WILL RECEIVE. THE ONLY MITIGATIONS PROVIDED ARE ONES THAT MAKE THE AIRPORT LOOK GOOD, SUCH AS THE LAX EXPRESSWAY. IN THEIR EIR THE LAWA EVEN SCOFFS AT THE IMPACT IT WILL HAVE ON THE 405 FREEWAY AND SAYS IT'S NOT THEIR PROBLEM.

Response:

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

PHF00041-7

Comment:

LAWA USES LOSSES AS A SCARE TACTIC. THEY WHINE THAT WE MIGHT LOSE VOLUME OR AIRLINES TO OTHER AIRPORTS YET AT THE SAME TIME TELL US HOW L.A. POPULATION AND ECONOMY WILL GROW. THERE WILL ALWAYS BE A NEED FOR AIR SERVICES AT LAX. IF THE POSSIBILITIES OF LOSS WERE REAL, LAWA WOULD HAVE FLOODED US WITH STATISTICS AND CHARTS, WHAT IF THIS AIRLINE LEFT, WHAT IF THAT BUSINESS SEGMENT WAS LOST. THEY DIDN'T. THE LOSSES ARE FICTITIOUS. LAWA USES JOB LOSSES AS A SCARE TACTIC TO ENLIST WORKERS' UNION SUPPORT FOR THEIR BAD PLAN.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00041-8

Comment:

THIS LAWA PLAN WILL DEVASTATE NEIGHBORHOODS. THEY HAVE A RING ROAD OFFRAMP AT EMERSON, AT CLOVERLEAF, AND DOWNTOWN WESTCHESTER?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts to neighborhoods from the LAX Master Plan Alternatives A, B, and C in Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns, as well as in Section 4.2, Land Use. The LAX Expressway and State Route 1 Improvements are described and analyzed in detail in Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR. The comment is regarding the proposed State Route 1 improvements, which would shift the existing roadway alignment to the north in order to accommodate runway improvements identified under Alternatives A, B, and C. The purpose of the proposed ring road is to allow continued and uninterrupted flow of traffic along the airport boundary perimeter and to provide access to the western end of the airport from the north. Two configurations are analyzed for the State Route 1 Improvements. Alternative 2 considers a diamond interchange and Alternative 3 considers an urban interchange, both of which are described in detail on page 18 of Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR with accompanying figures. The interchange improvements would occur at either end of the improvement area, within Segments A and C. The Segment A interchange would provide access from Westchester Parkway to Lincoln Boulevard. The Segment C interchange would provide access between Sepulveda Boulevard and Westchester Parkway. Emerson Avenue is located within Segment B and no ramps are proposed at this time. However, a traffic mitigation measure is proposed that would add an off-ramp from the ring road for westbound traffic onto northbound Emerson only. This is the only ring road access considered to or from Emerson. This ramp was added as a mitigation measure under Alternative A through C to provide the local residents living along Emerson with easier access when driving home from I-405. It is not expected that there would be any "cut through" traffic from Emerson due to the ramp, since this route would only benefit local inbound traffic approaching from the I-405. The provision of the ring road would allow vehicles more direct access to the airport rather than disrupting the surrounding neighborhoods. Regarding effects on neighborhoods and downtown Westchester see Topical Response TR-LU-2. Note that LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, which was added subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, does not include the LAX Expressway or ring road. The impacts of Alternative D were addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00041-9

Comment:

THEY SNEAK IN ZONING APPROVALS ON THE SUBDIVISION.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00041-10

Comment:

BASICALLY WE NEED REGIONAL SOLUTIONS HERE. THIS PLAN IS NOT A PLAN FOR THE REGION. IT OVERDEVELOPS ONE HIGHLY IMPACTED SITE AND FALSELY CLAIMS THE OTHER AIRPORTS' LIMITATIONS ARE GREATER. LAWA SHOULD GO BACK TO THE DRAWING TABLE, AND THEY SHOULD WORK WITH OTHER CITIES TO DEVELOP A TRUE REGIONAL PLAN.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

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

PHF00042 Francis, Tom Ballona Wetlands Land Trust 6/9/2001

PHF00042-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS TOM FRANCIS, AND I'M ALSO HERE ON BEHALF OF THE BALLONA WETLANDS LAND TRUST, AND I WANT TO START BY SAYING THAT I WAS BORN HERE. I'M A NATIVE. BOTH MY PARENTS ARE ALSO CALIFORNIA NATIVES, AND EARLY IN MY LIFE IN THE 60'S, WE LIVED ON A STREET CALLED DOVILLE AVENUE, AND MOST PEOPLE DON'T KNOW WHERE DOVILLE AVENUE IS BECAUSE IT ISN'T THERE ANYMORE, BUT IT WAS IN THE AREA THAT WAS ACTUALLY TAKEN OVER BY EMINENT DOMAIN BY THE LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT. SO I USED TO LIVE IN PLAYA DEL REY UNTIL THE L.A. AIRPORT TOOK OUR HOUSE. SO STARTING THERE, I ALREADY HAVE A RESENTMENT TOWARDS LAX.

BUT TO GO ON TO OTHER TOPICS, JONATHAN AURTHUR COVERED A LOT OF THE THINGS THAT I'M CONCERNED ABOUT FOR THE LAND TRUST, BUT I'M GOING TO FILL IN A FEW THINGS THAT I THINK HE MAY HAVE MISSED.

ONE IS I'M VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE CUMULATIVE IMPACTS THAT WOULD OCCUR BETWEEN THE PROPOSED PLAYA VISTA PROJECT, THE PROPOSED MARINA DEL REY EXPANSION, THE PROPOSED LAX EXPANSION, AND ALSO WHAT'S GOING ON WITH THE HOWARD HUGHES DEVELOPMENT. IT DOESN'T SEEM THAT THERE'S REALLY A REGIONAL PERSPECTIVE HERE ON ALL THE IMPACTS OF ALL THESE DIFFERENT DEVELOPMENTS. EVERYONE SEEMS TO HAVE A MITIGATION PLAN, BUT THEY'RE ALL KIND OF IGNORING EVERYONE ELSE'S DEVELOPMENT. I THINK THAT'S VERY DISINGENUOUS, AND I THINK IT'S A REAL SLAP IN THE FACE TO THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN THIS AREA.

Response:

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

PHF00042-2

Comment:

ANOTHER THING I'M CONCERNED ABOUT IS THE ADDITIONAL NOISE AND POLLUTION THAT WOULD BE GENERATED BY THE PROPOSED EXPANSION WOULD ADVERSELY IMPACT THE BALLONA WETLANDS ECOSYSTEM AND THE WILDLIFE THERE.

Response:

Section 4.10, Biotic Communities (subsections 4.10.3, 4.10.6, and 4.10.7) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR analyzed the potential impacts of noise levels and air quality on sensitive biotic communities and sensitive flora and fauna. Section 4.12, Wetlands (subsection 4.12.7) of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR analyzed cumulative impacts to wetlands. Impacts to biotic resources in the Ballona Wetlands were anticipated to occur in conjunction with the Playa Vista Second Phase Project as originally proposed; however, the subject project was substantially reduced in size and scope in November 2002. As currently proposed, the Playa Vista Second Phase Project, now referred to as the Village at Playa Vista Project, has no improvements or development proposed within the Ballona Wetlands.

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00042-3

Comment:

LET'S SEE WHAT ELSE. JUST TO SPEAK OF THE PLAYA VISTA PROJECT ALONE, JUST THE IMPACTS OF PLAYA VISTA ON THE 405 IF BUILT AS PLANNED, THERE WOULD BE 28 PERCENT MORE TRAFFIC ON THE 405. IF YOU ADD THIS TO WHAT THEY WANT TO DO AT LAX, I DON'T I SEE HOW THAT'S GOING TO WORK.

THE OTHER THING TO THINK ABOUT IS LINCOLN BOULEVARD, OKAY, AND SEPULVEDA. IF PLAYA VISTA IS BUILT, JUST PLAYA VISTA ALONE WOULD ADD 86 PERCENT TO THE TRAFFIC ON LINCOLN BOULEVARD. HOW DO YOU MIX THAT IT LAX? I JUST DON'T UNDERSTAND IT.

Response:

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

PHF00042-4

Comment:

THEN LASTLY I THINK THERE WAS A WOMAN EARLIER THAT SPOKE ABOUT VIOLENCE, AND I'M VERY CONCERNED ABOUT VIOLENCE. IT'S A WELL-KNOWN FACT THAT IF PEOPLE THAT LIVE IN A PARTICULAR COMMUNITY DO NOT HAVE A ENOUGH OPEN SPACE TO RECREATE AND JUST, YOU KNOW, RELAX A LITTLE BIT, THEN VIOLENCE INCREASES, OKAY. LOS ANGELES, THE LOS ANGELES METROPOLITAN AREA IS THE MOST UNDERPAKED METROPOLITAN AREA IN THE ENTIRE NATION. IT HAS THE ABSOLUTE LOWEST OPEN SPACE TO RESIDENT RATIO IN THE ENTIRE NATION. OKAY. A LOT OF PEOPLE THINK NEW YORK IS VERY DENSE AND OVERCROWDED. WELL, GUESS WHAT? THEY HAVE MORE OPEN SPACE THAN WE DO. NEW YORK CITY HAS MORE OPEN SPACE THAN LOS ANGELES. SO I JUST CAN'T UNDERSTAND WHY WE WOULD BE EXPANDING OVER ANYMORE OPEN LAND, SPRAWLING OVER ANY LAND THAT WE HAVE LEFT. ANY LAND WE HAVE LEFT WE NEED TO LEAVE FOR THE WILDLIFE AND FOR RECREATION.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00264-2 regarding expansion of parks and recreation areas. As discussed in subsection 4.26.3.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, implementation of the LAX Master Plan would largely have beneficial effects on park and recreational facilities within and around LAX, particularly in the Westchester area through such amenities as expansion of Westchester Golf Course, and incorporation of bike paths and greenbelts within the LAX Northside/Westchester Southside development area. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed wildlife and preservation of wildlife habitat in Section 4.10, Biotic Communities, and Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna. Furthermore, regarding space for wildlife, the 203-acre Dunes Habitat Preserve area located in the western portion of LAX is not proposed for development as part of the LAX Master Plan.

PHF00043

Conlin, William

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00043-1

Comment:

BEAR WITH ME. I'M VERY NERVOUS ABOUT THIS. MY NAME IS WILLIAM CONLIN. I LIVE BETWEEN ARBOR VITAE AND AIRPORT. MY AREA IS TARGETED TO BE TAKEN. I'VE LIVED IN WESTCHESTER FOR 41 YEARS. MY HOUSE WAS TAKEN IN THE 70'S. NOW THEY WANT TO TAKE IT AGAIN. I DO NOT LIKE THAT. COULD YOU FIGURE OUT SOMETHING ELSE TO DO? TAKE A HOTEL, TAKE A BUILDING, TAKE SOMETHING ELSE. WE LIKE IT HERE IN WESTCHESTER. WE DON'T WANT MORE HOUSES TAKEN. WE DON'T WANT WESTCHESTER TO BE KNOWN AS LAX-VILLE. OKAY. PLEASE DON'T TAKE IT. LEAVE IT ALONE. WE DON'T NEED THIS. THANK YOU.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PHF00044**Slopel, Len****None Provided****6/9/2001****PHF00044-1****Comment:**

I'M LEN SLOPEL AND A RESIDENT OF LOS ANGELES. I LIVE ON SOUTH HOLT STREET. I'M NOT GOING TO BE VERY POPULAR, BUT I'M GOING TO STAND UP IN SUPPORT OF THE MASTER PLAN. I THINK WE DON'T HAVE THE OPTION OF DOING NOTHING. I'M MOST FEARFUL OF DOING NOTHING. GROWTH IS NOT SOMETHING THAT WE CAN CONTROL ALL THE TIME, AND HAVING NO PLAN AND JUST ALLOWING GROWTH TO HAPPEN I THINK IS THE MOST UNSAFE, AND ALTHOUGH THERE ARE CERTAINLY OPPORTUNITIES FOR DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN GROUPS ABOUT WHAT THE BEST WAY TO HANDLE THE MODERNIZATION OF LAX IS, I'M MOST SCARED OF DOING NOTHING. AND I JUST WANTED TO SAY THAT.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00045**Olson, Dennis****None Provided****6/9/2001****PHF00045-1****Comment:**

MY NAME IS DENNIS OLSON, AND I REPRESENT TWO TRADE ORGANIZATIONS FOR THE AIRLINES SERVING LAX. THESE TRADE ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENT ALL OF THE CARRIERS AT THE AIRPORT, FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC, AND ARE THE ONES THAT CARRIED THE 67 MILLION PASSENGERS LAST YEAR AT LAX. WE ARE SUBMITTING A STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE MASTER PLAN, AND I'D LIKE TO READ THOSE VIEWPOINTS.

ONE, THE AIRLINES VIEW THE MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF LAX AS A PROJECT OF NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE AND WILL ENCOURAGE SUPPORT FOR THE PLAN AND ITS FUNDING WITH FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES AS APPROPRIATE.

TWO, THE AIRLINES RECOGNIZE THE ROLE OF EACH COMMERCIAL AIRPORT IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA IN PROVIDING AIRPORT CAPACITY AND SUPPORT AIRPORT PLANNING FROM A REGIONAL PERSPECTIVE AS DICTATED BY MARKET FORCES.

THREE, THE AIRLINES ALSO RECOGNIZE THE UNIQUE ROLE THAT LAX PLAYS IN MEETING THE REGION'S PASSENGER AND CARGO AIR SERVICE DEMANDS AND SERVING AS A MAJOR INTERNATIONAL GATEWAY.

FOUR, WHILE LAX CANNOT AND SHOULD NOT BE EXPECTED TO ACCOMMODATE ALL OF THE FUTURE AIR TRANSPORTATION DEMANDS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, IT IS ALSO UNDERSTOOD THAT THE UNIQUE LAX INFRASTRUCTURE CANNOT BE REPLICATED ELSEWHERE IN THE REGION. UNDER ANY REGIONAL PLANNING SCENARIO, THE LAX --

UNDER ANY REGIONAL PLANNING SCENARIO, THE LAX INFRASTRUCTURE SHOULD BE MODERNIZED AND UPGRADED TO ACCOMMODATE ITS REASONABLE SHARE OF THE ADDITIONAL DEMANDS.

FIVE, THE AIRLINES ALSO ENDORSE THE MODERNIZATION OF LAX AS A KEY ELEMENT OF THE GROWING GLOBAL TRADE AND TOURISM THAT BENEFITS ALL SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.

3. Comments and Responses

SIX, THE AIRLINES BELIEVE THAT THE RECOMMENDED CONCEPTUAL MASTER PLAN PROPOSED BY LAWA IS A REASONABLE AND NECESSARY STEP TOWARDS A LONG-TERM PLAN TO IMPROVE LAX SUBJECT TO A FISCALLY RESPONSIBLE FINANCIAL PLAN WHICH FULLY MAXIMIZES PFC'S, FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL FUNDING.

SEVEN, THE AIRLINES UNDERSTAND THAT ANY MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS AT LAX WILL INCLUDE APPROPRIATE GROUND ACCESS, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND OTHER MITIGATION MEASURES.

EIGHT, THE AIRLINES ARE COMMITTED TO CONTINUED PARTICIPATION WITH LAWA IN ALL ASPECTS OF THE LAX MASTER PLAN PROCESS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00046 Inouye, Julie

**Vista Del Mar Neighbors
Association**

6/9/2001

PHF00046-1

Comment:

I'M JULIE INOUE. I LIVE ON VISTA DEL MAR IN PLAYA DEL REY. I'M HERE IN REGARDS TO THE VISTA DEL MAR NEIGHBORS ASSOCIATION.

WITH RESPECT TO THE OVERALL PROJECT, WE ARE IN FAVOR OF A REGIONAL ALTERNATIVE TO EXPANDING LAX'S GROWTH. THIS REGIONAL APPROACH CANNOT BE EFFECTIVE UNLESS ONE OF TWO THINGS OCCURS: A, AS THE FACILITIES OWNED BY THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES WHICH SERVE THE SAME MARKET, ARGUABLY ONTARIO OR PALMDALE, THE CITY MAY BE ABLE TO ALLOCATE CERTAIN OPERATIONS UNDER A SERIES OF CASES KNOWN AS THE PERIMETER RULE CASES, DEALING WITH THE PROPRIETORS' POWER TO ALLOCATE COVENLY-OWNED FACILITIES; B, BY AGREEMENT WITH ALL INTERESTED PARTIES INCLUDING PRESENT AND PROSPECTIVE AIRLINE USERS, THE CITY AND THE DOT, FAA, FEDERAL APPROVAL OF SOME REGIONAL ALLOCATION SCHEME MIGHT BE OBTAINED.

Response:

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

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

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

PHF00046-2

Comment:

THE LAX EXPANSION PROJECT IMPACT ON PLAYA DEL REY IN WESTCHESTER IS THE OBVIOUSLY FACTOR THAT GROWTH ALWAYS HAS AN IMPACT, AND WE BELIEVE THAT THE EIS/EIR IS CAVALIER IN ITS TREATMENT BY PROPOSING THE MOVING OF THE OUTBOARD NORTH RUNWAY 300 FEET TO THE NORTH.

Response:

The commentor is correct in asserting that growth always has an impact. The relocation of Runway 6L/24R (the northern most runway) to the north 350 feet in Alternative C (the proposed project), however, is to enhance safe aircraft operations by providing a taxiway between the parallel runways. The purpose of this safety enhancement is to reduce the potential for runway incursions. At the same time, the proposed center taxiway would be designed to accommodate New Large Aircraft (NLA) based on the forecast which anticipates NLA operations in the future. Please see Response to Comment PC00015-1 for a discussion on the need of a center taxiway. See also Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PHF00046-3

Comment:

AS WE READ THE DOCUMENT, THERE ARE ABSOLUTELY NO MITIGATION MEASURES WHICH WOULD ENSURE THAT SUCH MOVEMENT WOULD NOT CREATE GREATER NOISE IMPACTS IN TWO RESPECTS. ONE, THE OPERATIONS ON THE OUTBOARD RUNWAY MAY BE CLOSER TO HOMES. TWO, THERE WOULD BE INCREASED OPERATIONS ON THE INBOARD NORTHERN RUNWAY WHICH WOULD BE PROMOTED BY THE GREATER SEPARATION BETWEEN THE TWO RUNWAYS.

THE BASIS FOR THE REPORT'S CONCLUSION THAT NO INCREASE OF NOISE WOULD OCCUR IS THE ASSUMPTION THAT THE OUTBOARD RUNWAY WOULD BE USED ALMOST EXCLUSIVELY FOR ARRIVALS WHERE THE NOISE TO THE NORTH ON THE WEST END IS MINIMAL. UNLESS WE HAVE A BINDING COMMITMENT TO SUCH UTILIZATION, THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO ASSURANCE THAT IT WILL BE MAINTAINED IN FACT.

THE REPORT ALSO FAILS TO ADEQUATELY TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE NOISE IMPACTS OF THE INCREASED OPERATIONS OF LARGE WIDE-BODY AIRCRAFT ON THE INBOARD NORTHERN RUNWAY WHICH WOULD BE ALLOWED BY REASONS OF THE RUNWAY RELOCATION.

WE FEEL THESE TWO MATTERS ARE POTENTIALLY SERIOUS FLAWS FOR OUR COMMUNITIES OF PLAYA DEL REY AND WESTCHESTER.

Response:

The commentor's concern for noise increases in Westchester and Playa Del Rey is acknowledged. The commentor is correct in identifying that all alternatives are forecasted to result in an increase in heavy jet operations on the north complex. This is a function of the increase in international traffic that is forecast over the planning period. The INM takes into consideration these runway and aircraft type changes in the modeling process. For further information about the noise levels generated by larger aircraft, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-6.3 regarding larger aircraft mean more noise.

Noise abatement and mitigation measures were addressed in Section 7, Noise Mitigation, of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 3, Alternative D Noise Mitigation, of Appendix S-C1, Supplement Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. To be recommended for new implementation, a measure should contribute to the substantial reduction of significant noise impacts. In the case of each alternative, the mitigation measure that provided the most significant reduction of noise impacts was the inclusion of all residences within the 65 CNEL contour within the area if sound insulation eligibility. When that condition was satisfied, the other mitigation measures had little impact on the areas of significant noise exposure because the alignment

3. Comments and Responses

of the runways and the location of impacted land uses lent little opportunity to make meaningful changes in operational flows resulting in noise abatement. For more information on this topic, please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-4.3 additional mitigation measures. These Alternatives were further defined in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, Appendix S-C-1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, Land Use Technical Report and S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report. The commitment to continue favoring the inboard runways for departures and outboard runways for arrivals was identified in Section 4.1.5 Master Plan Commitments of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, as is the commitment to use only the inboard runways between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m.

PHF00046-4

Comment:

WE UNDERSTAND THAT UNDER THE FEDERAL LAW THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES CANNOT BAR ANY OPERATIONS AT ITS AIRPORTS. THE ONLY LEGALLY PERMISSIBLE CONSTRAINTS ARE THOSE WHICH ARE CAUSED BY FACILITY LIMITATIONS. SO IN THE CASES OF LAX, GIVEN THE DEMAND PROJECTED IF YOU BUILD IT, IT BEING THE LAND SIDE OR AIR SIDE IMPROVEMENTS, THEY WILL COME, AND THEY WILL USE IT.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00051-56 regarding the impact of facility development on demand. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PHF00046-5

Comment:

WE, THEREFORE, GO ON RECORD ON THIS 9TH DAY OF JUNE 2001 TO OPPOSE ANY LAX IMPROVEMENTS WHATSOEVER AND SUPPORT FEDERAL, LOCAL, REGIONAL PLANNING.

Response:

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

PHF00047

Strumpell, Kent

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00047-1

Comment:

KENT STRUMPELL, WESTCHESTER. 6483 NANCY STREET IN WESTCHESTER. I GREW UP IN WESTCHESTER. I WENT TO OSAGE AVENUE SCHOOL, AND I WANT TO CRITICIZE THE ADEQUACY OF THE EIR BECAUSE OF ITS FAILURE TO EXPLORE VIABLE ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION MODES, NAMELY HIGH-SPEED RAIL. MANY OF YOU MAYBE SAW THIS SIGN AND WONDERED THE RELEVANCY OF THIS WAS. I WOULD LIKE TO EXPLAIN TO YOU AND TO THE GENTLEMEN FROM THE AIRLINE ASSOCIATION, IF YOU'RE NOT LEAVING, SIR, I GOT A BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY FOR YOU.

ANYHOW, EXPANSION OF LAX IS NEEDED TO OR IS BEING CONSIDERED TO ADDRESS OUR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS, AND A BIG PART OF OUR LOCAL TRANSPORTATION IS REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION. IN FACT, THE EIR STATES THAT FULLY 31 PERCENT OF AIR TRAFFIC, DOMESTIC AIR TRAFFIC AT LAX GOES TO JUST FIVE WESTERN CITIES -- SAN FRANCISCO, SACRAMENTO, OAKLAND, SAN JOSE, AND LAS VEGAS. ALL COULD BE SERVED BY HIGH-SPEED RAIL.

THE EIR ACKNOWLEDGES THAT THERE IS A CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY FUNDED BY THE STATE WHICH IS NOW STUDYING TO IMPLEMENT A SYSTEM OF HIGH-SPEED RAIL TRANSPORTATION THROUGHOUT THE STATE. THE EIR ALSO ACKNOWLEDGES THAT THIS SYSTEM WOULD SERVICE SAN FRANCISCO, SACRAMENTO, SAN DIEGO, BAKERSFIELD, PALMDALE. THAT'S WHAT'S BEING ENVISIONED. THE ENTIRE 700-MILE SYSTEM COULD BE CONSTRUCTED IN ABOUT 10 TO 15 YEARS.

WHAT THE EIR DOES NOT STATE IS THAT HIGH-SPEED RAIL HAS FAR LESS IMPACT ON OUR COMMUNITIES THAN AVIATION DOES. IT DOES NOT COMPARE THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT. IT DOES NOT INDICATE THAT HIGH-SPEED RAIL HAS ZERO EMISSIONS WHERE IT PASSES THROUGH OUR COMMUNITIES. IT DOES NOT HAVE THE HUGE NOISE FOOTPRINT OF AVIATION AND IS FAR MORE ENERGY EFFICIENT. NONETHELESS, THE EIR HAS DETERMINED THAT HIGH-SPEED RAIL IS NOT FEASIBLE OR PRACTICAL PRIMARILY BECAUSE IMPLEMENTATION WOULD TAKE 10 TO 15 YEARS, AND APPARENTLY THE AIRPORT IS LOOKING AT VERY SHORT-TERM NEEDS UNFORTUNATELY. BUT WHEN WE'RE CONSIDERING THE EFFECT THAT THE EXPANSION OF LAX WILL HAVE ON OUR REGION, 10 TO 15 YEARS IS NOT VERY LONG AT ALL TO BE LOOKING AT VIABLE ALTERNATIVES. THEREFORE, AN EIR THAT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE HIGHLY DESIRABLE AND VIABLE ALTERNATIVE OF HIGH-SPEED RAIL IN ASSESSING HOW WE SHOULD MEET OUR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS IS NOT AN ADEQUATE DOCUMENT. I SUGGEST THAT LAX AND THE AIRLINE, WHOSE REPRESENTATIVE JUST LEFT, REALLY MAKE A COMMITMENT TO EXPLORING HOW HIGH-SPEED RAIL CAN BE A VIABLE COMPONENT OF MEETING OUR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS INSTEAD OF JUST FOCUSING SOLELY ON AVIATION. I SUGGEST THAT THE AIRPORT AND THE AIRLINES GET INTO THE HIGH-SPEED RAIL BUSINESS.

Response:

The City of Los Angeles and LAWA are not responsible for development of high-speed rail systems in the region or state. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand.

PHF00048 Siames, Gus None Provided 6/9/2001

PHF00048-1

Comment:

EXPLAIN TO THESE PEOPLE, EXPLAIN WHY WE WERE MOVED AS CATTLE INTO THIS SMALLER ROOM. HALF OF THE PEOPLE HAVE GONE HOME. REAL NOBLE ONES REMAIN. AND RUTH GALANTER WENT HOME IMMEDIATELY.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00048-2

Comment:

MY NAME IS GUS SIAMES. BUILT OUR HOUSE, MY WIFE AND I, IN 1949 BECAUSE THE AIRPORT WAS HERE AND BECAUSE THE POLITICIANS WERE NOT HERE. THEY CAME AFTER COUNCILMAN TIMBERLAKE RESIGNED WHEN THEY TRIED TO PUSH HIM IN, AND HE PIGEON-HOLED IT, AND THEY TRIED TO PUSH HIM INTO THIS RUSTLE RAPE OF WESTCHESTER AND SUBSEQUENT COUNCILWOMEN RAPES OF WESTCHESTER POSING POLITICALLY AS ON OUR SIDE AND HELD OUR HANDS WHILE THOSE HOMES WERE WIPED OUT.

AND THE WESTCHESTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL I TAUGHT AT, THOSE KIDS AND 10,000 OTHERS WERE WIPED OUT. MY HOME WAS NEVER AFFECTED, BUT IT AFFECTED ME BECAUSE I AS A WORLD WAR II VETERAN, BY GOD, WE FOUGHT FOR PROPERTY RIGHTS, AND POLITICAL CONFISCATION WAS WRONG.

3. Comments and Responses

SO THE SCIENTIFIC ASPECTS HAVE BEEN MORE THAN COVERED BY THIS GROUP AND THE FLAWS IN IT.

LET ME GET INTO THE RUTHLESS POLITICAL MISREPRESENTATION THAT HAS DESTROYED A DEMOCRACY OF THE PEOPLE. THERE COULD BE NO QUESTION THAT THOUSAND -- AND I WOULD COMPLIMENT YOUR STAFF BUT YOU ARE -- WE'RE SPEAKING TO YOU, BUT YOU ARE NOT THE ONES BEHIND THE WALL. SADLY YOU HAVE TO TAKE OUR GUFF BECAUSE YOU'RE VERY PROFESSIONAL. THERE CAN BE NO QUESTION THAT THOUSANDS OF PROFESSIONAL HIGHLY QUALIFIED CIVIL SERVICE PERSONNEL OBEYED THE POLITICIANS' ORDERS TO WORK WITH OUTSIDE CORPORATE CAMPAIGN CASH CONTRIBUTORS AS CONSULTANTS FOR THE PAST FIVE YEARS TO PRODUCE THIS 20-VOLUME PLAN THAT WILL PRODUCE BILLIONS OF DOLLARS OF POLITICIANS' AND CORPORATE PERSONAL PROFIT AT THE TAXPAYERS' EXPENSE.

THE REAL QUESTION IS: WHY AREN'T THOSE SAME POLITICAL SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS HERE HERDED IN WITH THESE TAXPAYERS WHO HAVE TO PAY FOR THIS TO ALSO SPEAK PUBLICLY IN FAVOR OF THEIR OWN POLITICALLY ORDERED BUREAUCRATIC BILLION-DOLLAR BACK-ROOM PLAN THAT THEY IN FINAL POLITICAL CLOSURE HAVE NOW SET BEFORE US TO REVIEW AND PUBLICLY COMMENT BY THE THOUSANDS IN BUT LESS THAN FIVE HOURS.

Response:

Comment noted. There were 21 public hearings conducted providing everyone the opportunity to express their opinions about the project and alternatives.

PHF00048-3

Comment:

THIS IS NOT AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT PLAN THAT WILL BE POLITICALLY IMPLEMENTED AT SOME DATE IN THE FUTURE. THIS IS A POLITICIAN'S PLAN THAT HAS ALREADY CONFISCATED AND BULLDOZED CITIZENS' HOMES AND PRIVATE PROPERTY IN THE WESTCHESTER'S 90045 MANCHESTER SQUARE FOR THE PAST THREE YEARS WITH GALANTER'S APPROVAL. SHE DOES ADMIT -- YOU MUST RECOGNIZE, IF YOU'RE GOING TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM, YOU MUST RECOGNIZE WHAT THE PROBLEM IS. SHE DOES ADMIT THAT THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL DO POLITICALLY APPOINT AND APPROVE EVERY AIRPORT COMMISSIONER, EVERY ONE OF THEM. YOU CANNOT SAY THAT THEY ARE THE ENEMY WHEN YOU HAVE APPOINTED THEM.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that the acquisition of residential properties within Manchester Square and Belford is an action that is not a part of the Master Plan. A separate environmental document was prepared for that project in accordance with CEQA.

PHF00048-4

Comment:

AND NOW, WE THOUSANDS OF CITIZENS ARE GIVEN LESS THAN FIVE HOURS TO SPEAK, TO SPEAK ON THIS ALREADY IMPLEMENTED ENVIRONMENTAL PROPOSAL. IT'S NOT A PROPOSAL. IT'S SOMETHING IN FACT. FOR YOU IT'S A PROPOSAL.

LET ME TAKE A BRIEF MOMENT TO POINT OUT THAT EVEN THE LITTLE GERMAN PAINTER AND HIS CO-CONSPIRING KRUPP CANNON-MAKING GERMAN REPUBLIC GAVE THE JEWS, THE POLES, AND THE CZECHS MORE THAN FIVE HOURS TO PUBLICLY SPEAK BEFORE THEIR ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN OF CORPORATE AND POLITICAL PROFITS WERE IMPOSED TO POLITICALLY PLUNDER THE PEOPLE'S ABSTRACT INALIENABLE HUMAN RIGHTS TO A DEMOCRACY OF OPEN SOCIETAL SELF-DETERMINATION ON THESE BASIC ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES OF MANKIND'S RIGHT TO OWN PRIVATE PROPERTY VERSUS THE RULING MINORITY REPUBLIC'S POLICE STATE POWER.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES OF MANKIND'S RIGHT TO OWN PRIVATE PROPERTY VERSUS THE RULING MINORITY REPUBLIC'S POLICE STATE POWER TO COVERTLY CO-CONSPIRE FOR FIVE YEARS WITH CORPORATE CASH CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTORS FOR PERSONAL AND POLITICAL PROFIT. WE STILL OCCASIONALLY FIND A RARE HONORABLE STATESPERSON OF CONSCIENCE AMONG THE GANGS OF POLITICIANS WHO RULE AT THE TOP, BUT WE CAN ONLY HOPE A FEW MORE WILL RISE TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL CAUSE FOR THE PROTECTION OF CITIZENS' PROPERTY RIGHTS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00048-5

Comment:

INCIDENTALLY, THE LIST OVER THERE, BRAITHWAITE AND THE ENTIRE L.A. COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BLOCKED THAT ARBOR VITAE TRANSITION TO THE AIRPORT, AND THIS IS A THANK YOU NOTE, IF YOU WANT TO SIGN YOUR NAME TO THANK THEM. THEY DID RISE AND PUT PRINCIPLE OVER POLITICS. GALANTER AS PRESIDENT OF THE CITY COUNCIL DID NOT FOR THE TWO WHO WANTED TO SHUT ME UP.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00049 Saner-Trask, Mandie None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00049-1

Comment:

WELL, TO SAY SOMETHING NEW, I WAS LOOKING AT THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES'S BUDGET, NOT BUDGET, BUT IT'S COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL REPORT WHICH SHOWS WHAT THE FINANCES OF THE AIRPORT ARE. I'VE TRIED TO UNDERSTAND WHY IT IS I'M HAVING PROBLEMS, AND IN THIS REPORT IT SAYS THAT YOU HAVE OVER ONE BILLION DOLLARS IN YOUR ACCOUNT, AND I DON'T THINK THAT THE PUBLIC KNOWS THAT THAT MONEY NEVER GOES INTO THE GENERAL FUND TO OFFSET ANYTHING. IT'S ALWAYS KEPT IN THEIR CONTROL, AND THAT'S PART OF OUR PROBLEM. WE NEED THE MONEY BACK INTO THE GENERAL FUND WHERE IT IS NEEDED. YOU WOULDN'T HAVE \$85 MILLION TO SPEND ON THESE REPORTS. WE DON'T NEED THESE REPORTS.

Response:

Comment noted. However, it should be noted that federal law precludes airport revenues from being transferred to the City's General Fund.

PHF00049-2

Comment:

YOU CAN SEE THE AIR CLEANERS THAT I BROUGHT YOU ARE THE AIR CLEANERS FROM THE -- I BOUGHT THE FANCIEST AIR-CLEANING SYSEM I COULD GET, AND THEY'RE BLACKENED. AND SO FOR YOU TO TELL ME THAT I'M NOT -- THERE'S NO IMPACT IS PRETTY FOOLHARDY. YOU DON'T NEED AN \$85 MILLION REPORT TO TELL YOU THIS. I LIVE 3,000 FEET FROM WHERE YOU'RE SUPPOSED TO FLY OUT OF THIS PLACE, AND THAT'S WHAT I'M FACED WITH.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00049-3

Comment:

I DON'T APPRECIATE THE LIES IN THE REPORTS THAT YOU HAVE AND ESPECIALLY IN ALTERNATE C WHERE YOU'RE TELLING US THAT YOU'RE ADDING NO NEW RUNWAYS, WHEN, IN FACT, YOU'RE PUTTING IN A 12,000 FOOT RUNWAY, AND IT'S 400 FEET FURTHER NORTH THAN THE ONE WE HAVE. I HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THAT. I'D LIKE TO KNOW EXACTLY WHERE THESE SURVEYOR MARKS ARE. I'D LIKE FOR THE AIRPORT TO COME OUT AND SHOW ME WHERE THIS RUNWAY IS GOING TO BE, AND I WOULD LIKE TO SEE WHERE THE WESTCHESTER FREEWAY IS GOING TO BE, NOT THE ROAD THAT WE HAVE NOW. WE NEED TO KNOW WHAT IS BEING BUILT HERE, AND YOUR PLANS AND YOUR EXPLANATIONS ARE NOT ADEQUATE. WE WILL PROBABLY NEVER SEE THOSE -- NEVER SEE THOSE PLANS AGAIN THAT THEY HAD HERE TODAY. I HAVE HAD AN IMPOSSIBLE TIME TRYING TO FIND THE ONES THAT WE WE'RE SUPPOSED TO BE LOOKING AT TO COMPARE PLAN C TO WHAT EXISTS SO WE HAVE SOME GREAT IDEA OF WHAT'S GOING ON IN TOWN, AND I REALLY OBJECT TO THAT.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D does not propose and runway relocations/extensions to the north, does not include the LAX Expressway, or the ring road. Alternative D is now the LAWA staff-preferred alternative.

PHF00050

Simon, Joel

**United Chambers of Commerce
of the San Fernando Valley**

6/9/2001

PHF00050-1

Comment:

HELLO. MY NAME IS JOEL SIMON. I'M DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS FOR THE UNITED CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE FOR THE SAN FERNANDO VALLEY, A CONSORTIUM OF 21 CHAMBERS REPRESENTING OVER 8,000 SMALL BUSINESSES. THE UNITED CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE STRONGLY SUPPORTS THE RECOMMENDED LAX MASTER PLAN, AND URGES THE NEXT MAYOR OF LOS ANGELES, THE LOS ANGELES BOARD OF AIRPORT COMMISSIONERS, AND THE LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL TO MOVE FORWARD WITH TIMELY APPROVAL OF THIS PLAN.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00050-2

Comment:

UNITED CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE ALSO STRONGLY EMPHASIZES THAT THE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMPONENT OF THE LAX PLAN SHOULD BE DONE FIRST SO THAT SYSTEM CAN HANDLE THE INCREASED TRAFFIC AND SUPPORTS EFFORTS TO EXPAND THE OUTLYING AIRPORTS AND ENCOURAGE WORKING WITH AIRLINES TO DEVELOP PALMDALE AIRPORT.

Response:

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

PHF00050-3**Comment:**

THE LOS ANGELES BASIN'S ECONOMIC HEALTH IS DEPENDENT ON ITS TRANSPORTATION, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND AIR TRANSPORTATION IS A MAJOR COMPONENT OF THAT INFRASTRUCTURE. LAX IS THE REGION'S LEADING AIRPORT AND THE WEST COAST INTERNATIONAL GATEWAY. LAX IS A VITAL LINK FOR TRADE, TOURISM, CARGO, AND BUSINESS TRAVEL. AIR PASSENGER DEMANDS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WILL DOUBLE OVER THE NEXT 20 YEARS TO MORE THAN A 150 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS. AIR CARGO DEMAND WILL MORE THAN TRIPLE TO NEARLY 9 MILLION TONS ANNUALLY BY 2020.

EVEN WITH THE MAXIMUM EXPANSION AND UTILIZATION OF OTHER AIRPORT FACILITIES AND SITES IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, PASSENGER AND CARGO VOLUME AT LAX WILL CONTINUE TO GROW SIGNIFICANTLY. THE LAST MAJOR RENOVATION OF LAX WAS COMPLETED IN 1984, AND WITHOUT MODERNIZATION TO HANDLE PROJECTED PASSENGER, CARGO VOLUMES THE AIRPORT FACES FUTURE GRIDLOCK AND INTOLERABLE INCONVENIENCE FOR PASSENGERS, BUSINESSES, AND NEIGHBORS. FAILURE TO MODERNIZE LAX WILL MEAN A LOSS TO LOS ANGELES BASIN OF 330,000 JOBS AND 33 BILLION IN INCOME ANNUALLY.

AFTER YEARS OF RESEARCH AND PLANNING, A COMPREHENSIVE RECOMMENDED MASTER PLAN HAS BEEN DEVELOPED BY LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORT STAFF AND CONSULTANTS TO PREPARE LAX TO FULFILL ITS MISSION THROUGH 2015. THE RECOMMENDED LAX MASTER PLAN ADDRESSES MAJOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION CONCERNS AS WELL AS ACCOMMODATING AIR PASSENGER AND CARGO NEEDS. THE RECOMMENDED PLAN IS BASED ON SOUND PRINCIPLES AND CAREFUL REASONING.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE UNITED CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE SUPPORTS THE RECOMMENDED MASTER PLAN AND URGE YOU VOTE IN FAVOR OF ITS ADOPTION. PERSONALLY I WOULD LIKE TO URGE YOU TO OVERCOME THE NIMBY-ISM THAT IS PREVALENT HERE, THE PAROCHIALISM. I HAVE WATCHED IN SOUTH GATE WELL-INTENTIONED, ILL-INFORMED VOTERS OVERCOME A PLAN THAT PUT OUT CLEANER AIR THAN IT TOOK IN, AND AS A RESULT, WE HAVE ISSUES AS THE ENERGY CRISIS. IT'S A STANDOFF AND DO YOUR DUTY.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00051**Saenz, Patricia****None Provided****6/9/2001****PHF00051-1****Comment:**

HELLO, I'M PATRICIA SAENZ. IT'S LIKE "STREET SIGNS." A LOVELY LADY BY THE NAME OF MICHELE CAME UP HERE, AND SHE SAID IT'S A SHAME TO PUT MONEY OVER QUALITY TO LIFE, AKA, PLAYA VISTA. LAX HAS A CHANCE TO DO THINGS BETTER. THAT'S A REGIONAL SOLUTION. NOW, I LOVE LOS ANGELES, AND I LOVE LIVING NEAR LAX, OR I WOULDN'T LIVE HERE. I LIKE THE BIG PLANES. I LIKE BEING ON THEM, AND I LIKE WATCHING THEM FLY. I GET POETIC ABOUT THOSE PLANES, BUT LET ME TELL YOU SOMETHING. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH. OKAY?

THERE'S ONLY SO MUCH SPACE, THERE'S ONLY SO MUCH AIR SPACE, AND THERE'S ONLY SO MUCH GROUND SPACE. I WOULD NOT TRY TO GIVE BIRTH TO 25 BABIES AT ONCE. I LIVE SO CLOSE TO THE AIRPORT THAT I HAD TO DUCK ONCE. THE PLANE WENT OVER MY BUILDING, AND THEY DON'T FLY OVER MY BUILDING. OKAY. SO THAT'S WHERE WE'RE AT NOW WITH THE CONGESTION IN THE AIR SPACE. OKAY.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PHF00051-2

Comment:

YOU HOLD THREE MEETINGS AT ONE TIME, AND AS WAS STATED EARLIER, SAN FRANCISCO AIRPORT, NEW YORK CITY, THEY HAVE THREE AIRPORTS. HOW ABOUT LOS ANGELES AREA HAVING THREE AIRPORTS? THE SIZE OF LAX ALREADY IS NOTHING TO COMPARE WITH THE SIZE OF LAX IN THIS AREA.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process. The City and County of San Francisco own and operate one airport, San Francisco International Airport. The other two commercial airports in the San Francisco Bay Area are owned and operated by the City of Oakland and the City of San Jose. There is no joint powers authority with responsibility for the three Bay Area airports.

PHF00051-3

Comment:

I MEAN LET'S GET REAL. AND NO MORE THREATS. WHAT IS THIS BUSINESS OF ALL OR NOTHING? WE EITHER GET THIS HUGE EXPANSION OR WE GET NOTHING. LET'S IMPROVE, LET'S MODERNIZE, LET'S PUT SOME MORE PALM TREES UP. LET'S PUT SOME MORE TREES UP TO MITIGATE THE POLLUTION, AND YOU KNOW, I WANT TO TELL YOU SOMETHING.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and landscaping in Section 4.21, Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00051-4

Comment:

I'M VERY CONCERNED BECAUSE I HAD TWO BEAUTIFUL YELLOW LABS. ONE DIED AT AGE SEVEN. HER LIVER SHRIVELED UP. THE OTHER DOG DIED AT AGE SIX FROM THYROID CANCER. AND I LOOK AT THESE DOGS, THEIR FEET WALKED ON THESE STREETS, AND THEIR NOSES SMELLED GAS, AND THEY'RE DEAD VERY YOUNG, AND NOBODY COULD UNDERSTAND WHY SUCH HEALTHY DOGS WOULD DIE SO YOUNG. HOW MANY OTHER ANIMALS HAVE DIED OF CANCER OR PEOPLE AROUND HERE? ENOUGH IS ENOUGH.

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-3 regarding health impacts and Response to Comment AL00051-36.

PHF00051-5

Comment:

WE NEED BETTER PLANNING, WE NEED MODERNIZATION, YEAH, IMPROVE. BUT WE NEED BRAIN AND HEART EXPANSION. WE DON'T NEED ANY MORE LAX EXPANSION.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00052 Hefner, Roy LAX Area Advisory Committee 6/9/2001

PHF00052-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS ROY HEFNER. I'M A CITIZEN OF WESTCHESTER, LIVING AT 6548 WEST 80TH PLACE. I'M ALSO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE LAX AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE, HAVE BEEN ON THAT COMMITTEE FOR 26 YEARS. IT IS THRILLING TO ME TO SEE SOMEBODY FINALLY SUPPORTING MY STAND.

IN 1978 THE AIRPORT INDICATED THAT THEY WERE GOING TO LIMIT THE AIR GROWTH OF THAT AIRPORT TO 40 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF PALMDALE. IN 1983 OUR COMMITTEE FOUND IT TO BE ABSOLUTELY IMPORTANT THAT WE NOTIFY THE BOARD OF AIRPORT COMMISSIONERS THAT THEY WERE APPROACHING 40 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS. WE WENT AHEAD AND PUT INFORMATION IN THE LOCAL NEWSPAPERS. WE COULD NOT GET THE WESTCHESTER RESIDENTS TO BE TOO CONCERNED AT THAT TIME. BUT NOW IT'S TERRIFIC TO SEE YOU.

THE POINTS THAT I WAS GOING TO MAKE HAVE BEEN MADE IN GENERAL, BUT THERE'S A FEW THINGS THAT I THINK ARE EXTREMELY IMPORTANT THAT HAVE TO BE RE-EMPHASIZED. WHETHER IT'S THE NO ACTION, NO PROJECT PLAN OR WHETHER IT'S ALTERNATIVE A, B, OR C, THOSE FIGURES THAT YOU HAVE OF 79 MILLION, 98 MILLION, AND 89 MILLION ARE MEANINGLESS BECAUSE YOU KNOW AND WE KNOW THAT THERE IS NO WAY YOU CAN STOP AT THAT PARTICULAR TIME. YOU COULD NOT DO IT AT 40, AND YOU CANNOT DO IT THEN. THIS MASTER PLAN IS REALLY NOT A MASTER PLAN BECAUSE BY THE TIME YOU GET FINISHED, IT'S GOING TO BE THE YEAR 2004 IF IT EVEN DIES, AND YOU'RE ONLY TALKING ABOUT DOING GOING 15 YEARS PREV -- OR AFTER THAT. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT A MASTER PLAN THAT SHOULD BE LOOKING AT 25, 40, AND 50 YEARS BECAUSE THEN WE CAN GO AHEAD AND SEE WHAT'S GOING TO REALLY HAPPEN TO OUR COMMUNITY WHEN THESE AIRPLANES CONTINUE TO GO.

I'M GOING TO ASK YOU TO STOP ME AT THREE MINUTES BECAUSE I HAVE A LOT OF THINGS THAT I CAN SAY AND I'LL JUST KEEP GOING.

Response:

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

PHF00052-2

Comment:

THE EXPRESSION WHEN YOU SAY NO ADDITIONAL RUNWAY, THIS IS ONE OF THE BIGGEST PHONY DEALS THAT EVER CAME OUT OF MAYOR RIORDON'S MOUTH BECAUSE, IN ESSENCE, WE'RE GETTING A NEW RUNWAY, AND IT'S 350 TO 400 FEET CLOSER TO WESTCHESTER/PLAYA DEL REY. WE'RE GETTING A RUNWAY EXTENDED 2,900 FEET TO THE EAST, BUT DO YOU KNOW THEY'RE SUBTRACTING 1195 FEET TO THE WEST, AND THEY'RE

3. Comments and Responses

GOING TO GO AHEAD AND MOVE ANOTHER RUNWAY? SO WE HAVE TWO REMODEL JOBS, AND ONE NEW ONE, AND THEY SAY IT'S NO ADDITIONAL RUNWAY. THEY ARE RIGHT. THERE ARE STILL JUST FOUR RUNWAYS.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. This new option - Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. Under Alternative D, increased separation of runways in the northern runway complex (i.e., 06/27) would occur by moving runway 6R/27R southward, away from the community of Westchester. There would be no runway relocation that places any existing runway closer to Westchester. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment.

PHF00052-3

Comment:

THEY SPENT A HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS RECENTLY IN ONTARIO TO BUILD A WONDERFUL TERMINAL. SO THEY CAN SHOW US THAT THEY ARE REALLY CONCERNED WITH REGIONAL ACTIVITY. DOES THAT COMPARE TO THE 11 OR 12 BILLION DOLLARS THAT MAY BE SPENT UPON THE MASTER PLAN HERE AT LAX? IF THEY WERE TO PUT FORTH THAT TYPE OF MONEY IN ONTARIO, THEN MAYBE THAT AIRPORT COULD GO AHEAD AND DEVELOP.

Response:

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

PHF00052-4

Comment:

I WOULD LIKE TO EMPHASIZE THAT THE WESTCHESTER/ LAX/MARINA DEL REY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HAS NOT SUPPORTED AND IT DOES NOT SUPPORT THE EXISTING EXPANSION PROGRAM OF LAX. WITH THAT LAST GENTLEMAN CAME UP FROM THE CHAMBER, I WANT TO EMPHASIZE THAT OUR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HAS NOT TAKEN THAT SAME STAND.

Response:

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

PHF00052-5

Comment:

TODAY IN THE NEWSPAPER THE AIRLINES SURPRISINGLY SUPPORTED THIS EXPANSION PROGRAM. ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE HAVE TO RECOGNIZE AND I'VE RECOGNIZED THIS THROUGHOUT THE YEARS IS THAT THE AIRLINES DETERMINE WHERE THEY WANT TO GO AND WHEN THEY WANT TO GO, AND THEN EVERYBODY ELSE IS SUPPOSED TO BOW DOWN TO THEM. THE FAA BOWS DOWN TO THEM. THEY GIVE THEM MOST EVERYTHING THEY WANT. THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DOESN'T STOP THEM. THE ONLY WAY WE CAN STOP THEM HERE IS ON A LOCAL LEVEL, AND IT MAY BE VERY INCONVENIENT WHEN THAT COMES ABOUT.

Response:

Since passage of the federal Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, the airlines make the decision about which airports they will serve. As a general rule, airlines will choose to serve the airports near the highest concentrations of conveniently located customers. Within this general framework, however, airlines must make strategic decisions about air service to maximize their investments and gain competitive advantages. For instance, in regions with multiple airports, airlines tend to concentrate their air service at a single, well-located primary airport for reasons of economic efficiency. Concentrating service at a dominant airport also facilitates connecting service, which can significantly increase an airline's market and allow even greater frequencies to more destinations. International service in particular relies on the availability of domestic connecting flights to a wide range of destinations. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning for discussions of airline deregulation and airport regulation.

PHF00052-6**Comment:**

BUT IF WE'RE GOING TO HAVE REGIONAL, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO HAVE SITUATIONS SO THAT THE AIRLINES SAY "IT'S NOT FEASIBLE FOR US TO FLY INTO LAX. WE MUST FLY INTO SOME OTHER LOCATION."

Response:

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

PHF00053**Bray, Sandra****None Provided****6/9/2001****PHF00053-1****Comment:**

I DON'T LIVE IN MISSION VIEJO. I LIVE NEAR WILEY POST AND WILSON PARK AND I AM ANGRY. THREE-FOURTHS OF MY ADULT LIFE HAS BEEN SPENT IN WESTCHESTER. I KNOW THE HISTORY OF WHAT THIS LAWA HAS DONE WITH PAST EXPANSIONS. THEY HAVE LIED, BEEN DECEITFUL AND THEY HAVE BROKEN PROMISES OVER AND OVER AND NOW THEY ARE READY AGAIN, 25 YEARS LATER, TO RAPE WESTCHESTER OVER AGAIN. I AM MORE THAN FURIOUS. THEIR WORDS ARE ARROGANT AND CONTEMPTABLE, IN MY OPINION. YOU HAVE CAUSED ME AND MY NEIGHBORS UNACCEPTABLE STRESS AND YOU STILL ARE.

Response:

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

PHF00053-2**Comment:**

SINCE YOU HAVE STARTED, 57 HOMES IN YOUR COMMUNITY, AND MR. RITCHIE'S COMMENTS IN A DAILY BREEZE LAST NOVEMBER. "DO THEY WANT TO MOVE? PROBABLY NOT, BUT WE WILL PAY THEM." MONEY IS NOT THE ANSWER TO EVERYTHING. ABSOLUTELY IS NOT.

3. Comments and Responses

THAT COMMENT TO ME WAS THE HEIGHT OF UNCARING ARROGANCE. I AM NOT UP HERE TO PLEAD WITH YOU.

I WANT YOU TO LISTEN TO ME VERY CAREFULLY. YOU WILL NOT DO THIS AGAIN. I AM NOT GOING TO BEG YOU. NOT NOW. NOT EVER. WE WILL FIGHT UNTIL WE WIN. YOU HAVE RAPED OUR COMMUNITY FOR THE LAST TIME. THE VERY LAST TIME. THIS IS WHERE IT STOPS FOREVER.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed residential acquisition and relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition.

PHF00053-3

Comment:

AND REMEMBER, MODERNIZATION ALSO MEANS EXPANSION. DON'T TAKE UP THEIR TERMS. THEY SAY MODERNIZATION. THEY STILL MEAN EXPANSION. SAME THING. I AM NOT THANKING ANYONE FOR SPEAKING HERE. I AM FURIOUS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00054

Johansen, Gary

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00054-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS GARY JOHANSEN. I LIVE OVER AT THE AIRPORT AND 74TH STREET. I HAD NO INTENTION OF SPEAKING HERE TODAY. AS I CAME IN AND AS I WAS LISTENING TO QUITE A FEW OF THE OTHER FOLKS, I WROTE DOWN A FEW NOTES AND THREW A YELLOW CARD IN. I HAVE BEEN A RESIDENT OF WESTCHESTER FOR ABOUT 15 YEARS NOW. A FREQUENT PASSENGER IN AND OUT OF LAX. I HAVE FLOWN IN AND OUT OF A LOT OF OTHER AIRPORTS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00054-2

Comment:

I THINK THERE'S A REASON WHY KANSAS CITY AIRPORT IS 35 MILES NORTH OF TOWN. I THINK THERE'S A REASON WHY THE VFW IS SO FAR FROM FORT WORTH AND DALLAS SO NOBODY HAS TO DEAL WITH THAT. THERE'S REASON WHY A LOT OF OLDER INNERCITY AIRPORTS HAVE NOT BEEN EXPANDED AND THEY THINK THAT LAX IS A PERFECT EXAMPLE OF WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THIS SORT OF PSYCHOLOGY -- I DON'T KNOW WHAT ELSE TO CALL IT. SOMEHOW OR OTHER THERE IS THE BELIEF THAT LAX WILL CONTINUE TO ABSORB THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES IN THE WAY THAT IT IS LIKE A CANCER. I DON'T KNOW HOW ELSE TO DESCRIBE IT.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00054-3**Comment:**

I WROTE A FEW NOTES. I WANTED TO SAY THIS CONCEPT PREVIOUSLY EXPRESSED HERE THAT REGENTS AND THEIR CITIZENS SHOULD IN SOME WAY EQUITABLY SHARE THE BURDENS BROUGHT ABOUT BY NECESSARY EXPANSION OF PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE.

Response:

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

PHF00054-4**Comment:**

I HAVE WORKED WITH NETWORKS AND I CAN TELL YOU THAT TRAFFIC IS TRAFFIC. DIFFERENT TYPES OF TRAFFIC. WHEN YOU EXPAND PARTICULAR NETWORK ELEMENTS YOU HAVE TO EXPAND THE TRIBUTARIES AND FUNCTIONS AND INFRASTRUCTURE THAT SURROUNDS THAT THING. AND LAX EXPANSION WILL YIELD FURTHER GRIDLOCK ON 405 REQUIRING EXPANSION ON 405 AS WELL AS THE REST OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE. THE CURRENT PLANS ARE JUST THE FIRST STEP CARRIED BACKWARDS, CARRIED FORWARDS RESULTS IN JUST AN OVERALL PATTERN WHERE LAX ENDS UP ABSORBING OUR COMMUNITY.

Response:

The Master Plan considers the resulting needs of off-airport public roads (including regional roads) in expansion of LAX. Plans for the supporting facilities were included in the description of the constrained alternatives in Chapter V, Section 3.3, of the LAX Draft Master Plan. No assessment has been made regarding the need for additional improvements beyond the planning horizon of this study (2015). Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PHF00054-5**Comment:**

WESTCHESTER HAS BEEN AND CONTINUES TO BE FORCED TO CARRY AN UNFAIR BURDEN WHEN COMPARED TO THE REST OF THE REGION. PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURES IMPACTING OUR COMMUNITY, I WROTE DOWN OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD, 40 YEARS OF EXPANSION OF 40 YEARS. HYPERIOR PIPELINE TEN YEARS AGO BUILT UNDERNEATH OUR COMMUNITY CAUSING SETTLEMENT AND EXPLOSIONS AND KEEPING US UP AT NIGHT. THE HOWARD HUGHES CENTER WHICH I CAN TELL YOU KEPT ME PERSONALLY AWAKE AS THEY CARRIED 24-BY-7 CONSTRUCTION INTO THAT AREA AS WELL AS PLAYA VISTA.

THESE PROJECTS HAVE UNFAIRLY AND NEGATIVELY IMPACTED OUR QUALITY OF LIFE AND WILL ULTIMATELY DESTROY OUR NEIGHBORHOOD AND WILL DESTROY OUR WAY OF LIFE. STOP THE LAX EXPANSION. I CAN TELL YOU IT IS DESTRUCTIVE AND EXPENSIVE.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding potential impacts on the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase. In addition, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event noise at night in Section 4.1, Noise, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Air quality was addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00054-6

Comment:

THERE ARE CHEAPER ALTERNATIVES. IT HAS BEEN PROVEN SO FAR THAT THE REGIONAL EXPANSION APPROACH IS CHEAPER THAN THE EXPANSION THAT WE ARE LOOKING AT RIGHT NOW JUST FROM THAT ONE POINT OF VIEW.

Response:

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

PHF00055

Cope, Danna

LAX Area Advisory Committee

6/9/2001

PHF00055-1

Comment:

I AM DANNA COPE REPRESENTING THE LAX AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE WHICH CONSISTS OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE SEVEN COMMUNITIES ADJACENT TO LAX. I WANT TO FIRST COMMENT, THERE IS NO VIABLE, NO ACTION, NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE INCLUDED IN THE EIS/EIR AND THERE MUST BE ACCORDING TO THE OUTLINES AND GOALS OF THE CEQA AND NEPA.

Response:

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

PHF00055-2

Comment:

AS PROPOSED IN THE ACTION ALTERNATIVES A, B AND C, THE RING ROAD AND ITS CONNECTIONS WOULD DISSEMINATE THE WESTCHESTER BUSINESS DISTRICT CAUSING AN UNDUE ECONOMIC BURDEN ON THE COMMUNITY.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided additional discussion beyond that presented in the Draft EIS/EIR of potential acquisition effects on the Westchester Business District. As was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsections 4.2.6.2 through 4.2.6.4), acquisition within the Westchester Business District would be about 16 acres or 31 percent of the District under Alternative A, about 11 acres or 21 percent under Alternative B, or approximately 13 acres or 26 percent of the District under Alternative C. No shopping centers are proposed for acquisition and Ralph's Supermarket is not proposed for acquisition under any of the build alternatives. Alternative A would include acquisition of Longs Drugstore and Office Depot. Office Depot would also be acquired under Alternative C. Longs Drugstore would not be acquired under Alternatives B or C. Alternative A would also acquire the Mayfair Square Shopping area. Under Alternatives A through C, relocation opportunities would be available for some uses nearby within Westchester Southside. Also, many of the uses being acquired are airport related and a number of the community related uses that would be acquired (a bank, an office supply store, a bar and beauty shop) would remain available through other similar businesses located in close proximity within the Westchester Business District.

Also, as was described in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, note that in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not include any acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Refer to Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

It is expected that any economic burden placed on the community due to the loss of the referenced businesses under Alternatives A, B, and C, would be more than offset through the economic benefits that would accrue with development of the Westchester Southside project and the increased economic activity associated with increases in passengers and cargo.

PHF00055-3

Comment:

THE RING ROAD COULD CAUSE A SEVERE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT BY ROUTING COASTAL TRAFFIC THROUGH PLAYA DEL REY AND ALONG THE BEACH. THE INGRESS AND EGRESS POINTS ARE NOT SPELLED OUT. THESE IMPACTS ARE NOT ADDRESSED,

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. The alternatives would be designed to limit west terminal access from the north on Pershing Drive. That is, while access would be provided from Playa del Rey to and from the east on the Ring Road, direct access to and from the west terminal would not be allowed. This is designed to restrict airport cut-through traffic in Playa del Rey. This should help the airport traffic issues in that community. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are program-level environmental documents intended to analyze the impacts of a master plan. It is acknowledged that further documentation may be required to address certain environmental issues in a more specific manner, as necessary and appropriate. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00055-4

Comment:

ESPECIALLY DURING AIRFIELD REVERSALS WHEN AIRCRAFT TAKE OFF TO THE EAST. THE OSAGE AREA ALREADY HAS LOW-ALTITUDE AIRCRAFT OVERFLYING THE COMMUNITY RIGHT OVER OUR HOMES.

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to the comment PC01835-26. Please see Response to Comment PC01835-26 regarding aircraft flying at low altitudes over the Osage Area.

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00055-5

Comment:

ADDING ANOTHER RUNWAY OR MOVING 24 RIGHT NORTH AS ALTERNATIVE C WOULD GREATLY ESCALATE OVERFLIGHTS.

Response:

The commentor is a resident of Westchester. The development of Alternative A could result in additional takeoffs nearer Westchester, but the new northernmost runway in the north runway complex is planned for arrival use and departure operations would be conducted from the existing runways (24R and 24L on the north airfield; 25R and 25L on the south airfield). Therefore, it is less likely that small aircraft departing either runway in the north complex would turn across the landing course of aircraft using the new north runway. The development of Alternative C would move Runway 24R north 350 feet, however, new procedures would ensure that all westerly departures reach the coastline before initiating turns. For further information, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of airport. In addition potential noise abatement measures were addressed in Appendix D, of the Draft EIS/EIR, in particular Section 7.1.1.3, Noise Abatement Flight Routes, and Section 7.1.2, Airport Regulation Changes.

Following the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA developed a new alternative that, consistent with public comments calling for a regional approach alternative, is designed to accommodate passenger and cargo activity at LAX that would approximate those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, has fewer environmental impacts, and improves airport safety and security. Alternative D, the LAWA staff-preferred alternative, would have a four runways system similar to that of Alternative C. However, contrary to Alternative C, Runway 6L/24R would remain in its current location and no new airfield construction would occur to the north of Runway 6L/24R.

PHF00055-6

Comment:

INGLEWOOD WOULD ALSO SUFFER NEW NOISE AND AIR POLLUTION IMPACTS, ESPECIALLY IF RUNWAY 24 LEFT IS EXTENDED THE EAST AS IN ALTERNATIVE C.

Response:

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

PHF00055-7

Comment:

A REGIONAL ALTERNATIVE IS NOT INCLUDED. IT IS A NECESSITY. LAX SHOULD NOT EXPAND AT ALL UNTIL AND UNLESS OTHER AIRPORTS ARE EXPANDED TO SUPPORT THE AIR TRAFFIC DEMAND IN THOSE AREAS, ESPECIALLY IN ORANGE COUNTY TRAFFIC WHICH IS NOW COMING INTO LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered

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

PHF00055-8

Comment:

INCREASED OPERATIONS OF LAX WOULD CAUSE AN UNDO ENVIRONMENTAL SOLUTION ON THE ADJACENT COMMUNITIES. THESE WERE NOT ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED IN THE EIS/EIR. IT'S DIFFICULT TO DETERMINE WHAT MODELS WERE USED FOR THE ANALYSES IN THE DOCUMENT. THERE ARE VERY FEW REAL MITIGATION MEASURES INCLUDED.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00055-9

Comment:

WESTCHESTER AND PLAYA DEL REY HAVE ALREADY ENDURED THE LOSS OF THOUSANDS OF RESIDENTS TO PRIOR EXPANSIONS WHICH WERE TO BE THE LAST OF SUCH ACQUISITIONS BY LAX, SO WE WERE PROMISED. THE WESTCHESTER CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT HAS FINALLY RECOVERED FROM THE LOSS OF RESIDENCIES IN THE PAST.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01160-1. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester.

PHF00055-10

Comment:

THIS EIS/EIR IS FATALLY FLAWED. IT DOES NOT MEET THE GOALS OF CEQA AND NEPA. ALL THE ALTERNATES PROPOSED WOULD CLEARLY INFLICT UNDUE ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL BURDENS ON THE SURROUNDINGS COMMUNITIES. WE STRONGLY URGE THAT YOU DO NOT PROCEED WITH IT.

Response:

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

It should be noted that the conclusion of the Draft EIS/EIR is that Alternative C would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region. That conclusion has been superseded by that of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D is now considered to be the Environmental Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region.

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00056 Papson, Brian None Provided 6/9/2001

PHF00056-1

Comment:

BRIAN PAPSON. I LIVE AT 8337 BELFORD AVENUE IN L.A. I AM NEW HERE TO WESTCHESTER AND I GREW UP IN NORTH VIRGINIA. NATIONAL AIRPORT GOT TOO BIG. COULDN'T HANDLE IT. THEY BUILT DULLAS AIRPORT. THEY WENT OUT IN THE MIDDLE OF VIRGINIA BUILT A BEAUTIFUL AIRPORT. IT IS NOT PUMPING ALL OF THIS TOXINS ALL OVER OUR YARDS, ALL OVER OUR CARS, ALL OVER OUR CHILDREN.

DULLAS AIRPORT GOT A LITTLE BIT BIGGER THEY BUILT DWI NEAR BALTIMORE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00056-2

Comment:

AND I ALSO WORK FOR AN AIRLINE HERE. I WORK AT LAX AIRPORT. I WORK OUT ON THE TARMAC AND WITH THE TRAFFIC THAT WE HAVE IN THERE NOW IT IS INCREDIBLY DANGEROUS, AS IT IS NOW. WHY DO WE NEED TO THROW A WHOLE LOT MORE AIRCRAFT INTO THAT AIRPORT WHEN WE CAN'T HANDLE WHAT WE GOT NOW. THERE'S CONSTANT ACCIDENTS OUT THERE.

IF YOU GO TO THE AIRPORT POLICE AND TALK TO THEM, HOW MANY ACCIDENTS DO WE HAVE IN A YEAR OVER THERE AT THE AIRPORT. HOW MANY TIMES IS THERE A RUNWAY INFRACTION WHERE A TRUCK IS TOO CLOSE TO THE RUNWAY OR TOO CLOSE TO THE TAXI AREA.

Response:

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

PHF00056-3

Comment:

WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO GO INTO PALMDALE. WE NEED TO GO DOWN TO ONTARIO, EL TORO AIRPORTS. WE CAN'T HANDLE WHAT WE HAVE HERE AT LAX NOW.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PHF00056-4

Comment:

I AM ALL FOR IMPROVING THE AIRPORT, FIX THE FACILITIES THAT WE HAVE GOT NOW. LET US GET UNDER CONTROL WHAT WE HAVE. IT IS JUST RIDICULOUS TO THROW IN ANOTHER RUNWAY. ADD 70 MORE GATES TO THIS AIRPORT. IT IS JUST RIDICULOUS.

Response:

Comment noted. Also, please note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. No additional runways are proposed to be built in Alternative D.

PHF00057

Hormann, Pierce

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00057-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON EVERYBODY. I AM A RESIDENT OF WHAT MIGHT JUST BE LAX'S NEWEST PARKING LOT IF THEY DO SUCCEED IN EXPANDING WESTCHESTER AREA. I AM NOT ASKING FOR ANY SYMPATHY, I AM ACTUALLY LOOKING FORWARD TO MOVING A LITTLE BIT TOWARDS MALIBU OR ORANGE COUNTY. DON'T WORRY ABOUT IT.

TO ME I AM ADDRESSING MORE TO PEOPLE AROUND HERE THAN ANYBODY ELSE BECAUSE I DO BELIEVE THIS IS NOTHING BUT A SHAM OR PART OF PUBLICITY PROCEDURE. SO FAR THEY HAVE SUCCEEDED WITH THE MEDIA LEAVING. WHO AM I ADDRESSING? BASICALLY ONLY A RECORD. THAT'S ABOUT IT. I DON'T BELIEVE THESE PEOPLE ARE REALLY CONCERNED ABOUT ANYTHING. I DON'T THINK YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT IS GOING ON HERE.

Response:

Comment noted. All comments received regarding the project, alternatives, and potential environmental impacts will be addressed.

PHF00057-2

Comment:

THEY ARE NOT CONCERNED ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT. THEY ARE NOT CONCERNED ABOUT RESPECTING THE NEIGHBORS IN ONE OF THE THINGS THAT I SAW WHEN I WAS WALKING BY. THE ONLY AGENDA THEY HAVE IS TO MAKE MONEY. THAT'S IT. OTHERWISE THEY WOULD MOVE DOWN TO PALMDALE THE CARGO. THEY WOULD DISTRIBUTE THE ADDITIONAL AIRLINE PASSENGERS IN THE OTHER AIRPORTS. THEY ARE NOT INTERESTED IN THAT BECAUSE THEY WANT TO KEEP THE MONEY HERE. THAT'S ABOUT IT REALLY.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale, Response to Comment PC00281-19 regarding relocating cargo operations, and Response to Comment PC01881-176 regarding re-routing passengers.

PHF00057-3

Comment:

I ALSO WANT TO CONGRATULATE THE PUBLICITY DEPARTMENT FOR THIS BROCHURE THAT I PICKED UP ALONG THE WAY. IT SAYS ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE. IT SHOULD BE SPELLED ENVIRONMENTAL INJUSTICE. I SEE WHAT IS GOING ON. SINCE THEY CANNOT WIN IN THE ENVIRONMENT ISSUE, THEY ARE GOING INTO JOB ISSUES. LIKE HERE IS FROM THE MAGAZINE, LAX MAGAZINE. THEY ARE TRYING TO PUSH THE ISSUE OF CREATING JOBS BECAUSE EVERYTHING ELSE HAS BEEN PICKED APART BY PEOPLE WHO HAVE SOME INTELLIGENCE AND CAN SEE THAT IT IS NOTHING BUT A SMOKE SCREEN.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, and economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix F and Technical Report 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D and Technical Report S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00057-4

Comment:

I ALSO LISTENED TO ONE OF THE WORKSHOPS OVER HERE REAL BRIEFLY BY A GENTLEMAN WHO WAS TRYING TO EXPLAIN TO ME HOW EXPANSION OF LAX IS NOT GOING TO DECREASE POLLUTION. YEAH, RIGHT. WHAT IDIOT CAN BELIEVE THAT WHEN YOU ADD MORE VEHICLES AND MORE AIRPLANES YOU ARE GOING TO DECREASE THE POLLUTION. I WILL TELL YOU EXACTLY WHAT HE SAID. WE WILL CONCENTRATE IN ONE AREA OVER HERE SO IT DOESN'T DISTRIBUTE ALL THE WAY DOWN. NEVER MIND THE WIND FACTOR.

Response:

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

PHF00057-5

Comment:

I HAD ENOUGH OF THIS NONSENSE, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, SO GOOD LUCK AND THANK YOU FOR COMING. THE REST OF YOU HANG IN THERE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00058 Young, Robert OSAGE Neighbors Association 6/9/2001

PHF00058-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS ROBERT YOUNG, WESCHESTER RESIDENT AND ALSO A MEMBER OF ONA. MY THOUGHTS SAY HERE "GOOD AFTERNOONN LADIES AND GENTLEMEN." I HAVE TO CHANGE THAT KNOW TO NOW GOOD EVENING. WHAT I HAVE TO SAY IS I'M APPALLED AT THE STRONG-ARM TACTICS AND FAILURES IN YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES IN LACK OF INFORMING WE THE PEOPLE AND THE RESIDENTS OF THIS WONDERFUL CITY WE CALL LOS ANGELES. YOUR ATTEMPTS TO HAVE YOUR MASTER PLAN CONSIDERED WITHOUT TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION THE EFFECTS THAT IT WILL HAVE ON MANKIND AND TO THE POPULATION TO THE ENTIRE CITY OF LOS ANGELES. I AM ABSOLUTELY APPAULED BY THAT.

Response:

A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PHF00058-2

Comment:

AT A RECENT SCAG MEETING MAY THE 5TH I WENT THERE AND YOUR SPOKESMAN, I BELIEVE MR. HASANAGA HARATA, GAVE A WONDERFUL PRESENTATION IN YOUR FAVOR

AND QUITE HONESTLY ALSO HAD ME BELIEVING THAT THIS WAS A GREAT PLAN UNTIL I BROUGHT IT TO THEIR ATTENTION SCAG, THAT IS, THE QUESTION ON AIR POLLUTION. MR. HARATA'S RESPONSE WAS THAT LAWA DIDN'T HAVE ANY CONCLUSIVE FINDINGS AT THIS TIME.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00058-3

Comment:

I FOUND THIS TO BE A TRAVESTY AND I FOUND TO MY HORROR THAT ACCORDING TO THE AQM DATE AND EPA THAT THE LOS ANGELES BASIN AND SURROUNDING AREAS ARE CONSIDERED A NONATTAINMENT AREA AND DO NOT COMPLY WITH THE STANDARD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REQUIREMENTS.

AND INCIDENTALLY, THAT THESE DISASTROUS POLLUTION LEVELS HAVE BEEN OFF THE CHART FOR THE PAST 20 YEARS. I BRING THIS BEFORE YOU TODAY -- THIS IS ALSO UPDATED IN DECEMBER OF '98 -- CARBON MONOXIDE IS SERIOUS, PARTICULAR PM10 AND 25 IS EXTREME AND OZONE IS EXTREME. ALSO, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, PRESENT TO YOU TODAY IN 1988 WE ARE THE HIGHEST IN THE NATION FOR OZONE CONCENTRATIONS BEATING HOUSTON WITH A SCORE OF 62 DAYS TO THEIR SCORE OF 31 DAYS. WHAT A WONDERFUL VICTORY THAT IS. I AM NOT SURE I WANT TO TELL THAT TO MY GRANDCHILDREN. WHAT KIND OF LEGACY ARE WE GOING TO LEAVE THEM.

READING FURTHER, IN THE AIRCRAFT POLLUTION PRESENTED BY THE EPA, I HAVE THE DOCUMENTS HERE, BY THE WAY. IT IS FOR EVERYBODY TO GET. THIS IS ALL THE FACTS AND FIGURES THAT WERE BEING PRESENTED BY EPA, THAT THE FIVE MOST VOLATILE COMPONENTS AND POLLUTANTS ARE THE VOCs, COS NOXS, PM10S AND 25S AND SO2S, SULFUR DIOXIDES. BUT AGAIN YOU ALREADY KNOW WHAT THEY ARE. THOSE ARE CANCER-CAUSING CARCINOGENS AND THEY KILL PEOPLE. AND THAT IS WHAT YOU ARE GOING TO BE DOING.

ALSO IN THE EPA REPORT, OUT OF TEN MAJOR CITIES, THERE IS MORE THAN ONE AIRPORT IN THESE MAJOR CITIES, THEY CONSIST OF ATLANTA, BOSTON, CHARLOTTE, HOUSTON, NEW YORK, PHILADELPHIA, PHOENIX, WASHINGTON AND LOS ANGELES. OUT OF THESE TEN CITIES WE HAVE ONE ATTAINMENT BUT AT RISK, THREE SEVERE SITUATIONS, FIVE SERIOUS, AND LASTLY WE HAVE LOS ANGELES LAX IN EXTREME CONDITIONS. THESE ARE ALL FACTS AND FIGURES THAT YOU SHOULD GET HERE BECAUSE YOUR FIGURES DO NOT COMPLY, COME ANYWHERE NEAR CLOSE TO THESE.

Response:

The commentor is correct that the South Coast Air Basin is a nonattainment area for some criteria pollutants. As was noted in the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.6.3.2 and Table 4.6-4, the South Coast Air Basin is classified as an extreme nonattainment area with respect to the O3 NAAQS, a serious nonattainment area with respect to the CO NAAQS, and a serious nonattainment area with respect to the PM10 NAAQS. The South Coast Air Basin is also a nonattainment area with respect to the O3, CO, and PM10 CAAQS.

Also, please see Response to Comment PC00070-1 regarding a discussion of ambient air quality trends in the South Coast Air Basin, and Response to Comment PC01186-4 for a discussion of the relative contributions of emissions from sources on-site at LAX to emissions in the South Coast Air Basin.

The comment regarding aircraft pollution presented by USEPA appears to refer to the report from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) titled "Evaluation of Air Pollutant Emissions from Subsonic Commercial Jet Aircraft " dated April 1999. The comment suggests that the emission estimates in the USEPA report do not compare well with the emission estimates in the Draft EIS/EIR. While a direct comparison between these data cannot be made, since they are based on somewhat different assumptions for different time periods, the results are reasonably similar. For example,

3. Comments and Responses

comparing Table G-2, 2010 Commercial Aircraft Emissions (short tons/year), Default Mixing Height in the USEPA report to Table 4.6-8, Unmitigated Operational Emissions Inventories for On-Airport Sources (tons per year) for No Action/No Project Alternative in Horizon Year 2015 in the Draft EIS/EIR, USEPA's estimates are lower for two pollutants (CO and VOC) and higher for two pollutants (NOx and SO2). For example, compare emissions for CO of 14,530 tons/year (Draft EIS/EIR Table 4.6-8) to 7870 tons/year (USEPA report Table G-2); VOC of 1,789 tons/year (Draft EIS/EIR Table 4.6-8) to 2957 tons/year (USEPA report Table G-2); NOx of 6,308 tons/year (Draft EIS/EIR Table 4.6-8) to 6,455 tons/year (USEPA report Table G-2); and SO2 of 252 tons/year (Draft EIS/EIR Table 4.6-8) to 237 tons/year (USEPA report Table G-2). These differences in emissions estimates are likely attributable to differences in assumptions and calculation methods. It would be inappropriate to characterize one set of data as correct and the other data set as incorrect.

PHF00058-4

Comment:

BY THE YEAR 2010 -- INCIDENTALLY, YOUR MASTER PLAN CONSISTS OF PLAN A, B AND C WHICH IS ONLY FOR THE LAX AREA. SHOULDN'T THERE BE PLANS D, E AND F. FOR EXAMPLE, YOU HAVE FORGOTTEN PALMDALE, ONTARIO, AND DON'T LET ME GET STARTED ON EL TORO. BY THE YEAR 2010, LOS ANGELES AND SURROUNDING AREAS WILL ENDURE A POPULATION GROWTH OF NEW RESIDENTS TO THE TUNE OF APPROXIMATELY SIX MILLION PEOPLE.

1.75 PERCENT OF THESE PEOPLE WILL BE GOING TO PALMDALE. 1.75 PERCENT OF THESE PEOPLE WILLING TO RIVERSIDE COUNTY. TWO MILLION PEOPLE WILL GO TO ORANGE COUNTY. THESE ARE ALL FACTS. DOESN'T COMMON SENSE TELL YOU THAT THE JOBS FOR THESE PEOPLE WILL BE IN THE OUTLYING AREAS. THERE IS SO MUCH THAT I WANT TO GO ON ABOUT. I URGE YOU TO STOP WASTING OUR MONEY ON A PROJECT THAT REALLY DOESN'T HAVE A FUTURE. WAKE UP. REVISE YOUR PLANS.

Response:

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

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

PHF00059

Schivley, Gary

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00059-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS GARY SCHIVLEY. I LIVE OVER IN THE OSAGE NEIGHBORHOOD. I KNOW THAT LAWA HAS ALREADY SPEND \$85 MILLION AND THE CITY COUNCIL HAS AUTHORIZED ANOTHER TEN MILLION EXPENDITURES. I FOUND IT VERY INTERESTING THAT THEY COULDN'T BOTHER STAMPING THESE TO MAKE IT EASIER TO SEND IT OUT.

Response:

A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PHF00059-2

Comment:

THESE PROPOSED PROJECTS THAT THEY HAVE, THE RING ROAD, THE PROPOSED RING ROAD WILL INCREASE TRAFFIC, NOISE POLLUTION AND CONGESTION. PART OF THE LINE INCREASED WILL MEAN HUNDREDS OF 18 WHEELERS TO MOVE FREIGHT. THIS IS AN ADDITION TO EXISTING CARBON LEVELS. INCREASE NOISE LEVELS, CARCINOGENIC LEVELS OF DIESEL, SOOT AND POLLUTION.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand, Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, and Topical Response TR-AQ-2 regarding toxic air pollutants. Also, please note that Alternative D added subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR does not include the LAX Expressway or the ring road.

PHF00059-3

Comment:

ARBOR VITAE 405 RAMP, WE DON'T WANT IT. THIS PLAN INVOLVES REMOVING SOME 57 PROPERTIES, WASTING \$119 MILLION BETTER SPENT REPAIRING CURRENT ROADS. TRAFFIC IS DOWN AT HOLLYWOOD PARK AND THE FORUM IS NO LONGER A HIGH-USAGE ARENA. EXTENDING THE 105 RAMP INTO THE AIRPORT WOULD HAVE MADE BETTER SENSE. THIS IS A BETTER ALTERNATIVE.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment AL00008-8. Please see Response to Comment AL00008-8.

PHF00059-4

Comment:

MANCHESTER SQUARE AND AIRPORT/BELFORD AREAS, WE WANT THIS PROPERTY ZONED FOR OPEN SPACE FOR A PARK OR OTHER USEFUL BENEFIT. WE DON'T WANT CARGO BUILDINGS OR RUNWAY EXTENSIONS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00059-5

Comment:

FORTY SCHOOLS ARE IMPACTED TODAY BY THE CURRENT NOISE AND POLLUTION LEVELS. IT WILL ONLY EXACERBATE THE SERIOUS PROBLEM. NOISE LEVELS ARE EXTREMELY HIGH, EVEN WITH SOUNDPROOFING.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

It is not clear from the comment where the stated information was obtained. Table 14 in Technical Report 1, the Land Use Technical Report of the Draft EIS/EIR identified 31 schools exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels under the 1996 baseline. Since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR has been prepared that evaluated an additional Master Plan alternative (Alternative D), incorporated information on Year 2000 conditions, and provided more detailed analysis of single event aircraft noise levels that result in classroom disruption. This information was provided in Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, Appendix C-1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, and Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As presented in Table S4 of the Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, 31 different schools are exposed to 65 CNEL or higher noise levels under Year 2000 conditions. As listed in Table S9 of the Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, under 1996 baseline conditions 31 schools are exposed to single event noise levels that result in classroom disruption and 30 schools under Year 2000 conditions. Noise impacts on schools were presented throughout Sections 4.1.6 and 4.2.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment PC02302-63 and Topical Response TR-LU-5 for an overall discussion of impacts on schools. See Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise mitigation. See Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding impacts of increased pollution levels.

PHF00059-6

Comment:

I ATTENDED A MEETING AT WESTCHESTER HIGH RECENTLY AND THE NOISE WAS SO DEAFENING WE COULD BARELY HEAR. HOW CAN THE STUDENTS CONCENTRATE AND ACHIEVE SATISFACTORY EDUCATION WITH THIS DISTURBANCE. CARGO AND PASSENGERS FLIGHTS WILL ONLY ADD MORE NOISE AND TRAFFIC.

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.

PHF00059-7

Comment:

CURRENTLY I EXPERIENCE RATTLING OF MY WINDOWS AND EXTREME JET NOISE AT VARIOUS TIMES OF THE DAY, ESPECIALLY NIGHT, CAUSING SLEEP LOSS.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings in homes associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PHF00059-8

Comment:

INCREASE OF BLACK SOOT, WHICH THESE AIR FILTERS DISPLAY, UNBURNED KEROSENE FUEL ON MY CAR, HOME AND LANDSCAPING. I AM HAVING TO WASH MY CAR MORE OFTEN AND THE PAINT FINISH IS DAMAGEED FROM THESE DEPOSITS.

Response:

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

PHF00059-9

Comment:

THE CHOKING SMELL OF JET FUEL IN THE MORNING IS BECOMING WORSE. IT IS BECOMING MORE DIFFICULT TO BREATHE. THESE ARE PROVEN CARCINOGENS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors, Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, and Topical Response TR-AQ-2 regarding toxic air pollutants.

PHF00059-10

Comment:

INCREASE OF FLIGHTS OVER MY HOUSE ARE CONTRIBUTED TO THE EXTREME NOISE LEVELS AND POLLUTIONS. NOISE LEVELS ARE CONSIDERED 65 CNEL AND ABOVE. WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW ARE WHEN AND WHERE THESE MEASUREMENTS ARE PROVIDED. I AM REQUESTING THAT THEY MEASURE THESE NOISE LEVELS AT MY HOME DURING THE PEAK HOURS AND CARBON DEPARTURES. THE NOISE LEVELS HAVE RISEN CONSIDERABLY IN THE LAST FIVE YEARS IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD AREA.

Response:

Comment noted. Use of the INM computer model is required by FAA Order 1050.1D for preparation of noise contours in Environmental Impact Statements. It's successor, draft FAA Order 1050.1E indicates that measurements should not be used to calibrate noise contours. Furthermore, the noise levels required for inclusion in the EIS/EIR are for average annual conditions and do not include the extremes represented by peak conditions cited by the commentor. For more information please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding noise modeling approach and Appendix D, Section 2.2 Comparison of Environmental Baseline Noise To Quarterly Noise Report. Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided an evaluation of nighttime single event noise.

PHF00059-11

Comment:

I AM REQUESTING A REGIONAL APPROACH TO EXPANDING THE PASSENGER AND CARGO CAPACITY. EL TORO, ONTARIO AND PALMDALE ARE EXCELLENT ALTERNATIVES. YOU CANNOT EXPECT ONE AIRPORT TO EFFECTIVELY HANDLE ALL OF THESE AREAS TRAVEL AND CARGO NEEDS AND NOT DESTROY THE LIVING CONDITIONS OF OUR NEIGHBORHOODS.

Response:

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

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the

3. Comments and Responses

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

PHF00059-12

Comment:

THE ONE PRO-REPRESENTATIVE FOR ENLARGING LAX MENTIONED ABOUT NOT BEING ABLE TO REPLICATE THE INFRASTRUCTURE OF LAX. I DON'T BELIEVE THAT. DENVER COMPLETELY ABANDONED THEIR CURRENT AIRPORT AND BUILT A NEW ONE. SO IT CAN BE DONE. SO, PLEASE, CONSIDER THIS IN YOUR FUTURE PLANS AND DON'T DESTROY OUR NEIGHBORHOODS.

Response:

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

PHF00060 Satton, June OSAGE Neighbors Association 6/9/2001

PHF00060-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS JUNE SATTON AND I AM A RESIDENT OF WESTCHESTER AND I AM A MEMBER OF ONA, WHICH IS THE OSAGE ASSOCIATION IN WESCHESTER. FIRST OFF, I WANT TO ADDRESS OUR TWO GENTLEMAN UP HERE, MR. RITCHIE AND HIS PARTNER. I WANT TO SAY THAT I HAVE BEEN LISTENING TO A LOT OF PEOPLE SPEAK. IT KIND OF HURTS ME TO THINK THAT THEY SPENT BILLIONS AND BILLIONS OF DOLLARS TO COLLECT INFORMATION WHEN I HAVE HEARD SO MANY INTELLIGENT PEOPLE GIVING THE FACTS AND THE FIGURES HERE TODAY CONCERNING DEATH, CONCERNING THE POLLUTANTS. THEY HAVE BROUGHT YOU THE PROOF. YOU DON'T HAVE TO GO TO KANSAS CITY TO GET IT. YOU DON'T HAVE TO IMPORT PEOPLE FROM OTHER AREAS TO TELL YOU WHAT WORKS IN THIS AREA.

Response:

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

PHF00060-2

Comment:

I HAVE BEEN TO NUMEROUS SCAG MEETINGS AND CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS AND HEARD ALL THESE COMMITTEE REPORTS. I DON'T THINK THAT LAWA SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO PUSH THROUGH THIS PLAN AMONGST SMOKE SCREENS WHILE IGNORING CEQA AND NEPA. THERE'S A REASON THAT WE HAVE THESE. THAT IS TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE QUALIFY OF LIFE WE HAVE HERE.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that

of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

It should be noted that the conclusion of the Draft EIS/EIR is that Alternative C would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region. That conclusion has been superseded by that of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D is now considered to be the Environmental Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region.

PHF00060-3

Comment:

I KNOW THIS HAS ALREADY BEEN BROUGHT UP. ONE EXAMPLE OF THIS IS PUSHING AHEAD WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE MASTER PLAN OR ANY ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY FOR THE PURCHASE OF MANCHESTER SQUARE. THAT WAS REALLY PUSHED THROUGH. THOSE PEOPLE WERE RAILROADED OUT OF THERE. THEIR ENVIRONMENT WAS TORN APART BEFORE THEM. THEY WERE BEGGING TO LEAVE. WHY? THEY DIDN'T DO IT. THE AIRPORT DID IT.

Response:

The acquisition of residential properties within Manchester Square and Belford is an action that is not a part of the Master Plan. A separate environmental document was prepared for that project in accordance with CEQA.

PHF00060-4

Comment:

LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT SOMETHING THAT I KNOW VERY WELL ABOUT. I CAN GIVE YOU STATISTICS. I DO ALMOST 30,000 LAND MILES BT MY CAR A YEAR FOR MY JOB. LET'S TAKE TRAFFIC, FOR EXAMPLE. I WANT TO BRING UP THE STATISTICS TO YOU. THE STATISTICS THAT YOU OFFER DURING PEAK TIMES ARE AS FOLLOWS ON THE 405, THAT BETWEEN 7:00 A.M. AND 9:00 A.M., THESE ARE THE PEAK TIMES IN THE MORNING AND BETWEEN 5:00 P.M. AND 7:00 P.M. IN THE EVENING. FIRST OF ALL, THESE FACTS ARE ABSURDLY FALSE. I DRIVE THESE FREEWAYS AND ANYONE WHO DRIVES THE 405 ON A CONSISTENT BASIS KNOWS AT 9:00 A.M. GOING SOUTHBOUND YOU ARE GOING NO WHERE. IT IS NOT CLEARED UP. OR GOING NORTH COMING UP FROM LONG BEACH, YOU ARE AT A STAND STILL. I AM SORRY, LET ME GIVE YOU THE REAL FACTS AND FIGURES.

FROM ABOUT 6:30 A.M. OR EVEN EARLIER TILL ABOUT 10:30 OR LATER IN THE MORNING THE 405 SOUTHBOUND FROM THE VALLEY -- I WISH THAT GENTLEMAN FROM THE VALLEY WAS HERE BECAUSE I THINK THIS WAS HIS ONLY TRIP DOWN HERE. HE HAS NO IDEA WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT. THE FREEWAY IS AT A STANDSTILL OR A CRAWL. I GO UP THERE ALL THE TIME.

NORTHBOUND LANES COMING UP FROM LONG BEACH THOSE ARE EXACTLY THE SAME, EVEN BEFORE LONG BEACH IT IS AT A STAND STILL. REALISTICALLY FROM ABOUT 3:30 IN THE AFTERNOON, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, UNTIL ABOUT 7:00 P.M. IN THE EVENING THAT'S WHEN THE FREEWAYS ONCE AGAIN COME TO A STANDSTILL. THE AIRPORT SAYS THAT THEIR PEAK TRAVEL TIMES ARE BETWEEN 11:00 AND 1:00 A.M. THEY WANT THE 405 AT A STANDSTILL FROM ABOUT 6:00 IN THE MORNING TILL ABOUT 8:00 AT NIGHT. QUALITY OF LIFE. I THINK YOU NEED TO LOOK AT THESE FACTS. WE ARE THE PEOPLE THAT DRIVE AND KNOW THESE FACTS AND THESE FIGURES. THERE ARE MANY MORE THINGS TO SAY.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment AL00033-302. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-302. Also, the peak hours were determined based on actual traffic counts on freeways, ramps and arterials streets. Figure II-7.8 in the working paper (also shown as Figure II-7.5 in Technical Report 2b) clearly shows that when all of the freeway counts on I-105 and I-405 are analyzed together, the peak hours are

3. Comments and Responses

8:00 to 9:00 AM and 5:00 to 6:00 PM. It is possible that at some specific locations/directions the highest hour may differ. But in the aggregate the peak hours identified are clearly the hours of highest freeway volumes.

PHF00060-5

Comment:

THESE ARE PEAK TRAVEL TIMES, NOT TO MENTION THE FACT THAT WE KNOW WHAT HAPPENS WITH THE PROJECTED TONS OF CARGO THAT YOU WANT TO BRING INTO THE AIRPORT AND THE AREA. LET'S JUST SAY WE HAVE ONE OF THOSE TRUCKS OVERTURNED IN THIS AREA. THAT'S A MAJOR DISASTER. MAJOR. WE KNOW WHAT HAPPENS TO FREEWAYS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WHEN ONE TRUCK TURNS OVER CAUSE SIG ALERT IS A NAME THAT WE ARE ALL FAMILIAR WITH. I AM IN IT EVERYDAY. I KNOW. I AM NOT TALKING ABOUT STUFF I DON'T KNOW ABOUT.

GETTING TO AND FROM THE AIRPORT. ALSO, HOLIDAY TRAVEL, BAD WHETHER TRAVEL. CONGESTION ON THURSDAYS AND FRIDAYS. I KNOW ABOUT THE PEAK TIMES OF TRAVEL IN AND OUT OF THE AIRPORT. I KNOW ABOUT FRIDAY NIGHTS. I KNOW ABOUT THE HORRORS OF THURSDAYS. BRINGING MORE TRAFFIC.

Response:

Comment noted. The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic.

PHF00060-6

Comment:

IT IS NOT GOING TO WORK, NOT TO MENTION THE POLLUTION LEVELS THAT HAVE ALREADY BEEN DISCUSSED. THAT'S A HUGE FACTOR. THE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLER SAID THAT IT IS NOT SAFE AT LAX, LET'S EXPAND. IT'S LAX'S FAULT. WHY SHOULD WE SUFFER. WE SHOULD HAVE A REGIONAL PLAN. NOT DO NOTHING. LET'S HAVE A REGIONAL PLAN.

Response:

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

PHF00061

Bharadwa, Mina

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00061-1

Comment:

I AM MINA BHARADWA. I AM A REALTOR IN THE AREA. I HAVE BEEN WORKING HERE FOR ABOUT 18 YEARS. AND PEOPLE SAY TO ME WHY DO YOU CARE. YOU HAVE MORE HOUSES TO SELL. I DO CARE. I LIVE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00061-2

Comment:

I CARE ABOUT THE QUALITY OF LIFE. I BASICALLY CARE THAT OUR COMMUNITY IS NOT BEING KEPT AS A WHOLE COMMUNITY. IN ORDER TO BUILD THE LAX EXPRESSWAY AND THE RING ROAD, THE LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORTS WILL HAVE TO ACQUIRE ONE-THIRD OF THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT ON SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD. ALREADY IT IS LIKE A DEAD DISTRICT. WE HAVE TRIED TO IMPROVE IT BY BUILDING RALPHS AND SAV-ON. THAT MAY BE ACQUIRED WITH THE LAWA PLAN. THEN WE WOULD LOSE SOME HOUSES ON NEILSON FIELD AND PART OF THE HISTORIC CENTINELA ADOBE.

IF THE ONE RUNWAY MOVES, THAT'S ANOTHER 350 FEET NORTH AND EXTENDED 3,000 FEET EAST. THEY HAVE NOT LOOKED AT GROUND MITIGATIONS. THEY ARE SAYING THAT IT WON'T AFFECT OUR MAJOR ARTERIES. THEY HAVE NOT DONE ENOUGH RESEARCH INTO IT AND IT WILL DESTROY OUR COMMUNITIES' FEEL, THE BEAUTY AND THE FEEL OF THE COMMUNITY. ALSO THE FACT THAT WE WILL LOSE ONE OF OUR GROCERY STORES ON THE EAST SIDE OF WESTCHESTER.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land acquisition for each of the alternatives in Chapter 3 and Section 4.2, Land Use; cultural resources impacts in Section 4.9.1, Historic Architecture and Archeological/Cultural Resources; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 concerning impacts within the Community of Westchester and TR-HA-1 regarding the Centinela Adobe. As presented in Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Ralphs and SavOn would not be acquired under any of the build alternatives. Also note, as described in Section 4.2.6.5 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, in contrast to the other build alternatives, Alternative D (LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative), does not propose any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester Business District. Further, it does not include the ring road or the LAX Expressway. As a result Alternative D would have no potential for impacts on the Centinela Adobe. As was described in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA's programs for the acquisition of residences and business properties would conform to governing federal and State requirements for the payment of just compensation for the purchase of any needed property and applicable relocation assistance and payments would be provided to any person displaced from their home or business. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PHF00061-3

Comment:

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE EXPANSION ISN'T ENOUGH. WHAT HAPPENS WHEN YOU TRY TO TAKEOVER MORE AND MORE AND MORE HOUSES. THEN THE OTHER CONCERNS I HAVE IS THE CARGO DEMAND, THE PROJECTED CARGO DEMAND. THE AREAS OF CONCERN INCLUDE LARGER CARGO AIRCRAFT, MORE FLIGHTS, HEAVY AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS, DEVELOPMENT OF AREAS SURROUNDING THE AIRPORT FOR DISTRIBUTIONS, HEAVY SHIPPING, WAREHOUSING, HIGH TRUCK AND CARGO TRAFFIC. WHAT ABOUT US AS RESIDENTS. WHAT DO WE DO IN THAT INSTANCE.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land use impacts in Section 4.2, Land Use, and relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 1 and 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-1 and S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand, Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00061-4

Comment:

ALSO THE SAFETY ISSUE OF OUR OVERCROWDING OF THE AIR CORRIDORS MAY LEAD TO THE LIKELIHOOD OF MORE AIR DISASTER.

Response:

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

PHF00061-5

Comment:

THE AIR POLLUTION, THAT'S A BIG, BIG FACTOR. LAX IS ALREADY ONE OF THE AREAS SINGLE LARGEST SOURCE OF NOX EMISSIONS, THE PRIMARY PRECURSOR TO OZONE. THE AIR IS OUT OF COMPLIANCE FOR MANY POLLUTANTS, INCLUDING PM10.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01186-4.

PHF00061-6

Comment:

AND THAT IT CAN LEAD TO RESPIRATORY SYSTEMS AND CAN LEAD TO CANCER. WHAT ABOUT THE HEALTH OF PEOPLE WHO ARE LIVING IN THE NEIGHBORHOODS. PEOPLE WHO ARE DOING THE REPORTS. THEY MAY BE LIVING OUTSIDE THE NEIGHBORHOOD. WHAT ABOUT US. WE LIVE IN THE AREA.

Response:

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

PHF00061-7

Comment:

THE NOISE, THE CNEL, THAT IS A WEIGHTED DAILY AVERAGE. IT DOES NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT LOUD, SINGLE-EVENT NOISES. YOU COULD BE LIVING JUST A LITTLE BIT NORTH OF 65 CNEL AND HAVE AIRCRAFT EVERY 45 SECONDS ALL DAY LONG.

Response:

Comment noted. The model accounts for all aircraft noise events. It is correct to say that aircraft operations can overfly a particular area and the location can still be located outside of the 65 dB CNEL area. Please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, particularly Subtopical Response TR-N-2.1, CNEL doesn't display noise at it's heard every day-it shows averages. Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided an analysis of single event noise impacts.

PHF00061-8**Comment:**

TWO MORE ISSUES. TRAFFIC, I DON'T THINK THERE'S A MITIGATION MEASURES BECAUSE YOU ARE NOT CONCERNED ABOUT HOW THE TRAFFIC IS GOING TO FLOW ONTO THE FREEWAYS. YOU MAY BE ABLE TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT THE RING ROAD AND ABOUT LAX EXPRESSWAY.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Freeways are analyzed in the Congestion Management Program (CMP), which is summarized in Technical Reports 3b and S-2b, section 6.

PHF00061-9**Comment:**

WE ARE LOOKING FOR A REGIONAL SOLUTION. WE DO NOT NEED EL TORO'S. WE DON'T NEED THE COMMUNITIES AROUND LAX TO BEAR THE BURDEN OF ORANGE COUNTY'S NEED FOR AIR COMMERCE.

Response:

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

PHF00062**Rose, Harry****None Provided****6/9/2001****PHF00062-1****Comment:**

HELLO. MY NAME IS HARRY ROSE. I LIVE AT 7725 HINDRY AVENUE IN OSAGE PARK. FIRST OF ALL, I WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS AN ISSUE THAT CAME UP WITH SOME OF MY NEIGHBORS AS I WAS WALKING THROUGH THE NEIGHBORHOOD OVER THE LAST COUPLE OF DAYS TALKING ABOUT THIS MEETING. SEVERAL OF THEM EXPRESSED THE DESIRE TO COME TO ONE OF THESE MEETINGS, HOWEVER, THEY ALSO TOLD ME THAT THEIR CHILDREN WERE GRADUATING FROM SCHOOL AND IT WAS TODAY AND THEY CAN'T COME.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process, which included 21 public hearings at various dates, at various times, and at various locations throughout the Los Angeles area.

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00062-2

Comment:

I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO KIND OF EXPRESS MY CONCERN, ESPECIALLY WITH THAT GUY THAT CAME HERE FROM VAN NUYS. A LOT OF HIS CONCERNS ARE MY CONCERNS. TRAFFIC NEEDS TO FLOW IN AND OUT OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGION. HE EXPRESSED A CONCERN WITH AN ABILITY TO MOVE COMMERCE IN AND OUT OF THE REGION. WHY DON'T WE BUILD HIM AN AIRPORT IN VAN NUYS OR IN THE VALLEY.

Response:

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

PHF00062-3

Comment:

IT SEEMS TO ME TO BE INSANE TO BRING ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC INTO AN AREA THAT IS ALREADY PROBABLY THE MOST HEAVILY DEVELOPED AREA OF OUR CITY AND MOVE IT OUT TO OUTLYING REGIONS. WE NEED AN AIRPORT IN ORANGE COUNTY. WE NEED AN AIRPORT IN SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY. AND WE ALSO NEED AN AIRPORT TO SERVICE THE PEOPLE IN THE VALLEY. TO PUT ALL OF YOUR DUCKS INTO ONE LITTLE POND AND EXPECT IT TO WORK IS INSANE, FROM AN ECONOMIC STANDPOINT OF VIEW.

IN CONCLUSION, I WOULD LIKE TO URGE LAWA AND THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES TO CONSIDER A REGIONAL SOLUTION TO A TRAFFIC PROBLEM. I DON'T BELIEVE THAT YOU HAVE CURRENTLY DONE THIS ADEQUATELY.

Response:

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

PHF00063

Younglove, Chuck

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00063-1

Comment:

I AM CHUCK YOUNGLOVE. I LIVE AT 7713 BOEING AVENUE. I LIVE IN WESTPORT HEIGHTS, WHICH IS PART OF WESTCHESTER. I WANT TO JUST START AT THE BEGINNING, AS EVERYBODY ELSE HAS SAID. I, AND I AM ASSUMING EVERYBODY HERE, EXCEPT FOR THE GENTLEMAN FROM VAN NUYS, DO NOT WANT THE THREE ALTERNATIVES A, B OR C. WHAT WE DO WANT IS WE WANT NO ACTION AND NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE.

Response:

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

PHF00063-2

Comment:

THE EIS/EIR, ALL THOSE SEGMENTS DO NOT ADDRESS OR MITIGATE ALL THE ITEMS THAT HAVE BEEN MENTIONED TODAY. YOU HAVE 12,000 PAGES, BUT THE REALITY IS TRAFFIC, IT IS AT A STANDSTILL. THE 405, THE 105, THE 10 FREEWAY, THE 101. THEY DON'T WORK NOW. THEY HAVE NOT BEEN WORKING FOR OVER 15 YEARS. YOU HAVE NOTHING THAT HAS SUGGESTED THAT YOU ARE GOING TO SOLVE ANY OF THIS.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PHF00063-3

Comment:

POLLUTION WISE WE ARE NOW AT A POINT WHERE PEOPLE ARE DEVELOPING CANCER AND THE VOLUME OF RESPIRATORY PROBLEMS IS INCREASING SO DRAMATICALLY IN THIS AREA AND YOU HAVE NOT ADDRESSED ANY OF THAT AND YOU HAVE NO SOLUTIONS IN YOUR REPORT.

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.

PHF00063-4

Comment:

NOISE. THE VOLUME OF NOISE ON DECIBEL LEVEL AND THE FREQUENCY HAS INCREASED SO DRAMATICALLY IN THE LAST TEN YEARS BECAUSE YOU HAVE INCREASED FROM WHAT WAS ORIGINALLY ANTICIPATED 40 MILLION PASSENGERS AND A MILLION IN CARGO. YOU HAVE GONE TO 67 MILLION. EVERY NIGHT EVERYBODY HEARS NOISE AND IT IS A QUESTION OF WHETHER IT RUMBLES.

Response:

Additional information on vibrations can be found in Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise based vibration. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for extensive information on and comparisons of noise and noise-related land use impacts under the baseline and Year 2000 conditions and the various Master Plan alternatives including new Alternative D and information on nighttime noise impacts.

PHF00063-5

Comment:

EVERYBODY HAS TO CLOSE THEIR WINDOWS BECAUSE THEY CAN'T LISTEN TO THEIR T.V. THEY CAN'T EVEN HEAR BIRDS OUTSIDE. THAT'S NOT BEING ADDRESSED BY THE FAA. YOU JUST DON'T CARE AND IT IS OBVIOUS.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels. See also 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 see Topical Response TR-N-4 and Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise mitigation.

PHF00063-6

Comment:

SAFETY. IT HAS BEEN AN ISSUE REGARDING THE ISSUES OF CRASHES, LIKE THE ONE DOWN IN TORRANCE -- EXCUSE ME, CERRITOS. THE ONE THING THAT REALLY BOTHERS ME ON SAFETY, BESIDE THE IMPLICATIONS THAT THERE IS GOING TO BE A MAJOR PROBLEM WITH AIR SAFETY BECAUSE I KNOW THERE HAS BEEN AT LEAST A DOZEN MAJOR ISSUES WHERE PLANES HAVE ALMOST COLLIDED IN THIS LAST YEAR AND-A-HALF.

Response:

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

PHF00063-7

Comment:

THE ONE THING THAT REALLY DOESN'T MAKE ANY SENSE IS WE LIVE IN EARTHQUAKE COUNTRY AND FROM A SAFETY ISSUE YOU WANT TO CONCENTRATE ALL OF THE AIRPORT. IT DOES NOT TAKE A ROCKET SCIENTIST OR COMMON SENSE TO BRING IN THE ISSUE OF WHAT HAPPENS IF YOU HAVE ONLY ONE AIRPORT. WHAT HAPPENS IF IT GOES AHEAD AND IS DESTROYED BY A NORTHRIDGE-TYPE QUAKE. WHAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN TO THIS ENTIRE COMMUNITY. L. A. IS GOING TO BE DESTROYED ECONOMICALLY, BUSINESS-WISE, RESIDENTIALLY. YOU PEOPLE ARE JUST NOT ADDRESSING THAT. THAT'S WHY THERE'S MORE REASONS WHY THERE SHOULD BE A REGIONAL PLAN.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed geologic hazards, including earthquake-induced hazards, in Section 4.22, Earth/Geology, with supporting technical data and analysis provided in Technical Report 12 of the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PHF00063-8

Comment:

ALSO ENDANGERED SPECIES. I KNOW THERE IS THE EL SEGUNDO BUTTERFLY, AND I KNOW THAT IS IMPORTANT, BUT YOU ARE ALSO ENDANGERING THE PEOPLE THAT LIVE HERE FROM ALL THOSE OTHER FACTORS. I KNOW THEY ARE TRYING TO PUT THE RING ROAD/ARBOR VITAE INTERCHANGE AND AIRPORT CONNECTOR ROAD. ALL THOSE ITEMS ARE GOING TO DO ONE BASIC THING. THEY ARE GOING TO DESTROY THE RESIDENTS OF ABOUT 100,000 PEOPLE THAT LIVE IN THIS AREA.

AGAIN, YOU ARE NOT ADDRESSING THAT AT ALL AND THE WHOLE POINT IS THAT YOU ARE NOT ADDRESSING THE REGIONAL ISSUE. THE WHOLE THING IS GOING TO DESTROY WESTCHESTER AND EVENTUALLY YOU ARE GOING TO DESTROY L.A., THE WEST SIDE, BECAUSE THE BOTTOM LINE IS YOU ARE NOT GOING TO GO AHEAD AND STOP.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D does not include the ring road or LAX Expressway. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. In addition, surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00063-9

Comment:

ORIGINALLY LAX WAS PLANNED TO HAVE 40 MILLION PASSENGERS AND ABOUT A MILLION IN CARGO. YOU ALREADY HAVE BLOWN THAT LIMIT TO 67 MILLION PASSENGERS AND OVER TWO MILLION TONS OF CARGO. THAT EXPLAINS WHY WE HAVE GOT SO MUCH POLLUTION AND WHY WE HAVE GOT SO MUCH TRAFFIC PROBLEMS EVERYWHERE AND YOU CAN'T PUT THE SURROUNDING ROADS --

Response:

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

PHF00063-10

Comment:

THE BOTTOM LINE IS 2015 AND 98 MILLION PASSENGERS, THEY ARE RIGHT, IT IS PROBABLY GOING TO BE CLOSER TO 200 MILLION PASSENGERS AND MORE LIKE 8 MILLION IN CARGO. THE PROBLEM IS THE REGIONAL SOLUTION IS THE ANSWER. IF YOU DON'T GO AHEAD AND PUT INTO PLACE AND USE WHAT LAWA OWNS, WHICH IS PALMDALE AND ONTARIO, AND IF YOU DON'T PUSH ORANGE COUNTY TO TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEIR TRAFFIC, FOR THEIR POLLUTION AND FOR THEIR ECONOMIC NEEDS TO BUILD EL TORO, JOHN WAYNE, AND FURTHER SOUTH DOWN IN SAN DIEGO, IT IS NOT GOING TO WORK.

Response:

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

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PHF00063-11

Comment:

THE NEXT THING IS BASICALLY I HOPE JIM HAHN ACTUALLY GOES AHEAD AND LIVES UP TO HIS PROMISE. IF HE DIDN'T HE IS GOING TO HAVE A TOUGHER FOUR YEARS.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PHF00063-12

Comment:

THE OTHER ISSUE IS THE OVERDEVELOPMENT. HOWARD HUGHES, MARINA DEL REY, PLAYA VISTA AND BOLOGNA CREEK AREA, THAT HAS NOT BEEN BROUGHT INTO YOUR EIR, AND THE BOTTOM LINE IS THAT IS SO OVERWHELMING THAT YOU HAVE NOT ADDRESSED THE ISSUES AND THAT IS GOING TO GO AHEAD AND EXPONENTIALLY FIVE TIMES MORE THAN WHAT YOU ARE PLANNING IN YOUR SIMPLE MASTER PLAN AND YOU HAVE NOT ADDRESSED THAT.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00018-19 regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Regarding Ballona Creek, it is believed that the commentor is referring to the Playa Vista project. The Playa Vista project, Howard Hughes Center, and Marina del Rey development were accounted for in the cumulative impacts analysis of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00063-13

Comment:

CAN I SAY ONE LAST SENTENCE. I WOULD LIKE TO SAY TO ALL THE AUDIENCE THAT WHAT WE REALLY NEED TO DO IS WHAT THE VALLEY IS TRYING TO DO. WHICH IS HAVE WESTCHESTER SUCCEED FROM L.A. AND THAT WE NEED TO GO AHEAD AND FORMALIZE AND GET TOGETHER AND PUT MONEY TOGETHER SO THAT WE CAN CREATE A PUBLIC LAWSUIT JUST LIKE EL SEGUNDO HAS BECAUSE WE ARE NOT A CITY AND WE DON'T HAVE SUFFICIENT REPRESENTATION.

Response:

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

PHF00064	Hossan, Carole	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHF00064-1

Comment:

CAROL HOSSAN. I LIVE ON HINDRY IN WESTCHESTER. ONE THING I WANTED TO NOTE. I NOTICED YOU HAVE VERY EXPENSIVE BROCHURES THAT SORT OF EXTOL THE VIRTUES OF THIS PLAN AND ALL THAT. I AM WONDERING, YOU HAVE A LOT OF MONEY WHY YOU COULDN'T HAVE SENT FLYERS TO EVERY RESIDENCE IN WESTCHESTER, EL SEGUNDO AND INGLEWOOD, PEOPLE THAT ARE AFFECTED BY THIS. WHY WASN'T THAT IN YOUR BUDGET? WHY DIDN'T YOU THINK OF THAT? IT IS BECAUSE YOU DON'T THINK OF US AS PEOPLE. THAT'S WHY.

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.

PHF00064-2

Comment:

I WAS BORN AND RAISED IN WESTCHESTER AND I CAN'T PASS A LUNG FUNCTION TEST, AND LOOKING AT THOSE SCREENS I CAN SEE WHY. MY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL IS NOW A CAR RENTAL AGENCY. MY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL WAS IRONICALLY CALLED AIRPORT JUNIOR HIGH AND THE AIRPORT ATE IT. I WENT TO WESTCHESTER HIGH SCHOOL AND MY EARS STILL RING FROM THOSE PLANES SCREAMING OVERHEAD. IT WAS PAINFUL. I AM NOT KIDDING YOU.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00064-3

Comment:

IN ITS HISTORY THE AIRPORT HAS DESTROYED THOUSANDS OF HOMES AND I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY BUSINESSES. LAX HAS BEEN EXPANDING ITS BOUNDARIES, NOTE THE MANCHESTER SQUARE AND BELFORD SQUARE SITUATION. LAX WANTS TO PUT CARGO TERMINALS THERE. WE WANT A PARK. WE ARE PEOPLE.

Response:

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

PHF00064-4

Comment:

I LEFT OUT A POINT THAT I WANTED TO MAKE WHEN I SAW THOSE SCREENS AND THAT I AM FURIOUS THAT THE EIS DOES NOT HAVE A BASE LINE SETTING FOR TOXIC AIR POLLUTANTS ASSOCIATED WITH CURRENT AIRPORT OPERATIONS. WE ARE PEOPLE. WE DESERVE TO HAVE AIR THAT WE CAN BREATHE AND WE NEED TO KNOW WHAT WE ARE BREATHING.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-1 regarding the baseline used for the human health risk assessment included in Section 4.24.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00064-5

Comment:

LAX IS NOT CONTENT WITH BEING IN OUR BACKYARDS. IT WANTS TO BE ON OUR BACKS. IT MAKES ME SO MAD WHEN THESE ORANGE COUNTY PEOPLE THINK WE ARE BEING NIMBIES. WE HAVE PUT UP WITH THIS AIRPORT FOR YEARS. WE ARE NOT IN OUR BACKYARDS. IT IS IN OUR BACKYARDS AND WE ARE TRYING TO DO OUR BEST TO LIVE WITH IT. I HAVE WAKENED UP IN THE MIDDLE OF THE NIGHT AND IT IS SO LOUD SOMETIMES IT SOUNDS LIKE THE SKY IS CRACKING OPEN. I AM NOT KIDDING YOU.

HOW CAN YOU MITIGATE THE DEVASTATING EFFECTS OF THE DESTRUCTION, THE VERY CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY IN OUR COMMUNITY. DO THIS EIR AGAIN. GO BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD. WE MATTER.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

Alternative. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand.

PHF00065 Pena, Brian None Provided 6/9/2001

PHF00065-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS BRIAN PENA. I LIVE IN WESTCHESTER, WESTPORT HEIGHTS AREA. ABOUT SEVEN HOURS OR SO NOW, I DON'T KNOW WHAT TIME IT IS, BUT IT HAS BEEN A LONG DAY. I WAS TALKING TO YOUR PEOPLE INSIDE EARLIER ABOUT THE REPORTS AND A LOT OF THINGS DIDN'T SEEM TO BE CLEAR TO ME, SUCH AS IF WE ARE INCREASING CARGO CAPACITY. WHY IS IT THAT THERE ARE NO REPORTS ABOUT THE INCREASED TRUCKS COMING IN AND THE POLLUTION CAUSED BY THOSE ARE NOT BEING DEALT WITH.

Response:

The traffic, noise, and air quality analyses within the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR accounted for cargo truck traffic associated with each of the alternatives. Both the air quality analysis, presented in Section 4.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and the human health risk assessment, presented in Section 4.24, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR accounted for the effects of diesel emissions.

PHF00065-2

Comment:

I ALSO TRIED TO WADE THROUGH THE REPORT AND I NOTICED MISSING THERE WAS THE FACT THAT THEY DIDN'T HAVE ANY KIND OF STATISTICS ON THE HEALTH ISSUES. HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE GOING TO BE IN HOSPITALS AND DEAD FROM RESPIRATORY DISEASES BECAUSE OF THE EXPANSION OF LAX. THOSE THINGS CONCERN ME. I HAVE A LITTLE GIRL AT HOME. I HAVE NOT SEEN HER ALL DAY. I AM NOT BEING PAID TO BE HERE ALL DAY. I WOULD LIKE TO SEE HER TONIGHT. I AM HERE FOR HER HEALTH AND HER FUTURE, NOT MINE.

Response:

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

PHF00066 Spann, Aviva None Provided 6/9/2001

PHF00066-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS AVIVA SPANN. THIS IS MY DAUGHTER CHELSEA SPANN AND MY OTHER DAUGHTER LINDSAY SPANN. I HAVE LIVED IN PLAYA DEL REY SINCE THE '70S AND I FIRST WANT TO THANK THE AIRPORT. I HAD MY HOUSE SOUNDPROOFED AND I DIDN'T KNOW HOW BAD IT WAS UNTIL I DON'T HAVE THAT MUCH NOISE ANY MORE. FOR THAT I AM GRATEFUL. BUT I HAVE A HUGE CONCERN.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment below.

PHF00066-2

Comment:

TO TAKE MY KIDS TO SCHOOL IN SANTA MONICA, WE HAVE TO LEAVE AT FIVE TO 7:00 TO GET THEM THERE BY 8:30, AND THAT'S BECAUSE OF PERSHING AND CULVER BOULEVARD. MY CONCERN IS IF THERE'S AN OPENING TO THE AIRPORT ON PERSHING DRIVE, WHICH IS WHAT THE MASTER PLAN SAYS, THAT SEMI- CIRCULAR OPENING, I WILL FEEL LIKE A TRAPPED ANIMAL WITH MY CHILDREN, ESPECIALLY IF THERE'S AN EARTHQUAKE.

AT THIS POINT WE HAVE THE OCEAN ON ONE SIDE, WE HAVE GOT THE MARINA ON THE OTHER, WE HAVE GOT NOW IF THIS IS CREATED THE AIRPORT ON THE OTHER SIDE. THERE IS NO PLACE FOR US TO GO. IT IS A VERY FRUSTRATING, SCARY FEELING. AS IT IS NOW, I WORRY HOW TO GET OUT IF MY KIDS ARE IN SCHOOL. HOW DO I GET OUT IN THE MORNING TO GET THEM. UP ON THE HILL IS WHERE I LIVE, WHICH IS RIGHT THERE AT THE TOP OF MANCHESTER, AT THE END OF MANCHESTER. THERE IS NO WHERE FOR US TO GO. YOU ADD THAT INSULT TO INJURY AND WE ARE STUCK.

Response:

Comment noted. The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PHF00066-3

Comment:

THE OTHER CONSIDERATION I HAVE IS A LOT OF THE PEOPLE ON THE HILL HAVE GOTTEN THEIR HOUSES SOUNDPROOFED AND THEY FEEL THEY DON'T HAVE A VOICE BECAUSE THEY HAVE GIVEN AWAY THEIR EASEMENT. I THINK THEY OUGHT TO KNOW THAT THEY NEED TO BE HEARD.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR; however, please see Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.13 regarding aviation easements.

PHF00066-4

Comment:

IT JUST DOES NOT MAKE SENSE TO ME EVEN LOGICALLY. IF YOU ARE CREATING AN OPENING TO THIS AIRPORT INTO A RESIDENTIAL AREA. THIS IS A COUPLE OF BLOCKS AWAY FROM HOMES. HOW THIS INCREASES BUSINESS, I HAVE NO CLUE. ALL I KNOW IS MY KIDS WON'T BE ABLE TO GO BABYSIT A COUPLE BLOCKS AWAY WITHOUT BEING CONCERNED ABOUT TRAFFIC. I DON'T THINK AN APPROPRIATE ANSWER IS TO HAVE OPENING TO THE AIRPORT BEING INTO A RESIDENTIAL AREA.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The proposed plan is designed to separate airport traffic from local traffic. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00066-5

Comment:

THE OTHER LAST CONCERN I HAVE IS NOT AS IMPORTANT AS THE SAFETY ISSUE, BUT THERE ISN'T A HOUSE AROUND ME THAT DOESN'T HAVE BLACK ALL OVER IT. WE HAVE TO PAINT ALL THE TIME BECAUSE OF WHAT IS ON THE EXTERIOR. I CANNOT IMAGINE WHAT IS ON THE INTERIOR.

Response:

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

PHF00066-6

Comment:

I GUESS THAT'S ALL I HAVE TO SAY. PLEASE RECONSIDER THIS. THIS IS NOT WORKING FOR THE HUMAN BEINGS, FOR THESE KIDS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00066-7

Comment:

ONE LAST THING, AND THAT IS, MY KIDS WERE SMALL WHEN I APPLIED FOR THE SOUNDPROOFING PROGRAM THE BEGINNING OF '90. ONE OF THE REASONS I DID THAT IS ONE OF MY KIDS HAS SPECIAL NEEDS. THE ONLY WAY SHE COULD LEARN WAS AUDITORIALLY. EVERY SIX MONTHS I WOULD HAVE TO HAVE HER HEARING CHECKED AND OVER THE TIME PROGRESSIVELY IT GOT WORSE AND WORSE AND WORSE. IT IS REAL. IT IS MEASURABLE. I AM NOW GRATEFUL FOR THE SOUNDPROOFING, ALTHOUGH IT IS TEN YEARS DOWN THE ROAD FROM WHEN I FIRST APPLIED. I AM SURE FOR THE PEOPLE WHO DON'T HAVE IT IT IS AFFECTING THEM TOO. PLEASE TAKE NOTE FROM US. THIS IS A PLEA. PLEASE LISTEN TO US.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding the fact that existing and future noise levels at and around LAX are projected to be well below the OSHA and CalOSHA standards that serve to protect against hearing loss. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00038-11 regarding the impact of high noise levels on children.

PHF00067	Ciancimino, Judith	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	---------------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHF00067-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS JUDITH CIANCIMINO. I AM A RESIDENT OF WESTCHESTER AND LIVE WITH MY FAMILY IN A HOME THAT WE PURCHASED PRIOR TO THE CURRENT CONFIGURATIONS OF LAX AT A TIME WHEN LAX WAS PROMISING NO MORE EXPANSION. THERE HAVE BEEN A LOT OF PEOPLE UP HERE TODAY WHO KNOW A LOT MORE ABOUT THE TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF THE BANDAID THAT YOU CALL THE MASTER PLAN, SO I WON'T TALK ABOUT IT. I AM GOING TO SPEAK ABOUT SOMETHING THAT I ACTUALLY KNOW ABOUT AND THAT IS HOW I COMMUTE.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment below.

PHF00067-2

Comment:

I HAVE READ THAT THE TRAFFIC ON THE 405 AND SURROUNDING AREA INFRASTRUCTURE IS ONLY SLIGHTLY AFFECTED BY LAX AND THE LAX EXPANSION. IF YOU CONSIDER PASSENGERS ONLY, I SUPPOSE THIS MAY NOT BE A LIE. HOWEVER, NEARLY 60,000 PEOPLE WEAR A BADGE AT LAX. PILOTS AND FLIGHT ATTENDANTS DO NOT. MANY OF THEM EVEN LIVE SOUTH OF ROSECRANS, A FACT COMPLETELY IGNORED BY THE MASTER PLAN. IF ALL OF THEM CAME TO WORK ONLY ONE DAY A WEEK THAT WOULD RESULT IN OVER THREE MILLION VEHICLE TRIPS A YEAR INTO LAX AND IF THEY GO HOME ADD ANOTHER THREE MILLION. THIS IS PRIOR TO EXPANSION.

APPROXIMATELY 30 PERCENT OF THE PEOPLE WHO WORK AT LAX LIVE NEAR TO OR IN A COMMUNITY THAT HAS OR WANTS A VIABLE AIRPORT AND THAT IS WHERE THEY LIKE TO WORK. CLOSER TO THEIR FAMILIES, NOT A TWO-PLUS HOUR COMMUTE FROM THEIR HOMES. THEY WANT A LIFE WORTH LIVING IN THEIR OWN COMMUNITY JUST LIKE WE DO.

Response:

The LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR studies were careful to estimate all known aspects of traffic impact that air passenger, airport employees, construction vehicles, visitors of air passengers and other induced traffic will have at LAX and in the surrounding part of the region, including traffic on I-405. More detail on the impacts and mitigation to I-405 are discussed in Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

The forecasted growth of the airport employee workforce was included in trip generation and traffic analyses of both the on-airport and off-airport roadways. These forecasts of airport employee growth are considered to be conservative so as not to underestimate traffic impacts. The total airport employee workforce, including airlines, concessionaire, cargo, airfield ground services, LAWA, security, police and all other types of employees located on the airport have been accounted for in the calculations. The traffic forecasts and impacts were presented in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. On-Airport forecast and traffic impacts are presented in Section 2.4, Key Input Assumptions, and Chapter 4, Forecasts and Impacts, of Technical Report 3a, On-Airport Ground Transportation Report. Off-Airport traffic impacts are presented in Technical Reports 3b, Off-Airport Ground Transportation Report, and S-2b, Supplemental Off-Airport Ground Transportation Technical Report, with supplemental information provided in Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PHF00067-3

Comment:

LAX EXPANSION -- I HAVE WRITTEN THIS A THOUSAND TIMES TODAY. LAX EXPANSION DOES NOT SERVE THE CITIZENS OF LOS ANGELES, IT SERVES THE NEEDS OF THE PASSENGER AND CARGO AIRLINES OF THE WORLD. PLEASE REMEMBER NO MATTER HOW BIG YOU EXPAND ON THE GROUND, YOU CAN'T EXPAND AIR SPACE.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00068 Bernard, Sheila Lincoln Place Tennis Association 6/9/2001

PHF00068-1

Comment:

I AM SHEILA BERNARD, PRESIDENT OF THE LINCOLN PLACE TENNIS ASSOCIATION IN VENICE WHICH REPRESENTS THE INTEREST OF 2000 RESIDENTS, 800 HOUSEHOLDS. THE PROBLEM OF POLLUTION CAUSED BY TRANSPORTATION WILL HAVE TO BE SOLVED HOLISTICALLY. WE NEED TO MAXIMIZE NONPOLLUTING TRANSPORTATION TO NEARBY CALIFORNIA CITIES BECAUSE, AS YOU MIGHT HAVE HEARD FROM KEN STROMPOLE, IF HE SPOKE EARLIER, NEARBY CALIFORNIA CITIES WHICH COULD BE REACHED QUICKLY BY HIGH-SPEED TRAINS, COMPRISE A SIGNIFICANT PERCENTAGE OF DESTINATIONS OUT OF LAX.

Response:

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

PHF00068-2

Comment:

WHAT THE PEOPLE ARE EXPRESSING TO YOU HERE TODAY IS THAT THEY WOULD RATHER HAVE A SMALLER CHOICE OF FLIGHTS FOR THEIR OCCASIONAL LONG TRIPS RATHER THAN HAVE THEIR QUALITY OF LIFE FURTHER ERODED DAY AFTER DAY AFTER DAY.

Response:

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

PHF00068-3

Comment:

WHEN SO MANY SECTORS OF OUR SOCIETY WHICH ARE OFTEN ON OPPOSITE SIDES OF ISSUES ARE VIRTUALLY UNANIMOUSLY OPPOSED TO THE EXPANSION OF THE AIRPORT, IT IS INCUMBENT UPON LAWA TO CHANGE ITS FOCUS.

LAWA SHOULD FOCUS ON THE NO-PROJECT ALTERNATIVE. I DON'T MEAN THE NO-PROJECT ALTERNATIVE IN THE CURRENT EIR WHICH THREATENS UNMITIGATED GROWTH EVEN WITHOUT EXPANSION. I MEAN A NO-PROJECT ALTERNATIVE WHICH IS GUIDED BY THE COMMUNITY WHICH LAWA SERVES. GUIDANCE WHICH COULD HELP LAX BECOME MORE EFFICIENT AND LESS POLLUTING OVER TIME BY INTEGRATING AIR TRAVEL INTO A RANGE OF LESS POLLUTING OR NONPOLLUTING OPTIONS.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the ability of LAWA to control activity levels at LAX.

PHF00069 Mueller, Ingrid None Provided 6/9/2001

PHF00069-1

Comment:

GOOD EVENING. I WAS AWAKENED BY A JET TAKING OFF FROM SANTA MONICA AIRPORT. I LIVE IN A VENICE COMMUNITY EAST OF LINCOLN BOULEVARD. WHEN I WENT OUT ON THE BALCONY AT 7:00 IN THE MORNING I DID SEE THE BIG JUMBOS TAKING OFF FROM LAX. I AM

NOT RIGHT UNDERNEATH IT BUT I AM ONLY A BLOCK AWAY FROM LINCOLN BOULEVARD, AND BELIEVE ME, WE ALL KNOW WHAT THAT STREET LOOKS LIKE AND WE DON'T WANT IT TO GET ANY WORSE.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PHF00069-2

Comment:

I STUMBLED OUT OF BED, HAD ANY COFFEE AND WROTE A LETTER TO MR. KESSLER AND MR. RITCHIE AND A COPY TO OUR COUNCILWOMAN RUTH GALANTER. AND I ACTUALLY TOOK DEEP BREATHS AND DID SOME YOGA AND ACTUALLY STARTED THE LETTER WITH DEAR MR. KESSLER AND DEAR MR. RITCHIE. I AM TRYING TO BE VERY CIVIL, IN OTHER WORDS. AND I AM READING IT WORD FOR WORD.

FOR YEARS, BUT ESPECIALLY SINCE THIS NEW MILLENNIUM DAWNS UPON US HAVE WE TRUSTED AND TALKED AND FOUGHT ABOUT OUR LOS ANGELES WEST SIDE'S IMPACT ON THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION LAW AND MAYOR RIORDON'S PROGRESS AT ANY COST APPOINTEES. YOU BOTH KNOW THAT YOUR PIECE-MEALING HAS COST MAJOR IMPACTS ON LAX'S SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOOD ALREADY.

Response:

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

PHF00069-3

Comment:

HOW ADDITIONAL SPACE FOR CARGO HANGARS AND MORE JETS IN THE LANDING PATTERNS THAT IS YOUR MAJOR EXPANSION PROPOSALS WILL IMPACT OUR NEIGHBORHOODS TODAY AND TOMMORROW IS INFINITELY MORE REAL THAN A MYTHICAL GROWTH ANY WAY WITH NO MITIGATION PLAN THAT YOU ARE DESCRIBING IN THE EIR. THIS IS NOT ABOUT CRUNCHING NUMBERS DOWN. THIS IS ABOUT RESPECT FOR LOS ANGELES RESIDENTS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00069-4

Comment:

THERE ARE OTHER AIR TRAVEL AND TRANSPORT ALTERNATIVES IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA THAT WON'T IMPACT THIS ECONOMY. I FIND MYSELF REPEATING MYSELF BECAUSE THIS IS WHAT I WROTE A COUPLE OF YEARS AGO WHEN I CAME TO THE FIRST PUBLIC HEARINGS HERE. ONCE THE SKYS OF L. A. ARE DARKENED WITH SMOG, ONCE RESIDENTS CAN'T HEAR THEMSELVES SPEAK ANY MORE, ONCE THE FREQUENCY OF AIR TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS SCARES THE WORLD AWAY FROM LAX, YOU WILL HAVE TO LEARN ONE IMPORTANT LIFE LESSON TOO LATE.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, 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.

PHF00070

McGindley, Bob

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00070-1

Comment:

THANK YOU, BOB MCGINDLEY. I WOULD LIKE TO RANT AND RAVE, BUT I REALIZE THAT NEITHER THE AIRPORT NOR FAA GIVE A CRAP ABOUT WHAT I THINK. I HAVE BEEN A RESIDENT OF PLAYA DEL REY AND WESTCHESTER FOR 34 YEARS. I'VE ALREADY LOST ONE HOUSE TO THE AIRPORT. I DO NOT INTEND TO LOSE A SECOND HOUSE. I FEEL THE AIRPORT HAS LIED TO ME THE ENTIRE TIME I HAVE LIVED IN THE AREA. MY PERCEPTION IS THAT THE ENTIRE PLAN IS FUELED BY GREED WITH ABSOLUTELY NO REGARD TO PEOPLE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD OR THE ENVIRONMENT. IF THE COMMISSION IS SO DAMN SMART, HOW COME THEY DON'T KNOW YOU CAN'T PUT FIVE POUNDS IN A THREE-POUND BAG. AND, FINALLY, MY SYMPATHY GOES TO THE FAMILIES OF THOSE WHO WILL LOSE THEIR LIVES IF THIS INSANE PLAN TAKES PLACE.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition. Please see Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, and Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. Please 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.

PHF00071

Komoc, Bashar

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00071-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS BASHAR KOMOC. I AM A HEALTH-CARE PROVIDER. I LIVE ON 91ST STREET OVER HERE. I AM HERE TO TALK TO THE AUDIENCE MUCH MORE THAN THE GENTLEMAN AND LADIES HERE ON THE PANEL. FROM WHAT HAPPENED BEFORE FROM THE BOLOGNA WETLANDS AND THE LETTERS I HAVE SEEN TO THE CONGRESS SEEING ALL THE PEOPLE AND IT DIDN'T WORK OUT, OBVIOUSLY.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00071-2

Comment:

I AM HERE JUST TO ATTRACT YOUR ATTENTION OF PARENTS AND GRANDPARENTS. I KNOW IN THIS SOCIETY WHEN I MOVED IN IN '97 I WAS THE YOUNGEST ONE ON THE STREET. I

REALIZE YOU HAVE KIDS AND GRANDKIDS. AS A HEALTH-CARE PROVIDER I WANT TO DRAW YOUR ATTENTION THAT WHAT YOU ARE BREATHING IS REALLY CARCINOGEN AND CARCINOGENIC MATERIAL. THAT'S WHAT YOU ARE BREATHING.

THIS RETROFIT MATERIAL, WHATEVER THEY DID TO YOUR HOUSE IT IS NOT GOING TO EFFECT. YOU ARE GOING TO OPEN YOUR DOORS AND GET OUT TO THE YARD AND YOUR KIDS AND GRANDKIDS WILL BREATHE THIS MATERIAL. I USED TO PRACTICE IN WESTWOOD AND I HARDLY SAW AN ASTHMATIC PATIENT, HARDLY. NOW I MOVED MY PRACTICE HERE TO SOUTH BAY AND ALMOST 90 PERCENT OF MY PATIENTS, ESPECIALLY YOUNG KIDS, ARE ASTHMATIC.

THIS IS YOUR LEGACY TO YOUR KIDS AND GRANDKIDS. THOSE KIDS I SEE ARE FOUR YEARS OLD. THEY ARE ASTHMATIC. THIS IS THE LEGACY THAT YOU ARE LEAVING BEHIND TO YOUR KIDS AND GRANDKIDS. I WANT TO BRING THIS TO YOUR ATTENTION. THIS IS YOUR FUTURE. THE KIDS ARE THE FUTURE AND YOU HAVE TO LEAVE THEM SOMETHING NICE.

Response:

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

PHF00071-3

Comment:

JUST A FOOTNOTE HERE TO WHAT I WANT TO LEAVE WITH. I IMMIGRATED HERE FROM A COUNTRY WHERE PEOPLE'S OPINIONS DON'T MIND AT ALL AND IT DOESN'T MATTER. I CAME HERE IN A HOPE OF A GOOD LIFE. IF THIS PROJECT GOES THROUGH, IT IS GOING TO BE A SHAMEFUL REMINDER OF THAT LAND I LEFT BEHIND.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00072

Sexton, John

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00072-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS JOHN SEXTON. I LIVE ABOUT A MILE FROM HERE ON NAYLOR AVENUE. I WOULD LIKE TO ADD MY NAME TO THE VERY LONG LIST OF PEOPLE WHO ARE ADAMANTLY OPPOSED TO EXPANSION OF LAX. MY WIFE AND I ARE LY NEW RESIDENTS. WE HAVE LIVED IN WESTCHESTER FOR ABOUT FIVE AND-A-HALF YEARS. AND WE CONSISTENTLY CONSIDER OURSELVES VERY FORTUNATE TO LIVE HERE. WE CONSIDER OURSELVES FORTUNATE THAT WHEN WE BEGAN TO LOOK FOR A HOUSE IN A NEIGHBORHOOD WHERE WE COULD AFFORD TO LIVE, WE FOUND AN AREA LIKE THIS. WE HAVE ENJOYED EVERY DAY OF BEING IN THIS AREA.

WE HAVE LEARNED TO LIVE WITH THE NOISE OF THE JETS COMING IN AND OUT. THE ONES THAT OCCASIONALLY RATTLE OUR WINDOWS AT TIMES DURING THE NIGHT. WE HAVE LEARNED TO LIVE WITH THE SOMETIMES SMELL OF JET FUEL THAT I CAN EVEN TASTE ON MY TONGUE WHEN I STAND IN OUR BACKYARD. BUT WE HAVE CONSIDERED THOSE THINGS TO BE VERY TOLERABLE TRADEOFF FOR WHAT WE LIKE ABOUT LIVING IN THE AREA.

HOWEVER, THE THOUGHT OF AN INCREASE IN NOISE, THE THOUGHT OF AN INCREASE IN THAT SMELL -- MY SON HAPPENS TO BE A STUDENT AT ST. BERNARD'S HIGH SCHOOL,

3. Comments and Responses

WHICH IS A BIT WEST OF HERE. I KNOW AT TIMES WHEN I HAVE SAT AT HIS BALL GAMES, WE ACTUALLY HAD TO STOP SPEAKING BECAUSE WE CANNOT HEAR A WORD WHEN THE JETS ARE GOING OUT. THAT TO ME IS SYMBOLIC TO WHAT WILL HAPPEN WHEN THE AIRPORT EXPANDS.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and school impacts in Section 4.27, Schools. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1 and 17 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester, Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration, Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, and Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHF00072-2

Comment:

ABOUT AN HOUR AND-A-HALF AGO I WATCHED YOUR VIDEO OUT IN THE HALLWAY. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THERE WERE THREE THINGS THAT WERE MENTIONED AS PRIMARY THINGS FOR EXPANDING THE AIRPORT. ONE WAS THAT IT WOULD BRING SO MANY JOBS INTO THE AREA. A SECOND IS THAT IT WOULD BRING A LOT OF MONEY INTO THE AREA. AND A THIRD IS THAT IT WOULD ENHANCE THE REPUTATION OF L. A. THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.

Response:

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

PHF00072-3

Comment:

I WOULD NOT WANT TO TAKE ANYBODY'S JOB AWAY, BUT IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THE PEOPLE WHO WILL COME TO WORK HERE ARE LIKE YOURSELF, MR. RITCHIE, THEY ALSO COME A LONG WAYS FOR A GOOD JOB. IF THE PEOPLE WHO ARE GOING TO BENEFIT FROM THE JOBS, IF THE MONEY IS GOING TO BE SPREAD THROUGHOUT THE AREA, IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THE BURDEN SHOULD BE SPREAD THROUGHOUT THE AREA AS WELL.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PHF00019-4.

PHF00073	Bowen, Harold	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHF00073-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS HAROLD BOWEN AND I LIVE ON 7018 TRASK AVENUE IS PLAYA DEL REY. WE BOUGHT THAT HOUSE IN THE EARLY '60S, MOVED IN THERE, AND ABOUT THAT TIME THE AIRPORT ANNOUNCED ITS INTENTIONS TO BUILD A NORTH RUNWAY. THE EXISTING RUNWAYS WERE SOUTH OF THE TERMINAL AREA AT THAT TIME. THEY SAID THEY WANTED AN ADDITIONAL NORTH RUNWAY IN CASE OF EMERGENCY. THEY SAID PERHAPS AN ACCIDENT OR SOME TRAGIC CIRCUMSTANCE ON THE SOUTH COMPLEX WOULD RENDER THE EXISTING RUNWAYS UNUSABLE, SO THEY NEEDED ANOTHER RUNWAY.

I BELIEVE AT THAT TIME THAT THE POWERS THAT BE HELD SOME SECRET -- NOT NECESSARILY SECRET -- BUT NOT WELL-PUBLICIZED HEARINGS OF THE CITY COUNCIL AND

THE AIRPORT COMMISSIONS AND ALL THE REST OF THEM. THEY GAVE THEMSELVES A CONDITIONAL-USE PERMIT TO BUILD A NORTH RUNWAY ON RESIDENTIALLY OWNED PROPERTY. THAT PROPERTY WAS RESIDENCIALY ZONED IN THOSE DAYS. PERHAPS IT STILL IS. I DON'T KNOW.

THEY BUILT A RUNWAY. THE PEOPLE SAID THAT SOUNDS PRETTY REASONABLE. IN CASE OF EMERGENCY THEY MIGHT NEED A NORTH RUNWAY, SO THEY STARTED BUILDING IT. AND THEN SHORTLY AFTER THAT THEY STARTED BUILDING A SECOND NORTH RUNWAY. AND THE PEOPLE SAID, HEY, JUST A MINUTE HERE. HOW MANY EMERGENCY ARE YOU GOING TO HAVE? THEN THEY BUILT THE SECOND NORTH RUNWAY, WHICH IS TWO-FOUR RIGHT AND SIX LEFT, IF YOU ARE FAMILIAR WITH THE AIRPORT. THEY BUILT THOSE RUNWAYS WITHIN JUST A FEW HUNDRED FEET OF EXISTING HOMES. THEY HAD NO INTENTION OF BUYING THOSE HOMES AND PEOPLE COULDN'T SLEEP IN THEIR HOUSES.

AS I RECALL, THERE WERE SEVERAL SCHOOLS THAT HAD TO BE CLOSED BECAUSE THE TEACHERS COULDN'T BE HEARD IN THE CLASSROOMS. THE LOCAL COMMUNITIES GOT SOME MONEY TOGETHER AND HIRED ATTORNEYS AND TOOK THE AIRPORT TO TASK AND MADE THEM BUY SOME OF THOSE HOMES. THERE WAS ALSO AN ISLAND OF HOMES OFF THE WEST END NEAR THE BEACH AND THEY HAD NO INTENTION OF BUYING THOSE, THEY WERE GOING TO LET THOSE PEOPLE LIVE THERE.

THROUGH LEGAL ACTION THE AIRPORT WAS FORCED TO BUY THOSE HOMES. AND THEY SAID, OKAY, WE WILL GIVE YOU MARKET VALUE FOR THOSE HOUSES. MARKET VALUE WAS ZIP. YOU COULDN'T GIVE THOSE HOUSES AWAY. PEOPLE COULDN'T SLEEP IN THEM. COULDN'T HEAR A THING. THROUGH LEGAL ACTION THEY FORCED THE AIRPORT TO BUY AND GIVE REPLACEMENT VALUE. IF SOMEBODY LIVED ALONG THE BEACH AND HAD AN OCEAN VIEW AND WANTED TO GO UP TO MALIBU FOR THE SAME VIEW, THEY HAD TO GIVE THEM THAT VALUE, AS I REMEMBER. MY TIME IS GETTING SHORT HERE.

THE POINT IS, I THINK THE BOTTOM LINE IS THAT YOU CAN'T BELIEVE WHAT THE PEOPLE, THE PROPONENTS OF THE AIRPORT SAY. THEY CAN'T BE TRUSTED. THEY COULDN'T BE TRUSTED IN THE '60S AND THEY CAN'T BE TRUSTED NOW. I COULD GO ON AND ON, BUT I GUESS I AM OUT OF TIME HERE. THAT IS MY FINAL COMMENT.

Response:

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

PHF00074 Cassman, Alan None Provided 6/9/2001

PHF00074-1

Comment:

GENTLEMAN, MY WIFE AND I HAVE LIVED HERE 50 YEARS IN THE COMMUNITY AND OUR KIDS ATTENDED WESTCHESTER HIGH AND WHEN THEY GRADUATED THEIR GRADUATIONS EACH OF THEM WERE PUNCTUATED BY THE NOISE OF THE AIRPLANE. SO WE HAVE BEEN HERE AND WE HAVE EXPERIENCED THE AIRPORT.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00074-2

Comment:

WHAT TROUBLES ME IS I THINK YOU HAVE BASICALLY A FLAWED SYSTEM. YOU COME TO US WITH AN EIR AND PLANS THAT ARE EXTREMELY SPECIFIC AND THEY ARE ALL BASED ON GUESSTIMATES THAT YOU PROVIDE US AS TO THE NUMBER OF PASSENGERS YOU INTEND TO PROVIDE IN THE FUTURE. AND THAT IF THE PAST IS ANY EXPERIENCE, YOU REALLY CAN'T RELY ON THE FIGURES YOU PRESENT TO US AND YOU MUST KNOW THAT. BECAUSE

3. Comments and Responses

IF YOU HAVE AN AIRPORT THAT IS SUITABLE FOR 40 MILLION AND IT NOW EXCEEDS 67 MILLION, YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT A 75 PERCENT INCREASE. I THINK IF YOU INCLUDE INTO YOUR FUTURE ESTIMATES A 75 PERCENT INCREASE, WHICH I THINK IN ALL ANTICIPATION YOU MUST EXPECT, BECAUSE APPARENTLY YOU CANNOT POSSIBLY CONTROL AT THE LOCAL LEVEL AT THE AIRPORT THE NUMBER OF LANDINGS THAT YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE AT THIS AIRPORT. IT IS BEYOND YOUR POWER. IF YOU COULD YOU WOULD HAVE LIVED UP TO YOUR WORD IN THE PAST AND WE WOULD HAVE 40 MILLION PEOPLE IN THIS AIRPORT TODAY. SO I THINK IT BECOMES AN ACT OF FAITH.

THE GENTLEMAN HERE CAME FROM ANOTHER COUNTRY AND SAID PEOPLE IN OTHER COUNTRIES GET TREATED WITHOUT ANY CONCERN OR CONSIDERATION. I'M AFRAID THE AIRPORT IS DOING JUST THAT BECAUSE YOU ARE BUILDING AN ANTICIPATED GROWTH ON A HOUSE OF SAND. YOU CANNOT GUARANTEE AND WON'T GUARANTEE THAT THE FUTURE FIGURES YOU ARE GOING TO PROVIDE FOR US WILL STAND UP. JUST AS YOU HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO GUARANTEE THAT IN THE PAST.

Response:

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

PHF00074-3

Comment:

THOSE OF US WHO LIVE HERE AND ARE INVOLVED IN THE QUALITY OF LIFE THINK THAT THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE YOU HAVE BROUGHT INTO THIS AIRPORT ALREADY IS EXCESSIVE AND HAS DESTROYED THE QUALITY OF OUR LIFE AND WE BEG YOU TO CONSIDER THAT AND AT LEAST KEEP THIS AIRPORT AT THE OVERWHELMING LARGE NUMBERS THAT YOU NOW HAVE. DO NOT INCREASE IT.

Response:

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

PHF00075

Russell, Tom

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00075-1

Comment:

I WAS BORN AND RAISED IN WESTCHESTER, BAPTIZED AT VISITATION CHURCH, VISITATION SCHOOL, ORVILLE WRIGHT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, WESTCHESTER HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF '68. I WOULD LIKE TO THANK MINA FOR HER FLYER THAT REMINDED ME ABOUT THIS. I DIDN'T TAKE ANY NOTES, BUT THE YOUNG LADY THAT CAME UP HERE WITH HER DAUGHTERS, THAT WAS INTERESTING. SHE SAID, TO MY WEST IS THE PACIFIC OCEAN, TO THE NORTH IS MARINA DEL REY, THE LARGEST MAN-MADE BOAT HARBOR IN THE WORLD, I BELIEVE. PRETTY NICE PLACE. PRETTY NICE PLACE TO SEE.

YUCCA FLATS ARIZONA USED TO TEST DRIVE FORDS BACK IN THE '60S. IT WAS OUT OF THE WAY. IT WASN'T A PLACE TO LIVE, REALLY. IT WAS A PLACE TO TEST MACHINES. THIS IS NOT YUCCA FLATS, ARIZONA. I KNEW A MAN BY THE NAME OF BOB SMITH HE WORKED FOR THE TELEPHONE COMPANY BACK IN THE LATE '40S. HE DROVE ALL OVER LOS ANGELES. HE PICKED WESTCHESTER. HE KNEW LOS ANGELES. THIS IS A GREAT PLACE TO LIVE. THE CLIMATE, THE PROXIMITY TO THE OCEAN, THE CENTRAL LOCATION, AND IT HAD A NICE LITTLE AIRPORT, BY THE WAY, THAT WASN'T ANYTHING LIKE IT WAS NOW. IF ANYBODY SAYS THE AIRPORT WAS HERE FIRST, I AM SORRY, BUT IT WASN'T THE SAME. A LOT DIFFERENT.

THAT'S ALL I CAN SAY.

Response:

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

PHF00075-2**Comment:**

YOU KNOW DENVER IS A LOT BIGGER. THE AIRPORT IS A LOT BIGGER. LAX IS ABOUT THREE, FOUR POSTAGE STAMPS ON A MANILA ENVELOPE COMPARED TO THEIR SIZE. THEY MOVED IT OUT OF THE WAY SO PEOPLE WOULDN'T BE BOTHERED BY IT. WE ARE BOTHERED BY LAX QUITE A BIT. I THINK IT IS TIME FOR A REGIONAL SOLUTION.

Response:

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

PHF00076**Purcell, Leslie****None Provided****6/9/2001****PHF00076-1****Comment:**

I AM LESLIE PURCELL. I LIVE IN SANTA MONICA NOW. I USED TO LIVE IN VENICE. I WOULD LIKE TO PROPOSE THAT YOU GUYS REALLY LISTEN TO PEOPLE. I HAVE BEEN TO A LOT OF HEARINGS LATELY ON VARIOUS ISSUES. I FEEL LIKE MOST OF THE TIME PEOPLE STAND UP HERE WITH VERY PERSONAL OR EVEN SCIENTIFIC, WELL THOUGHT OUT REASONS THAT THEY COME BEFORE TO SPEAK, AND OFTEN IT JUST GOES BY. THE DECISION IS REALLY ALREADY MADE OR IT IS ABOUT TO BE MADE.

THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WE THE PEOPLE, THE PUBLIC, FEEL LIKE WE HAVE BEEN DISENFRANCHIZED. I HOPE THAT YOU REALLY ARE TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE FACT THAT I HAVE HEARD ONE PERSON SO FAR FROM NOT THIS AREA AT ALL SAY THIS IS A GOOD IDEA.

Response:

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

PHF00076-2**Comment:**

SO, PERSONALLY I WOULD JUST LIKE TO SAY THERE'S ALREADY WAY TOO MUCH SMOG AND POLLUTION. IF YOU FLY IN AND OUT OF LAX YOU SEE IT. YOU FLY IN. THERE'S A BIG YELLOW/BROWN BLANKET OVER THE LOS ANGELES BASIN. WE DO NOT NEED MORE POLLUTION FROM MORE PLANES COMING IN, MORE DIESEL TRUCKS, MORE TRAFFIC.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-3.

PHF00076-3

Comment:

THE OUTLYING AREAS COULD CERTAINLY USE MORE AIRLINE TRAFFIC AND ACCESS FOR THEIR NEEDS. I USED TO FLY IN AND OUT OF BURBANK AND I THINK IT IS MUCH BETTER TO HAVE OTHER AIRPORTS THAT ARE FUNCTIONING. THE BAY AREA HAS TWO MAJOR AIRPORTS AND SAN JOSE A THIRD ONE. IT IS NOT NEARLY AS BIG AS LOS ANGELES.

Response:

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

PHF00076-4

Comment:

THE EIR I DON'T BELIEVE TAKES INTO ACCOUNT THE OTHER DEVELOPMENTS AND THEIR TRAFFIC PROBLEMS IN THE AREAS.

THAT WOULD INCLUDE THIS EXPANSION THAT IS GOING ON IN THE MARINA DEL REY AREA WHICH IS HUGE. THIS ALSO INCLUDES THE PLANNED AND ONGOING PLAYA VISTA, WHICH IS SOMEWHAT HALTED IN ITS TRACKS, BUT IT IS STILL PLANNING TO PROCEED AS FAST AS THEY CAN. THESE KINDS OF THINGS ADD UP TO A MUCH LARGER TOTAL THAN IS ADDRESSED IN ANY OF THE INDIVIDUAL PLANNING PROCESSES. I THINK THAT PEOPLE NEED REALLY LOOK AT THAT.

Response:

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

PHF00076-5

Comment:

I THINK THAT IT IS ALSO ALREADY WHEN YOU ARE ON THE GROUND IN LAX IT IS HARD TO BREATHE. IF YOU WALK OUT OF THE TERMINAL, THERE'S SO MANY VEHICLES THERE WAITING TO PICK PEOPLE UP AND DROP PEOPLE OFF, IT IS LIKE HORRIBLE. THAT NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED RIGHT NOW. THERE NEEDS TO BE LIKE RAIL OR I PERSONALLY THINK HAVE A MONORAIL LIKE DISNEYLAND. DO THAT. THAT'S MY IDEA. THAT KIND OF THING NEEDS TO BE TAKEN UNDER CONTROL AS IT IS WITHOUT EXPANDING.

Response:

The airport's Central Terminal Area (CTA) is highly congested today. There are more cars, buses, and other vehicles during the peak hours than can be adequately handled without congestion and the resulting air quality issues. The master plan alternatives are intentionally designed to off-load much of that CTA traffic and consequently improve the traffic and air quality conditions in the CTA. The traffic

impacts of each alternative were discussed in Sections 4.3, Surface Transportation, and the air quality impacts were discussed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR.

Discussions on the pedestrian conveyance systems in each of the Master Plan Alternatives were discussed in Sections 3.2.8, 3.3.8 and 3.4.8 of Technical Report 3a, On-Airport Ground Transportation Technical Report. Monorail technologies could be considered for application to the alternatives' people mover systems. Supplemental information on the on the analyzed transit technologies accessing the airport is provided in Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PHF00077 Rosen, Stan

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00077-1

Comment:

I WILL BE BRIEF. I WANT TO THANK THE PANEL HERE FOR TAKING THE TIME TO HEAR US. I KNOW I HAVEN'T SPENT THE WHOLE DAY HERE, BUT YOU HAVE AND PUT UP WITH QUITE A BIT. AND THANKS TO THE AUDIENCE.

THE FIRST THING I WOULD SAY IS THAT SEVERAL OF THOSE SPEAKERS HAVE SAID THAT WE ARE SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF NO ACTION AT ALL AND I WON'T TAKE THAT POSITION. I THINK WE HAVE TO DO SOMETHING. YOU HAVE HEARD MANY PEOPLE TALK ABOUT THE FACT THAT THE AIRPORT AS IT IS TODAY IS BROKEN AND NEEDS TO BE FIXED. IT NEEDS TO BE FIXED FOR OUR NEIGHBORHOOD. I AM FROM WESTCHESTER. IT NEEDS TO BE FIXED FOR ALL OF L.A.

I DON'T HAVE THE ANSWER TO WHAT WE HAVE TO DO BUT I BELIEVE FROM WHAT I HAVE SEEN THE PROCESS YOU ARE WORKING IS INCOMPLETE. YOU ARE TRYING TO SOLVE A PROBLEM THAT HAS BEEN GIVEN TO YOU AND WHAT YOU HAVE TO DO IS LOOK OUTSIDE THE BOX. I AM STANDING HERE NOT TO GIVE YOU ANY SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS, THEY ARE IN MY WRITTEN COMMENTS AND I WILL GET TO THAT, BUT TO ENCOURAGE ALL OF US TO FIND WAYS TO LOOK AT THE BIGGER PROBLEM AND SEE IF THERE IS SOMETHING THAT WE CAN DO TO SOLVE THE REGIONAL PROBLEM WE HAVE AND THE LOCAL PROBLEMS THAT WE HAVE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00077-2

Comment:

FOR EXAMPLE, IN THE EIR ALL OF THE PROPOSED SOLUTIONS TALKING ABOUT AIR POLLUTION DO NOT MEET THE FEDERAL QUALITY STANDARDS. IT WAS OBVIOUSLY NOT A CONSTRAINT ON THE PROJECTS THAT WERE GIVEN THAT THEY MEET FEDERAL AIR QUALITY STANDARDS FOR OUR REGION OR FOR THE L.A. AREA. IF WE SOLVE THE PROBLEM OF TRYING TO MEET AIR QUALITY STANDARDS YOU OBVIOUSLY CAME UP WITH A DIFFERENT SOLUTION.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00077-3

Comment:

ALSO, IT IS OBVIOUS THAT SEVERAL BOUNDS WERE PUT ON THE PROBLEM YOU ARE TRYING TO SOLVE. THERE IS A QUOTE HERE IN THE MATERIAL THAT WAS HANDED OUT. IT SAYS NOBODY HAS SUGGESTED THAT THE REGIONS AVIATION DEMAND SHOULD NOT BE ACCOMODATED. I'LL SUGGEST THAT. I THINK THERE IS A POSSIBILITY TO LOOK BACK AND

3. Comments and Responses

SAY, WHAT IS THE PROBLEM WE ARE TRYING TO SOLVE. IT MAY BE DIFFERENT THAN WHAT WE THINK IT IS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00077-4

Comment:

THERE ARE OTHER WAYS FOR PEOPLE TO MOVE IDEAS FROM THE POINT A TO POINT B. GROWING TELECOMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES MAKE IT LESS NECESSARY FOR PEOPLE TO TRAVEL FROM POINT A TO POINT B COMING IN AND OUT OF L.A. THERE ARE LOTS OF OPPORTUNITIES TO CHANGE THE WAY THAT WE MOVE PEOPLE AND IDEAS IN AND OUT OF A REGION THAT DON'T INVOLVE AIR TRANSPORTATION. WE CAN WORK THE BIGGER PROBLEM.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00022-185.

PHF00077-5

Comment:

ANOTHER ISSUE IS ECONOMICS. SIMPLY BY INCREASING THE FEE STRUCTURE OF PEOPLE LANDING IN LOS ANGELES AND INCREASING THE COST OF DOING BUSINESS HERE, YOU WILL SIGNIFICANTLY IMPACT THE TRAFFIC RATE. YOU WEREN'T GIVEN THE PROBLEM IN SOLVING THIS PROBLEM OF TRYING TO CHANGE THE LEVEL OF TRAFFIC INTO AND OUT OF LOS ANGELES. YOU WERE GIVEN THE PROBLEM OF HOW TO FIX THE AIRPORT. I THINK YOU SHOULD DO THAT. I AM ASKING THAT YOU LOOK BEYOND THE PROBLEM THAT WAS GIVEN.

Response:

The City of Los Angeles owns and LAWA controls the operation and potential expansion of four airports: LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys. The other regional airports are controlled by other jurisdictions that are responsible for their respective operation and expansion.

Palmdale's remote location and limited local passenger market have made it difficult for airlines to maintain air service at the airport despite past subsidies by LAWA. Palmdale's only air service in the past consisted of commuter operations into LAX. About 19,000 passengers used the airport in 1997. In early 1998, the sole airline providing service at Palmdale ceased operations. Currently, Palmdale has no scheduled air service.

On a number of occasions since the airlines were deregulated, airport operators have sought to implement more economic-based pricing models with limited and mixed success. The U.S. Department of Transportation rejected Massport's peak period pricing theory because it was based on a faulty cost-allocation methodology. The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey was successful in promulgating a congestion pricing recommendation through the FAA's Notice of Proposed Rule Making procedure in 2000. The NPRM has been set aside for now due to the downturn in activity since mid-2001. The FAA's current Rule on Rates and Charges, under the principle of Prohibition of Unjust Discrimination, would not seem to permit peak period pricing in order to force aircraft operators to use another airport.

The landing fees and terminal rentals at a given airport typically represent between 4 and 6 percent of an airline's cost to operate at that airport. Differential pricing between airports in a region would be a minor factor among the many that an airline would consider when deciding whether to provide service to a given airport.

PHF00077-6

Comment:

WHAT I WOULD LIKE IS TO MEET UP WITH ANYBODY HERE WHO CAN, IN FACT, HAVE THE IDEAS THAT WE CAN LOOK FOR AND NEW WAYS TO SOLVE THE LARGER PROBLEM OUTSIDE

THE BOX AND I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHO IS LOOKING FOR THE PROBLEM TO OF WHAT WE SHOULD DO OF MAKING THE PROBLEMS THAT THESE LADIES AND GENTLEMEN ARE TRYING TO SOLVE MORE PRACTICAL. THE SITUATION AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS IS BROKEN.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00078

Reed, Doug

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00078-1

Comment:

GOOD EVENING. MY NAME IS DOUG REED. I LIVE IN VENICE. I AM REALLY STRUCK BY THE INTELLIGENCE AND THE INQUISITIVITY, IF THAT'S A WORD, AND THE PASSION THAT I HAVE HEARD SPOKEN BY ALL THESE FOLKS HERE TODAY. I KNOW VERY LITTLE BIT ABOUT THE MASTER PLAN. I HAVE NOT READ THE MASTER PLAN. I THOUGHT I WOULD WHEN I ARRIVED HERE, BUT AS I SAT AND LISTENED I HAVE LEARNED QUITE A BIT FROM THE PEOPLE WHO ALREADY SPOKE.

I WASN'T GOING TO SPEAK EITHER BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW THAT MUCH ABOUT THINGS, BUT I WAS COMPELED TO BECAUSE WHAT I HAVE BEEN HEARING IS THAT IT IS A HUGE AMOUNT OF DISTRUST. I KNOW HOW I FEEL WHEN SOMEBODY DOESN'T TRUST ME WHEN I THINK I HAVE TOLD THE TRUTH OR WHEN I THINK I HAVE PRESENTED MYSELF IN A TRUSTWORTHY WAY AND SOMEBODY DOESN'T TRUST ME, IT IS SOMETHING THAT I CAN'T SLEEP AT NIGHT.

I HAVE HEARD A VARIETY OF PEOPLE COME UP AND LOOK RIGHT AT YOU GUYS AND SAY "WE DON'T TRUST YOU." SO THAT'S WHY I WAS COMPELLED TO COME UP AND SPEAK AND JUST UNDERSCORE THE URGENCY THAT YOU GUYS TAKE THIS THING REALLY SERIOUS.

Response:

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

PHF00078-2

Comment:

I HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO WORK WITH KIDS. I AM NOT A TEACHER BUT I DO ART AND I WORK WITH CHILDREN UP HERE IN WESTCHESTER AND PLAYA DEL REY. AND SOMEBODY CAME UP AND SPOKE, A COUPLE OF PEOPLE SPOKE ABOUT THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR THE CHILDREN. SINCE I WORK WITH KIDS ALMOST ON A DAILY BASIS, THAT'S SOMETHING THAT I CARE A LOT ABOUT. I AM NOT A PARENT BUT I CARE A LOT ABOUT THE KIDS. AND IT IS HORRIFYING AND ESPECIALLY PUT IN THE LIGHT OF DISTRUST. IT IS HORRIFYING FOR ME TO THINK ABOUT YOU GOING HOME TONIGHT THINKING ABOUT THE QUALITY OF CHILDREN'S LIVES AND PEOPLE NOT TRUSTING YOU.

Response:

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

PHF00078-3

Comment:

FINALLY, I WORK SOMETIMES IN THE ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY AS WELL AND SOMEBODY CAME UP AND SAID THEY ACCUSED THIS FORUM OF BEING SOMETHING OTHER THAN WHAT IT IS. ACCUSED IT OF BEING A SHAM. IF THAT IS THE CASE, IT IS PRETTY GOOD ENTERTAINMENT. BUT I WOULD HOPE TO THINK THAT I AM NOT WASTING MY BREATH. THAT OUR FRIEND FROM CHRISTMAS VALLEY, OREGON ISN'T WASTING HIS AND YOU FOLKS AREN'T EITHER.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00079

Stevens, Mike

LAX Expansion No!

6/9/2001

PHF00079-1

Comment:

I'M MIKE STEVENS. I'M PRESIDENT OF A GROUP CALLED LAX EXPANSION NOW. WE'RE THE ONES WITH THE SIGNS. I'D JUST LIKE TO SAY TO THE PEOPLE OF WESTCHESTER YOU'VE DEFINITELY MADE AN IMPACT TODAY, BUT BY NO MEANS DOES TODAY MEAN THAT THE BATTLE IS OVER.

TO THOSE OF YOU WHO ARE TAKING -- WHO ARE TAKING NOTES, I'D LIKE TO TELL YOU THAT COMMUNITY OUTREACH IN INGLEWOOD WAS VERY POOR. I SUGGEST THAT YOU HAVE ANOTHER MEETING IN INGLEWOOD FOR INGLEWOOD RESIDENTS AND CONDUCT AN OUTREACH SO THAT THEY CAN BE NOTIFIED ADEQUATELY THAT A MEETING IS TAKING PLACE IN THE COMMUNITY. THERE WAS A NOTICE THAT WAS SENT OUT BY CONGRESSMAN MAXINE WATERS THAT HAS JULY 9 AS THE DATE. MANY PEOPLE BELIEVE THAT THAT IS THE DATE. THEIR OWN DOCUMENTATION EVEN HAD THE DATE OF THE 14TH ON IT. SO WE NEED TO -- WE NEED TO GET SOME TYPE OF -- SOME TYPE OF OUTREACH GOING THAT IS MORE ACCURATE SO THAT THE PEOPLE CAN BE PROPERLY NOTIFIED.

Response:

A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PHF00079-2

Comment:

IN REFERENCE TO YOUR DOCUMENT ITSELF, I'D LIKE TO STATE THAT YOUR FLEET MIX IS ALSO A WEAK LINK. AS FAR AS WHAT I'VE BEEN ABLE TO REVIEW, IF YOU TAKE ONE COMPONENT, SUBSTITUTE A DC-10 FOR A 747, EVERYTHING IS THROWN OUT OF WHACK, BUT MORE THAN THAT THE -- YOUR ACTUAL FORMULA IS NOT EVEN TRULY PRESENT. IN ORDER TO FIND OUT WHAT YOUR FORMULA IS THAT WAS USED, YOU HAVE TO CONTACT MR. KESSLER. SO YOU DON'T EVEN LIST YOUR FORMULA INSIDE THE DOCUMENT ITSELF THAT YOU ARRIVED AT YOUR NUMBERS ON.

Response:

For LAX to serve a greater number of passengers without an increase in the number of operations, aircraft size would increase wherever possible. The design day fleet forecast reflects fleet updates such as upgrades to larger, replacement, and newer generation aircraft. For example, a DC-10 (with around 280 seats) might be replaced by a 747 (with around 400 seats) in order to meet the passenger demand of a particular region. The 747 aircraft will allow for the number of passengers served to increase without having to add an additional operation. The air carrier fleet mix varies by region and is derived based on the 1994 distribution of passengers by region and forecast annual operations, passengers, and load factors. To meet the target enplanements per departure and design day operations forecast, the base year fleet mix in each region is updated (aircraft sizes may be increased). Please see Chapter II, Section 2.2.1 of the LAX Draft Master Plan for a detailed discussion of the steps taken to derive at the design day fleet mix.

Please see Chapter 3.3.3 of the Draft Master Plan Addendum for a detailed discussion on forecast air service changes if Alternative D were constructed.

PHF00079-3

Comment:

IN CLOSING, I WOULD JUST LIKE TO SAY THIS: I DON'T BELIEVE THAT AFTER SPENDING THREE YEARS ON THIS DOCUMENT THAT LAX/LAWA ACTUALLY BELIEVES THAT THIS IS GOING TO PASS. WHAT THEY'RE LOOKING FOR IS PORTIONS OF IT TO BE -- TO PASS, AND BY THAT MEANING THAT THE EXTENSION OF THE RUNWAY.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00079-4

Comment:

IN ORDER TO EXTEND THAT RUNWAY, THEY MUST HAVE AN EIR/EIS COMPLETED. UNDER FAA REGULATIONS THIS IS SOMETHING THEY HAVE TO HAVE. SO THEY CAN GET A PARTIAL APPROVAL, THOUGH. EVERYTHING ELSE CAN BE THROWN DOWN THE DRAIN, BUT THAT PORTION THEY WOULD GO FOR, AND I BELIEVE THAT'S WHAT YOUR GOAL IS, AND THAT WOULD IMPACT WILEY POST, THE OSAGE NEIGHBORHOOD, AND WESTCHESTER AND NOW INGLEWOOD BECAUSE NOW THE TRAJECTORY OF THE PLANES CHANGES ON TAKEOFF, AND WHEN I'M TALKING ABOUT WHEN YOU TURN THE AIRPORT AROUND. NOW WE CAN DEBATE WHETHER TOUCHDOWN IS GOING TO REMAIN WHERE IT PRESENTLY IS, BUT WE ALL KNOW THAT THESE PLANES ARE NOT ON RAILS.

Response:

Comment noted. The impacts of changes in the runway configurations to surrounding communities under all the build alternatives were addressed in detail in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00079-5

Comment:

SO BOTTOM LINE IS THAT I THINK YOU'RE SHOOTING FOR INCREMENTAL EXPANSION. I THINK THAT YOUR DOCUMENT SHOULD INCLUDE SOME COMPONENTS DEALING WITH INCREMENTAL EXPANSIONS, SPECIFICALLY THE ACQUISITION OF MANCHESTER SQUARE, EVEN THOUGH YOU DO NOT ADDRESS THAT IN YOUR DOCUMENT ADEQUATELY, AND THE EXTENSION OF THE RUNWAY ALONG THOSE LINES.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. This new option - Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment. Although the conclusion of the Draft EIS/EIR is that Alternative C would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region, that conclusion has been superseded by the conclusion of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D is now considered to be the Environmental Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region.

As was described in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR, the acquisition of properties within Manchester Square was initiated, and will continue, as an action separate from that of the Master Plan.

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00079-6

Comment:

SO WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO SAY GOOD NIGHT AND FOR ALL OF YOU, YOU'VE GONE A GREAT JOB. WESTCHESTER, YOU REALLY WOKE THEM. YOU DID A SUPER JOB.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00080

Humble, Kathleen

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00080-1

Comment:

HELLO. I WANT TO THANK YOU FOR COMING OUT TO LISTEN TO US. YOU'VE HEARD A LOT OF PEOPLE GIVE A LOT OF TECHNICAL DETAILS ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON HERE. SO I'M GOING TO TALK MORE EMOTIONALLY ABOUT WHAT IT'S LIKE TO LIVE HERE. I'VE LIVED HERE FOR 28 YEARS NEAR THE CORNER OF VENICE AND CENTINELA, AND MY DAUGHTER HAS ASTHMA, AND SHE HAS SINCE SHE WAS A CHILD. THIS AREA WHEN WE FIRST MOVED HERE WAS JUST GORGEOUS. IT WAS ALMOST A PARADISE, AND PROGRESSIVELY IT'S GOTTEN MORE AND MORE AND MORE CROWDED, MORE BUILT UP. THERE'S TRAFFIC EVERYWHERE NOW. COMING DOWN THE HILL TO MY HOUSE FROM THE FREEWAY, THERE'S A LINE OF CARS THAT JUST SNAKES ALL THE WAY DOWN THE HILL. SO WE'RE ALL SITTING THERE WITH ALL THAT POLLUTION, YOU KNOW, BLOWING, BLOWING AROUND US, AND GETTING FRUSTRATED TRYING TO GET HOME. PEOPLE START CUTTING THROUGH THE NEIGHBORHOODS JUST TO TRY TO GET WHERE THEY'RE GOING. I MEAN THE TRAFFIC IS ALREADY HORRIBLE. LINCOLN IS HORRIBLE. THE 405 IS HORRIBLE. SO NOTHING HAS REALLY BEEN DONE TO MITIGATE AGAINST WHAT WE'VE GOT NOW, WHICH IS GRIDLOCK.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding health impacts and TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PHF00080-2

Comment:

AND SO I WORK FOR THE BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS AND AS A VOLUNTEER FOR THE SIERRA CLUB AND SOME OTHER ORGANIZATIONS. I'VE BEEN STANDING IN PARKING LOTS, ET CETERA, PASSING OUT LITERATURE, AND IF YOU WANT TO TAKE THIS AS A STATISTICAL SAMPLE, WHEN I PASS OUT THESE THINGS, EVERYBODY KNOWS WHAT I'M TALKING ABOUT WHEN I SAY "ARE YOU AGAINST THE EXPANSION OF PLAYA VISTA?" EVERYBODY KNOWS IT, AND THEY'RE AGAINST IT.

SO I HOPE YOU'RE LISTENING TO US BECAUSE WE HAVE SOME ORGANIZATIONS HERE THAT ARE WORKING STEADILY TO STOP THIS. PEOPLE ARE UP IN ARMS AT THIS POINT. THEY BELIEVE THAT THEIR GOVERNMENT HAS LIED TO THEM. RUTH GALANTER HAS MOVED ON A NO-DEVELOPMENT OR SLOW-GROWTH PLATFORM. THAT'S TWICE THE SIZE OF CENTURY CITY THEY PROPOSED, TWICE THE SIZE. IT'S JUST IMPOSSIBLE. SO A REGIONAL APPROACH. WE'VE HAD ENOUGH. WE'VE HAD ENOUGH. I MEAN JUST ENOUGH IS ENOUGH, AND PEOPLE IN OTHER AREAS NEED TO TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEIR SHARE OF THIS GRIDLOCK AND FOR THEIR SHARE OF THE AIRPORTS ON A REGIONAL APPROACH.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Response to Comment PC00148-2 regarding potential impacts from Playa Vista. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00081**Slaughter, Velma****None Provided****6/9/2001****PHF00081-1****Comment:**

MY NAME IS VILMA SLAUGHTER, S-L-A-U-G-H-T-E-R. ADDRESS 10420 THIRD AVENUE, INGLEWOOD, CALIFORNIA, AND THAT WOULD BE CENTURY HEIGHTS. I DO NOT LIVE IN THE GHETTO WHERE THEY TELL ME I DO. I DO NOT GET THE BENEFITS, BUT SO MUCH FOR THAT. I WOULD LIKE TO SAY I AM OPPOSED OF LAX -- ANY EXPANSION TO LAX. WE DO NOT NEED THE TRAFFIC, THE NOISE, THE POLLUTION. WE DO NOT NEED ANYMORE OF OUR COMMUNITIES DISMANTLED.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice impacts in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, 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, Appendix F, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-D, 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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHF00081-2**Comment:**

I HAVE LIVED IN INGLEWOOD OVER 27 YEARS. I HAD MY SON IN INGLEWOOD. HE WENT TO SCHOOL IN HAWTHORNE, AND HE'S IN THE NAVY NOW, AND I DON'T HAVE -- HAVE BUT THE ONE SON, BUT I'M FIGHTING FOR MY NEIGHBORS' KIDS AND THEIR GRANDKIDS AND THE ELDERLY BECAUSE WE HAVE A LOT OF SICK PEOPLE, AND PEOPLE ARE GETTING SICKER AND SICKER, WORSE, MORE AND MORE EVERY DAY WITH ASTHMA, BRONCHITIS, CANCER, AND WE CANNOT AFFORD TO HAVE LAX EXPAND.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00081-3

Comment:

WOULD YOU GUYS PLEASE LISTEN TO US AND THINK OF AN ORIGINAL PLAN TO HAVE AN INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PUT IN ANOTHER COUNTY, SOMEPLACE ELSE? JUST STOP LAX WHERE IT IS RIGHT NOW. WE CANNOT TAKE ANYMORE. AND I HAVE THIS OLD SAYING. IT GOES LIKE THIS. YOU CANNOT PUT LOS ANGELES INTO BAKERSFIELD. SO, PLEASE, I BEG OF YOU FIND AN ORIGINAL SOLUTION TO LAX. LOOK AT OTHER COUNTIES, PLEASE. WE ARE TOO CONGESTED NOW. YOU'RE MESSING WITH PEOPLES' LIVES, HEALTH, FAMILY, WELL-BEING. WE NEED THAT TO STOP. PLEASE STOP AND LISTEN. PUT YOURSELF IN OUR PLACE.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 2, 3, and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2 and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHF00082

Campbell, Bruce

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHF00082-1

Comment:

GOOD EVENING. BRUCE CAMPBELL. LAX IS CLEARLY THE NUMBER ONE AIRLINE POLLUTER IN THE L.A. REGION ALREADY. THE HUGE PLAYA VISTA PROJECT AND THE CHEVRON REFINERY AND THE NEARBY 405 EXACERBATE THE PROBLEM IN THE AREA. I HEAR THAT SANTA FE SPRINGS HAS THE WORST AIR POLLUTION IN THE COUNTY PROBABLY DUE TO INDUSTRY, BUT ALSO THE EAST-WEST DRIFT OF THE LAX FUMES AND THE PLANES GOING OVER THERE PLUS VEHICULAR REASONS. SO ADDRESS SOME POLLUTION, SAFETY OBVIOUSLY.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01186-4.

PHF00082-2

Comment:

THERE'S LOT OF NEAR MISSES AT THIS POINT, AND A LARGE EXPANSION OF LAX WILL OBVIOUSLY CAUSE CRASHES. WHO SHOULD BE HELD LIABLE FOR THE CRASHES IF IT IS EXPANDED?

Response:

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

PHF00082-3

Comment:

SO WHO'S REALLY BEHIND THE EXPANSION? I IMAGINE THE MOST POWERFUL PEOPLE ARE THE INVESTORS WHO CLOSED DOWN INDUSTRY IN THE INNER CITY IN THE LAST COUPLE OF DECADES AND SHIPPED THE JOBS OFF TO CHINA AND MEXICO AND ELSEWHERE, AND SO

THE BIG CARGO INFLUX YOU'RE PROBABLY GOING TO GET AND PROBABLY MAYOR RIORDON'S BUDDIES AND OTHERS ON THE TOP WHO INVESTED IN THESE COMPANIES AND SHIPPED JOBS OVERSEAS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHF00082-4

Comment:

OVIOUSLY LOOK AT WHAT'S HERE, PARTICULARLY GROWTH IN THE L.A. AREA, THE SANTA CLARITA AREA, THE INLAND EMPIRE, AND ALSO LANCASTER-PALMDALE. SO THAT'S -- THE LAST WOMAN SAID THE REGIONAL SOLUTION IS WHAT WE NEED.

Response:

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

PHF00082-5

Comment:

AND THEN AS FAR AS THE L.A. AREA, A LOT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMES HERE. SO NOT ONLY IS THERE THE ALAMEDA CORRIDOR, WHICH GETS THINGS FROM THE L.A./LONG BEACH HARBOR, BUT IF THE CARGO WENT TO ONTARIO, SINCE YOU'RE OFTEN SHIPPING FURTHER INLAND INCLUDING TO THE MIDWEST FROM THE PACIFIC RIM, ONTARIO MAKES PERFECT SENSE FOR INCREASED CARGO AND INCREASED PEOPLE.

Response:

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

PHF00082-6

Comment:

WE HAVE GRIDLOCK, A COMBINATION OF A NONBOOM ECONOMY DUE TO THE FEEDING FRENZY OF THE LAST DECADE, RECOMBINANT GROWTH, MAD COW DISEASE, GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOOD. DECLINE IN POPULATION AT LEAST BY THE NEXT DECADE IF NOT LATER ON IN THIS ONE.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land use impacts in Section 4.2, Land Use, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 1, 2, 3 and 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and in Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-3 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PHF00082-7

Comment:

AND LASTLY I THINK WE SHOULD EXPAND THE SEWER SYSTEM BECAUSE OF THE RESIDUE LEFT OVER FROM THE DECEPTIVE AND RACIST RECENT MAYORAL CAMPAIGN ON THE PART OF MAYOR-ELECT JIM HAHN.

Response:

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

PHF00083 Terry, Bob None Provided 6/9/2001

PHF00083-1

Comment:

LAX, I AM YOUR NEIGHBOR. I LIVE A BLOCK FROM THE AIRPORT, BUT THAT'S NOT WHAT I'M HERE TO TALK ABOUT. APPARENTLY -- I GUESS A COUPLE OF PEOPLE. NO ONE HAS SPOKEN OF TERRORISM. NOW YOU GUYS, TERRORISM. OKAY. WE'VE JUST HAD AN ATTEMPTED ATTACK ON LAX. IT JUST CAME OUT TWO WEEKS AGO THAT BIN LADEN'S TARGET FOR THE MILLENNIUM WAS LAX. DO WE WANT TO MAKE THIS A BIGGER TARGET? DO WE WANT TO MAKE THIS THE TARGET IN THE WESTERN PART OF THE U.S.? THAT'S WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT. THAT'S ALL.

Response:

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

PHF00084 Warner Morrison, None Provided 6/9/2001
Nancy

PHF00084-1

Comment:

HELLO, I'M NANCY GENE MORRISON, AND I LIVE ON 81ST STREET HERE IN WESTCHESTER. I'VE LIVED HERE 19 YEARS, AND SINCE I MOVED HERE, I HAVE GOTTEN ASTHMA, WHICH I DID NOT HAVE BEFORE I MOVED TO WESTCHESTER.

Response:

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

PHF00084-2

Comment:

BUT ONE OF THE THINGS I'D LIKE TO DISCUSS IS MY EXPERIENCE THIS LAST THURSDAY WHEN I FLEW FROM LAX TO OAKLAND AND BACK THE SAME AFTERNOON. I WAS INFORMED AT THE AIRPORT WHEN I GOT THERE THAT THE PLANE COMING IN TO GO TO OAKLAND COULDN'T COME IN BECAUSE OF THE BAD WEATHER HERE AT LAX. THE SUN WAS SHINING. THE SUN HAD BEEN SHINING SINCE AT LEAST 10:00 OR 11:00 IN THE MORNING. BUT THEY

SAID IT WAS FOGGED IN. SO THE PLANE CAME IN AN HOUR LATE. WE LEFT AN HOUR LATE, AND ON MY RETURN TRIP IN THE EVENING, THE PILOT DECIDED TO GO OUT TO TAXI OUT TO BE READY WHEN LAX, THE AIR TRAFFIC GAVE THEM CLEARANCE TO LEAVE. WE WERE TOLD THAT IT WAS DUE TO THE BAD WEATHER AT LAX. AGAIN, WHEN I LANDED, YOU COULD SEE VERY WELL COMING IN. I'M NOT AN AVIATION EXPERT AT ALL, BUT WE WERE ABOUT TWO HOURS LATE. WE WERE TOLD INSTEAD OF DEPARTING AT 7:35 AS SCHEDULED, IF WE HAD STAYED AT THE GATE, WE WOULD NOT HAVE CLEARANCE UNTIL 11:00 P.M.

NOW, THE PLANE -- BOTH PLANES WERE ALMOST ENTIRELY FULL. IT GIVES A REALLY BAD REP FOR L.A. AND LAX TO BE TOLD THAT THEY CAN'T HANDLE THE TRAFFIC HERE NOW. AND AS A RESIDENT, I AGREE WITH MOST OF THE SPEAKERS THAT I'VE HEARD THIS EVENING WHO ARE OPPOSED TO ENLARGING LAX AND HAVING MORE TRAFFIC HERE, ET CETERA. BUT IT'S ALREADY VERY BAD, AND I THINK YOU NEED TO BE AWARE HOW BAD IT IS ON A DAY WHEN WE AREN'T SOCKED IN WITH FOG. YES, THERE WAS SOME DRIZZLE AT 7:00 A.M. ON THURSDAY. IT WAS A LITTLE CLOUDY. IT WAS NOT HORRIBLE. THERE WAS VISIBILITY. I WAS OUT DRIVING ABOUT BEFORE I LEFT, AND WHEN I CAME HOME, YOU COULD SEE AT LEAST A COUPLE OF MILES FROM THE STREET LEVEL WHEN I CAME BACK. SO SOMETHING'S GOING ON THAT AIR TRAFFIC SAYS IT'S TOO FOGGY TO LAND HERE, AND YET THAT'S NOT THE WAY IT LOOKS. I DON'T SEE HOW YOU CAN HANDLE MORE FLIGHTS THAN YOU ALREADY HAVE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00001 Wasserman, Dan Congresswoman Jane Harman's 6/9/2001
Office

PHM00001-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS DAN WASSERMAN, I'M CONGRESSWOMAN JANE HARMAN'S DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR. THE CONGRESSWOMAN SUBMITTED WRITTEN TESTIMONY TO TODAY'S PROCEEDINGS, COPIES ARE AVAILABLE HERE AND ON OUR WEB SITE WHICH IS WWW.HOUSE.GOV/HARMAN. WE HAVE ALSO POSTED A FORM ON OUR SITE WHERE YOU CAN MAKE COMMENTS ON THE MASTER PLAN WHICH WE WILL SUBMIT TO LAWA AND THE FAA ON JULY 25TH OF THIS YEAR.

THE CONGRESSWOMAN REGRETS THAT SHE'S NOT ABLE TO ATTEND THESE HEARINGS IN PERSON, BUT HAS ASKED ME TO DELIVER THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT SUMMARIZING HER TESTIMONY:

"DEAR FRIENDS, I APPRECIATE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT MY VIEWS, WHICH REFLECT MANY E-MAILS, LETTERS, PHONE CALLS AND CONVERSATIONS WITH DISTRICT RESIDENTS WHO ARE PASSIONATELY CONCERNED ABOUT WHAT LAX EXPANSION WILL DO TO THEIR COMMUNITIES.

"DECISIONS WE MAKE ABOUT AIRPORTS WILL COST BILLIONS OF DOLLARS AND AFFECT MILLIONS OF RESIDENTS, TRAVELERS AND BUSINESSES. IT IS CRITICAL NOT ONLY THAT WE MAKE THE RIGHT CHOICES, BUT ALSO THAT THE PROCESS BY WHICH DECISIONS ARE REACHED BE THOUGHTFUL, INCLUSIVE, FAIR AND COMPREHENSIVE. HEARINGS LIKE THIS ARE A GOOD START; HOWEVER, THREE HEARINGS ON ONE DAY DOES NOT REFLECT A REAL COMMITMENT TO ACTIVE COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION.

"ASSEMBLYMAN NAKANO, STATE SENATOR BOWEN AND I WROTE A LETTER TO LAWA ASKING THAT MORE HEARINGS BE HELD. WE DID NOT RECEIVE A RESPONSE.

Response:

The intent of the one hearing at three locations was to maximize the number of persons that could provide input and provide more access to the most convenient hearing site. A major component of the

3. Comments and Responses

LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PHM00001-2

Comment:

I AM OPPOSED TO THE MASTER PLAN. I SUPPORT A TRULY REGIONAL APPROACH TO AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. I AM FOCUSING ON DEVELOPMENT OF AN ALTERNATIVE TO EXPANSION AT LAX.

"A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES SIGNED BY MYSELF AND 12 OTHER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FROM ACROSS SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA OFFERS OUR SUPPORT FOR A PLAN THAT IS MADE BY CONSENSUS ACROSS THE REGION, FAIRLY ALLOCATES BENEFITS AND BURDENS OF AIR TRANSPORTATION, EXPANDS AIRPORTS WITH UNDERUTILIZED CAPACITY, DOES NOT FORCE GROWTH AT ALREADY OVERBURDENED AIRPORTS, AND INCLUDES APPROPRIATE GROUND TRANSPORTATION.

"THE MASTER PLAN IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THESE PRINCIPLES. IT DOES NOT REFLECT A REGIONAL CONSENSUS, IT MAKES LITTLE OR NO EFFORT TO DISTRIBUTE AIR TRAFFIC TO UNDERUTILIZED AIRPORTS, IT MAKES NO EXPLICIT COMPARISONS TO THE REGIONAL APPROACHES TAKEN BY OTHER U.S. CITIES. THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE PROJECTS 89 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS AT LAX. IT FAILS TO PROVIDE CONVINCING EVIDENCE THAT LAX WILL NOT BE FORCED TO HANDLE MUCH MORE CAPACITY.

Response:

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

PHM00001-3

Comment:

"THE MASTER PLAN DOES NOT TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION PUBLIC INVESTMENT AT MILITARY BASES IN PALMDALE AND ELSEWHERE IN THE REGION.

Response:

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

PHM00001-4

Comment:

IT MAKES LITTLE OR NO EFFORT TO COMPARE THE COST OF LAX EXPANSION TO THE COST OF BUILDING NEW FACILITIES AT AIRPORTS OTHER THAN LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PHM00001-2.

PHM00001-5

Comment:

IT DOES NOT CONSIDER SCAG'S RECENT DECISION TO BASE ITS REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN ON A SCENARIO WHICH DOES NOT INCLUDE NEW FACILITIES AT LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

PHM00001-6

Comment:

AND, FINALLY, IT DOES NOT CONSIDER THE POTENTIAL ROLE OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY IN DEVELOPING AN ALTERNATIVE TO EXPANSION AT LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 for information on the role of Southern California Regional Airport Authority and the Southern California Association of Government in the development of the LAX Master Plan. The decline in air travel demand due to the economic recession, the events of September 11, 2001, the war in Iraq, and SARS has largely driven the Southern California Regional Airport Authority (SCRAA) back to inactivity. Riverside County voted in July 2002 to withdraw from SCRAA. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PHM00001-7

Comment:

"I LOOK FORWARD TO HEARING HOW LAWA AND THE FAA RESPOND TO THESE CONCERNS AND TO OTHER COMMENTS MADE HERE TODAY. I WILL SHARE THOSE RESPONSES WITH MY CONSTITUENTS, AND I WILL CONTINUE TO PLAY AN ACTIVE ROLE IN SUPPORTING A TRULY REGIONAL APPROACH TO MEETING SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S AIR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PHM00001-1 through PHM00001-6 above and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00002

Nakano, George

California State Assembly

6/9/2001

PHM00002-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON, I'M GEORGE NAKANO AND I REPRESENT THE 53RD ASSEMBLY DISTRICT IN WHICH LAX IS WHOLLY ENCOMPASSED IN MY DISTRICT. IT IS A PLEASURE TO BE HERE TODAY AND WELCOME ALL OF YOU TO THE 53RD ASSEMBLY DISTRICT. WE ALL WISH YOU COULD HAVE COME SOONER AND SPENT A BIT MORE TIME THIS TRIP, BECAUSE UNFORTUNATELY YOUR SEVEN OR SO HOURS HERE PROBABLY WILL NOT BE A TERRIBLY PLEASANT ONE.

AS SOMEONE WHO HAS BEEN ACTIVELY INVOLVED IN REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION ISSUES FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS, FIRST AS A CITY COUNCIL MEMBER AND NOW AS A MEMBER OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE ASSEMBLY, THIS EIR AND THE ENTIRE PROPOSAL TO EXPAND LAX ARE DEEPLY TROUBLING. FRANKLY, THE CONTENT OF THIS EIR IS SEVERELY FLAWED, EITHER THROUGH DELIBERATE ACTION OR INCOMPETENCE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00002-2

Comment:

THE BASELINE YEAR USED IN THIS STUDY IS 1996, PRIOR TO THE YEAR THE NOISIEST PLANES WERE PHASED OUT, THUS ON PAPER APPEARING TO REDUCE THE IMPACT OF PROPOSED GROWTH.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues, Subtopical Response TR-N-1.3 regarding noise modeling and baseline issues, and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.3 regarding the phase out of Stage 2 aircraft.

PHM00002-3

Comment:

FURTHER, THE EIR LACKS ANY ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF NOISE FROM FLY-OVERS ON THE SOUTHERN HALF OF THE SOUTH BAY AND THE PALOS VERDES PENINSULA.

Response:

Under NEPA and CEQA thresholds of significance, the South Bay communities and the Palos Verdes Peninsula communities are not significantly impacted by aircraft noise. Furthermore, the Master Plan alternatives will not result in a modification of the locations where aircraft fly in the area. Therefore, detailed evaluations of changes in noise levels and effects are not warranted for the purposes of this EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1.

PHM00002-4

Comment:

THE DOCUMENT PAYS NO ATTENTION TO THE NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED EXPANSION ON THE SURFACE TRAFFIC CONGESTION SOUTH OF ROSECRANS BOULEVARD. THE COMMUNITIES OF MANHATTAN BEACH, HERMOSA BEACH, REDONDO BEACH AND

TORRANCE WILL BECOME GRIDLOCKED AND THEIR ALREADY OVERCROWDED ARTERIALS JAMMED WITH LAX TRAFFIC.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Subtopical Response TR-ST-2.1 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology and Subtopical Response TR-ST-4.1 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PHM00002-5

Comment:

MORE IMPORTANTLY, THIS WHOLE PROCESS HAS OPERATED OFF THE ASSUMPTION THAT LAX IS THE ONLY OPTION IN MEETING THE GROWING DEMANDS OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S AIR TRAFFIC NEEDS. NOTHING COULD BE FURTHER FROM THE TRUTH. TRYING TO CRAM THE ENTIRE BURDEN OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S AIR TRANSPORT DEMAND INTO LAX IS MISGUIDED, SHORTSIGHTED AND ULTIMATELY INEFFECTIVE, ESPECIALLY GIVEN THE OTHER RESOURCES AVAILABLE.

PALMDALE AIRPORT CAN HANDLE PASSENGER DEMANDS FROM THE WESTERN SAN FERNANDO VALLEY AND VENTURA COUNTY, AND THE CITIZENS OF THE ANTELOPE VALLEY WANT THE AIRPORT TO GROW. ONTARIO AIRPORT HAS THE CAPACITY AND THE PRIME LOCATION TO HANDLE AN INCREASE IN THE PASSENGERS AS WELL.

Response:

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

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

PHM00002-6

Comment:

MARCH AIR FORCE BASE HAS AN EXISTING RUNWAY WELL SUITED FOR CARGO.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00002-7

Comment:

ANOTHER KEY POINT TO REMEMBER IS THAT ANY REGIONAL PLAN MUST ADDRESS THE FACT THAT 20 PERCENT OF THE PASSENGER TRAFFIC INTO AND OUT OF LAX COMES FROM ORANGE COUNTY, AND THE CARGO TRAFFIC IS EXPECTED TO DOUBLE WITHIN THE NEXT 10 TO 15 YEARS.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand.

PHM00002-8

Comment:

FINALLY, IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA, THERE ARE THREE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORTS - SAN FRANCISCO, OAKLAND AND SAN JOSE. THERE IS ONLY ONE IN ALL OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND THE POPULATION HERE IS MUCH MORE DENSE. THESE ARE THE COMPONENTS OF A TRULY REGIONAL AIRPORT PLAN, AND A REGIONAL AIRPORT PLAN THAT DISBURSE -- DISBURSES SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S AIR TRANSIT NEED DEMANDS THROUGHOUT ALL OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA IS THE ONLY VIABLE SOLUTION TO THIS EQUATION.

Response:

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

PHM00002-9

Comment:

I LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH MY COLLEAGUES AT THE STATE, LOCAL AND FEDERAL LEVELS, OUR NEIGHBORS THROUGHOUT THE SOUTH BAY, AND THE FAA AND LAWA TOWARD THIS GOAL.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00003

Knabe, Don

County of Los Angeles

6/9/2001

PHM00003-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS DON KNABE, I'M A COUNTY SUPERVISOR REPRESENTING THE FOURTH SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT WHICH ENCOMPASSES LAX AND BOTH THE PORTS OF LONG BEACH AND LOS ANGELES. I AM ALSO CURRENTLY THE CHAIR OF THE SOUTHERN

CALIFORNIA REGIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY, BUT MORE IMPORTANTLY, I WAS ALSO MAYOR IN THE CITY OF CERRITOS IN AUGUST 31ST, 1986 WHEN AN AERO MEXICO DC-9 WENT DOWN IN OUR COMMUNITY.

I'M NOT HERE TO -- I'M HERE TO ACKNOWLEDGE A NUMBER OF THINGS, BUT TO BRING TO YOUR ATTENTION A NUMBER OF OTHERS. WE'RE NOT DE-EMPHASIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF LAX TO THE ECONOMY OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGION, BUT I THINK THAT THE LAWA OFFICIALS AS WELL AS THE FAA NEED TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT LAX HAS A SERIOUS, IF NOT DEVASTATING, IMPACT ON THE COMMUNITIES THAT SURROUND IT AND THE RESIDENTS WHO LIVE WITHIN THOSE COMMUNITIES.

I PARTICULARLY REPRESENT OVER 2 MILLION PEOPLE IN MY DISTRICT, FROM MARINA DEL REY TO DIAMOND BAR TO CATALINA ISLAND, AND OVER HALF OF THOSE PEOPLE ARE IMPACTED BY WHAT YOU'RE ATTEMPTING TO DO TO LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT. LAWA NEEDS TO FOCUS ON BEING A GOOD NEIGHBOR AND NOT JUST ON REVVING ITS ECONOMIC ENGINES.

Response:

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

PHM00003-2

Comment:

COULD LAWA AND THE FAA HAVE BEEN A BETTER NEIGHBOR? YES, THEY COULD. AND DID YOU? ABSOLUTELY NOT. THE PROCESS YOU HAVE FILED IS A SUBSTANTIAL FAILURE. IT VIOLATES YOUR OWN STATED COMMITMENT TO FOSTER THE BROADEST POSSIBLE PARTICIPATION PROCESS TODAY. SCHEDULING A SINGLE DAY OF PUBLIC HEARINGS AT THREE SEPARATE LOCATIONS AT EXACTLY THE SAME TIME IS NO MORE THAN AN ATTEMPT TO FRAGMENT AND LIMIT PUBLIC PARTICIPATION, NOT FOSTER IT.

Response:

The intent of the one hearing at three locations was to maximize the number of persons that could provide input and provide more access to the most convenient hearing site. A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PHM00003-3

Comment:

MOREOVER, ENVIRONMENTAL EXPERTS IN THE AREA OF TRAFFIC, AIR QUALITY, NOISE, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, NEPA AND CEQA PROCESSES HIRED BY THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES HAVE FOUND THE DRAFT EIR/EIS FATALLY FLAWED AND THAT THE PROBLEMS WITH THE DOCUMENTS ARE SO PERVASIVE AND SYSTEMIC, THAT THE ONLY PRACTICAL REMEDY IS TO START OVER.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comment Letter AL00022 for responses to the individual comments provided by the County's environmental consultants.

PHM00003-4

Comment:

SPECIFICALLY, IN THE SCANT TIME THAT HAS BEEN ALLOCATED TO ME, I WOULD CALL TO YOUR ATTENTION THE FOLLOWING DEFICIENCIES:

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PHM00003-5

Comment:

WHY DOES THE DRAFT EIR/EIS DESCRIBE LAX AS SERVING THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGION, THE ENTIRE REGION, BUT THE SCOPING AND OUTREACH DID NOT INCLUDE A CONTACT WITH A SINGLE AGENCY WITHIN THE ORANGE, RIVERSIDE, SAN BERNARDINO OR VENTURA COUNTIES?

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00007-1 regarding the scoping undertaken for the LAX Master Plan.

PHM00003-6

Comment:

WHY DOES THE DRAFT EIR CONCLUDE THAT THE REGIONAL AIRPORT SYSTEM IS NOT FEASIBLE WITH L.A. WORLD AIRPORTS BUT THE OWNERS OF LAX OWN PALMDALE AND ONTARIO? AND IF A REGIONAL SYSTEM IS NOT FEASIBLE, HOW CAN THE DRAFT EIR/EIS CONCLUDE THAT FUTURE DEMAND WILL BE ABSORBED BY OTHER AIRPORTS OTHER THAN LOS ANGELES? WHAT YOU'RE ATTEMPTING TO DO ON 3,500 ACRES YOU DID AT DENVER ON 35,000.

Response:

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

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

PHM00003-7

Comment:

WE STRONGLY ENCOURAGE LAWA TO START THIS PROJECT OVER BEGINNING WITH A SCOPING PROCESS THAT ACKNOWLEDGES THE REGIONAL NATURE OF THIS UNDERTAKING AND FOLLOWING A FRESH LOOK AT ALTERNATIVES THAT INCLUDES AT LEAST ONE REGIONAL OPTION AMONG THEM.

IF LAWA IS WILLING TO TAKE THE STEP OF REEVALUATING ITS OPTIONS, THE LAX MASTER PLAN IS AN IMPORTANT UNDERTAKING AND WE HOPE THAT LAWA WILL REACH OUT TO THE COUNTY AS WELL AS OTHER COMMUNITIES --

-- AND OTHER AGENCIES IN THE REGION TO SUPPORT THIS GOAL. WE THANK YOU AND WE WILL SUBMIT OUR WRITTEN COMMENTS BY JULY 25TH.

Response:

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

PHM00004 Lazzaretto, Andy County of Los Angeles 6/9/2001

PHM00004-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS ANDY LAZZARETTO. I AM ALSO REPRESENTING THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES AT THE REQUEST OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. AFTER CAREFUL REVIEW OF THE EIS/EIR, WE HAVE CONCLUDED THAT THE ERRORS AND OMISSIONS AND INACCURATE ASSUMPTIONS IN THE DOCUMENT ARE SO PERVASIVE AS TO TOTALLY COMPROMISE THE VALIDITY OF THE ENTIRE DOCUMENT. AS A RESULT, THE ONLY APPROPRIATE ACTION, AS MR. KNABE POINTS OUT, IS TO SUBSTANTIALLY REVISE AND RECIRCULATE THIS DOCUMENT.

WE BASE THESE CONCLUSIONS IN PART ON THE FOLLOWING FACTORS:

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00004-2

Comment:

THAT THE ORIGINAL SCOPING DID NOT INCLUDE THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE THAT IS NOW BEING RECOMMENDED BY THE STAFF, ALTERNATIVE C. THIS DENIED THE PUBLIC ACCURATE TIME TO COMMENT ON THIS AT THE SCOPING LEVELS SO THAT THERE WAS NO PRE-KNOWLEDGE OF THIS PARTICULAR ALTERNATIVE.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00022-17 regarding the public notice pertaining to Alternative C.

PHM00004-3

Comment:

CONSIDERING THE SIZE AND THE SCOPE OF THIS PROJECT, HAVING ONLY THREE ALTERNATIVES SEEMS TO US TO BE VERY, VERY LIMITED GIVEN THE SIZE AND MAGNITUDE OF THE PROJECT.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHM00004-4

Comment:

THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE CONTAINS THE MOST SIGNIFICANT IMPACT, YET MEETS THE LEAST NUMBER OF OBJECTIVES AS SET FORTH IN THE EIR/EIS.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00022-3 regarding the number and severity of impacts associated with Alternative C compared to Alternatives A and B and Response to Comment AL00022-43 regarding Alternative C's fulfillment of the project objective.

PHM00004-5

Comment:

THE DOCUMENT REPEATEDLY ACKNOWLEDGES THAT LAX IS PART OF THE REGIONAL SYSTEM, AND YET, AS MR. KNABE POINTS OUT, THE REGIONAL AGENCIES SUCH AS THE COUNTIES OF SAN BERNARDINO, ORANGE AND RIVERSIDE WERE NOT CONTACTED DURING THE SCOPING PROCESS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00007-1 regarding the scoping undertaken for the LAX Master Plan.

PHM00004-6

Comment:

FURTHERMORE, DURING THE TIME THAT THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN IN CIRCULATION, JUST RECENTLY SCAG HAS TAKEN AN ALMOST UNANIMOUS DECISION IN TERMS OF A REGIONAL SOLUTION, AND JUST IN THE PAST WEEK, THE FAA HAS ANNOUNCED NEW TECHNICAL IMPROVEMENTS TO THE AIR SIDE SYSTEM OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL WHICH SHOULD SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVE THE OPERATION OF ALL THE REGIONAL AIRPORTS, AND ESPECIALLY LAX. AND THIS IS NEW INFORMATION WHICH ADMITTEDLY LAX DID NOT HAVE AVAILABLE TO THEM DURING THE SCOPING OR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCUMENT, BUT WE POINT THIS OUT TO SHOW HOW MUCH TIME HAS PASSED AND HOW FLAWED THE INFORMATION THAT YOU ARE NOW DEALING WITH ACTUALLY IS. THE PROJECT HORIZON OF THE YEAR 2015 IS NOT ATTAINABLE AT THIS POINT. IT SKEWS THE POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT.

Response:

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

Although the conclusion of the Draft EIS/EIR is that Alternative C would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region, that conclusion has been superseded by the conclusion of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D is now considered to be the Environmental Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region. The comment is unclear and nonspecific as to what is meant by "new technical improvements to the air side system of air traffic control." In the event that the commentor is referring to the FAA "Benchmark Study," please see Response to Comment AL00036-30. Relative to completing the proposed project by the horizon year 2015, please see Response to Comment AL00033-26.

PHM00004-7

Comment:

IN CLOSING, LET ME POINT OUT THAT AT THE VERY LEAST, THE BASELINES THAT HAVE BEEN USED ARE VERY, VERY AGED. 1996 IS USED IN MANY PLACES, BUT THEN THERE ARE OTHER PLACES WITHIN THE DOCUMENT WHERE THE YEAR 2000 AND OTHER YEARS ARE USED AS A BASELINE.

Response:

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

PHM00004-8

Comment:

WE TAKE ISSUE WITH THE FACT THAT THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE SECTION SHOWS ABSOLUTELY NO MITIGATION MEASURES. THIS IS CONTRARY TO CEQA, NEPA, AND FEDERAL GUIDELINES PUBLISHED BY THE PRESIDENT.

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.

PHM00004-9

Comment:

THE TRAFFIC IS A MAJOR PROBLEM WHICH WILL BE ADDRESSED BY ONE OF MY COLLEAGUES, AS IS AIR AND NOISE.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00004-10

Comment:

ONCE AGAIN, WE FEEL THAT THE REGIONAL SOLUTION AND A REGIONAL APPROACH NEEDS TO BE TAKEN WITH THIS DOCUMENT. IT NEEDS TO BE SUBSTANTIALLY REVISED AND RECIRCULATED FOR COMMENT BY THE PUBLIC.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The environmental impacts specific to Alternative D are fully addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR dealt only with the development of LAX. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. The recommendation that the FAA conduct a comprehensive analysis of various regional scenarios is beyond the scope of the subject EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PHM00005

Kurtz, Barry

County of Los Angeles

6/9/2001

PHM00005-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. I'M BARRY KURTZ REPRESENTING THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND MY COMMENTS ARE GOING TO BE ADDRESSED ONLY TO TRAFFIC TRANSPORTATION ISSUES IN THE EIR/EIS.

THE LAX EXPANSION PROJECT COMES WITH A COMPREHENSIVE PACKAGE OF TRANSPORTATION MITIGATION MEASURES AND WE GENERALLY SUPPORT ANY TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM THAT PROVIDES DIRECT ACCESS FROM THE FREEWAY SYSTEM TO THE AIRPORT, SIMILAR TO MANY OTHER CITIES ACROSS THE NATION. HOWEVER, WE HAVE SEVERAL MAJOR CONCERNS ABOUT THE TRAFFIC INFORMATION IN THE EIR/EIS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED.

OUR DEPARTMENT FINDS THE TRAFFIC STUDY IS INADEQUATE, INCOMPLETE AND FLAWED. A 50-UNIT HOUSING DEVELOPMENT WILL COME TO THE COUNTY TO SCOPE OUT THEIR PROJECT, AND A PROJECT THAT'S OF A MAGNITUDE LIKE THE LAX EXPANSION, YOU WOULD EXPECT THEY WOULD COME TO US TO SCOPE OUT THE PROJECT, YET THERE WAS NO SCOPING, THEY DIDN'T CONTACT US, AND CONSEQUENTLY, THE INFORMATION THAT THEY SUBMITTED IS TOTALLY INCOMPLETE.

THE COUNTY'S GUIDELINES WERE NOT USED AT ROADWAYS AND INTERSECTIONS NEAR THE AIRPORT. THE COUNTY EXPECTS THAT THE STUDY SHOULD HAVE INCLUDED ALL THE NEARBY UNINCORPORATED AREAS INCLUDING MARINA DEL REY, BALDWIN HILLS, ATHENS, DELAMARE, EL CAMINO VILLAGE, LADERA HEIGHTS AND SO ON. THEY WERE NOT INCLUDED IN THE TRAFFIC INFORMATION.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please refer to the Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology for a discussion of the study area and identification of facilities analyzed. That topical response also includes a comparison of the guidelines used for the impact analysis to the County's guidelines. Since this Master Plan is being processed in the City of Los Angeles, a Memorandum of Understanding was executed with LADOT specifying the methodology to be used in the traffic impact analysis.

PHM00005-2**Comment:**

TRANSPORTATION STUDIES WERE BASED ON OUTDATED 1996 TRAFFIC DATA AND WERE NOT VALIDATED.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology, which includes a description of the definition of baseline scenarios and incorporation of local/regional plans and programs. Also, a discussion of an updated baseline condition was provided in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHM00005-3**Comment:**

WE'RE VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE OVERLOADING OF THE SAN DIEGO FREEWAY NORTH OF THE LAX EXPRESSWAY BECAUSE OF THE SPILLOVER FACTOR, AND THE CITIES IN THAT AREA ARE GOING TO BE IMPACTED, CULVER CITY, AND THE NORTHWEST -- NORTH/SOUTH ARTERIALS SUCH AS LA CIENEGA, LINCOLN AND SEPULVEDA ALSO NEED TO BE LOOKED AT. SIMILARLY, SOUTH OF THE FREEWAY WHERE WE DON'T HAVE AN LAX EXPRESSWAY, THOSE JURISDICTIONS SOUTH OF THE FREEWAY ARE GOING TO BE IMPACTED ALSO. WE NEED TO KNOW THE EXACT IMPACT OF THOSE CITIES.

IN CONCLUSION, WE HAVE NOT RECEIVED ALL THE INFORMATION NECESSARY FOR THE COUNTY TO COMPLETE ITS REVIEW. THE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED TO ENABLE US TO DETERMINE IF THE AIRPORT EXPANSION AND TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS WILL PROVIDE A BETTER SITUATION AND WILL POSE A SERVICE THAN NO AIRPORT EXPANSION AND NO MITIGATION MEASURES.

AS OF NOW, WE DON'T HAVE ALL THE INFORMATION NECESSARY TO COMPLETE OUR REVIEW.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please refer to the Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology, for a discussion of the study area and identification of facilities analyzed and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PHM00005-4**Comment:**

AND OUR LAST CONCERN IS BASICALLY THE FACT THAT LAX WAS DESIGNED FOR 45 MAP, IT'S NOW AT 68 AND A POTENTIAL TO GO TO 79 WITHOUT THE EXPANSION, SO IF THE EXPANSION WILL ALLOW 89 MAP, WHAT'S TO ENSURE US THAT THE INCREASED TRAFFIC WON'T RESULT IN ABOUT A 150 PERCENT INCREASE, SIMILAR TO WHAT'S BEEN DONE BEFORE?

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00006

Mestre, Vincent

County of Los Angeles

6/9/2001

PHM00006-1

Comment:

THANK YOU. MY NAME IS VINCENT MESTRE, I'M HERE ON THE BEHALF OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES. I'M A CONSULTANT IN THE AREA OF ACOUSTICS AND AIR QUALITY AND I HAVE THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS ON THE EIR/EIS.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments below.

PHM00006-2

Comment:

NOISE. SINCE THE 1970'S, CALIFORNIA LAW HAS REQUIRED ALL CALIFORNIA AIRPORTS TO PUBLISH A QUARTERLY REPORT THAT DESCRIBES NOISE IMPACTS. UNDER THAT LAW, LAX IS REQUIRED TO OPERATE A PERMANENT NOISE MONITORING SYSTEM AND ENSURE THAT NOISE CONTOURS PUBLISHED IN THE QUARTERLY REPORTS CORRESPOND TO NOISE MONITORING DATA.

LAX HAS COMPLIED WITH THIS LAW FOR THE PAST 30 YEARS BY SUBMITTING QUARTERLY REPORTS TO THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES AND THE STATE DIVISION OF AERONAUTICS. FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 1996, LAX SUBMITTED A QUARTERLY REPORT SHOWING THAT 85,907 PEOPLE WERE LOCATED INSIDE THE CRITERIA NOISE CONTOUR. THE EIR/EIS FOR THE PROJECT IDENTIFIES THIS SAME 1996 BASELINE YEAR AND IDENTIFIES 36,907 PEOPLE INSIDE THE SAME CRITERIA CONTOUR.

THERE IS A SIGNIFICANT AND UNDISCLOSED DISCREPANCY IN THE NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS AND POPULATION BETWEEN THE EIR/EIS BASELINE YEAR AND THE DATA PUBLISHED BY LAWA. THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE IMPACTS IS DRAMATIC. APPROXIMATELY 15,000 HOMES AND 37,000 RESIDENTS APPEAR TO BE UNDERCOUNTED. THE EIR/EIS STATES THAT THE NOISE CONTOURS ARE ADJUSTED TO REFLECT NOISE MONITORING DATA. THIS STATEMENT APPEARS TO BE INACCURATE AND CONFLICTS WITH STATEMENTS TO THE CONTRARY ELSEWHERE IN THE REPORT.

THE RESULTS OF THE NOISE MONITORING DATA SHOW NOISE IN SITES EAST OF THE AIRPORT, PRIMARILY IN INGLEWOOD, AT SIGNIFICANTLY HIGHER NOISE LEVELS THAN THE MODEL PREDICTS, AND NO ATTEMPT WAS MADE IN THE EIR/EIS TO EXPLAIN OR CORRECT THIS DIFFERENCE. THIS MAKES IT DIFFICULT TO ESTABLISH A CREDIBLE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC WHEN NO ATTEMPT IS MADE TO EXAMINE THE REASON FOR THE NOISE MODEL UNDER-PREDICTION OF AIRCRAFT NOISE.

IN ADDITION, QUESTIONS ON THE BASELINE CONTOURS, THERE IS SUBSTANTIAL UNCERTAINTY ASSOCIATED WITH THE FUTURE OPERATIONAL ASSUMPTIONS WITHIN THE EIS/EIR.

Response:

Section 2.2, Comparison of Environmental Baseline Noise To Quarterly Noise Report, of Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report Section 2.1.7 Relationship of 2000 Contours to 4th Quarter 2000 Report Contours of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed alleged discrepancy in population and dwelling units. Please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-1.2 regarding modeled vs. measured baseline year noise levels, Subtopical Response TR-N-1.5 regarding accuracy of forecast fleet mix, and Responses to Comments PC00109-5, AL00036-24 and SAL00013-69.

PHM00006-3

Comment:

THE ASSUMPTIONS FOR OPERATIONS FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT ARE BASED ON NO CHANGE IN CURRENT TECHNOLOGY THAT AFFECTS AIRPORT AND AIR SPACE CAPACITY. THIS IN SPITE OF NUMEROUS INDUSTRY EFFORTS AND PROGRAMS TO UPGRADE AND IMPROVE TECHNOLOGY TO ENHANCE AIRPORT CAPACITY. THE NET EFFECT IS THAT SUBSTANTIALLY GREATER NUMBERS OF AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS ARE LIKELY TO OCCUR FOR THE IDENTIFIED PROJECT.

AS AN EXAMPLE OF THE EIR/EIS UNDERPREDICTION OF OPERATIONS, THE EIR/EIS PROJECTS THAT THE YEAR 2015 BASELINE OPERATIONS WILL GROW FROM 1996 BASELINE CONDITIONS TO 2,124 OPERATIONS PER DAY. IN FACT, YEAR 2000 OPERATIONS HAD ALREADY EXCEEDED THIS PROJECTION AT 2,280 OPERATIONS PER DAY.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00036-30 for a discussion on the impact of technology improvements on capacity. The Draft EIS/EIR projected that design day operations would increase from the 1996 baseline level to 2,279 design day operations in the No Action/No Project Alternative in 2015 as was shown on page 3-15 Table 3-2. This is only a slight increase in operations from the Year 2000 with 2,275 operations due to the limited runway capacity at LAX. Please see Chapter V, Section 3.3.2 of the Draft Master Plan for further discussion of the activity levels of the Master Plan alternatives.

PHM00007

Gordon, Mike

City of El Segundo

6/9/2001

PHM00007-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS MIKE GORDON, I'M THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO. AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT IS SUPPOSED TO CONSIDER A REASONABLE RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT, YET THIS EIR/EIS EXAMINES A VERY LIMITED RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES AND THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE EXAMINED IS TO MAKE ALTERNATIVE C LOOK GOOD.

THE EIR DOES NOT CONSIDER ALTERNATIVES THAT RESULT IN IMPACTS LESS SEVERE THAN THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE C,

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option - Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan - was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Although the conclusion of the Draft EIS/EIR was that Alternative C would have the fewest negative impacts to the surrounding communities and the region, that conclusion has been superseded by the conclusion of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D is now considered to be the Environmentally Superior alternative and would have the fewest negative impacts to the local communities and the region. Alternative D has replaced Alternative C as the LAWA staff preferred alternative.

PHM00007-2

Comment:

AND MOST NOTABLY, AFTER THREE-AND-A-HALF YEARS OF WORK BY SCAG AND ALL OF THE CITIES IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND COUNTIES INVOLVED, THIS EIR NEVER SERIOUSLY CONSIDERS A TRULY REGIONAL AIRPORT SYSTEM SUCH AS THE ONE PROPOSED BY SCAG. PASSENGER CARGO DEMANDS ARE CLEARLY UNDERSTATED. THE ASSUMPTIONS AND

3. Comments and Responses

WORKSHEETS IN THIS PLAN ARE BASED ON PROJECTIONS THAT WE CANNOT FIND ANY ACCURATE INFORMATION THAT WAS REVIEWED TO DRAW THESE CONCLUSIONS.

Response:

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

PHM00007-3

Comment:

WE BELIEVE THAT THE EIR/EIS CONSISTENTLY AND VERY SIGNIFICANTLY UNDERSTATES THE ENVIRONMENTAL BURDENS THE PUBLIC WILL EVENTUALLY BEAR AS A CONSEQUENCE TO THE AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT ENVISIONED UNDER EACH ALTERNATIVE.

Response:

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

PHM00007-4

Comment:

LET'S TALK ABOUT TRAFFIC. ONE OF THE MOST SEVERE IMPACTS LIKELY TO OCCUR AS A RESULT OF THE EXPANSION OF LAX IS EXCESSIVE TRAFFIC CONGESTION. THIS BURDEN OF CONGESTION IS NOT LIMITED TO THE IMMEDIATE AIRPORT AREA, RATHER IT SPREADS THROUGHOUT THE SUBREGIONAL FREEWAY AND ARTERIAL SYSTEM. NEVERTHELESS, AND INEXPLICABLY, THE IMPACTS OF THE LAX EXPANSION ON THE I-405 ARE HARDLY EXAMINED IN THE EIR WHATSOEVER, DESPITE CERTAIN AND SEVERE TRAFFIC ROUTES WE FELT UP AND DOWN SEPULVEDA, LINCOLN, MANCHESTER, AVIATION AND CENTURY BOULEVARDS, TO NAME JUST A FEW.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, Section 1 and 3, and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PHM00007-5

Comment:

THERE IS NO MITIGATION PLAN OF ANY KIND PROPOSED FOR SUBREGIONAL ARTERIALS. IN FACT, THE ONLY TRAFFIC CONGESTION THE AIRPORT SEEMS CONCERNED TO MITIGATE IS ITS OWN AIRPORT TRAFFIC.

Response:

In accordance with NEPA and CEQA, the proposed mitigation plan includes measures for any impacted facility included in the study, including sub-regional arterials. Further, the proposed Neighborhood Protection Program (see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts) would help to limit any affects on neighborhood streets. Also, the project is required to determine the impacts resulting from the project and to mitigate those impacts to the extent feasible. It is not required to mitigate traffic impacts from other, unrelated projects. The Draft EIS/EIR, Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and Final EIS/EIR meet that criterion for both CEQA and NEPA.

PHM00007-6**Comment:**

NOISE. THE EIS/EIR INCLUDES COMPLETE MIXED ASSUMPTIONS THAT ARE UNREASONABLE AND UNSUPPORTED AND FAILS TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE TREMENDOUS UNCERTAINTIES OF THE MARKETPLACE FOR NEWER, LARGER AIRCRAFT MODELS. THIS COMPLETE MIXED VOODOO MAKES THE ANALYSIS OF NOISE IMPACTS ENTIRELY SPECULATIVE AND DRAMATICALLY LOWER WHAT POTENTIALLY COULD OCCUR.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-1.5.

PHM00007-7**Comment:**

EVEN SO, THE EIR/EIS CONCLUDES THAT EXPOSURE TO AIRCRAFT NOISE IN 2015 UNDER ALTERNATIVE C FOR MANY POPULATION GROUPS WITH NOISE-SENSITIVE USES WILL BE SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE. IN SHORT, TAKE IT. YET REMARKABLY, THERE ARE NO NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES PROPOSED IN THIS DOCUMENT.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise mitigation presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and significant and unavoidable impacts that would remain after mitigation.

PHM00007-8**Comment:**

AIR QUALITY. LAX IS ALREADY THE GREATEST LARGEST SINGLE SOURCE OF NOX EMISSIONS IN THE REGIONS. EVEN THOUGH ALTERNATIVE C AS ACCEPTED HAS ARTIFICIALLY LOW ACTIVITY LEVELS, THE EXPANSION PLAN WILL AS MUCH AS TRIPLE THE NOX EMISSIONS FROM THE AIRPORT.

Response:

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

PHM00007-9**Comment:**

ALL THREE EXPANSION SCENARIOS PROPOSED WILL MORE THAN DOUBLE THE PARTICLE ACTIVITY AT LAX. THAT WILL DOUBLE THE TRUCK TRAFFIC AND THE DIESEL EMISSIONS LAX NEIGHBORS WILL HAVE TO BREATHE.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts including particulate matter emissions, in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The level of significance following mitigation of these impacts was addressed in Section 4.6.9 of each document.

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00007-10

Comment:

DIESEL ENGINE CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT WILL ALSO BE A SIGNIFICANT SOURCE OF NOX EMISSIONS AND PARTICULATES DURING THE 16-YEAR CONSTRUCTION PERIOD.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts from diesel engine construction equipment in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHM00007-11

Comment:

IN SHORT, THIS WILL DESTROY THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR COMMUNITIES AROUND THIS AIRPORT. WHAT WE NEED IS A TRULY REGIONAL AIRPORT PLAN.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PHM00008

Jacobs, Sandra

City of El Segundo

6/9/2001

PHM00008-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS SANDRA JACOBS, I AM THE MAYOR PRO TEM OF THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO AS WELL AS FIRST VICE PRESIDENT OF THE SOUTH BAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT AND CHAIR THAT BODY'S TRANSPORTATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE. I ALSO SERVE AS A MEMBER OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS' TRANSPORTATION COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE AND SERVE ON THE REGIONAL COUNCIL.

THERE ARE MANY AREAS OF CONCERN WITH THIS DRAFT EIS/EIR WHICH WOULD TAKE MUCH LONGER THAN THE THREE MINUTES, SO I WOULD LIKE TO FOCUS MY COMMENTS IN REGARDS TO SEVERAL DEFICIENCIES IN THE TRAFFIC ANALYSIS. IN REFERENCE TO PAGE 428485, THE STATEMENT THAT LITTLE CUT-THROUGH TRAFFIC IS ON SOUTH BAY ARTERIAL ROUTES IS A HOLLOW AND UNSUBSTANTIATED STATEMENT. ONCE THE 405 FREEWAY STOPS MOVING, TRAFFIC WILL SPILL OUT JUST LIKE FLOODING WATERS TO FIND OTHER TRIBUTARIES, IN THIS CASE OUR LOCAL STREETS AND NEIGHBORHOODS.

Response:

The cut-through traffic referred to on pages 4-282 and 4-285 of the Draft EIS/EIR referred to existing conditions and addressed airport traffic that gets off of the freeway early and uses arterial streets instead. The text simply pointed out that the freeway alignment in the South Bay area does not create the same incentive for this type of diversion for airport trips, when compared to the freeway alignment north of LAX. North of LAX, it is possible to shorten the distance to LAX by getting off the freeway early and using arterial streets. South of LAX, exiting I-405 early and using arterial streets does not shorten the distance to LAX. The analysis showed that a higher percentage of airport trips stay on I-405 south of LAX, compared to I-405 north of LAX. North of LAX, a higher percentage of airport trips exit the freeway early to use an alternative arterial street. South of LAX, the percentage of airport trips that exit I-405 early to use an alternative arterial street is lower, in relative terms. This comparative effect is shown graphically in Technical Report 3b, Attachment B. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PHM00008-2

Comment:

THE PLAN APPEARS TO HAVE STUDIED PRIMARILY LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION JURISDICTIONS AND PROVIDES MOST OF THE MITIGATION IN THOSE AREAS. NOWHERE IN THE PLAN DOES IT APPEAR THAT DATA HAS BEEN COLLECTED REGARDING TRAFFIC FROM PALOS VERDES PENINSULA OR THE BEACH COMMUNITIES. I AM ASKING THAT A CLEAR STATEMENT BE MADE AS TO WHY THE INTERSECTIONS INVOLVED WERE SELECTED AND WHY AREAS SOUTH OF ROSECRANS BOULEVARD WERE IGNORED.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please refer to Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology for a discussion of the study area and identification of facilities analyzed.

PHM00008-3

Comment:

TRAFFIC CONDITIONS IN THE SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD TUNNEL HAVE NOT BEEN PROPERLY ANALYZED. SINCE THIS ARTERIAL PROVIDES MAIN ACCESS TO THE CENTRAL TERMINAL AREA FROM THE SOUTH, IT MUST BE INCLUDED IN ANY ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES MUST BE IDENTIFIED.

Response:

This comment is similar to Comment PC00236-1. Please see Response to Comment PC00236-1.

PHM00008-4

Comment:

IT IS UNCLEAR HOW THE RING ROAD RELATES TO IMPERIAL HIGHWAY. I AM REQUESTING CLARIFICATION OF SPECIFIC ACCESS TO IMPERIAL HIGHWAY FOR MAIN STREET AND CALIFORNIA STREET.

Response:

The Ring Road would replace Imperial Highway from its current merge with I-105 westward. There would be a grade separation from the Ring Road to Main Street. At this location, it is anticipated that the Ring Road would be below grade, with the extension of Main Street passing overhead. On the north side of the Ring Road, the Main Street extension would curve to the east to provide access to various ancillary facilities on the north side of the Ring Road. Freeway ramps would be provided to and from the east, accommodating westbound Ring Road traffic exiting to Main Street/ancillary facilities, and providing eastbound Ring Road access for Main Street/ancillary facilities. All new construction would take place north of the existing southern right-of-way boundary of Imperial Highway. Further design details will be provided during the design process for this project. California Street access would also continue to be provided, although its exact alignment may be altered by the Ring Road. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as was detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHM00008-5

Comment:

LASTLY, THERE ARE NO COSTS OF FUNDING SOURCES IDENTIFIED IN THE RECOMMENDED TRAFFIC MITIGATION MEASURES. PLEASE ANSWER THE ALLEGATION THAT PREVIOUSLY-

3. Comments and Responses

APPROVED GROUND TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS ARE ALSO INCLUDED IN THIS PLAN TO HELP MEET THE MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS OF NEW BURDENS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding funding. All proposed mitigation measures are specific to this project. In the past, some mitigation measures, such as those for the LAX Northside project, were implemented by LAWA even though the project necessitating those mitigations was never built.

PHM00008-6

Comment:

PRIOR EXPERIENCE WITH THIS AIRPORT'S EXPANSION AND ITS FAILURE TO IMPLEMENT MITIGATION CAUSES ME TO ASK THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION BE INCLUDED IN THE FINAL REPORT: IDENTIFY SPECIFIC FUNDING SOURCES FOR ALL MITIGATION PROJECTS. PRESENT A SCHEDULE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THESE PROJECTS. DEVELOP A REMEDY FOR NONPERFORMANCE OF THE SCHEDULE. WITHOUT THESE ASSURANCES, THE MITIGATION PROJECTS WILL SIMPLY BE WORDS ON A PAGE TO BE FOUND YEARS FROM NOW ON A DUSTY VOLUME OF THIS EIR.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AR00003-63 regarding the mitigation monitoring and reporting program. There are no requirements under CEQA or NEPA that funding sources for mitigation measures be specified. Please see Response to Comment SAL00015-8.

PHM00009 Wernick, Nancy LAX Area Advisory Committee 6/9/2001

PHM00009-1

Comment:

I'M HERE SPEAKING AT THE PRESENT TIME IN THIS INCARNATION FOR THE LAX ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SOMETHING THAT THE BOARD OF AIRPORT COMMISSIONERS HAVE PUT TOGETHER FOR THE SURROUNDING CITIES THAT WERE IMPACTED BY LOS ANGELES AIRPORT PRIOR TO ITS EXPANSION.

WE HAVE SEVERAL QUESTIONS. HAVE THE RECENT POPULATION CHANGES REFLECTED IN THE 2000 CENSUS IMPACTED THE MASTER PLAN ASSUMPTIONS?

Response:

The 2000 census has not been reflected in the Master Plan since it was not available at the time when the Master Plan was prepared. The Master Plan was prepared based on the latest and best available data at that time.

PHM00009-2

Comment:

SPECIFICALLY, HOW HAS THE 6.5 -- 69.5 PERCENT GROWTH IN PALMDALE AFFECTED THE ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE PALMDALE AIRPORT IN THE MASTER PLAN?

Response:

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

PHM00009-3

Comment:

WHERE IS THE, QUOTE, "EVIDENCE FROM OTHER REGIONS AND NATIONS" THAT INDICATES THAT ATTEMPTS TO RELOCATE ACTIVITY FROM AN ESTABLISHED AIRPORT TO NEW FACILITIES RESULTS IN A FAILURE AND A LOSS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS? THAT'S ON PAGE 2.2. WE'D LIKE TO KNOW WHERE THE EVIDENCE IS FOR THAT.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, specifically the discussion regarding Mirabel Airport in Canada and MidAmerica Airport in Illinois.

PHM00009-4

Comment:

HOW MUCH OF THE REDUCTION IN TOTAL POPULATION EXPOSED TO THE NOISE LEVEL ABOVE 65 CNEL OF APPROXIMATELY 1,500 TO 1,600 MORE THAN THE NO ACTION PLAN IS DUE TO THE ACQUISITION OF 84 DWELLING UNITS ALREADY?

Response:

As was stated in the Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.6), and Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR regarding noise-exposed population, compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative, Alternative A would result in an overall reduction of 50 residents, Alternative B would result in an overall increase of 16,440 residents, and Alternative C would result in an overall increase of 1,350 residents. Since the 84 dwelling units would be within the 65 CNEL contour under the No Action/No Project Alternative but would be acquired under Alternatives A, B, and C the removal of these residents from the 65 CNEL contour represents a decrease compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. The 84 dwelling units are estimated to house approximately 172 residents, based on an average of 2.54 persons per single-family unit per 1990 U.S. Census of Population and Housing (Census) data for census tract (CT) 2780 (in which the affected units are located), and assuming 1 person per multi-family unit within the former motel to be acquired. Even with this population removed, due to residential acquisition, under Alternatives B and C there is an increase in residents exposed to the 65 CNEL or greater contour and under Alternative A the reduction of residents exposed to high noise levels is less than the number of residents associated with the acquired dwelling units. This is due to the shift in noise contours under the build alternatives that would remove some population from high noise levels but would also result in some population that would be newly exposed to high noise levels. Under Alternative D as was described in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, no residential uses are proposed for acquisition. However, compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative, the population exposed to the 65 CNEL would be reduced by 1,350 residents.

PHM00009-5

Comment:

WHAT PEOPLE WILL BE EXPOSED TO THE 1.5 DECIBEL OR GREATER INCREASED NOISE LEVELS UNDER ALTERNATIVE C AND HOW MUCH GREATER?

Response:

Comment noted. Since the commentor does not specify whether Alternative C is to be compared to the environmental baseline or the No Action/No Project Alternative, detailed information on Alternative C was provided in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR. In particular, see Section 4.2.6.4, Alternative C-No Additional Runway.

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00009-6

Comment:

WHY WOULD ALTERNATIVE C HAVE GREATER IMPACTS IN THE SHORT TERM ON POPULATION EXPOSED TO THE 1.5 CNEL THAN ALTERNATIVES A OR B AND WHAT WOULD THAT IMPACT BE? NONE OF THESE QUESTIONS ARE ANSWERED.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor is referred to page 4-71 Section 4.1, Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR for a description of the reasons there will be greater impacts in the near term for Alternative C relative to Alternatives A and B. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addresses noise impacts associated with Alternative D in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. .

PHM00009-7

Comment:

WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE ON-SITE UTILITIES, WE HAVE A REAL PROBLEM. YOUR COST ESTIMATES ARE GROSSLY UNDERSTATED AND YOUR DANGER TO THE SURROUNDING AREAS IS NOWHERE TO BE FOUND. WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE AN OFF-SITE CONSEQUENCES REPORT FOR YOUR FUEL FARM AND FOR THE PIPES THAT WILL LEAD FROM SCATTERGOOD ACROSS IMPERIAL TO THE NEW LAWA SITE. WHAT JURISDICTIONS WILL THESE CROSS OVER? HAVE YOU CHECKED WHAT LANDS YOU'RE GOING TO BE DIGGING UNDER AND WHAT THEIR LAWS ARE? WHY ARE YOU NOT SUBJECTED TO AN OFF-SITE CONSEQUENCES REPORT WHEN EVEN THE HYPERION SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT IS?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the potential impacts of each Master Plan alternative at a program level of analysis. The impacts of the off-site fuel farm, proposed under Alternative B, were addressed where appropriate within the environmental analysis presented in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR. See, in particular, Sections 4.18, Light Emissions, 4.21, Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics, and 4.24.3, Safety, for discussions of issues most relevant to the off-site fuel farm. If Alternative B is selected, additional more detailed environmental evaluation and review would be conducted for the off-site fuel farm, including potential pipeline routes.

PHM00009-8

Comment:

YOU CAN PARTIALLY SOUND PROOF YOUR HOME. YOU CAN FORCE PEOPLE TO LIVE IN A BUNKER. YOU CANNOT AIR PROOF YOUR HOME, AND THE AIR QUALITY THAT YOU ARE PRODUCING AT THE PRESENT TIME HAS BEEN SHOWN TO CAUSE DISEASE. WE'D LIKE TO KNOW WHERE THE FIGURES ARE ON THAT AND THE STUDIES FROM THE UCLA STUDY AND WHY WERE THEY NOT INCLUDED.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00001-36 regarding the UCLA study, Response to Comment PC00599-5 regarding jet exhaust, Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

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

PHM00009-9

Comment:

TABLES A5.10, A5.11 AND A5.12 DON'T APPEAR TO BE EVEN INCLUDED. THAT'S ONLY ONE SECTION -- THAT'S ONLY ONE SECTION THAT'S NOT INCLUDED IN A FLAWED PLAN.

Response:

The comment is unclear as to where the referenced tables can be found. There are no Tables A5.10, A5.11, or A5.12 within the Draft EIS/EIR or the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHM00010 Mackenbach, Fred City of Palos Verdes Estates 6/9/2001

PHM00010-1

Comment:

YES, MY NAME IS FRED MACKENBACH, I'M A CITY COUNCILMAN FOR THE CITY OF PALOS VERDES ESTATES, AND ALSO REPRESENT US AT COG, WHICH IS MADE UP OF 15 CITIES IN THE SOUTH BAY AS WELL AS THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES HARBOR GATEWAY AREA.

YOU AND YOUR MASTER PLAN HAVE DONE A WONDERFUL JOB OF UNITING THE CITIES THAT MAKE UP COG. IT'S DONE SO WELL, THAT WE HAVE PUT TOGETHER A PHENOMENAL TEAM OF PEOPLE WHO WILL BE SUBMITTING AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT TO LAWA.

WHY DID WE GO THIS ROUTE? I THINK IT'S VERY SIMPLE. IN 1984, THE AIRPORT WAS DESIGNED FOR 40 MILLION PEOPLE. LAST YEAR WE PUT 68 MILLION THROUGH IT, AS BEST I CAN TELL, AND I MADE THE CALCULATION THAT'S A 70 PERCENT INCREASE, AND NOW WE WANT TO GO TO 89? IF WE DO THAT, AND WE'VE USED THE SAME TYPE OF LOGIC OR EXPECT THE SAME FROM LAWA, WE'LL HAVE 151 MILLION PEOPLE GOING THROUGH THAT AIRPORT, AND I HOPE THE PEOPLE IN THIS AUDIENCE REMEMBER THOSE NUMBERS. AND ALSO, WE HAVEN'T EVEN TALKED ABOUT THE ADDED IMPACT OF THE FREIGHT AND CARGO.

Response:

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

PHM00010-2

Comment:

IN THE SOUTH BAY, WE ARE SICK AND TIRED OF THE OVERFLIGHTS, BOTH THE TURBO PROPS DURING THE DAY, AND WE ARE SICK AND TIRED OF THE AIR FREIGHTERS, CHINA AIRLINES IS ONE OF THEM, THAT ARE TAKING OFF TO THE EAST, BECAUSE THEY ARE OVERLOADED, IT'S ADVANTAGEOUS FOR THEM TO DO THAT, AND THEN CIRCLING BACK OVER THE PENINSULA AND AWAKENING A LOT OF OUR RESIDENTS AT NIGHT. YOU ARE ATTACKING OUR ENVIRONMENT AND YOU ARE ATTACKING THE PROPERTY VALUES OF THE AREA WHERE WE HAVE THE OVERFLIGHTS.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor may be affected by easterly takeoffs at night that circle back to the west on their departures to Asia. LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction to alleviate that situation by making over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. As noted by the noise abatement procedures delineated in Topical Response TR-N-6, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather or wind conditions require east traffic flow. Additionally, for easterly arrivals at night, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.2 regarding east flow operations at night. For information about overflights of the South Bay communities by traffic taking off to the west, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. Aircraft noise mitigation

3. Comments and Responses

was described in Section 4.2.8 of the Draft EIS/EIR beginning on page 4-216. Mitigation measures for road traffic, construction equipment, and automated people mover noise were provided in Section 4.1.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR beginning on page 4-78. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR also provided mitigation measures for aircraft noise in Sections 4.1.8 and 4.2.8. Refer to Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values.

PHM00010-3

Comment:

OUR REPORT, WHICH WILL ADDRESS THE OVERFLIGHTS, THE POLLUTION, WHICH OTHER PEOPLE HAVE ADDRESSED, AND THE OTHER MAJOR ISSUES, WILL BE ADDRESSED BY THIS GROUP THAT WE HAVE HIRED, AND THEY'RE A DYNAMITE GROUP, IN GREAT DETAIL, AND YOUR PLAN IS FLAWED.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00011 Wilson, Linda

City of Manhattan Beach

6/9/2001

PHM00011-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS LINDA WILSON, I'M A COUNCILMEMBER HERE IN MANHATTAN BEACH, I AM ALSO CHAIR OF THE SOUTH BAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT WHICH IS A 15-CITY ORGANIZATION, PLUS PARTS OF LOS ANGELES THAT HAVE COME TOGETHER TO SOLVE MUTUAL PROBLEMS AND SEEK COMMON GOALS.

WE HAVE SOME REAL CONCERNS ABOUT THIS DRAFT THAT HAS BEEN PRESENTED TO US. WE'RE CONCERNED ABOUT THE GROUND TRAFFIC CONGESTION, WE'RE CONCERNED ABOUT AIR QUALITY ISSUES, NOISE AND SAFETY.

Response:

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

PHM00011-2

Comment:

A MORE COMPLETE REPORT WILL FOLLOW MY PRESENTATION TODAY, BUT JUST BRIEFLY, I WANTED TO INDICATE SOME OF OUR CONCERNS.

WE FEEL THAT THERE IS AN IMPROPER BASELINE USED IN THE DRAFT. LAWA USES THREE DIFFERENT BASE LINES TO CONCEAL THE TRUE IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT.

Response:

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

PHM00011-3**Comment:**

NOISE IMPACTS. THE DRAFT DOES NOT ANALYZE NOR DISCLOSE ANY CUMULATIVE NOISE IMPACTS THAT THE PROJECT WILL HAVE ON THE SOUTH BAY COMMUNITIES.

Response:

The commentor's annoyance with flights over the South Bay is acknowledged. The commentor is correct in identifying that no over-flight noise levels are identified for the Manhattan Beach area. They were not addressed because projected noise levels in Manhattan Beach would be below the levels of significance defined by the Federal and State regulations. Federal Aviation Regulations define compatible land use impacts based on noise from aviation activities, using the 65 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), or a 1.5 CNEL increase in existing areas of 65 CNEL, as the impact thresholds for noise sensitive uses. For California evaluations, the Caltrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, provides noise and safety compatibility criteria for review of development near airports. The suggested noise compatibility criteria calls for no new residential development to be located within the 65 CNEL contour. South Bay communities such as Manhattan Beach are not located in the 65 CNEL for existing conditions or any of the identified future build or no project/no action alternatives. Noise levels at locations outside the 65 CNEL contours were further addressed in Section 5, Location Impact Analysis in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report. Therefore, no further noise impacts analysis was necessary. For additional information on noise effects beyond the area of significance, please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-2.2 regarding use of the 65 CNEL to determine significant impacts. Additionally, for more information on the South Bay see Response to Comment PC00552-12.

PHM00011-4**Comment:**

AND SURFACE TRAFFIC. THE DRAFT BARELY CONSIDERS TRAFFIC IN THE SOUTH BAY AT ALL.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PHM00011-5**Comment:**

AIR QUALITY. THE DRAFT RECOGNIZES THE EXISTENCE OF SPECIFIC UNMITIGATABLE AIR QUALITY IMPACTS BUT PROPOSES TO DELAY A COMPLETE ANALYSIS OF THESE IMPACTS UNTIL THE FINAL EIS/EIR, WHICH MAKES IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR THE PUBLIC TO FREELY ANALYZE THE PROJECT'S AIR QUALITY IMPACTS AND AIR SPACE.

Response:

This comment is essentially the same as Comment PC01958-16. Please see Response to Comment PC01958-16.

PHM00011-6**Comment:**

THE DRAFT TREATS AIRCRAFT OVERFLYING THE SOUTH BAY COMMUNITIES AS IF THE AIRCRAFT IMMEDIATELY ENTER A BLACK HOLE OR DROP OFF THE RUNWAY AFTER TAKEOFF. NOT ONLY DOES THE DRAFT IGNORE IMPORTANT AIR SPACE ISSUES, BUT WHEN IT DOES SUPPLY DATA, IT USES INACCURATE, OUTDATED SOURCES AND CONSULTANT OPINION.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to Comment AL00051-60. Please see Response to Comment AL00051-60 regarding the airspace and flight path analysis.

PHM00011-7

Comment:

THE SOUTH BAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT HAS PASSED A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING A REGIONAL SOLUTION TO SOLVING THE AIR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AIR BASIS. WE FEEL IT'S ONLY EQUITABLE THAT OTHER PARTS OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ABSORB THEIR TRAFFIC NEEDS INSTEAD OF PUTTING ALL OF THEIR DIRTY LAUNDRY IN OUR AIRPORT.

Response:

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

PHM00011-8

Comment:

AS I SAID, MORE DETAILED COMMENTS WILL FOLLOW, BUT THANK YOU FOR YOUR LISTENING TO US TODAY.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00012 Aldinger, Jim City of Manhattan Beach 6/9/2001

PHM00012-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS JIM ALDINGER, I'M A COUNCILMEMBER WITH THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH, AND THERE ARE MANY FLAWS IN THIS EIR. THE FIRST IS THE USE OF A BASELINE YEAR, MULTIPLE USES OF BASELINE YEARS TO BASICALLY SELECTIVELY USE THAT TIME OR THAT BASELINE TO MINIMIZE THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FOR THE DIFFERENT BASELINE YEARS. THEY USE IT PRETTY MUCH TO THEIR ADVANTAGE WHENEVER THEY WANT TO.

Response:

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

PHM00012-2**Comment:**

THE NEXT BIG THING IS THE DRAFT EIR SHOULD TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE LATEST SCAG REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN. THE REGIONAL PLAN IS REALLY THE ONLY WAY THAT THIS REGION IS GOING TO BE ABLE TO TAKE ON THE ADDED TRANSPORTATION NEEDS THAT WE HAVE. THERE'S NO REASON THAT ORANGE COUNTY SHOULD NOT PICK UP THEIR USE, AND THE INLAND EMPIRE, WHICH IS WHERE MOST OF THE POPULATION GROWTH IS HAPPENING, SHOULD PICK UP THEIR FAIR SHARE.

Response:

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

PHM00012-3**Comment:**

TRAFFIC. THE AREAS TO THE SOUTH TOTALLY NOT MENTIONED. IN MANHATTAN BEACH HERE ESPECIALLY, THE HIGHLAND AVENUE, ALL THE IMPACTS DOWN ALONG THE BEACH FOR US WILL BE RATHER SIGNIFICANT. THE 405 IS ALREADY HEAVILY IMPACTED.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology for a discussion of the study area and identification of facilities analyzed.

PHM00012-4**Comment:**

THROW IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PLAYA VISTA, WHICH IS NOT INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT, AND THE 405 IS JUST GOING TO BE MUCH WORSE THAN IT IS RIGHT NOW.

Response:

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

PHM00012-5**Comment:**

NOISE, THE OVERFLIGHTS, ESPECIALLY ALONG OUR SOUTHERN COAST, THE IMPACTS FROM THAT ARE JUST TOO GREAT TO NOT MENTION IN THIS REPORT.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The commentor's annoyance with flights over the South Bay is acknowledged. Please see Response to Comment PC00552-2 for more information on noise impacts in South Bay. Additionally, please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-2.2 regarding use of the 65 CNEL to determine significant impacts.

PHM00012-6

Comment:

AND THEN AS FAR AS AIR POLLUTION, THERE'S JUST SO MANY DIFFERENT THINGS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN MENTIONED, THAT HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THIS, THERE ARE ALMOST TOO MANY TO MENTION, BUT THE -- I GUESS THE ONE THING IS ALL THE TRAFFIC IMPACTS FROM THE GROUND TRAFFIC, NOT INCLUDING THAT IN THIS REPORT IS, TO ME, A MAJOR FLAW.

Response:

Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the traffic impacts of each Master Plan alternative. Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the impacts of air pollutants from several sources, including from ground traffic, for each Master Plan alternative.

PHM00012-7

Comment:

SO I WILL DEFINITELY WANT TO INCLUDE MORE WRITTEN COMMENTS, AND I THINK HOPEFULLY, FOR ME ANYWAY, WE -- SINCE WE HAVE A NEW MAYOR NOW, THAT THIS WILL, IN L.A., THAT THAT WILL HAVE A BIG IMPACT ON US.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00013 Mc Taggart, John City of Rancho Palos Verdes 6/9/2001

PHM00013-1

Comment:

I'M JOHN MC TAGGART, MAYOR PRO TEM OF THE CITY OF RANCHO PALOS VERDES. A FEW YEARS AGO, THE FAA FORMED A SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TASK FORCE TO IDENTIFY PROBLEMS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE EXISTING PROBLEMS WITH LAX. WE WERE LED DOWN THE PRIMROSE PATH TO THINK THAT THIS WAS GOING TO RESULT IN SOLUTIONS, THEN THE FAA ABANDONED US.

TO THEIR CREDIT, THE LAX PEOPLE HAVE FORMED A ROUND TABLE FOR THE COMMUNITY TO TRY AND MITIGATE THESE MEASURES. I PERSONALLY DON'T THINK THAT EXPANSION OF ANY KIND SHOULD TAKE PLACE IF WE CAN'T MITIGATE WHAT'S THERE NOW. MY RESIDENTS CAN'T GET ANY SLEEP, THEY HAVE HEAVY JETS GOING OVER THEIR HEADS AT NIGHT. WE PUT UP WITH TURBO PROP TRAFFIC THAT WAS SUPPOSED TO BE MOVED OFFSHORE, BUT THE AIRLINES DIDN'T WANT TO DO IT, SO IT DIDN'T HAPPEN. WE'RE NOT TOO HAPPY ABOUT THAT.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PHM00013-2

Comment:

I ECHO THE COMMENTS OF FRED MACKENBACH AND OF SUPERVISOR KNABE ON THE FLAWS IN THIS PARTICULAR DOCUMENT. MY CITY'S COMMENTS THAT WERE MADE SEVERAL YEARS AGO WERE NOT ANSWERED. MY CITY WILL SUBMIT THEIR COMMENTS, OFFICIAL COMMENTS, BY THE DEADLINE.

I HAVE ONE FURTHER COMMENT. I DIDN'T NEED THREE MINUTES AND I KNOW I DIDN'T, BUT I JUST WANTED TO TELL YOU THAT THE EIS/EIR IS SO BADLY FLAWED, AS BEEN POINTED OUT BY OTHER SPEAKERS, THAT YOUR AGENCY SHOULD BE EMBARRASSED TO HAVE PUBLISHED IT.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00014 Hardison, Dee

City of Torrance

6/9/2001

PHM00014-1

Comment:

I'M DEE HARDISON, I'M THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE, BOARD MEMBER OF THE SOUTH BAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT, AND ALSO I'M A REGIONAL COUNCILMEMBER OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS THAT WAS INVOLVED WITH THAT VOTE SOME FEW WEEKS AGO.

TODAY I'M SPEAKING FOR THE SOUTH BAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT, AND YOU KNOW WHO WE ARE. THE CITY OF TORRANCE WILL BE PRESENTING OUR COMMENTS IN WRITING BY THE DEADLINE.

A COUPLE OF COMMENTS, THERE ARE A COUPLE OF AREAS THAT I WANT TO COMMENT ON, AND I GUESS IT'S SOME TRUST. WE, SOUTH BAY CITIES, WE TRUSTED LAX THAT WHEN THEIR POPULATION GREW BEYOND THE 40 MILLION, THAT THEY WOULD TAKE CARE OF THE MITIGATIONS THAT WERE HAPPENING TO OUR COMMUNITIES SOUTH OF THE AIRPORT.

Response:

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

PHM00014-2

Comment:

WE HAD TRUSTED THAT THOSE NOISE IMPACTS THAT WE FACE NOW, THE CITY OF TORRANCE FACES THEM OVER OUR SOUTHERN BORDER, AS WITH THE PALOS VERDES PENINSULA, YOU'VE HEARD THAT THE CITIES ALONG THE COAST FACE THOSE, AND THEN A COUPLE OF YEARS AGO, SURPRISINGLY, SOME WORK HAPPENED AT THE AIRPORT AND THEY STARTED ALLOWING SOME OF THOSE LATE CARGO PLANES TO FLY THE OPPOSITE WAY, AND SO NOW REGULARLY FROM 12:30 TO TWO IN THE MORNING, OUR RESIDENTS ARE DISTURBED AND WOKE UP BY THOSE PLANES.

Response:

Living in Torrance, the commentor may be affected by easterly takeoffs circling back to the west on their departures to Asia. LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction to alleviate that situation by making over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. During a recent 18 month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. As noted by the noise abatement procedures delineated in Topical Response TR-N-7, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather or

3. Comments and Responses

wind conditions require east traffic flow. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. Nighttime single event noise impacts and mitigation were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting information in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1.

PHM00014-3

Comment:

WE TRUSTED LAX AND FAA THAT THEY WOULD TAKE CARE OF THOSE. THOSE HAVE NOT HAPPENED. SO I WOULD TELL YOU THAT AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED, YOU HAVE TO COME BACK AND PUT -- SHOW US THAT YOU CAN TAKE CARE OF THE PROBLEMS YOU HAVE RIGHT NOW BEFORE YOU LOOK TO DO ANY EXPANSION OF ANY KIND AT THE AIRPORT. YOU HAVE TO RESOLVE WHAT YOU HAVE. YOU HAVE NOT ADDRESSED IT, TO MY THINKING, IN THE EIR/EIS THAT YOU HAVE SUBMITTED.

Response:

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

PHM00014-4

Comment:

I WOULD ALSO INDICATE THAT WE HAVE A REAL CONCERN ABOUT TRAFFIC SOUTH OF THE AIRPORT. WE ARE VERY LIMITED IN OUR FREEWAYS DOWN THAT WAY AND ANY IMPACTS THAT YOU DO NOT ADDRESS WITH FURTHER EXPANSION OF TRAFFIC AT THE AIRPORT WILL COME ONTO ALL OF OUR NEIGHBORHOOD STREETS, AND THAT HAS NOT BEEN ADDRESSED SUFFICIENTLY, VERY FLAWED IN THE EIR/EIS.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PHM00014-5

Comment:

AT THIS POINT I WOULD SAY THAT THERE'S NO WAY THAT THIS REPORT CAN BE ACCEPTED AND THAT AT THIS POINT YOU SHOULD LOOK AT NO PROJECT TILL YOU SOLVE THE PROBLEMS YOU HAVE RIGHT NOW.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00015	Wernick, Nancy	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHM00015-1

Comment:

I AM BACK AGAIN, THIS TIME I GET TO SPEAK FOR PEOPLE IN MY COMMUNITY EL SEGUNDO WHICH HAS BEEN HEAVILY IMPACTED BY THE AIRPORT. WE SUPPORT A NO ACTION/NO PROJECT OF ALL THE PLANS THAT HAVE BEEN PLACED IN FRONT OF US, BUT WE ACTUALLY SUPPORT A REGIONAL APPROACH WHERE EVERYONE BEARS A LITTLE BIT OF THE WEALTH AND EVERYONE BEARS A LITTLE BIT OF THE PAIN INSTEAD OF A FEW SELECT CITIES.

Response:

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

PHM00015-2**Comment:**

AS I WAS COMING IN HERE TODAY, A GENTLEMAN SAID TO ME, "WELL, THIS IS THE WAY GOVERNMENT WORKS, WE'LL ALL BE SHUFFLED IN, WE'LL ALL SAY A FEW THINGS THAT WE DON'T LIKE, YOU'LL LISTEN PATIENTLY, NOT SO PATIENTLY AFTER A WHILE, AND THEN YOU WILL GO OFF AND MAKE THE DECISION YOU WERE GOING TO MAKE IN THE FIRST PLACE."

I AM HOPING THAT HE IS INCORRECT, BECAUSE A LIE IS AS POWERFUL AS THE TRUTH IF YOU GET PEOPLE TO BELIEVE IT, AND IF YOU GET PEOPLE TO BELIEVE THIS EIR, THAT IT WILL NOT DO MORE DAMAGE, THAT ONE LIFE OF A CHILD IN EL SEGUNDO OR A CHILD IN WESTCHESTER OR A CHILD IN INGLEWOOD IS NOT NEARLY AS PRECIOUS AS ONE LIFE OF A CHILD IN PALMDALE, IF EXPOSING PEOPLE TO THE POLLUTANTS, THE NOISE AND THE DANGERS THAT YOU WILL EXPOSE US TO IS YOUR WAY OF SAYING THIS IS THE TRUTH, THEN YOU HAVE A PRETTY POWERFUL LIE, AND I'M HOPING THAT MOST PEOPLE DON'T BELIEVE IT.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00015-3**Comment:**

FOR THE FAA, PLEASE CONSIDER CAPPING THE NUMBER OF FLIGHTS COMING INTO ANY AIRPORT, NOT JUST LAX. YOU WILL MEET THIS RESISTANCE NO MATTER WHERE YOU GO. UNTIL WE LEARN TO LIVE WITHIN OUR MEANS, WE'RE LIKE A CHILD WITH A CREDIT CARD. YOU NEVER GIVE A 15-YEAR-OLD A CREDIT CARD WITHOUT HAVING ANY CREDIT AND TELL THEM TO GO GET WHAT THEY WANT. THAT'S WHAT WE HAVE ALLOWED AIRPORTS TO DO, AND EVERY TIME THAT WE COME TO YOU TO ASK FOR SOLUTIONS, WE ARE, "IT'S NOT THE AIRPORT, IT'S THE FAA." "IT'S NOT THE FAA, IT'S THE AIRLINES."

I'VE DECIDED THAT IN ORDER TO RULE THE WORLD, I AM GETTING TOGETHER A GROUP OF PEOPLE, WE'RE BUYING AN AIRLINE AND WE WILL BE BACK.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01018-29 regarding the authority of FAA and LAWA to limit future activity at airports. As described therein, Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan is designed for an activity level comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHM00016	Poss, Diana	Central City Association	6/9/2001
-----------------	--------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------

PHM00016-1**Comment:**

GOOD AFTERNOON. I SUSPECT I WON'T BE VERY POPULAR HERE BECAUSE I'M THE FIRST PERSON WHO'S COMING FORWARD TO ACTUALLY SUPPORT THE LAWA PROPOSAL, BUT MY NAME IS DIANA POSS AND I AM A DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS FOR THE CENTRAL CITY ASSOCIATION.

THE CENTRAL CITY ASSOCIATION IS A 300-MEMBER BUSINESS ADVOCACY ASSOCIATION REPRESENTING OVER 250,000 EMPLOYEES IN DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES AND THE REGION.

3. Comments and Responses

THE CENTRAL CITY ASSOCIATION STRONGLY BELIEVES THAT THE VITALITY AND HEALTH OF THE REGION'S ECONOMY IS DIRECTLY LINKED TO THE MODERNIZATION OF LAX.

AS PEOPLE HEAR ME TESTIFY TO THE CAPPING OF THE AIRPORT'S MILLIONS OF ANNUAL PASSENGERS, OR MAP, THAT PASS THROUGH LAX, WE BELIEVE THEY IGNORE THE SIMPLE FACT THAT A CAP WILL SIGNIFICANTLY STUNT FUTURE GROWTH OF OUR ECONOMY THROUGH THE LOSS OF POTENTIALLY THOUSANDS OF JOBS DIRECTLY AND INDIRECTLY RELATED TO THE AIRPORT. PROJECTIONS STATE THAT BY 2015 A POTENTIAL LOSS OF UP TO \$22 BILLION CAN BE REALIZED.

AS WE PREPARE FOR OUR FUTURE WITH TECHNICAL INFRASTRUCTURE, AS MEDICAL RESEARCH CONTINUES TO MAKE TREMENDOUS LEAPS FORWARD IN DISCOVERING, AS AN ENTREPRENEUR CONTEMPLATES WHETHER OR NOT TO OPEN A SMALL BUSINESS, WE MUST NOT LOSE SIGHT OF OUR BASIC ECONOMIC NEED FOR MOBILITY IN DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES BASIN AND THE REGION.

AND YET, AS IT WAS STATED SO SUCCINCTLY BY PERSONS REPRESENTING THE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS AND AIRLINE PILOTS ASSOCIATIONS IN OTHER HEARINGS ON THIS ISSUE, ECONOMIC VITALITY SHOULD NOT BE OUR ONLY REASON FOR MODERNIZING LAX, OUR PRIMARY REASON SHOULD BE SAFETY. AS OUR REGION CONTINUES TO EXPAND IN POPULATION, A 78 MAP PLAN WILL NOT BE SATISFACTORY FOR SAFE COMMISSIONS FOR AIRCRAFT MOVEMENT AT LAX. WE RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES ADOPT THE LAWA-RECOMMENDED 89 MAP TO EXTEND NOT JUST THE LIFE OF OUR VERY STRONG ECONOMY, BUT THE LIVES OF PASSENGERS AS WELL.

LOS ANGELES IS A WORLD CLASS CITY AND AN INTERNATIONAL HUB. A WORLD CLASS CITY AND AN INTERNATIONAL HUB DESERVES A WORLD CLASS AIRPORT DESIGNED TO HANDLE THE ECONOMIC GROWTH THAT WILL CONTINUE TO FLOW WEST BY WAY OF LAX.

OF COURSE LAX SHOULD NOT HANDLE THE ENTIRE BRUNT OF PASSENGERS AND CARGO. WE RECOGNIZE THAT A REGIONAL PLAN IS NECESSARY TO FACILITATE EASE OF USE TO AND FROM LAX AND THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES. THE LAX MASTER PLAN IS PART OF THAT REGIONAL PLAN AND WE SUPPORT LAWA'S STAFF RECOMMENDATION ALTERNATIVE C.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00017 Wenger, Bill

Kilroy Realty Corporation

6/9/2001

PHM00017-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS BILL WENGER, I'M THE DIRECTOR OF ASSET MANAGEMENT FOR KILROY REALTY AT 2250 IMPERIAL HIGHWAY IN EL SEGUNDO. I'M ALSO A RESIDENT OF EL SEGUNDO. KILROY REALTY OWNS AND MANAGES MILLIONS OF SQUARE FEET OF OFFICE BUILDINGS IN EL SEGUNDO, WEST LOS ANGELES AND SANTA MONICA AND HAS BEEN A NEIGHBOR OF LAX FOR OVER 50 YEARS. TWO OF OUR PROPERTIES ARE LOCATED DIRECTLY ACROSS THE STREET FROM LAX.

KILROY IS RECOMMENDING THE STUDY OF AN ALTERNATIVE PRIOR TO FINALIZING THE EIR/EIS AND WE OFFER THE FOLLOWING OBSERVATIONS: AS WRITTEN AND AS NOTED BY MAYOR HARDISON EARLIER, THE EIR DOES NOT CALL FOR MITIGATION OF EXISTING TRAFFIC CONGESTION PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MASTER PLAN. WE ASK WHY NOT? WE URGE THAT THE TIMING OF THE TRAFFIC MITIGATIONS BE ADDRESSED AND STUDIED FURTHER IN THE EIR, BECAUSE THE AIRPORT IS OVERDUE IN MITIGATING THE CONSEQUENCE OF THE PREVIOUS EXPANSION.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PHM00017-2**Comment:**

KILROY IS INTIMATELY FAMILIAR WITH TRAFFIC PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNCONSTRAINED GROWTH OF LAX, IS RECOMMENDING THAT A SYSTEM OF REMOTE PASSENGER TERMINALS BE STUDIED AS AN ALTERNATIVE. WE BELIEVE THAT THE DEVELOPMENT OF OFF-SITE TERMINALS WILL GO A LONG WAY TO MITIGATE THE EXISTING TRAFFIC CONGESTION IN THE AIRPORT AREA, ESPECIALLY IN THE CENTRAL TERMINAL AREA. LAWA HAS PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED OFF-AIRPORT REMOTE FACILITIES FOR PARKING AND CHECK-IN BUT NEVER FORMALLY FOLLOWED THROUGH ON STUDYING A REGIONAL SYSTEM OF SUCH FACILITIES.

WE BELIEVE THAT LAWA MAY BE MISSING AN OPPORTUNITY TO STUDY A FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVE AND SHOULD DO SO AS PART OF THE MASTER PLAN EIR ANALYSIS. KILROY IS RESEARCHING REMOTE TERMINALS SERVING OTHER AIRPORTS AND WILL BE HAPPY TO SHARE ITS WORK AND FINDINGS WITH LAWA. THE REMOTE TERMINALS WILL BE SIMILAR BUT MUCH MORE COMPREHENSIVE AND SOPHISTICATED THAN THOSE PROPOSED TO ENHANCE THE VAN NUYS FLYWAY.

THESE REMOTE TERMINALS WILL ALLOW PASSENGERS ARRIVING BY FLIGHT-ONLY VEHICLES, RENT-A-CARS AND ENHANCED MASS TRANSPORTATION TO CHECK IN BAGGAGE, GET BOARDING PASSES AND TAKE AUTOMATED PEOPLE MOVERS TO THE LAX TO BOARD THE AIRPLANES. THESE SOPHISTICATED REMOTE TERMINALS COULD BE PLACED LOCALLY AT THE CONTINENTAL CITIES SITE AT MANCHESTER SQUARE, AT THE LOT ADJACENT TO THE TERMINAL NUMBER ONE LOCATION NEAR THE PLAYA VISTA PROJECTS AS WELL AS SPREAD OUT THROUGHOUT THE REGION SUCH AS PLACES SUCH AS DOWNTOWN L.A. CONVENTION CENTER AND AT HOTELS.

WITH THE AUTOMATED PEOPLE MOVER, REMOTE TERMINALS WILL GO A LONG WAY TO MITIGATE EXISTING ROADWAY CONGESTION IN THE LAX AREA ELIMINATING THOUSANDS OF VEHICULAR TRIPS A DAY NEAR LAX. THIS ALTERNATIVE WOULD FACILITATE AND AUGMENT THE REGIONAL AIR PASSENGER HANDLING PLAN AND COULD BE IMPLEMENTED WITHIN THREE TO FIVE YEARS AT A COST MUCH LESS THAN THE PROPOSED PLAN. WE BELIEVE THAT THE REMOTE PASSENGER TERMINAL DEVELOPMENT SPREAD THROUGHOUT THE REGION IS A VIABLE ALTERNATIVE AND WE ASK THAT IT BE STUDIED.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00050-6 regarding Flyaway service.

PHM00018**Martin, Aileen****None Provided****6/9/2001****PHM00018-1****Comment:**

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS AILEEN MARTIN. I'M HERE TODAY BECAUSE I'M A RESIDENT OF HERMOSA BEACH AND I HAVE BEEN FOR 30 YEARS. I'M ALSO A TEACHER IN THE LENNOX SCHOOL DISTRICT AND I'VE BEEN A TEACHER THERE FOR 25 YEARS.

FOR 11 YEARS I TAUGHT AT A SCHOOL CALLED LARCH WHICH WAS -- WHICH HAD TO BE REBUILT AS AN UNDERGROUND SCHOOL DUE TO AIRPORT NOISE. I TAUGHT FOR FIVE YEARS ALSO AT FELTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. THIS IS A SCHOOL THAT THE AQMD LISTED AS THE MOST CONTAMINATED SCHOOL IN L.A. COUNTY DUE TO ITS PROXIMITY TO LAX, THE 405 AND THE 105 FREEWAYS. IN ADDITION, ALL THE SCHOOLS IN LENNOX HAVE WHAT -- I'M

3. Comments and Responses

LEARNING THIS NEW TERM "COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVELS," OR CNEL'S, OF 65. FELTON'S IS AT 75 DECIBELS AND 90 WHEN THE PLANES ARE LANDING.

Response:

Comment noted. Existing noise levels and project-related noise impacts at Felton Elementary School were included within the noise analysis completed for the proposed Master Plan. The subject school was included as noise sensitive receptor location "PBS035" shown on Figure 4.1-2 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Existing and future noise levels, in terms of Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), can be generally determined in reviewing the noise contour figures presented throughout Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. A more exact assessment of the noise levels at that location can be seen in Table S13 of Appendix S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As indicated therein, noise levels at that location were 72.0 CNEL in the 1996 baseline conditions, 71.7 in the Year 2000 conditions, and are estimated to range from 69.8 CNEL to 74.2 CNEL in 2015 under the four build alternatives.

PHM00018-2

Comment:

NOW, WHAT I JUST TAUGHT MY SEVENTH GRADERS AT THE MIDDLE SCHOOL A FEW WEEKS AGO WHEN I WAS TEACHING THEM ABOUT THEIR EARS IS THAT WHEN YOU'VE GOT TO 115, YOU'VE GOT PERMANENT EAR DAMAGE. OUR PLANES -- THE PLANES FROM LAX LAND, AS THEY COME IN, THEY'RE ONLY 200 FEET ABOVE OUR SCHOOLS WHEN THEY'RE LANDING.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding the fact that existing and future noise levels at and around LAX are projected to be well below the OSHA and CalOSHA standards that serve to protect against hearing loss. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings and school disruption associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1.

PHM00018-3

Comment:

TWICE IN MY TIME IN LENNOX -- WELL, I'LL JUST EXPLAIN ONE TIME, THERE WAS A HUGE CHUNK OF ICE THAT FELL OFF THE BOTTOM OF A PLANE AND LANDED ON OUR SCHOOLYARD. IF THAT HAD HIT A KID, THE KID WOULD HAVE DIED. IT'S REALLY SCARY.

Response:

Comment noted. There is occasionally minor liquid leaks from aircraft service areas such as galleys and rest rooms. The ice formed from such leakage normally melts as the aircraft descends into warmer air, though in some instances it may detach from the aircraft, most often falling harmlessly in remote areas. There is no statistical correlation between these incidents and the numbers of operations at airports.

PHM00018-4

Comment:

YOU KNOW, I HAVE -- I KNOW TWO TEACHERS SINCE I'VE BEEN THERE THAT HAVE LEFT WITH PERMANENT EAR DAMAGE, DAISY BOOKER AND HAL WAGNER, AND THAT MAKES ME WONDER, WHAT ABOUT OUR KIDS? ARE THEY SUFFERING THE SAME FATE? EVERY MINUTE AND 16 SECONDS A PLANE FLIES OVER OUR HEADS IN LENNOX FROM SEVEN IN THE MORNING WHEN I GET THERE AT SCHOOL TO 10:00 AT NIGHT, SO THAT'S 15 HOURS A DAY. WE'RE TRYING TO TEACH READING AGAINST HORRENDOUS ODDS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-246 regarding the fact that existing and future noise levels at and around LAX are projected to be well below the OSHA and CalOSHA standards that serve to protect against hearing loss. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00038-11 regarding the impact of high noise levels on children. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings and school disruption associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1.

PHM00018-5

Comment:

BESIDES THE ONE UNDERGROUND SCHOOL I'VE TALKED ABOUT, MOFFETT, THAT WE HAVE IN LENNOX, WE'RE IN THE PROCESS OF BUILDING TWO MORE UNDERGROUND SCHOOLS BECAUSE OF THE PROBLEMS WITH LAX BECAUSE OF THE NOISE. SO WE HAVE SIX SCHOOLS, 7,200 KIDS, AND NOT ONE WINDOW IN THE ENTIRE SCHOOL DISTRICT.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts, including as related to 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.

PHM00018-6

Comment:

THERE'S -- I'M GOING TO PARAPHRASE THIS TO SPEED UP, THERE'S A CORNELL UNIVERSITY STUDY BY EVANS AND NOXELL IN 1997 THAT FOUND A DISTINCT CORRELATION BETWEEN A KID'S ABILITY TO READ AND THE NOISE LEVELS THAT THEY CHRONICALLY LIVE WITH, IT'S A DEFINITE PREDICTOR OF LACK OF ABILITY TO READ.

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.

PHM00018-7

Comment:

JUST AS A RESIDENT OF HERMOSA, I'VE NOTICED HERE IN MY COMMUNITY, MY QUIET LITTLE COMMUNITY OF HERMOSA BEACH, I HEAR A LOT MORE AIRPLANE NOISE THAN I USED TO IN THE -- MY WORST FEAR IS THAT MY BEAUTIFUL COMMUNITY IS GOING TO END UP LIKE THE PLAYA DEL REY GHOST TOWN ALONG VISTA DEL MAR.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02203-41. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase associated with the project alternatives.

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00019 Czyzyk, Joe

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00019-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS JOE CZYZYK. FIRST, LET ME TELL YOU WHO I AM. I AM THE CEO OF A COMPANY CALLED MERCURY AIR GROUP WHICH OPERATES AT LAX AND NUMEROUS SOUTHLAND AIRPORTS. I'M ALSO VICE PRESIDENT OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES TAXICAB COMMISSION, AND IN ADDITION TO THAT, I'M A RESIDENT OF PLAYA DEL REY.

THE LAX MASTER PLAN IS THE ONLY SOLUTION FOR THE RESIDENTS, BUSINESSES AND THEIR COMMUNITIES SURROUNDING LAX, ESPECIALLY SINCE IT DOES CONTEMPLATE A REGIONAL AIRPORT SOLUTION. YOU KNOW, THE BATTLE LINES ARE DRAWN, THE PICTURE IS MURKY. THE VICTIMIZED COMMUNITY, THE RESIDENTS, THE ELECTED OFFICIALS IN ONE CAMP, OF COURSE MIGHTY BUSINESS AND LABOR IN THE OTHER.

NOW, THIS IS A DISTORTED PICTURE. THE REGIONAL AIRPORT SOLUTION WON'T HAPPEN OVERNIGHT, BUT THE GROWTH OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S VIBRANT ECONOMY IS GROWING AS I SPEAK. THE ONLY CURRENT OUTLET FOR THAT GROWTH IS LAX, AND WHICH PERSON, POLITICIAN OR GROUP WANTS TO HAMPER OUR ECONOMIC GROWTH WHILE WE WAIT FOR MANY YEARS FOR A FUNCTIONAL REGIONAL AIRPORT SOLUTION TO BE ACCOMPLISHED?

I'VE LIVED IN PLAYA DEL REY FOR 11 YEARS, WORKED IN WESTCHESTER SINCE 1985, PAY A LOT OF TAXES. I HEAR THE JETS LOUD AND CLEAR IN MY BEDROOM AS THEY TAKE OFF FROM THE NORTH RUNWAYS AT LAX. I EVEN HEAR THEM OCCASIONALLY THROUGH MY DOUBLY-INSULATED WINDOW IN MY CAR AND IN MY OFFICE. I WOULD THINK THAT PERHAPS I WOULD HAVE GOTTEN USED TO IT BY NOW. I HAVEN'T. AND THE LAST THING I WANT TO SEE IS MORE NOISE AND TRAFFIC IN MY COMMUNITY, BOTH RESIDENTIAL AND BUSINESS.

Response:

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

PHM00019-2

Comment:

THEN WHY DIDN'T I BECOME AN ANTI-LAX GROWTH PROPONENT? SIMPLY BECAUSE I'M A PRAGMATIST, SIMPLY BECAUSE I CAN'T SNAP MY FINGERS AND PRETEND LAX IS NOT HERE. CAN WE STOP THE AIRPORTS FROM GROWING? CAN WE STOP OUR LOCAL ECONOMY FROM GROWING? THE ANSWER IS NO. LAX WILL CONTINUE TO EXPAND ORGANICALLY EVEN WITHOUT A MASTER PLAN, MAKE NO MISTAKE OF IT. YOU CAN'T STOP THE AIRLINES FROM INCREASING FLIGHTS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00019-3

Comment:

WITHOUT OUR MASTER PLAN, COMMUNITIES SURROUNDING LAX WOULD EXPERIENCE EVER-INCREASING FREEWAY AND STREET CONGESTION AS WELL AS THE ADDED

POTENTIAL OF AIRCRAFT INVOLVED DISASTERS DUE TO HIGHER AND TIGHTER OPERATING PROXIMITIES. SHOULD WE COMPROMISE OR SHOULD WE WORK WITH THE MASTER PLAN PROCESS IN TANDEM WITH THE REGIONAL SOLUTION?

THE OBVIOUS SOLUTION TO ME AS A PRAGMATIST, IF WE WORK WITHIN THE MASTER PLAN PROCESS, THE CONGESTION ON THE RUNWAYS AND TAXIWAYS WILL BE IMPROVED BY ADDITIONAL TERMINALS, WE'LL HAVE HIGHER CAPACITY ACCESS IN AND OUT OF THE AIRPORT WHICH WILL BE CREATED BY A NEW RING ROAD WHICH WILL TAKE PRESSURE OFF OF SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD.

EVEN WITH ALL THE REGIONAL AIRPORT EXPANSION PLANS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT, THE ESTIMATES FOR GROWTH AT LAX WILL BE 90 MILLION PASSENGERS BY THE YEAR 2000. IT'S ONLY NINE YEARS FROM NOW.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00020

**De Deurwaerder,
Charles**

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00020-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS CHARLES DE DEURWAERDER, I'M 42 YEARS AN ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES EDUCATOR, FIVE YEARS WITH THE GOVERNMENT PLANNING, AND 17-AND-A-HALF YEARS IN PROFESSIONAL OFFICE PRACTICE IN SITE PLANNING AND LAND USE DEVELOPMENT. I'VE BEEN WORKING WITH LAX AND WITH THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES IN IDENTIFYING AND TRYING TO COME TO REASONABLE RESPONSES TO THE PROBLEMS OF EXPANDING AN AIRPORT HERE.

I WOULD FIRST OFF CALL ATTENTION TO THE FACT THAT OF THE 797 ISSUES RAISED DURING THE SCOPING PROCESS BY SOUTH BAY COMMUNITIES, I HAVE NOW READ THE FULL 12,000-PAGE REPORT AND I CAN FIND RESPONSES TO FEWER THAN 300 OF THOSE ISSUES. I'M SORRY, I FIND THE REPORT INADEQUATE TO ITS TASK.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00020-2

Comment:

I BROUGHT WITH ME, AND I'M PLANNING TO LEAVE A FULL PAPER RESPONSE TO CONCERNS, BUT I ONLY WANTED TO CALL ATTENTION TODAY TO THE FACT THAT ANYONE THAT HAS TRAVELED WESTWARD ON ANY OF THE ARTERIALS TOWARDS THE SOUTH BAY AREA, ANYONE THAT HAS COME DOWN OVER THE SEPULVEDA PASS IN A SOUTHBOUND DIRECTION HAS BEEN ABLE TO RECOGNIZE VERY DISTINCTIVELY HOW PLEASANT THE AREA IS WITHIN FOUR MILES OF THE COAST FROM SANTA MONICA DOWN TO PALOS VERDES. IT'S THE BEST LIVING ENVIRONMENT THAT ONE COULD POSSIBLY HOPE FOR IN THE ENTIRE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AREA. THAT LIVING ENVIRONMENT STANDS TO BE SPOILED BY EXPANDING ON ANY ADVERSE CONDITIONS THAT HAPPEN WITHIN THAT AREA.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00020-3

Comment:

WE'RE IN A PLACE THAT, ACCORDING TO MY THREE-DIMENSIONAL MAP OF THE LOS ANGELES BASIN, THE BAND OF PREVAILING AIR MOVEMENT TAKES ALL OF THE GENERATED POLLUTION FROM OUR REGION AND SPREADS IT RIGHT INTO THE ENTIRE BASIN. WE AFFECT THE REST OF THE LOS ANGELES BASIN. I WOULD URGE THAT THE DECISION MAKERS TAKE THAT INTO ACCOUNT AS THEY LOOK INTO EXPANDING OF ANY OF THE POLLUTANT GENERATORS AND WEATHER EFFECTORS THAT WE HAVE CURRENTLY LOCATED WITHIN THIS PRECIOUS, MOST PRECIOUS FOUR-MILE SPAN.

Response:

Comment noted. Air dispersion modeling takes into account local meteorological conditions.

PHM00021 Hilkey, Jason

Surfrider Foundation

6/9/2001

PHM00021-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS JASON HILKEY, I LIVE HERE IN MANHATTAN BEACH, 3525 POINSETTIA, I'M ALSO ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF SURFRIDER FOUNDATION, THE SOUTH BAY CHAPTER.

THIS EIR/EIS REMINDS ME OF THE ONE THAT WAS DONE FOR PLAYA VISTA. IT'S A JOKE, IT'S FLAWED, IT'S SELF-SERVING, IT DOESN'T LISTEN TO THE INTERESTS OF OTHER PEOPLE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00021-2

Comment:

THESE HEARINGS DON'T REALLY GO ANYWHERE, YOU JUST GET A CHANCE TO SAY WHAT YOU WANT TO SAY. IN SPITE OF THAT, I'M STILL GOING TO SAY WHAT I WANT TO SAY.

Response:

Comment noted. Responses to individual comments included in this public hearing testimony are provided below.

PHM00021-3

Comment:

WATER QUALITY. WE'RE CONCERNED ABOUT STORMWATER RUNOFF, IT'S THE NUMBER ONE POLLUTANT IN SANTA MONICA BAY. THE EIR DOES NOT REALLY ADDRESS THE WATER QUALITY TREATMENT SYSTEMS. IT MENTIONS THEM, IT DOES NOT SAY WHAT THEY WILL BE. WE WANT TO SEE A SOURCE POINTED WATER QUALITY TREATMENT SYSTEM FOR THE WET WEATHER SEASONS.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HWQ-2 regarding Master Plan Commitment HWQ-1 and compliance with regulations.

PHM00021-4**Comment:**

ALSO, THE SERVICE FACILITIES IN SEVERAL OF THE PLANS HAVE MOVED OFF SITE. THAT MEANS THEY'RE MOVED OUT OF THE PLAN. WE WANT TO SEE THE EIR -- WELL, THE EIR DOES NOT INCLUDE WATER QUALITY TREATMENT SYSTEMS FOR THESE OFFSITE SERVICE FACILITIES. THOSE ARE THE NUMBER ONE, PROBABLY THE LARGEST STORMWATER POLLUTANTS IN THE PLAN.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-HWQ-2 regarding Master Plan Commitment HWQ-1.

PHM00021-5**Comment:**

THE ATMOSPHERIC FALLOUT OF THE JETS. WE REQUEST THAT THE ATMOSPHERIC FALLOUT STUDY BEING DONE THAT WAS A RESULT OF THIS EIR/EIS BE INCLUDED IN IT. THIS STUDY STARTED AFTERWARDS AND WE WANT TO SEE IT PUT INTO THIS STUDY.

Response:

The results of the deposition study performed for LAWA are included in Attachment Z of Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PHM00021-6**Comment:**

THE FALLOUT CAN OVER TIME AND THROUGH FUEL DUMPING CAN INFECT THE OCEAN WITH POLLUTANTS THAT WE DO NOT WANT TO SURF OR SWIM IN.

Response:

Please see Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality (subsection 4.7.5), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding the development of a detailed drainage plan that will incorporate BMPs to minimize the effects of airport operations to surface water quality and prevent a net increase in pollutant loading. Also, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding fuel dumping from aircraft and Response to Comment AR00002-7 regarding potential water quality impacts due to aerial deposition.

PHM00021-7**Comment:**

THE WASTE WATER. THE EIR DOES NOT ADDRESS SEWAGE LINES IN THE PLAN.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR discussed on- and off-site sewage pipelines and associated infrastructure, including regional wastewater treatment facilities and treatment capacity, as well as project impacts, in Section 4.25.2, Wastewater (subsections 4.25.2.3 and 4.25.2.6). Furthermore, Master Plan Commitment PU-1, presented on page 4-1154 of the Draft EIS/EIR, described the utility relocation program that LAWA has committed to, which would upgrade/relocate utilities, including wastewater infrastructure, as appropriate to avoid impacts to the conveyance system, prior to construction of Master Plan components.

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00021-8

Comment:

THESE NEED TO BE INSPECTED FOR DAMAGE AND THE OLD ONES NEED TO BE REPLACED AND UPGRADED TO PREVENT STORMWATER CONTAMINATION DURING WET WEATHER.

Response:

The upgrade, replacement, or repair of existing sewers is the responsibility of the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation. As was discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR (page 4-1148), LAWA is committed to a utility relocation program, which will assess the particular relocations necessary to minimize impacts to wastewater facilities from project construction. At this stage of planning, however, the need for, and location of, new conveyance facilities cannot be effectively evaluated. As more specific plans are completed in the future relative to specific facilities or components of the Master Plan, the specific improvements to the wastewater conveyance system at LAX will be assessed.

PHM00021-9

Comment:

AIR QUALITY. LAX BEING THE SECOND LARGEST SINGLE SOURCE OF POLLUTION IN L.A., THE EIR DOES NOT ADDRESS THAT MOVING THAT POLLUTION FURTHER WEST AND THE IMPACT IT'S GOING TO HAVE ON THE OCEAN AND THE COMMUNITIES NORTH AND SOUTH. IT ONLY LOOKS AT COMMUNITIES TO THE EAST.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01186-4 regarding LAX as a source of emissions in the South Coast Air Basin. Also, please see Response to Comment AL00018-10 regarding the location of dispersion modeling receptors.

PHM00021-10

Comment:

WITH TRAFFIC, ONCE AGAIN, THE EIR JUST LOOKS AT WHAT'S RIGHT AROUND THE PLAN, IT DOESN'T LOOK ANYTHING BEYOND ITSELF, BUT EVEN CLOSE TO HOME, LIKE VISTA DEL MAR, THERE'S ROADS THAT WILL BE DIVERTED ONTO VISTA DEL MAR. IT SAYS THAT THE TRAFFIC WILL BE INCREASED, BUT IT DOES NOTHING TO MITIGATE THAT INCREASE.

WE WANT TO SEE SOMETHING DONE WITH THAT, WITH VISTA DEL MAR. IT'S ALREADY OVERLOADED AND DANGEROUS AND WE ALSO WANT TO SEE IT DONE IN A WAY THAT DOESN'T IMPACT THE COASTAL ZONE.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHM00022

Bowen, Debra

California State Senate

6/9/2001

PHM00022-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON, SENATOR DEBRA BOWEN REPRESENTING THE 28TH STATE SENATE DISTRICT. I WOULD BE REMISS IF I DIDN'T START BY EXPRESSING MY DISAPPOINTMENT

THAT THIS MEETING HAS BEEN BROKEN UP INTO THREE PIECES SIMULTANEOUSLY, IN COMMUNITIES THAT ARE CLOSE TO EACH OTHER. IN MY VIEW, THIS JUST MAKES IT HARDER FOR COMMUNITY MEMBERS TO BELIEVE THAT THE REGIONAL ALTERNATIVE IS SUPERIOR, TO UNDERSTAND WHAT OTHER COMMUNITY MEMBERS ARE FEELING. IT MAKES IT HARDER FOR THE PRESS TO FOCUS ON THE VITAL ISSUES THAT ARE BEING RAISED HERE.

Response:

The intent of the one hearing at three locations was to maximize the number of persons that could provide input and provide more access to the most convenient hearing site. A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PHM00022-2

Comment:

AND LET ME SAY THAT I THINK EVERYONE IN THIS ROOM IS CONCERNED WITH GROWTH AND CONCERNED WITH THE HEALTH OF THE ECONOMY IN THE LOS ANGELES BASIN. WE DIFFER IN THE BEST APPROACH TO GET THERE. WE WATCH THE SILICON VALLEY CHOKING ON ITS OWN GROWTH RIGHT NOW, CHOKING ON ITS TRAFFIC, AND WE READ THE CENSUS DATA THAT TELLS US THAT THE POPULATION IS GROWING, NOT IN THE AREA UP AROUND LAX, BUT IN THE INLAND EMPIRE AND IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY, AND WE QUESTION, WHO IN THEIR RIGHT MIND WOULD MAKE THE DECISION THAT THOSE PEOPLE IN THE AREAS THAT ARE GROWING SHOULD DRIVE ACROSS THE ENTIRE LOS ANGELES BASIN, USING OUR FREEWAYS, TO GET TO THE ONLY AIRPORT THAT CAN SERVE INTERNATIONAL DESTINATIONS?

Response:

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

PHM00022-3

Comment:

MUCH OF THE TRAFFIC INFRASTRUCTURE THAT WILL BE NEEDED TO DEAL WITH WHATEVER AIRPORT PATTERNS WILL HAPPEN WILL BE FUNDED BY STATE AND LOCAL TAXPAYERS, AND NOT BY THE [UNINTELLIGIBLE] FEES OR LEASEHOLD REVENUES. THE PROVISIONS IN THIS EIR/EIS FAIL ENTIRELY TO DEAL WITH THE REGIONAL TRAFFIC PATTERNS THAT WILL RESULT FROM MANY MILLION ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC TRIPS FROM SAN BERNARDINO, RIVERSIDE, COLTON, BAKERSFIELD, AND THE AREAS OF THIS REGION THAT ARE GROWING, TO LAX.

THIS IS NOT JUST AN ISSUE IN THIS LOCAL AREA, IT IS A REGIONAL ISSUE, AND IF WE WISH TO SPEND OUR SCARCE TRANSPORTATION DOLLARS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA WISELY, WE MUST PLAN OUR AIR TRANSPORTATION SO THAT WE ARE NOT HAVING TO BUILD LANE AFTER LANE AFTER LANE OF FREEWAY TO ACCOMMODATE AIR

3. Comments and Responses

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS THAT COULD BE MET IF WE WERE SIMPLY SMART ABOUT SITING AIR TRANSPORTATION ACTIVITIES.

Response:

The LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR analyzed the traffic impacts associated with the development of the alternatives. Mitigation measures are included which alleviate the associated impacts by the additional traffic generated by the development of the concepts. These mitigation measures would be funded as part of the Master Plan development. In addition Alternative D is a new alternative which was analyzed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR which constrains the operation to 78.9 MAP at LAX and requires other airports in the region to accommodate a higher percentage of the air travel demand. For a complete explanation of the additional traffic generated as a result of the alternatives please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PHM00022-4

Comment:

I URGE YOU IN THE STRONGEST TERMS TO GO BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD AND DEAL WITH THE REGIONAL ALTERNATIVE. I REJECT THE ARGUMENT THAT THE REGIONAL GROWTH NEEDS WILL BE MET ONLY BY FULLY EXPANDING LAX. THIS PROJECT WILL NOT BE DEPLOYED ANY FASTER THAN A REGIONAL SOLUTION. IT WILL GENERATE JOBS ONLY FOR LAWYERS, LEGAL ASSISTANTS AND COURT REPORTERS IN ITS CURRENT FORM.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PHM00022-2.

PHM00023	Jones, John	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	--------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHM00023-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS JOHN JONES, A RESIDENT OF EL SEGUNDO FOR OVER 30 YEARS. CURRENTLY LAX IS THE LARGEST POLLUTER IN THE SOUTH BAY. JUDGING BY YOUR PROPOSED PLAN, YOUR INTENT IS TO MAINTAIN THIS DUBIOUS HONOR FOR YEARS TO COME.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01186-4.

PHM00023-2

Comment:

SEVERAL YEARS AGO, THE CITIZENS OF EL SEGUNDO WERE TOLD WHEN THE THIRD RUNWAY WAS ADDED TO SUPPORT AIR CARGO THAT RUNWAY WOULD ONLY BE USED FOR LANDING AND THEN PLANES WOULD BE TOWED TO THE TERMINAL. WELL, IF YOU WERE PEOPLE OF INTEGRITY, YOU WOULD LIVE UP TO YOUR WORDS AND PUT THAT INTO EFFECT IMMEDIATELY.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00023-3

Comment:

YOUR REPORT DOES NOT TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION THAT WITH INCREASED AIR CARGO COMES INCREASED TRAFFIC WITH HEAVY TRUCKS AND LARGE TRACTOR TRAILERS. NOT ONLY AN INCREASE IN AIR POLLUTION FROM THE DIESEL ENGINES, BUT A FULLY LOADED

3. Comments and Responses

TRACTOR TRAILER CAN WEIGH AS MUCH AS 90,000 POUNDS. THAT HAS A HUGE EFFECT ON OUR INFRASTRUCTURE. WHEN YOU CONSIDER COMPARED TO A CADILLAC WEIGHS LESS THAN 5,000 POUNDS, THE CITIZENS ARE THE ONES THAT HAVE TO MAINTAIN THE HIGHWAYS AND PAY FOR AND THAT WAS NOT TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION IN YOUR REPORT.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic which includes a discussion of truck diesel pollution/air quality. The streets around LAX that are designated for truck use are designed to handle the type of traffic generated by cargo trucks. The traffic generated by LAX would not be unusual.

PHM00024 Jones, Wendy None Provided 6/9/2001

PHM00024-1

Comment:

I'M WENDY JONES, A 20-YEAR RESIDENT OF EL SEGUNDO, AND I ALSO THOUGHT IT WAS QUITE INTERESTING THAT SUCH AN IMPORTANT ISSUE WAS SCHEDULED FOR JUST THE ONE DAY. THAT SHOULDN'T BE.

Response:

The intent of the one hearing at three locations was to maximize the number of persons that could provide input and provide more access to the most convenient hearing site. A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PHM00024-2

Comment:

THE RESIDENTS IN EL SEGUNDO LIVE NOT MILES, BUT BLOCKS AWAY FROM THE AIRPORT, AND I'M STRESSING THIS POINT SPECIFICALLY FOR ORANGE COUNTY PEOPLE WHO MAY NOT BE AWARE THAT WE CAN EASILY READ THE NAME AND THE LOGO ON THE PLANES THAT FLY ALONG OUR TOWN BORDER, AND IN THE CASE OF THE PEOPLE ON IMPERIAL HIGHWAY, IT'S RIGHT ACROSS THE STREET.

THE FOLKS WHO TELL US THAT WE KNEW WHEN WE MOVED TO EL SEGUNDO THAT LAX WAS NEXT DOOR, THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY'RE TALKING ABOUT. THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO WAS INCORPORATED IN 1917. MANY RESIDENTS MOVED HERE MANY YEARS BEFORE THE AIRPORT EXPANDED TO ITS PRESENT LOCATION. ALSO, THE INCREASED NUMBER OF PLANES THAT TAKE OFF NOW HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH WHAT THE SITUATION WAS WHEN WE MOVED IN.

Response:

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

PHM00024-3

Comment:

AS WE WHO ARE OPPOSED TO THE EXPANSION HAVE REPEATEDLY STATED, YOU CAN'T PUT TEN POUNDS OF POTATOES IN A FIVE-POUND BAG. THE CAPACITY IS MAXXED OUT. LAX ACREAGE IN COMPARISON TO OTHER MAJOR AIRPORTS IS VERY SMALL. THE COMPARISON CHART I HAVE IN 1997 INDICATES THAT LAX IS 3,500 ACRES. TO GIVE PEOPLE AN IDEA, THIS IS ONE FIFTH THE SIZE OF DALLAS-FORT WORTH. IT'S A LITTLE OVER ONE HALF THE SIZE

3. Comments and Responses

OF CHICAGO O'HARE. DENVER INTERNATIONAL IS OVER NINE TIMES THE SIZE OF LAX. OUR OWN PALMDALE AIRPORT IS OVER FIVE TIMES THE SIZE OF LAX.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01790-3 for a discussion of how the size of an airport relates to activity levels.

PHM00024-4

Comment:

THE DISPLAYS AND FILMS AND DISCUSSIONS HERE TODAY WERE, TO ME, VERY GENERAL.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR, Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, Draft Master Plan, and Draft Master Plan Addendum provide extensive detailed information regarding the proposed project.

PHM00024-5

Comment:

THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT HAS UNDERSTATED THE PROBLEMS AND HAS NOT CONSIDERED REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES. FOR EXAMPLE, THE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDIES THAT WERE CONDUCTED ARE TOTALLY INADEQUATE.

Response:

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

PHM00024-6

Comment:

TODAY I GOT TWO DIFFERENT ANSWERS REGARDING A PROPOSED GREEN LINE. IS IT GOING UNDERGROUND, IS IT GOING ABOVE GROUND? I GOT BOTH ANSWERS. IF IT'S UNDERGROUND, IS IT GOING BELOW THE FUEL PIPES OR ABOVE? THEY DON'T KNOW. I GUESS THAT'S A DETAIL. ALSO, THE EARTHQUAKE ISSUES, IS THAT ANOTHER DETAIL?

Response:

Under Alternatives A, B, and C, the extension of the Green Line would transition from above-grade at the existing elevated station to below-grade along the southern boundary of the airport and likely rise to at-grade upon reaching the proposed West Terminal. For the below-grade section, existing and proposed underground utilities that cross the alignment would either be placed above the Green Line corridor or below it, depending on the nature, size, and existing relative elevation of each utility line. A determination of where and how to locate or relocate such facilities would be made in conjunction with the more detailed planning and engineering of the subject extension. Under Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, the existing Green Line would not be extended. Instead, a proposed Intermodal Transportation Center connected to a proposed Automated People Mover would be constructed adjacent to the existing Green Line Station. Seismic issues were fully discussed in Section 4.22, Earth/Geology, of both the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHM00024-7

Comment:

WE'RE TALKING COMMON SENSE HERE, WE'RE TALKING ABOUT QUALITY OF LIFE, AND DOESN'T IT MAKE SENSE TO SPREAD IT AROUND THE REGION? IT'S NOT -- THE EXPANSION

3. Comments and Responses

IS NOT A GOOD IDEA SAFETY WISE, GROUND TRAFFIC WISE OR ECONOMIC WISE. THE MAYOR-ELECT IS OPPOSED TO THE EXPANSION AS ARE ALL THE COUNTY SUPERVISORS.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, and safety impacts in Section 4.24.3, Safety, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2, 3, 5 and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2, S-3, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHM00024-8

Comment:

WE HAVE TO USE COMMON SENSE AND FORGET ABOUT THIS GREED AND SHORT-SIGHTEDNESS.

Response:

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

PHM00025 Smith, James None Provided 6/9/2001

PHM00025-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS JAMES PATRICK SMITH AND I LIVE AT 947 VIRGINIA, EL SEGUNDO. I HAPPEN TO BE THE CEO OF 947 VIRGINIA. I HAVE LIVED THERE ONE HALF BLOCK FROM IMPERIAL FOR 25 YEARS. I CAN HEAR EVERYBODY IN THIS ROOM AND I'M ALIVE. PRIOR TO THAT, I LIVED SIX BLOCKS SOUTH OF IMPERIAL AND I MOVED CLOSER TO THE AIRPORT WHEN THE NOISE LEVEL WENT DOWN. I AM FULLY IN SUPPORT OF YOUR, I GUESS WE COULD CALL IT PROPOSITION C.

OKAY. ALL RIGHT. I'M IN FAVOR, OR THE CORPORATION AT 947 IS IN FAVOR OF THIS PROPOSITION C BECAUSE OF SAFETY. I DON'T CARE ABOUT ANYTHING ELSE. SAFETY IS WHAT WE LOOK AT.

MY DAUGHTER WAS AT WEBB PARK ONE SATURDAY MORNING IN LATE -- IN THE LATE 1960'S WHEN AN AIRPLANE CRASHED INTO AN APARTMENT HOUSE IN EL SEGUNDO. SHE'S ALIVE, THANK GOODNESS, BUT SOME OTHER PEOPLE WEREN'T. MY TOTAL FOCUS ON THE AIRPORT IS SAFETY. I'M A SPECIAL ED TEACHER, MY DAY JOB IS, AND I BECOME VERY SIMPLISTIC WHEN I'M DEALING WITH MENTALLY RETARDED PEOPLE, AND MY STUDENTS ARE SEVERELY MENTALLY RETARDED, SO THEREFORE --

Response:

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

PHM00026 Golden, Terry None Provided 6/9/2001

PHM00026-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS TERRY GOLDEN, I LIVE AT 730 ESPLANADE, REDONDO BEACH. I'VE LIVED IN THE SOUTH BAY FOR ABOUT NINE YEARS, AND I WANT TO ADDRESS THE GROSS INADEQUACIES

3. Comments and Responses

OF THE IMPACT OF TRAFFIC IN THE EIR, BOTH IN TERMS OF ON THE CARS AND ALSO IN THE AIR SPACE.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PHM00026-2

Comment:

AS IT RELATES TO THE CARS, THE TRAFFIC AT LAX RIGHT NOW IS THE MAJORITY OF THE TIME GRIDLOCKED. THERE ARE TOO MANY PASSENGER CARS GOING INTO THE AIRPORT, THEY'RE SPILLING OVER INTO THE STREETS, AND THE CONCEPT THAT YOU CAN BY BUILDING A \$6 BILLION EXPRESSWAY ON A RING ROAD SOMEHOW WILL CURE THE PROBLEMS IS JUST MATHEMATICALLY IMPOSSIBLE. YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT ROUGHLY A 100 PERCENT INCREASE OVER WHERE THE BASELINE WAS, AND SOMEHOW THE CARS ON THE EXISTING ROAD, THE 405, WHICH AS EVERYONE HAS LOCALLY KNOWN IS CALLED THE FOUR OR FIVE HOUR HIGHWAY BECAUSE OF THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND YOU'RE GOING TO ADD MORE CARS TO IT IS JUST RIDICULOUS.

Response:

Comment noted. The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PHM00026-3

Comment:

THE CONCEPT THAT THE AIRLINES HAVE THAT YOU HAVE TO USE THIS AIRPORT IS ALSO FROM A MARKETING STANDPOINT RIDICULOUS. THE LAST TIME I NEEDED TO GO TO PHOENIX, I WENT OUT OF BURBANK FOR ONE REASON. I DON'T HAVE THE TIME TO BASICALLY WAIT AN HOUR THAT IT TOOK ME THE LAST TIME, LATE AT NIGHT, TO GET OUT OF FROM TERMINAL ONE JUST TO THE ROAD THAT TAKES ME BACK HOME, WHEREAS IN BURBANK I CAN JUST DRIVE OFF FROM WORK AND BASICALLY FLY RIGHT OUT. I THINK THEY NEED TO HAVE A REGIONAL APPROACH TO USING THE AIR SPACE AS WELL.

Response:

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

PHM00026-4

Comment:

AS A PERSON WHO'S A PILOT, I'M SEEING A PROBLEM WITH THE DESIGN OF THE THING BECAUSE BASICALLY THE AIR SPACE OUT THERE IS ALSO USED FOR TRAINING FLIGHTS AND YOU'RE POURING A LOT MORE SPACE OUT THERE AND IT'S NOT GOING TO HAVE ANY CONSIDERATION IN THE DOCUMENT FOR GENERAL AVIATION.

Response:

The commentor is correct in asserting the airspace is also used for general aviation including training flights. General aviation would not decline in the number of operations that can be accommodated in any of the alternatives despite the overall increase in operational activity. There are 39 general aviation and reliever airports within the Los Angeles Basin. As the activity at LAX increases, general aviation may look to operate from less active airports. Please see Response to Comment PC00656-2 regarding airspace capacity.

PHM00026-5

Comment:

ALSO, I'M COMPLAINING ABOUT THE FACT THAT IN THE LAST TWO YEARS I'M SEEING A SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN NOISE FROM PLANES. IT'S VERY COMMON RIGHT NOW, ESPECIALLY DURING THE MIDDLE OF THE WEEK, TO HEAR PLANES AT 11:00 OR MIDNIGHT AT ALTITUDES THAT I CAN RECOGNIZE THAT ARE ABOUT LESS THAN 6,000 FEET, AND THESE ARE JETS, YOU KNOW, NOT JUST THE TURBO PROPS THAT I'VE HEARD AND OTHER PEOPLE HAVE.

Response:

The commentor may be affected by easterly takeoffs circling back to the west on their departures to Asia. LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction to alleviate that situation by making over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. During a recent 18 month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement, and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. Additionally, please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for detailed information on nighttime noise impacts.

PHM00026-6

Comment:

SO THEREFORE, I THINK IF ANYONE IS REALISTIC, THAT THIS PLAN IS NOT GOING TO FLY. IF THEY BUILD IT, IT WILL BE A DISASTER, IT WILL POUR MORE TRAFFIC OUT THERE, THE AIRPORT WILL BE JUST AS CONGESTED AND, IN ESSENCE, WILL NOT MEET THE NEEDS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00026-7

Comment:

I WOULD ASK THE LAWA TO WORK ON EITHER BANNING PRIVATE CARS OR PUTTING SOME MECHANISM IN, BASICALLY LIMIT THE TRAFFIC, PUT A PEOPLE MOVER SYSTEM IN THAT WILL GET RID OF THE CAR SHUTTLES AND TAKE PEOPLE OUT TO THE HOTELS WITH A MONORAIL OR SOMETHING EQUIVALENT. MAKE THE EXISTING SYSTEM WORK AS THE WAY IT SHOULD BEFORE WE LOOK AT EXPANDING IT.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02252-2 regarding banning private vehicles.

PHM00027

Johnstone, Tom

Lennox School District

6/9/2001

PHM00027-1

Comment:

I'M TOM JOHNSTONE, I'M ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT OF PERSONNEL AT THE LENNOX SCHOOL DISTRICT AND A RESIDENT OF WESTCHESTER.

IT WOULD BE HARD TO IMAGINE ANOTHER SCHOOL DISTRICT IN THE LOS ANGELES METROPOLITAN AREA THAT HAS ITS CHILDREN EXPOSED TO GREATER LEVELS OF NOISE AND POLLUTION THAN THE CHILDREN IN THE LENNOX SCHOOL DISTRICT. THE IMPACT OF POLLUTION ON THE HEALTH AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF LENNOX STUDENTS IS ONLY NOW COMING INTO CLEAR FOCUS.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. In addition, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to school disruption associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and 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.

PHM00027-2

Comment:

FOR THE PAST EIGHT YEARS, THE UCLA SCHOOL OF MEDICINE HAS CONDUCTED HEALTH FAIRS AT THE SIX LENNOX SCHOOLS. DURING THIS TIME, MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS HAVE SCREENED MORE THAN 3,500 STUDENTS AND ADULTS. ONE CONSISTENT FINDING HAS BEEN A HIGH INCIDENCE OF CHILDREN DEMONSTRATING ASTHMA AND ALLERGY SYMPTOMS. THE MEDICAL EVIDENCE CLEARLY SUGGESTS THE ABERRATIONS IN THE IMMUNE SYSTEM THAT ARE DIRECTLY LINKED TO INCREASED LEVELS OF AIR POLLUTION WHICH ARE THE RESULT OF THE DISTRICT'S LOCATION DIRECTLY ADJACENT TO LAX AND TWO MAJOR FREEWAYS, THE 105 AND THE 405.

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment AF00001-36; please refer to Response to Comment AF00001-36.

PHM00027-3

Comment:

THE AQMD HAS ALSO TESTED THE AIR QUALITY AT ONE OF OUR SCHOOLS, FELTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, AND THE AMOUNT OF THE PARTICULATE MATTER IN THE AIR WAS HIGHER THAN ANY SCHOOL IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY.

Response:

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

PHM00027-4

Comment:

THE ISSUE OF NOISE POLLUTION IS OF EQUAL CONCERN TO US IN THE LENNOX SCHOOL DISTRICT. THE ENTIRE COMMUNITY FALLS WITHIN THE COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT

LEVEL, CNEL, OF 65 DECIBELS OR GREATER. THE 65 CNEL IS CONSIDERED AN UNHEALTHY NOISE LEVEL FOR MANY USES THAT INCLUDE RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS, SCHOOLS AND OUTDOOR RECREATION.

Response:

A large portion of the Lennox community is within the 65 CNEL noise contour under 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, as was shown on Figure S4.2-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, noise-sensitive uses, such as residential and school uses, within the 65 CNEL noise contour are considered to be incompatible as was further described in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Regarding outdoor recreation uses, as described in Topical Response TR-LU-4, new exposure to the 75 CNEL noise contour (rather than the 65 CNEL) for certain outdoor uses such as parks and school playgrounds are generally considered to be incompatible. Please see Response to Comment AL00034-25 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 Lennox School District. See Topical Response TR-LU-5 for a discussion of noise impacts and mitigation measures.

PHM00027-5

Comment:

THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE DRAFT EIR ON PAGE ES-28 RECOGNIZES THE NECESSITY TO HAVE THE IMPACT OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED. THE REPORT INDICATES THAT THE FAA WILL MAKE THE FINAL DETERMINATION AS TO WHETHER THE MASTER PLAN HAS A DISPROPORTIONATELY HIGH AND ADVERSE HUMAN HEALTH OR ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT ON MINORITY AND LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00027-6

Comment:

THIS IS ABUNDANTLY OBVIOUS TO US IN LENNOX WHERE MOST OF THE COMMUNITY IS AFFECTED DUE TO OUR LOCATION AND OUR COMMUNITY BEING THE POOREST IN THE SOUTH BAY. HOWEVER, IN CONTRADICTION ON PAGE 4-67, THE REPORT INDICATES THAT ONE OF THE SCHOOLS IN LENNOX, AND THAT WOULD AGAIN BE FELTON, WOULD BE EXPOSED TO OUTDOOR NOISE LEVELS THAT WOULD REMAIN SIGNIFICANT AFTER MITIGATION, YET NO MITIGATIONS ARE REQUIRED SINCE ENROLLMENT IMPACTS ARE CONSIDERED LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00004-7 and Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise mitigation.

PHM00027-7

Comment:

THIS ANALYSIS IS LOGICALLY FLAWED AND IS TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE. THE EXPANSION ON LAX WILL HAVE A DISPROPORTIONATE NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE LENNOX COMMUNITY WHICH IS NOT ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED IN THIS DOCUMENT. THE REQUIREMENT TO MITIGATE AGAINST ENVIRONMENTAL INJUSTICE HAS NOT BEEN MET.

Response:

Areas within the community of Lennox are identified and analyzed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Disproportionately high and adverse noise effects and potentially adverse air quality and health effects on minority and low-income

3. Comments and Responses

populations within Lennox are identified. Regarding provision of mitigations measures, the reason the Draft EIS/EIR 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. The analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR did however account for mitigation measures presented in other relevant sections within Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences and Mitigation Measures. 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 communities and their representatives.

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.

PHM00028	Gurich, Yuri	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	---------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHM00028-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS YURI GURICH. I AM A RESIDENT OF MANHATTAN BEACH FOR 16 YEARS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00028-2

Comment:

WE IN MANHATTAN BEACH LIVE ON BORROWED TIME. OF COURSE, THERE ARE NOISE, POLLUTION, TRAFFIC PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE AIRPORT. BUT MOST OF ALL, IT'S QUITE CLEAR THAT THERE WILL BE A MAJOR AIR DISASTER SOONER OR LATER, WHATEVER IMPROVEMENTS AT LAX ARE MADE OR NOT MADE.

I AM TALKING ABOUT A CATASTROPHE SIMILAR TO WHAT HAPPENED IN PARIS. LAX IS THE ONLY MAJOR AIRPORT IN THE WORLD BUILT IN THE CENTER OF SUCH A LARGE CITY AS LOS ANGELES, EXCEPT PERHAPS FOR HONG KONG, BUT I GUESS, AND AT LEAST HOPE, WE ARE NOT HONG KONG HERE.

Response:

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

PHM00028-3

Comment:

LAX CANNOT SERVE GROWING LOS ANGELES ANYMORE. MORE THAN THAT, IT DESTROYS NORMAL RESIDENTIAL LIFE IN MANHATTAN BEACH, EL SEGUNDO, INGLEWOOD AND OTHER LOCAL CITIES.

Response:

Comment noted. 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-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PHM00028-4

Comment:

A POSITION ON THE LAX EXPANSION ALREADY COST THE POLITICAL LIFE OF A LOCAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS. I AM TALKING ABOUT MR. KUYKENDALL.

I AM A REPUBLICAN, HAVE NEVER VOTED FOR A DEMOCRAT, BUT I DIDN'T VOTE FOR MR. KUYKENDALL ONLY BECAUSE OF HIS MORE THAN WEAK POSITION ON LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00028-5

Comment:

ALL THESE SMART WORD AS MITIGATION OF EXPANSION SERVE ONLY TO LEGITIMIZE LAX. BUT I DIDN'T VOTE FOR JANE HARMAN EITHER. SHE SENT ME A LETTER COMPARING LAX WITH THE DENVER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT. OF COURSE, DENVER AIRPORT IS BETTER. NOT NOISE TO SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES, 34,000 ACRES FOR 1371 FLIGHTS PER DAY, ABOUT 15 TO 20 TIMES MORE ACRES PER FLIGHT THAN IN LAX. WHAT DOESN'T SHE KNOW IS THAT DENVER AIRPORT WAS RELOCATED FROM THE CITY TO OUTSIDE OF DENVER.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00028-6

Comment:

THERE IS ONLY ONE REASONABLE LONG-TIME SOLUTION, WHICH SHOULD BE CLEAR TO ANYONE WHO IS NOT SUCH AN INSANE PERSON AS FORMER L.A. MAYOR RIORDAN: TO REMOVE LAX TO PALMDALE. THIS CITY WANTS AN AIRPORT, HAS PLENTY OF SPACE FOR AN AIRPORT AND REPRESENTS THE FUTURE OF LOS ANGELES. THE SOONER WE REMOVE LAX FROM THE PRESENT LOCATION, THE MORE LIVES AND MONEY WE WILL SAVE FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00028-7

Comment:

OF COURSE, WE LIVE IN A GREAT DEMOCRACY. BUT WHEN I CAME TO THIS MEETING, I NOTICED POLICE IN THE LOBBY. SO PERHAPS EVEN OFFICIALS REALIZE THAT THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE LEFT FOR LOCAL RESIDENTS TO THE EIR/EIS MITIGATION AND EXTENSION PLANS IS A RIOT. IT IS REALLY SAD THAT THIS IS THE ONLY LANGUAGE BUREAUCRATS UNDERSTAND THESE DAYS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00029	Bainbridge, Steve	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	--------------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHM00029-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS STEVE BAINBRIDGE. I LIVE N HAWTHORNE. I HAVE A HOME IN INGLEWOOD IN THE INCREASING NOISE ZONE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00029-2

Comment:

I HAVE THREE DOCUMENTS HERE THAT I GOT FROM THE LAWA EXPANSION OFFICE. AND THE DOCUMENT NUMBERS ARE M00004, EFFECTS OF JET AIRCRAFT NOISE ON HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS. THAT DOCUMENT SAYS THE INCREASE IS 29 PERCENT. THAT STUDY WAS DONE IN 1977.

Response:

The document the commentor is referring to is "Effects of Jet Aircraft Noise on Mental Hospital Admissions" by W.C. Meecham and H.G. Smith (1977). The subject study, conducted in the vicinity of LAX, found that there was a 29 percent increase in mental hospital admissions in the "maximum noise area", compared to those of the corresponding control area, that MAY be credited to the major difference in the two areas: jet noise. As was discussed on page 4-1041 in Section 4.24.2, Health Effects of Noise, of the Draft EIS/EIR, research on the potential health effects of noise on humans has focused on the aspects related to physiological and psychological health, including interference with speech communication, sleep disturbance, learning effects, and work performance effects. Many findings show that there is little reliable evidence on the relationship between noise exposure and mental health. In addition, research pertaining to the long-term effects of noise on human health is contradictory. Some studies suggest that there are indicators that high noise levels, particularly from aircraft, may have a detrimental effect on the cardiovascular system, mortality rates, birth defects, achievement scores, psychiatric admissions, sleep disturbance, and overall psychological well being; others show no conclusive evidence of these effects. However, the results of such studies continue to be controversial and are not accepted by the general scientific community at this time. Specifically, the scientific community has cited methodological and epidemiological problems with the studies and none of the studies has gained the universal acceptance from researchers that would allow them to be used as a basis for impact assessment. Please also see Response to Comment AL00017-52.

PHM00029-3**Comment:**

I HAVE DOCUMENT M0005, EFFECTS OF JET NOISE ON MORTALITY RATES. THAT STUDY WAS DONE IN 1979. 30 PERCENT INCREASE IN MORTALITY RATES IN THE HIGH NOISE ZONE. I THINK IN ANY EIR OR EIS REPORT YOU SHOULD EXPLAIN HOW YOU'RE GOING TO SPECIFICALLY MITIGATE FOR THOSE PROBLEMS IN THAT AREA AND PAY FOR IT FROM AIRPORT FUNDS.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments AL00017-52 and PHM00029-2.

PHM00029-4**Comment:**

THERE'S ANOTHER STUDY, G0013, NOISE-INDUCED SLEEP DISTURBANCES AND OTHER EFFECTS ON HEALTH, 1978. THEY DON'T UNDERSTAND ENOUGH ABOUT THAT AND HOW MUCH IT COSTS PEOPLE IN THEIR LIVES. THAT NEEDS MORE STUDY.

Response:

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

PHM00029-5**Comment:**

ON ANOTHER SUBJECT, THE GREEN AREA IN THE LITTLE MAP I RECEIVED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF THE AIRPORT WAS PURCHASED. PEOPLE WERE FORCED TO MOVE TO MITIGATE NOISE 20 YEARS AGO, MAYBE MORE. ALL THAT AREA IS NOW DESIGNATED TO BE DEVELOPED FOR COMMERCIAL SITES, NOT ANYTHING TO DO WITH THE AIRPORT.

BUT WE'RE GOING TO INCREASE TRAFFIC THERE SO THAT THEY CAN COME DO THINGS, LIKE A BUSINESS PARK, COMMERCIAL RETAIL, AND A RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PARK. ON YOUR MAP IT LOOKS LIKE THE, SORT OF LIKE IT'S GOING TO STAY A PARK, BUT IT'S ALL GOING TO BE DEVELOPED, INCREASING TRAFFIC THERE.

IT WAS CALLED THE AIRPORT NORTH. NOW, FOR PUBLIC RELATIONS, I THINK IT'S CALLED WESTCHESTER SOUTH. AND I DON'T KNOW IF THAT'S INCLUDED IN YOUR REPORT, THE EFFECTS OF THAT, BUT IT SHOULD BE.

Response:

Comment noted. Certain properties close to the airport have been, or are currently being, converted from residential use to commercial, industrial, or other use compatible with airport operations, particularly as related to noise considerations.

Surface transportation impacts are addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in

3. Comments and Responses

Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

The area to the north of LAX is currently known as LAX Northside. The subject area is proposed under Alternatives A, B, and C as a mix of commercial, employment, and hotel uses referred to as Westchester Southside. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR accounted for the development of LAX Northside/Westchester Southside, as appropriate.

PHM00030 Ackerson, Beverly Peninsula Aircraft Noise/Safety 6/9/2001
Information Committee

PHM00030-1

Comment:

I'M BEVERLY ACKERSON OF 27129 SPRING CREEK ROAD, RANCHO PALOS VERDES AND ALSO THE PENINSULA AIRCRAFT NOISE SAFETY INFORMATIONAL COMMITTEE, WHICH WAS FORMED AFTER AUGUST '97, WHEN WE HAD THE INVASION OF TURBOPROPS COMING UP OUR CANYONS AND GOING OVER OUR HOMES, AND IT WAS SUCH AN IMPACT ON OUR COMMUNITY.

IT WAS SO QUIET THAT YOU COULD HEAR BIRDS. AND WE HAVE LIVED THERE 42 YEARS AND HAVE NEVER, NEVER HAD ANY SUCH THING AS THIS IMPACT UPON OUR LIVES. THE QUALITY OF LIFE HAS BEEN DESTROYED. THE SAFETY OF US HAS BEEN DESTROYED BECAUSE YOU'RE FLYING TOO CLOSE TO MY HOME, OVER MY HOME.

CHINA AIRLINES, MARCH 11, WAS ONE, JUST ONE. EARLY IN THE MORNING. AND I DID CALL ALL PLACES: WASHINGTON, CHINA AIRLINES, EVERYONE. HE IS NOT FLYING OVER THERE, BUT THERE IS STILL SOME COMING OVER 3:00 O'CLOCK, 4:00 O'CLOCK IN THE MORNING. THE JETS DEPARTING EAST FROM THE AIRPORT, SWINGING OVER, STILL THROTTLES GOING, OPEN, GETTING OVER THE PENINSULA. IT'S 1500 FEET.

AND WITH THEM, AT THE SAME TIME WE HAVE THEM COMING FROM THE WEST. I CAN SEE THEM FROM MY HOME. THEY GO OUT AND TURN IN THE OCEAN AND COME TOWARD MY HOME OVER THE PENINSULA. AGAIN, TOO LOW, FULL THROTTLE OVER OUR HOMES.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Responses TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PHM00030-2

Comment:

THIS IMPACT OF NOISE HAS BEEN TERRIBLE, AS WELL AS OUR HEALTH. WE HAVE PEOPLE THERE THAT HAS ASTHMA THAT NEVER HAD IT BEFORE. WE HAVE A DEPOSIT ON OUR PATIO. SO THIS IS A GREAT IMPACT UPON US FROM THE LAX AIRPORT, YET THE EIS/EIR HAS NOT ADDRESSED OUR AREA.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PHM00030-3

Comment:

YOU KNOW ABOUT US. OUR COMMITTEE HAS BEEN VERY ACTIVE. WE SUBMITTED SCIENTIFIC REPORTS TO THE FAA. WE HAVE EXPERTS WHO HAVE WORKED WITH NASA AND THE TRWS, GETTING AEROSPACE CRAFT UP THERE. WE'VE WORKED VERY CLOSELY. THEY DON'T FIND ANY OF YOUR FIGURES CORRECT. AND I THINK THAT THIS NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00030-4

Comment:

AND WHY AREN'T WE INCLUDED IN THIS EIS/EIR? WE ARE IMPACTED BY YOU, AND WE NEED TO BE INCLUDED. AND THIS IS JUST ONE OF THE AREAS.

Response:

Comment noted. Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of aircraft noise at those areas that may be significantly impacted. Palos Verdes and the Palos Verde Peninsula will not be significantly impacted by aircraft operations at LAX. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 for additional information regarding LAX aircraft operations and associated noise impacts to south bay cities.

PHM00030-5

Comment:

WE DO NEED TO GO TO A REGIONAL APPROACH FOR AIRPORTS. BUT THIS IS JUST ONE ISSUE, AND I WILL ADDRESS MORE IN LETTER FORM TO YOU.

Response:

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

PHM00031 Jones, Lynn

P.A.N.I.C.

6/9/2001

PHM00031-1

Comment:

HELLO. MY NAME IS LYNN JONES, 5511 EAU CLAIRE, RANCHO PALOS VERDES. I'M A MEMBER OF PANIC.

I'D LIKE TO ADDRESS THE MASTER PLAN ADDRESSES ECONOMIC INPUT. IT ALSO ADDRESSES POLLUTION, NOISE, GROUND, ENVIRONMENT, BUT IT DOES NOT INCLUDE AN AIR SPACE DESIGNED FOR ADDITIONAL AIRCRAFT.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00031-2

Comment:

I HAVE BEEN TOLD BY THE FAA THAT THERE IS NO CURRENT ROOM OFFSHORE TO PUT MORE AIRPLANES LEAVING LAX. HOW AND WHERE WILL THE ADDITIONAL PLANES BE ROUTED? OVER THE BEACH CITIES? OVER PALOS VERDES? OR ALL? THAT'S MY QUESTION.

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to Comment PC02273-4. Please see Response to Comment PC02273-4 regarding the airspace routes of the Master Plan alternatives.

PHM00032

Pentille, Robert

County of Los Angeles

6/9/2001

PHM00032-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS ROBERT PENTILLE. MY ADDRESS IS 520 SOUTH GRAND AVENUE IN LOS ANGELES, 90071. I REPRESENT THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES AND I'D LIKE TO PROVIDE A LEGAL ASPECT TO THE HEARINGS TODAY.

ON BEHALF OF THE COUNTY, WE STRENUOUSLY OBJECT TO THE DESIGN AND FORMAT OF THE THREE PUBLIC HEARINGS BEING HELD SIMULTANEOUSLY IN THESE THREE LOCATIONS TODAY. AS SUCH, WE MAKE THE DEMAND OF FAA AND LAWA TO SCHEDULE FURTHER PUBLIC HEARINGS TO ACCOMMODATE THE ADEQUATE REQUISITE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS.

FIRST, PART OF THE GOVERNING FAA STATUTE REGARDING AIRPORT IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDES 49 UNITED STATES CODE SECTION 47106. THAT SECTION REQUIRES THAT AN ADEQUATE PUBLIC HEARING BE HELD TO ASSESS THE, QUOTE, ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THIS PROJECT. FAA REGULATIONS INTERPRETING THAT STATUTE, INCLUDING 14 CFR SECTION 1355, FURTHER STATES THAT SUCH AN ADEQUATE PUBLIC HEARING MUST, AT A MINIMUM, BE SCHEDULED TO ADAPT A REASONABLE DATE, TIME AND PLACE WITH, QUOTE, DUE REGARD GIVEN TO THE CONVENIENCE TO THOSE WHO WISH TO BE HEARD.

THREE SIMULTANEOUS HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR TODAY ARE IN PLAIN CONTRAVENTION OF THESE REQUIREMENTS BECAUSE IT IS PATENTLY UNREASONABLE TO ASSUME THAT INTERESTED SPEAKERS FROM OTHER PARTS OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGION WOULD BE ABLE TO CONVENIENTLY MAKE ANY ONE OF THESE THREE HEARINGS, ALL OF WHICH ARE BEING HELD WITHIN FIVE MILES OF LAX ALL AT THE SAME TIME. THIS IS ESPECIALLY TRUE SINCE PEOPLE NEAR OTHER AIRPORTS WHICH HAVE BEEN SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR/EIS AS AFFECTED BY THE PROJECT WOULD NATURALLY WANT TO BE HEARD.

BUT GIVEN THE DISTANCE AND LIMITED TIME SCHEDULE OF THESE HEARINGS, SUCH PEOPLE ARE BEING PRECLUDED FROM COMMENTING, IN PLAIN VIOLATION OF THE FAA'S OWN POLICY INCORPORATING THE PUBLIC AS BROADLY AS POSSIBLE. REALISTICALLY, THERE IS NO WAY ANYBODY COULD BE EXPECTED TO DRIVE MANY MILES TO ANY OF THESE LOCATIONS IF THEY COME FROM THE EAST SIDE OF LOS ANGELES, ESPECIALLY IF THEY'RE ONLY ENTITLED TO BE HEARD FOR THREE MINUTES.

SECONDLY, FAA AND LAWA HAVE SIMILARLY FAILED TO LIVE UP TO THE REQUIRED LEVEL OF, QUOTE, PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT DEMANDED BY NEPA AND CEQA STATUTES GOVERNING THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESS FOR WHICH THIS PROJECT IS PROPOSED. IN IMPLEMENTING NEPA, THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT, AGENCIES ARE REQUIRED TO HOLD PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR THE PURPOSE OF SOLICITING APPROPRIATE INFORMATION FROM THE PUBLIC. AND I WOULD CITE 40 CFR 1506.6 FOR THAT.

THERE ARE COUNTLESS IMPACTS FROM THIS PROJECT WHICH IMPLICATE NEPA, MANY OF WHICH ARE SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIED ITSELF IN THE EIR/EIS AS AFFECTING A BROAD SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGION, MOST, IF NOT ALL, OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA IN FACT. AS SUCH, MORE EXTENSIVE AND SPREAD-OUT HEARINGS MUST BE SCHEDULED TO INCORPORATE THE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND VIEWS OF OTHER MEMBERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY.

Response:

This is similar comments as those of Attorney Ross representing Los Angeles County. The intent of the one hearing at three locations was to maximize the number of persons that could provide input and provide more access to the most convenient hearing site. A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PHM00032-2

Comment:

FINALLY, WE HAVE SUBMITTED MORE COMMENTS IN LETTER DETAIL, AND ALTHOUGH WE SUBMIT THESE COMMENTS NOW, THE COUNTY DOES NOT WAIVE ANY FURTHER CHALLENGES OR COMMENTS TO EITHER THESE PROCEDURES OR ANYTHING ELSE RELATED TO THE EIS/EIR.

Response:

Written comments submitted by the County of Los Angeles on the Draft EIS/EIR are identified as Comment Letters AL00008, AL00022, AL00036, and AL00041. Please see the responses to these comment letters.

PHM00033 Kuntz, David

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00033-1

Comment:

DAVID KUNTZ, RESIDING AT 28409 QUAIL HILL DRIVE IN RANCHO PALOS VERDES.

THE EXISTING EIR FOR LAX IS VALID FOR 40 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS, BUT LAX HAS BEEN OPERATING SIGNIFICANTLY OVER THAT LIMIT FOR MANY YEARS. OBVIOUSLY, LAX MANAGEMENT HAS NEVER FELT CONSTRAINED TO ABIDE BY THEIR EXISTING EIR. SO MY FIRST QUESTION IS IF A PROPOSED EXPANSION IS APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED, HOW DO WE KNOW YOU WILL STAY WITHIN ITS LIMITS?

MY FEAR IS THAT ONCE WE ALLOW ANY EXPANSION OF THE PHYSICAL CAPACITY OF THE AIRPORT, YOU WILL SIMPLY INCREASE THE TRAFFIC WITHOUT CONCERN FOR THE LIMITS SET BY THE NEW EIR. AFTER ALL, THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT YOU HAVE DONE IN THE PAST.

IF LAX WANTS TO HAVE ANY CREDIBILITY WITH THE PUBLIC, THEN YOU SHOULD SHOW YOU'RE WILLING TO ABIDE BY THE EXISTING EIR AND LIMIT PRESENT LAX TRAFFIC TO 40 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS. ONCE YOU HAVE PROVEN YOU ARE WILLING TO ABIDE BY THE EXISTING LAW, THEN WE HAVE A BASIS OF DISCUSSING THE EXPANSION OF LAX.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00033-2

Comment:

BOTH LAWA MANAGEMENT AND THE FAA HAVE SET THEMSELVES IN AN ADVERSARIAL POSITION TO THE PUBLIC THAT THEY ARE SUPPOSED TO SERVE. THIS HAS LED TO A GENERAL PERCEPTION THAT THE PRIMARY AIM OF LAWA AND FAA IS TO MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE AIRLINE PROFITABILITY.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00033-3

Comment:

FOR EXAMPLE, ON JULY 24, 1994, THE L.A. TIMES RAN AN ARTICLE ON THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE METRO GREEN RAIL INTO LAX. THAT ARTICLE STATED, QUOTE, AIRPORT AND FAA OFFICIALS WARNED THAT THE GREEN LINE'S PATH NEAR RUNWAYS COULD DISTRACT PILOTS WITH ITS LIGHTS, BEFUDDLE RADAR WITH ELECTROMAGNETIC EMISSIONS, AND STAND IN THE WAY OF LOW-FLYING AIRCRAFT IN EMERGENCIES. ANOTHER REPORT, MTA OFFICIALS SAY, FOUND THAT CONSTRUCTION OF AN AIRPORT METRO STATION WOULD CAUSE MAJOR UTILITY CONFLICTS, DISRUPT AIR SERVICE DURING CONSTRUCTION, AND POTENTIALLY DISTURB TWO UNDERGROUND, QUOTE, CONTAMINATION AREAS. THAT'S THE QUOTE FROM THE L.A. TIMES.

HOWEVER, NOW THAT EXTENDING THE GREEN LINE IS SEEN AS A POLITICAL EXPEDIENT TO EXPANDING LAX, THIS SAFETY CONCERN HAS EVAPORATED. THIS DOESN'T SAY MUCH FOR THE FAA'S CREDIBILITY AS A WATCHDOG OF PUBLIC SAFETY. IN ANY CASE, I'D LIKE TO KNOW WHY THE FAA'S CONCERNS ABOUT THE GREEN LINE HAVEN'T BEEN INCLUDED IN THE EIR.

Response:

The Aeronautical Study conducted by the Federal Aviation Administration in 1994 proposed the Green Line continue north along Aviation Boulevard above ground, thus their concern about the possible "storbing effect." The Master Plan proposal for the Green Line would have it proceed west along Imperial Highway and via tunnel under Sepulveda Boulevard to the proposed west terminal area. Please refer to Figure 3-7, Alternative A-2015 Added Runaway North, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Figure S-4.2-15, Alternative D 2015 LAX Plan Proposed Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding the location of existing light rail facilities (e.g., Green Line) in relation to proposed improvements.

PHM00033-4

Comment:

IF YOU TRULY WANT A SOLUTION FOR THE PUBLIC, THEN GET THE PUBLIC INVOLVED IN THE PROCESS. THIS PROCESS SHOULD INCLUDE MORE THAN A FEW PUBLIC MEETINGS LIKE TODAY, WHICH ARE TRANSPARENT, OBVIOUS POLITICAL WINDOW-DRESSING.

Response:

The intent of the one hearing at three locations was to maximize the number of persons that could provide input and provide more access to the most convenient hearing site. A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PHM00033-5

Comment:

I PROPOSE LAWA MANAGEMENT URGE L.A.'S MAYOR-ELECT TO PUT INDIVIDUALS FROM ALL PARTS OF THE COMMUNITY, INCLUDING VARIOUS CITIZENS GROUPS, ON THE BOARD OF AIRPORT COMMISSIONERS TO REPLACE THE GROUP OF YES-MEN STOOGES THAT WAS INSTALLED BY MAYOR RIORDAN.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00034 McFadden, Melissa None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00034-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS MELISSA. I RESIDE IN EL SEGUNDO ALONG WITH MY SON AND ELDERLY PARENTS. I AM A CONCERNED CITIZEN. I AM ALSO A REGISTERED NURSE AND HEALTH CARE ADVOCATE. I NORMALLY DO NOT SPEAK OUT IN A PUBLIC FORUM BUT THE ADVERSE HEALTH EFFECTS OF AIRPORT EXPANSION HAS BROUGHT ME HERE TODAY TO VOICE MY CONCERN.

I AM VERY FAMILIAR WITH CHRONIC AND ACUTE RESPIRATORY AILMENTS, WHICH USUALLY RESULT IN A SLOW AND UNCOMFORTABLE DEATH FROM SUFFOCATION. THIS IS NOT A PRETTY SIGHT.

AIRPORT OPERATIONS, BOTH GROUND AND AIR, PUMP THOUSANDS OF TONS OF VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS OVER EL SEGUNDO DAILY, TONS OF THOUSANDS OF HAZARDOUS AND TOXIC EMISSIONS, SUCH AS BENZENE, FORMALDEHYDE, NITROGEN OXIDE, SOOT, PARTICLES AND OILY RESIDUE.

TO ELABORATE FURTHER, BENZENE HAS BEEN LINKED TO LEUKEMIA AND BIRTH DEFECTS. FORMALDEHYDE CAN PRECIPITATE LUNG AND EYE IRRITATION. A WORST CASE SCENARIO CAN RESULT IN BRAIN AND SKIN CANCER. YOU CAN ONLY IMAGINE LOOKING INTO LUNGS AND AIRWAYS FILLED WITH SOOT, OIL AND PARTICLES.

AS A NURSE I HAVE CARED FOR HUNDREDS OF PATIENTS SUFFERING FROM EMPHYSEMA, CANCER OF THE LUNG, AND BRONCHITIS, PULMONARY FLUID AND PNEUMONIA. IMAGINE THE QUALITY OF LIFE WHEN ONE IS UNABLE TO CATCH THEIR BREATH, LITERALLY GASPING FOR VITAL AIR. AT TIMES LIKE THIS, I HAVE STOOD BY HELPLESSLY AS MEDICATION, OXYGEN AND RESPIRATORY TREATMENTS ARE NOT EFFECTIVE.

MEDICAL RESEARCH HAS REVEALED THAT HUMAN EXPOSURE TO AIR POLLUTANTS CAN RESULT IN ANNUAL HEALTH CARE COSTS OF FORTY TO FIFTY BILLION DOLLARS ANNUALLY. AS A NURSE I MUST VOICE MY OPINION AND CONCERN ON THIS VITAL ISSUE. I'M OPPOSED TO AIRPORT EXPANSION, OR AT THE VERY LEAST, SIGNIFICANT AIRPORT EXPANSION.

AIRPORT EXPANSION, MORE FLIGHTS, MORE EMISSIONS, MORE AIR POLLUTION WILL LITERALLY DELIBERATELY AND IRREVERSIBLY AFFECT OUR HEALTH, AND THE LONG-TERM IMPLICATIONS ARE MIND BOGGLING. IF WE DO NOT HAVE OUR HEALTH, WE HAVE NOTHING.

PLEASE, PLEASE ALLOW US TO CONTINUE TO ENJOY LIVING, WORKING, PLAYING AND BREATHING IN EL SEGUNDO.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data

3. Comments and Responses

and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-2 regarding airport emissions and link with adverse health effects, Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts, Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns.

PHM00035 McElroy, Don

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00035-1

Comment:

DON MCELROY, 623 SHELDON STREET, EL SEGUNDO.

YOU JUST HEARD THE MEDICAL ASPECTS OF THE AIR POLLUTION QUALITY, THE LACK OF QUALITY. I WOULD GIVE YOU PHYSICAL EVIDENCE OF THAT BECAUSE I CANNOT HAVE LAWN FURNITURE IN MY YARD BECAUSE OF THE RESIDUE FROM JET FUEL. THE AIRPORT HAS DONE NOTHING TO CLEAN UP THE AIR POLLUTION.

Response:

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

PHM00035-2

Comment:

ALSO, YOU DUMP HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF GALLONS OF FUEL IN THE OCEAN EVERY TIME YOU HAVE AN AIR MISHAP AT LAX. THAT'S NEVER BEEN ADDRESSED. NO ONE BRINGS IT UP OTHER THAN A LITTLE BIT OF AIR QUALITY. YOU NEED TO DEAL WITH THE QUALITY OF THE WHOLE ISSUE OF DUMPING THE FUEL.

Response:

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

PHM00035-3

Comment:

ALSO, ON TRAFFIC, THE IMPACT FROM LAX WILL BE HORRENDOUS. IT ALREADY IS ON THE 405 FREEWAY, WHICH IS KNOWN AS THE PARKING LOT IN THE SKY. THERE'S A GRIDLOCK CALLED THE SOUTH BAY CURVE THAT GOES FROM THE SANTA MONICA FREEWAY TO ROSECRANS. YOU DON'T MOVE THROUGH THAT AREA AT FOUR O'CLOCK IN THE AFTERNOON.

ALSO, THE STREETS THROUGH L.A. -- SEPULVEDA, IMPERIAL, ROSECRANS AND CENTURY -- THOSE STREETS DON'T MOVE DURING TRAFFIC OR WHEN, ACTUALLY, WHEN WE LET FACTORIES OUT NOW. IF YOU MAKE A RING ROAD FROM THE 105 DOWN IMPERIAL AROUND TO WEST IMPERIAL TERMINAL, YOU WILL LOCK EL SEGUNDO INTO THE CITY. THEY WILL NOT BE ABLE TO GET OUT.

YOU'VE MOVED PERSHING DRIVE THREE TIMES. IT USED TO BE AT WEST IMPERIAL TERMINAL. THEN IT WAS EVEN WITH MAIN STREET IN EL SEGUNDO. NOW IT'S DOWN WHERE IT IS, AND YOU WANT TO BLOCK IMPERIAL TO KEEP US FROM GETTING AROUND THE AIRPORT. THAT WOULD MOVE US DOWN TO PERSHING DRIVE, WHICH IS A GRIDLOCK ALREADY IN THE AFTERNOON. SO THAT'S NOT GOOD.

ALSO, TRIPLE A HAS ALREADY DONE RESEARCH THAT SHOWS IF I HAVE TWO PEOPLE, ONE LEAVING LAX AND ONE WAS TO DRIVE OUT TO BURBANK, TAKE AN AIRPLANE TO SAN

FRANCISCO, THE GUY THAT WENT TO BURBANK, EVEN THOUGH HE HAD TO TRAVEL TO BURBANK, WOULD GET TO SAN FRANCISCO FIRST BECAUSE OF ALL THE DELAYS AT LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

PHM00035-4

Comment:

I THINK YOU NEED TO GO TO A REGIONAL PLAN BECAUSE WE'RE NOT USING THE EL TORO AIR BASE. THAT HAS NOT BEEN DEVELOPED. JOHN WAYNE SHUTS DOWN AT TEN O'CLOCK. RIVERSIDE CAN ALSO BE IMPROVED AND THERE'S SEVERAL AIRPORTS THAT COULD BE IMPROVED.

THE EXPANSION FOR THE NEED IS NOT AT LAX. LIKE IT WAS MENTIONED EARLIER, THAT TRAFFIC FROM THE INLAND EMPIRE IS DRIVING TO LAX. SO THE TRAFFIC IMPACT IS NOT ONLY IN THIS AREA. IT'S ALL THE WAY OUT TO THE INLAND EMPIRE.

Response:

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

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

PHM00036 Busch, Eric LAXMP Advisory Commission 6/9/2001

PHM00036-1

Comment:

HELLO. MY NAME IS ERIC BUSCH. I RESIDE IN THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO AND I REPRESENT THE LAX MASTER PLAN ADVISORY COMMISSION AND THE LAX AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00036-2

Comment:

THE FAA SPECIFICALLY PROHIBITS AIRPORTS FROM PLACING CONSTRAINTS ON ITS OPERATIONS AND THE NUMBER OF PASSENGERS IT SERVES. LAX, UNDER THE NO-ACTION NO-PROJECT OPTION, IS PROJECTED TO SERVE 78.7 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS. WITH 165 GATES, THIS EQUATES TO 477,000 PASSENGERS PER GATE PER YEAR ON AVERAGE.

CURRENTLY, SOME GATES AT LAX SERVE OVER 800,000 PASSENGERS PER YEAR. IF ALL CURRENT GATES COULD HANDLE 800,000 PASSENGERS PER YEAR, LAX WOULD BE SERVING 132 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS.

GRANTED, THE EXISTING ROADS, RUNWAYS AND SUPPORT SERVICES MAY NOT BE CAPABLE OF HANDLING THIS NUMBER OF PASSENGERS PER GATE PER YEAR AND THE TERMINALS WON'T HAVE THE SPACE TO ACCOMMODATE THEM; HOWEVER, IN ALL OF THE OPTIONS PRESENTED TO US, A, B AND C, THE TERMINAL SQUARE FOOTAGE INCREASES BY NEARLY DOUBLE OR UP TO TWO AND A HALF TIMES THE EXISTING SQUARE FOOTAGE.

THEREFORE, WITH THE RING ROAD, REMOTE TERMINALS, RAIL ACCESS AND NEW GATES IN LARGER TERMINALS, LAX IS LIKELY TO SERVE 800,000 PASSENGERS PER GATE PER YEAR. THUS, FOR LAX TO ESTIMATE UNDER OPTION C THAT ONLY 89.6 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS WOULD OR COULD USE LAX IS A GROSS UNDERSTATEMENT.

Response:

The Terminal 1 gates operated by Southwest are serving in excess of 800,000 annual enplaned passengers per gate. Southwest is a unique airline with unique operating characteristics that allow it to achieve more efficient utilization of its facilities than other airlines. In addition, the utilization of the gates at LAX is high, even by Southwest standards. Alternatives A, B, and C assume high utilization of the gates compared to industry standards. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and to make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. Gate utilization is one component of a complex system of facilities that make up an airport. The system is only as capacious as its least capacious element.

PHM00036-3

Comment:

WITH NO CONTROLS ON THE NUMBER OF PASSENGERS SERVED, LAX WOULD SOON EXCEED 89 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS, JUST AS IT HAS EXCEEDED THE 40 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS ESTIMATED IN THE PREVIOUS EIR/EIS.

LAX IS CURRENTLY ACCOMMODATING 50 PERCENT MORE PASSENGERS THAN THE PREVIOUS ESTIMATE. IF ALLOWED TO PROCEED IN CONSTRUCTING OPTION C OR A OR B, LAX WILL SOON BE OVER 100 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS. THEREFORE, THE EIR DOES NOT ADEQUATELY ADDRESS THE TRANSPORTATION LOADS ON OUR STREETS NOR THE POLLUTION LOADS PLACED UPON OUR LAND, WATER AND AIR.

Response:

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

PHM00036-4

Comment:

I URGE LAX TO BE MORE REALISTIC IN THEIR ESTIMATES AND REVISE THEIR EIR/EIS ACCORDINGLY. HOWEVER, THE ONLY WAY TO CONTROL GROWTH AT LAX AND ENCOURAGE TRAVELERS AND AIRLINES TO UTILIZE OTHER REGIONAL AIRPORTS IS TO CONSTRAIN THE

FACILITY ITSELF SO THAT IT MAY NOT PHYSICALLY HANDLE AND CANNOT PHYSICALLY HANDLE ADDITIONAL PASSENGERS.

THUS, LIMITING LAX TO ITS CURRENT CONFIGURATION IS REALLY THE ONLY OPTION WHICH MAKES ANY SENSE.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels. It should be noted that, subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D was added. Alternative D focuses on improvements to the existing airport facilities and provides for a future (2015) level of airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHM00037 Hartman, Randall None Provided 6/9/2001

PHM00037-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS RANDALL HARTMAN. I LIVE IN TORRANCE.

I'VE WORKED AT LAX FOR APPROXIMATELY 17 YEARS AS AN AIRCRAFT MECHANIC AND INSPECTOR. I'VE SEEN THE AIRPORT INCREASE IN TRAFFIC AND AIR POLLUTION OVER THE YEARS. JET FUEL IS VERY TOXIC STUFF. IT'S OILY. IT DOESN'T COMPLETELY GET BURNED. IT HAS A FUNGICIDE IN THERE THAT'S EVEN MORE TOXIC AND CANCER CAUSING.

I'VE SEEN, I DON'T HAVE HARD EVIDENCE, BUT PEOPLE WHERE I WORK ARE DYING YOUNGER AND YOUNGER, 40S, 50S, 60S. THEY JUST SEEM TO BE GETTING CANCER AT A HIGH RATE.

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment PC00214-15; please refer to Response to Comment PC00214-15.

PHM00037-2

Comment:

I WOULD LIKE TO SEE SOME DAY SOMEONE DO A STUDY ON THAT COMPARED TO PEOPLE WORKING IN OTHER FIELDS.

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment PC00214-15; please refer to Response to Comment PC00214-15.

PHM00037-3

Comment:

ONE OF THE PROBLEMS I SEE THAT HAS INCREASED AIR POLLUTION IS THE CHANGES THAT HAVE BEEN DONE OVER THE YEARS. IT USED TO BE WHEN AIR TRAFFIC WAS TAKEN FROM THE GATE TO MAINTENANCE, THEY USED TO BE TOWED, BUT BECAUSE OF THE INCREASE IN TRAFFIC AND TO INCREASE THE LOAD, THEY HAVE TO NOW TAXI ON THEIR OWN POWER.

I WOULD SAY APPROXIMATELY 50 PERCENT OF THE AIR POLLUTION IS JUST FROM PLANES TAXIING FROM MAINTENANCE TO THE GATE AND BACK. AND THERE ARE TIMES IN THE MORNING WHEN YOU HAVE TO WAIT ON THE TAXIWAY AT LEAST AN HOUR TO GET CLEARANCE. AND THAT WHOLE TIME, THAT PLANE IS IDLING AND RUNNING WITH ALL ITS ENGINES.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please note that all the build alternatives result in a reduction of the taxi/idle times.

PHM00037-4

Comment:

IT'S RIDICULOUS. TO INCREASE TRAFFIC AT LAX IS JUST INSANE. WE SHOULD GO TO A MORE REGIONAL APPROACH. WE SHOULD -- NO ONE HAS EVEN MENTIONED HIGH SPEED RAIL. I WORKED FOR AN AIRLINE. YOU'D THINK I WOULD WANT MORE AIR TRAFFIC, BUT I DON'T JUST THINK OF MYSELF. I THINK OF THE GENERAL WELFARE OF THE WHOLE REGION. WE SHOULD HAVE HIGH SPEED RAIL. WE SHOULD HAVE RAIL GOING TO THE SAN FRANCISCO-SAN JOSE CORRIDOR. WE SHOULD HAVE RAIL TO LAS VEGAS, RAIL TO SAN DIEGO.

SOMEONE MENTIONED THIS AS A WORLD CLASS CITY. IT'S THE ONLY WORLD CLASS CITY I KNOW THAT DOESN'T HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL PART OF THEIR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS BY RAIL AND ALSO THE ONLY CITY THAT HAS AN AIRPORT IN THE CENTER OF THE CITY. I WAS JUST IN FRANCE AND RUSSIA AND OTHER COUNTRIES OVER IN EUROPE. THEY PUT THEIR AIRPORTS AT THE OUTSKIRTS OF THE CITY AND USE LIGHT RAIL TO GET THE PASSENGERS OUT.

IT'S WHAT WE SHOULD DO. WE SHOULD USE PALMDALE. WE SHOULD USE ONTARIO.

Response:

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

PHM00038

Schroeder, Rita

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00038-1

Comment:

HELLO. I'M RITA SCHROEDER. I'M A CITIZEN, PRIVATE CITIZEN, AND ALSO RESIDENT OF PALOS VERDES ESTATES.

LOS ANGELES IS SUPPOSED TO BE ONE OF THE GREATEST CITIES IN THE WORLD, AND WHAT REALLY MAKES THIS CITY SPECIAL IS THE BEAUTIFUL OCEAN AND THE COASTLINE. IF WE INCREASE THE AIR TRAFFIC AND CAR TRAFFIC, IT WILL POLLUTE THE AIR EVEN MORE. AND THE CLEAN SEA BREEZE THAT WE STILL GET TO SOME EXTENT WE WON'T HAVE ANYMORE.

Response:

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

PHM00038-2

Comment:

I DON'T SEE WHY LOS ANGELES, LIKE ANY OTHER BIG CITY, AND I'M BEING REPETITIOUS OF THE GENTLEMAN THAT JUST LEFT, THAT LIKE OTHER BIG CITIES, NEW YORK, FOR INSTANCE, OR LONDON, PARIS, MILAN, THEY ALL HAVE SEVERAL AIRPORTS.

AT THE SPEED THAT THIS CITY IS GROWING, AND EVEN MORE AND MORE PEOPLE WILL COME TO LOS ANGELES BY THE TIME THIS PROJECT WILL BE FINISHED, I THINK THE AIRPORT THEN WOULD EVEN BE TOO SMALL. SO LOS ANGELES IS SO SPREAD OUT THAT IT IS BIGGER THAN SOME COUNTRIES THAT I'VE BEEN TO.

AND I THINK MOST PEOPLE TRAVEL SUCH TREMENDOUS DISTANCE ANYWAY TO THE AIRPORT. SO WHY CAN'T SEVERAL AIRPORTS IN DIFFERENT LOCATIONS ACCOMMODATE MORE PEOPLE AND NOT JUST PUT THE WHOLE BURDEN ON THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES AND CITIES OF THE LAX AIRPORT?

Response:

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

PHM00039 Rosencrans, Ernest None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00039-1

Comment:

I AM NOT MR. SCHROEDER. I'M RITA'S HUSBAND. I'M DR. ERNEST ROSENCRANS.

OF COURSE, I'M VERY CONCERNED ABOUT POLLUTION THAT MANY MEMBERS, MANY SPEAKERS HERE HAVE MENTIONED. THE HEALTH CONSEQUENCES ARE FAMILIAR TO US ALL, INCLUDING THE RESPIRATORY ILLNESSES AND MIGRAINE HEADACHES THAT ARE BROUGHT ON BY AIR POLLUTION.

Response:

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

PHM00039-2

Comment:

I'M CONCERNED ABOUT THE GROWING AIR TRAFFIC AND THE SPACING OF THE PLANES. AND IT MAKES ME A LITTLE NERVOUS TO SEE SO MANY PLANES APPROACHING L.A. AIRPORT ON TWO RUNWAYS AT THE SAME TIME. AND I AGREE WITH THIS MR. YURI, WHO SPOKE OF AN ACCIDENT WAITING TO HAPPEN AND WHAT IS GOING TO OCCUR.

Response:

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

PHM00039-3

Comment:

AND HAVE PLANS BEEN MADE FOR THE NEW AIRBUS THAT WILL HAVE 600 OR MORE PASSENGERS, MAYBE UP TO 1000? IT WILL BE A TREMENDOUS NEW LOAD, MEGA-PASSENGER CAPACITY THERE.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The commentor is correct in asserting that the new airbus would be able to accommodate a significant number of passengers. The new airbus would be considered as a New Large Aircraft (NLA), which is introduced into all design day schedules by 2015. There would be 27 NLA operations in the No Action/No Project Alternative and 30 NLA operations in each of the build alternatives. Indicated as a 74X, the NLA would assume a 600-seat capacity. In the No Action/No Project Alternative these aircraft would park at remote gates, however in the build alternatives, gates would be added and/or reconstructed to accommodate the NLA. The build alternatives would also consider NLA restrictions (Group VI standards) in designing new taxiways and modifying the existing taxiways. For a discussion of the design day activity and the airfield taxiway exhibits please see Chapter V, Section 3.3 and Appendix J of the Draft LAX Master Plan, respectively.

In Alternative D there would be 27 NLA operations. Gates would be added and/or reconstructed to accommodate the NLA. Group VI standards would also be considered when designing new taxiways and modifying existing taxiways. For a discussion of the design day activity and airfield taxiway exhibits for Alternative D, please see Sections 2.1 and 2.2 and Appendix E of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum, respectively.

PHM00039-4

Comment:

AND I CERTAINLY ENDORSE THE IDEA OF LIGHT RAIL TRAVEL. YOU ALREADY HAVE THE GREEN LINE. PERHAPS IT CAN BE EXPANDED. BUT IN OTHER CITIES YOU ACTUALLY HAVE THE RAILROADS RIGHT WITHIN THE AIR TERMINAL AND YOU CAN GO TO VARIOUS CITIES AT A DISTANCE.

I THINK IN OUR COUNTRY IN THE 21ST CENTURY WE SHOULD OVERCOME THE DEPENDENCE ON AUTOMOBILE TRAFFIC AND RESORT MORE TO RAIL TRAFFIC TO SUPPLEMENT THE FLYING PUBLIC.

Response:

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

PHM00040	Van Drie, Gerhardt	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	---------------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHM00040-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS GERHARDT VAN DRIE. I'M A RESIDENT OF EL SEGUNDO, 724 WEST PINE. I HAVE LIVED IN EL SEGUNDO FOR OVER 30 YEARS. I WAS CITY ENGINEER AND PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR AT ONE TIME.

ONE OF THE BIG PROBLEMS THAT WE HAVE IN EL SEGUNDO IS WE HAVE A LOT OF SOOT AND TIRE RUBBER THAT COMES DOWN OUT OF THE SKY. IT MAKES OUR CARS DIRTY. IT MAKES OUR SIDEWALKS, OUR DRIVEWAYS, MAKES OUR CLOTHES DIRTY. IT MAKES OUR DRAPES INSIDE OF OUR HOUSE DIRTY. IT MAKES OUR CARPETS DIRTY AND IMPACTS OUR HEALTH. IT IMPACTS THE HEALTH OF OUR STUDENTS AND ALL OF THE CITIZENS. SO WE HAVE A REAL BIG PROBLEM WITH THAT.

AND FROM THE INFORMATION THAT'S BEEN PRESENTED, I HAVE SEEN VERY LITTLE ACCOUNT SHOWING ANY KIND OF MEASUREMENT OF THE PARTICULATE MATTER THAT'S IN THE AIR. AND SO I DECIDED TO MAKE A TEST RUN ON MY OWN RELATIVE TO MEASURING SOME OF THAT. AND I USED MY WIFE'S VACUUM CLEANER FOR THE SUCTION DEVICE AND I RIGGED UP A UNIT AND I FILTERED THE AIR THROUGH A PIECE OF TOILET PAPER.

AND THIS IS WHAT IT LOOKED LIKE AFTER NINE HOURS. AND THIS IS THE KIND OF MEASUREMENT THAT SHOULD BE DONE IN A LOT OF DIFFERENT PLACES, IN EL SEGUNDO AND THE REST OF THE CITIES AROUND AND RESIDENTIAL AREAS AROUND THE AIRPORT, TO GET SOME KIND OF A HANDLE ON THE IMPACT OF THE SOOT FROM THE FUEL FROM THE AIRPLANES AND THE TIRE RUBBER THAT'S EXPOSED.

AND IT SEEMS LIKE THAT PARTICULAR AREA HAS BEEN COMPLETELY NEGLECTED IN THE EIR AND REPORTING THEREOF. SO I'D LIKE TO SEE SOMETHING BEING DONE ABOUT THAT SO WE HAVE SOME ACTUAL GOOD MEASUREMENT OF THE PARTICULATE MATTER THAT'S IN THE AIR.

Response:

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

PHM00040-2

Comment:

BUT IT HAS A GREAT IMPACT UPON OUR CHILDREN, OUR LIFESTYLE, OUR HEALTH. THE AIRPORT HAS TREMENDOUS IMPACT ON THE HEALTH OF THE PEOPLE IN THE SURROUNDING AREAS. IT SEEMS LIKE THE CITY OF L.A. AND THEIR THRUST TO TRY TO SATISFY THE BUSINESS ASPECTS HAVE, TO A LARGE EXTENT, REALLY NOT COME TO FOCUS FULLY ON THIS PARTICULAR ASPECT. AND I THINK IT'S SOMETHING THAT HAS TO BE DONE.

Response:

Comment noted. Human health impacts are addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PHM00040-3

Comment:

RELATIVE TO THE REGIONAL AIRPORT ASPECTS, I THINK THAT WE HAVE TO DO MORE THAN JUST CALL OUT FOR REGIONAL AIRPORTS. AND THE FAA SHOULD ALSO BE INVOLVED IN TRYING TO SHOW DIFFERENT SCENARIOS, HOW THE AIRLINES COULD FIT IN AT SOME OF THESE REGIONAL AIRPORTS. MAY BE THEY SHOULD BE GIVEN A TEN-YEAR EXEMPTION TO OPERATE AT THOSE DIFFERENT LOCATIONS.

Response:

Since the federal Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, the airlines make the decision about which airports they will serve. As a general rule, airlines will choose to serve the airports near the highest concentrations of conveniently located customers. Within this general framework, however, airlines must make strategic decisions about air service to maximize their investments and gain competitive advantages. For instance, in regions with multiple airports, airlines tend to concentrate their air service at a single, well-located primary airport for reasons of economic efficiency. The City of Los Angeles owns and LAWA controls the operation and potential expansion of four airports: LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys. The other regional airports are controlled by other jurisdictions that are responsible for their respective operation and expansion. FAA does not have the authority to dictate to airport sponsors that they must further develop their airports in an effort to limit the capacity of LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00041 Olsen, Robert

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00041-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS ROBERT OLSEN. I RAN FOR CITY COUNCIL FOR MANHATTAN BEACH IN 1999. AND ONE OF MY MAIN THRUSTS WAS TO STOP LAX EXPANSION. I'M SORRY TO SAY, IT STILL SEEMS TO BE GOING AHEAD AND IT'S INSANE. THAT'S THE WORD I WOULD USE FOR IT. ONLY ONE WORD, INSANE. PEOPLE HAVE TO HAVE MORE BRAINS THAN WHAT'S BEING SHOWN.

Response:

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

PHM00041-2

Comment:

AND THE EIR MUST NOT MEAN ANYTHING. IT'S NOT REGARDING PEOPLE, HUMAN BEINGS. IN PLACE OF MACHINES? MACHINES BECOME MORE IMPORTANT THAN THE PEOPLE. AND BUSINESS, OF COURSE, ALWAYS WAS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00041-3

Comment:

ANYWAY, I'M PROUD OF BEING AN AMERICAN BECAUSE WE HAVE A CHANCE TO SPEAK, AND I THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THAT. AND I HOPE IT JUST KEEPS CONTINUING TO BE A PRIVILEGE.

MANY PEOPLE LEFT HERE. I DON'T KNOW WHY. MAYBE THEY FELT INTIMIDATED. WE SHOULDN'T HAVE HAD POLICE HERE AT ALL.

Response:

Comment noted. The police presence is standard procedure for large public gatherings and in no way is an intimidation factor.

PHM00041-4

Comment:

ANYWAY, I DO TAKE THE BUS. I HAVEN'T HAD A CAR FOR 20 YEARS. I PRACTICE WHAT I PREACH. I DON'T BELIEVE IN POLLUTION. THE AIRPORT IS INCREASING AND INCREASING POLLUTION.

I WANT THIS MIKE TO BE LOUD ENOUGH. THERE'S TOO MUCH POLLUTION IN THE BASIN. WE LIVE IN MANHATTAN BEACH, USED TO BE PRISTINE. NOW IT ISN'T.

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.

PHM00041-5

Comment:

MANY OF THE BEACH CITIES HAVE OVERFLIGHTS OF TURBOPROPS. I'VE COMPLAINED. I'VE GOT EVIDENCE OF OVERFLIGHTS BROUGHT TO MY ATTENTION BY EVEN LAX OFFICIALS. THEY SENT THESE TO ME. THEY'RE PROUD OF IT.

TURBOPROPS FLYING OVER MANHATTAN, HERMOSA, A REGULAR PATTERN SHOWING IT. SKYWEST AIRLINES, AMERICAN EAGLE AIRLINES. IS THIS MIKE -- OKAY. MAYBE I'M NOT TALKING RIGHT INTO IT.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Responses TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PHM00041-6

Comment:

I HOPE YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE PEOPLE OF THE BEACH CITIES WILL NOT STAND FOR UNLIMITED GROWTH OF LAX. TWO-THIRDS OF THE TRAFFIC IS, I'M TOLD BY THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE AIRPORT AT LAX THEMSELVES, SAYING TWO-THIRDS OF THE TRAFFIC IS FREIGHT. YOU CERTAINLY CAN DO SOMETHING ABOUT THAT. WE CAN HAVE A PALMDALE FREIGHT CENTER. THAT'S EASY TO DO IF WE WOULD HAVE STARTED YEARS AGO. HARDER NOW.

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 cannot force these companies to use Ontario or Palmdale. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PHM00041-7

Comment:

AND AS FAR AS POLLUTION, EVERYTHING HAS BEEN MENTIONED BEFORE. THERE'S ALSO ONE THING THAT WASN'T MENTIONED, AND THAT WAS THOSE BUSES FOR THE CAR RENTALS, THEY GO ONE AFTER ANOTHER. WE'RE AT THE LAX BUS CENTER AND WE SEE THEM GO BY. THERE MUST BE HUNDREDS OF THESE THINGS ALL DAY LONG RUNNING MOSTLY EMPTY BECAUSE THEY HAVE TO MAKE A QUICK, COMPLETE CIRCLE OF THE AIRPORT FOR HERTZ AND EVERY KIND OF CAR RENTAL AGENCY THERE IS.

Response:

Comment noted. Issues related to air quality were addressed in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also note that each of the build alternatives propose a consolidated rental car facility, which would substantially reduce the need for, and operation of, rental car company shuttle vans.

PHM00041-8

Comment:

ANYWAY, THERE'S NO MORE TIME. I HOPE I'VE MADE SOME KIND OF IMPACT. I BELIEVE IN THE PEOPLE COMING FIRST.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00042

Morris, Steve

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00042-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS STEVE MORRIS. I RESIDE AT 95 CREST IN MANHATTAN BEACH.

TWO ISSUES. MY UNDERSTANDING IS AIRLINES ARE GOING TO KEEP COMING. WE CONTINUE TO BUY TICKETS. THE DEMAND IS THERE. THEY MAKE MONEY. THEY'RE GOING TO CONTINUE TO GROW. THAT'S A GIVEN.

I DO BELIEVE WE NEED A REGIONAL SOLUTION, BUT I DON'T THINK YOU SHOULD COMPROMISE WHAT WE'RE DOING NOW TO MODERNIZE LAX.

I'M A BUSINESS TRAVELER. I UTILIZE LAX EXTENSIVELY. I AM CONTINUING TO BE INCONVENIENCED BY DELAYS, WHETHER SITTING ON THE TAXIWAY WAITING FOR CLEARANCE OR THE AIRLINES HAVE INADEQUATE SPACE TO BE ABLE TO PROCESS ME FOR TRAVEL, PARKING, ENTERING THE AIRPORT OR LEAVING TO GET HOME IN TIME TO MY FAMILY.

I AM PROGRESSIVELY SPENDING SATURDAYS TRAVELING AND SUNDAYS TRAVELING AND NOT SPENDING WEEKENDS TO BE ABLE TO BE HOME WITH MY FAMILY. I WANT TO STOP BEING INCONVENIENCED. I WANT MODERNIZATION TO GO FORWARD. I THINK THAT A LOT OF THE ISSUES OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND MITIGATION MEASURES CAN TAKE PLACE.

I THINK THAT SAFETY IS A PRIMARY ISSUE TOO AS WELL AS JUST THE CONVENIENCE FOR THE GENERAL PUBLIC, MAKING SURE THAT BUSINESS TRAVELERS CAN HAVE LAX TO FACILITATE BUSINESS. I JUST DON'T THINK WE SHOULD PENALIZE PEOPLE THAT USE IT RIGHT NOW WHILE WE WAIT FOR THE REGION TO CATCH UP.

I THINK WE SHOULD MOVE FORWARD WITH ALTERNATIVE C BUT ALSO PRESSURE THE REGION TO STEP UP AND TAKE THEIR DEMAND OF THE AIR TRAVEL PUBLIC.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00043

Brestoff, Nelson

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00043-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS NELSON BRESTOFF, 4147 BALCONY DRIVE IN CALABASAS, CALIFORNIA. A NUMBER OF PEOPLE HAVE MENTIONED THE SPACING OF THE PLANES, AND I WANTED TO BRING UP SOMETHING THAT WOULD REQUIRE YOU TO DO ONE MORE THING IN THE DRAFT EIR/EIS, AND THAT IS TO DO A COMPREHENSIVE AIR SPACE STUDY.

I HAVE ATTENDED MEETINGS OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS, AND I'M AWARE THAT THEY HAD MADE AN INITIAL FIRST STEP WITH RESPECT TO A COMPREHENSIVE AIR SPACE STUDY. BUT IT DID NOT PRETEND AT ALL TO BE ANYTHING LIKE A COMPREHENSIVE AIR SPACE STUDY. AND WE DO NOT HAVE THIS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.

WE TEND TO THINK OF THE AIR AND THE GROUND AND THE WATER. WE DON'T TYPICALLY THINK IN THE THIRD DIMENSION. BUT JUST AS OUR FREEWAYS HAVE BECOME CONGESTED, THE SKIES ABOVE US HAVE BECOME CONGESTED.

THIS IS A BASELINE STUDY THAT IS NECESSARY IN ORDER FOR YOUR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND STATEMENT TO BE CONSIDERED AN ADEQUATE DOCUMENT. WITHOUT THAT BASELINE STUDY, IT WILL NOT BE ADEQUATE. IT WILL BE INADEQUATE.

SOMETIMES IT'S TOO OFTEN THE CASE THAT A PLANE HAS TO FALL OUT OF THE SKY FOR US TO REALIZE THAT THE AIR SPACE IS NOW QUITE CONGESTED. I HOPE THAT DOESN'T HAPPEN. THIS DOCUMENT PRESENTS YOU WITH THE OPPORTUNITY TO DO A COMPREHENSIVE AIR SPACE STUDY, AND I HOPE THAT WILL BE DONE IN CONNECTION WITH THE FINAL REPORT.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00044 Eisen, Bill

Residents for a Quality City

6/9/2001

PHM00044-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS BILL EISEN SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF MYSELF AND A GROUP CALLED RESIDENTS FOR A QUALITY CITY, A GROUP OF ABOUT 650 RESIDENTS OF MANHATTAN BEACH.

ONE NOT NEED TO READ PAST PAGE 1 OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE DRAFT EIR/EIS TO REALIZE THAT IT IS FATALLY FLAWED. IN FACT IT SUFFERS FROM THE VERY SAME FLAWS AS THE RECENTLY COMPLETED EIR FOR THE AMERICAN AIRLINES EXPANSION PROJECT AT LAX.

ACCORDING TO PAGE 1 OF THE DRAFT EIR/EIS, IT NEED ONLY COMPARE THE POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF LAX'S PROPOSED EXPANSION AGAINST A NO-PROJECT ALTERNATIVE, QUOTE, AS MODIFIED BY WHAT WOULD REASONABLY BE EXPECTED TO OCCUR IN THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE IF THE PROJECT WERE NOT APPROVED BASED ON CURRENT PLANS AND CONSISTENT WITH AVAILABLE INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITY STRUCTURES, END QUOTE.

IN OTHER WORDS, THE DRAFT EIR/EIS MEASURES POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AGAINST EXISTING CONDITIONS AS MODIFIED BY CURRENT PLANS. BUT IF SUCH A COMPARISON WERE PERMITTED BY EIR/EIS GUIDELINES, AN EIR/EIS WOULD NEVER BE REQUIRED BECAUSE A COMPARISON OF THE PLANS FOR A PROJECT WITH THOSE VERY SAME PLANS WOULD ALWAYS NECESSARILY RESULT IN A FINDING OF LESS THAN A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.

Response:

Comment noted. Please note that "current plans" include adopted land use and other plans; "current plans" do not include the proposed project, the proposed LAX Master Plan. In accordance with CEQA requirements, and as was explained in the introduction to Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the impacts of each alternative were measured against existing conditions, referred to as environmental baseline conditions in order to determine significant impacts under CEQA. In accordance with NEPA requirements, as also explained in the subject documents, the impacts of each alternative were measured against future (2015) conditions characterized by the No Action/No Project Alternative in order to determine impacts under NEPA.

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00044-2

Comment:

IN JULY 1997, WHEN THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION WAS PUBLISHED, LAX WAS OPERATING AT A LEVEL, ACCORDING TO FIGURES PROVIDED BY LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORT, OF APPROXIMATELY 60 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS. ACCORDING TO LAWA, LAX OPERATIONS HAVE SINCE BEEN EXPANDED TO A LEVEL OF 68 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS.

Response:

In 1997, LAX served 60.1 million annual passengers (MAP). In 2000, LAX served 67.3 MAP. Passenger activity decreased to 61.6 MAP in 2001, due primarily to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

PHM00044-3

Comment:

HOWEVER, AS A PERSON WHO LIVES ABOUT TWO MILES FROM LAX AND WHO USES THE 405 FREEWAY AND SURFACE STREETS IN THE VICINITY OF LAX ON A DAILY BASIS, I CAN ASSURE YOU THAT TRAFFIC CONGESTION IN AND AROUND LAX HAS INCREASED VERY SUBSTANTIALLY DURING THE PAST THREE YEARS. THIS INCREASE IN TRAFFIC CONGESTION CAN ONLY BE EXPLAINED BY LAX'S EXPANSION OF ITS PASSENGER AND CARGO OPERATIONS.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. Regarding traffic measures to minimize neighborhood impacts, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6. Regarding traffic concerns pertaining to the cargo truck traffic plan and neighborhood impacts from trucks, please see Topical Response TR-ST-1.

PHM00044-4

Comment:

LAX'S PURCHASE OF THE MANCHESTER SQUARE AREA FOR AIR FREIGHT FORWARDING IS PROCEEDING AND WILL RESULT IN A VERY SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE IN CARGO OPERATIONS AT LAX. OBVIOUSLY, EIR OR NO EIR, LAX WILL CONTINUE TO EXPAND UNLESS THE EXPANSION IS CURTAILED EITHER BY THE LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL, THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION OR BY THE COURTS.

Response:

Please see the Introduction section of the Preface located in the Draft EIS/EIR for a description of the regulatory and approval process requirements and recommendations for approval. In addition, the role of each applicable federal, state, and local agency was delineated in the Introduction section as well. Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand.

PHM00045

Collis, Adrienne

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00045-1

Comment:

HI. I'M ADRIENNE COLLIS. I LIVE AT 1501 EAST MAPLE IN EL SEGUNDO. AND I'M AGAINST THE EXPANSION BECAUSE ALL ALONG LAX HAS BEEN A REALLY BAD NEIGHBOR. I LIVE IN THE MOST IMPACTED BUILDING IN EL SEGUNDO AT THE END OF THE RUNWAY.

Response:

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

PHM00045-2

Comment:

WE'RE LOOKING FORWARD TO SOUNDPROOFING OUR ENTIRE BUILDING. IT'S SOMETHING THAT LAX CAUSED. WE DIDN'T CAUSE IT. THEY HAD THE FUNDING AND THEY YANKED IT BACK. THEY DIDN'T CARE. IT WAS A MATTER OF RIGHT AND WRONG, BUT THEN YOU GET INTO ALL THESE LEGALITIES THAT DON'T REALLY MATTER TO PEOPLE.

Response:

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

PHM00045-3

Comment:

LAX HAS BEEN NOTHING BUT A BIG BULLY. ON TOP OF THAT, TO GET THE SOUND MITIGATED, WE HAVE TO WAIVE ALL OUR RIGHTS. EVEN IF YOU SMASH YOUR PLANE INTO OUR BUILDING, WE CAN'T SUE YOU. THAT'S BULLYING TACTICS. IT'S NOT RIGHT. IT'S RIDICULOUS. THERE'S NO ACCOUNTABILITY.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR; however, please see Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.13 regarding aviation easements.

PHM00045-4

Comment:

WHEN SOMETHING GOES WRONG, LAX POINTS AT THE FAA, THE FAA POINTS AT THE AIRLINES. NOTHING EVER GETS RESOLVED. I CALLED FOR NOISE COMPLAINTS, FOR GROUND NOISE RUN-UP, AND THEY GIVE ME A FLIGHT PATTERN AND SAY NOBODY FLEW OVER YOU. THAT IS ISN'T EVEN WHY I'M CALLING. THEY CAN'T GET IT TOGETHER NOW AND THEY WANT TO EXPAND. IT MAKES ME CRAZY.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00045-5

Comment:

IN ADDITION, THERE ARE NOT ADEQUATE STUDIES. I HEARD TODAY A MAN FROM THE LENNOX SCHOOL DISTRICT TALK ABOUT THE IMPACT ON THE SCHOOL DISTRICT THERE. I HAVE NEVER SEEN ANY STUDIES ON OUR SCHOOL DISTRICT.

BUT I HAVE SEEN ONE ON THEIR SCHOOL DISTRICT IN 1980. IT HAD SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THEIR DISTRICT IN COMPARING IT WITH SAN PEDRO, AND THAT WAS IN 1980. HERE WE ARE 20 YEARS LATER AND THEY HAVEN'T DONE ANYTHING TO MITIGATE THAT. ON TOP OF IT, WHEN YOU SOUNDPROOF IT 20 YEARS AGO, NOW IT'S 20 YEARS LATER AND THAT SOUNDPROOFING MIGHT NOT BE WORKING NOW.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to school disruption associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PHM00045-6

Comment:

SO I'M CALLING FOR MORE STUDIES. I'D LIKE TO CALL FOR SOME SLEEP STUDIES BECAUSE I CAN SEE MY HUSBAND SLEEPING AND REACTING TO THE PLANES. HE DOESN'T EVEN REALIZE THE IMPACT OF THE AIRPORT ON HIM.

I WOULD LIKE TO VOLUNTEER MY FAMILY AS THE FIRST FAMILY IN THAT STUDY TO SEE HOW THAT IS DEALING WITH THE JET NOISE AND THE ENGINE RUN-UP. AND IT'S JUST NOT PEOPLE FLYING OVER. IT'S THE OTHER THINGS THAT THE AIRPORT DOES. AND NOBODY ADDRESSES IT AND NOBODY IS ACCOUNTABLE. AND WE HAVE LAWS THAT HAVE NO PENALTIES.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings in homes associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

PHM00046 Crowley, Brian

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00046-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. I'M BRIAN CROWLEY, 501 CALIFORNIA STREET, EL SEGUNDO.

I'M AN AEROSPACE ENGINEER BY TRADE, BUT I'M ALSO CHAIRMAN OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO. BUT I'M HERE IN A PRIVATE CAPACITY.

THIS EIR FAILS TO CONSIDER ALTERNATIVES. AND AS A PLANNER, I LOOK AT IT FOREMOST AS A PLANNER, AND YOU HAVE TO STEP BACK AND LOOK AT THE FOREST BECAUSE WE'RE EMBEDDED IN THE TREES HERE WHEN WE'RE LOOKING AT THE DETAILS. WHAT WE HAVE HERE IS VERY BAD PLANNING.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHM00046-2

Comment:

THE PRINCIPLES ON HOW YOU OUGHT TO BUILD CITIES THE WAY WE USED TO BUILD THEM SAY THAT YOU HAVE TO DISTRIBUTE THE NEEDED SERVICES AMONG THE USERS WHO NEED IT. WE DON'T DO THAT WITH THIS IDEA. THE AIRPORT ITSELF IS LOCATED ON THE EDGE OF THE BASIN; SO IT CAN ONLY ACCOMMODATE TRAFFIC IN A 180 DEGREE SECTOR. THEY'RE ONLY ONE-HALF THE WAY OUT THAT THEY ARE AT OTHER AIRPORTS.

Response:

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

PHM00046-3

Comment:

ALSO, QUITE SIMPLY, YOU HEARD IT BEFORE, WE HAVE TOO SMALL A FOOTPRINT FOR A MAJOR AIRPORT AND THERE'S NO MORE ROOM FOR EXPANSION. AND AS I STOOD THERE PULLING OUT WEEDS IN MY GARDEN -- AND I LIVE IN THE FAR END OF EL SEGUNDO FROM THE LADY THAT JUST SPOKE, A QUIET PART -- BUT I LOOKED UP STRAIGHT FROM MY WEEDS TO THE NOISE OF A 767 ABOUT 400 FEET ABOVE MY HEAD JUST A COUPLE OF WEEKS AGO BECAUSE THEY'RE LANDING THEM NOSE-TO-TAIL.

AND THERE WAS NO MORE ROOM ON THE RUNWAY FOR THAT PLANE TO COME DOWN. THEY HAD TO DO A SHARP LEFT AND THEY FLEW OVER ME. AND I'M VERY FAR FROM WHERE THAT AIRPORT OUGHT TO HAVE AIRPLANES.

Response:

Comment noted. Occasionally pilots execute go-arounds resulting in a change of course as an aircraft nears the airport and aborts its landing. Go-arounds are a routine occurrence at all airports.

PHM00046-4

Comment:

WE HAVE A LOT OF FLAWED ASSUMPTIONS THAT THIS WHOLE CONCEPT IS BASED ON. ONE, IT ASSUMES THE MARKET CAN'T OR WON'T ADJUST TO CHANGES IN WHERE THE AIRPORT IS LOCATED. THAT'S A TAUTOLOGICAL ARGUMENT. THEY SAY, GEE, PEOPLE THAT USE THE AIRPORT ARE LOCATED NEAR THE AIRPORT. BUT THEY WILL MOVE IF IT PAYS THEM TO DO SO.

THIS IS A MARKET-MANIPULATED SITUATION. READ THE L.A. TIMES TOMORROW. LOOK AT THE TRAVEL SECTION IN THE TIMES. THE NEXT-TO-LAST PAGE SHOWS YOU THE PRICES OF FLIGHTS OUT OF THE VARIOUS AIRPORTS TO CITIES IN THE UNITED STATES. YOU WILL FIND

3. Comments and Responses

THAT THE OTHER AIRPORTS IN THE L.A. AREA ARE TWO TO FIVE TIMES AS MUCH TO GO TO CITIES. WHY WOULD ANYBODY WANT TO GO TO ANOTHER AIRPORT?

IT ASSUMES THERE HAS TO BE ONE AIRPORT. WE'VE GOT LOTS OF CITIES WITH MULTIPLE AIRPORTS.

Response:

Comment noted. Actually, the average fare for domestic flights from LAX is higher than for Burbank, Long Beach, Ontario, and Orange County. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PHM00046-5

Comment:

ONE THING I WANT TO POINT OUT, IT MENTIONS THE GREEN LINE EXTENSION IS GOING TO BE CONSIDERED AS A MITIGATION FOR THIS MASTER PLAN. THEY OWE THAT TO US ALREADY. THAT PLACE OPERATES UNDER A C.U.P. WITH A VARIANCE, AND THEY OWE US THAT ALREADY. THIS SHOULD NOT COUNT AS AN ADDITION TO HELP THEM OUT. THEY OWE US THIS ALREADY.

Response:

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

PHM00046-6

Comment:

AND I HAVE RIDDEN THAT GREEN LINE SINCE IT'S OPENED. WE'RE NOT HYPOCRITICAL IN EL SEGUNDO. BUT THE EXPANDED AIRPORT DOESN'T DO ANYTHING FOR US THAT THE CURRENT AIRPORT DOESN'T DO. WE DON'T DEPEND ON IT THAT MUCH. AND WE WERE THERE FIRST. THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO HAS BEEN THERE BEFORE THE AIRPORT WAS THERE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00046-7

Comment:

SO YOU CANNOT APPROVE THIS KIND OF THING UNLESS THE IMPACT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD OF THE HARMS CAN BE MITIGATED TO A NEGLIGIBLE LEVEL. AND YOU CAN'T DO IT WITH THIS EIR. YOU CAN'T CERTIFY THIS EIR.

Response:

Under both NEPA and CEQA, a project can be approved despite significant, unavoidable impacts. If a project would result in significant effects which cannot be avoided or substantially lessened, the agency must prepare a written statement of overriding considerations. Economic, legal, social, technological, or other project benefits are all possible bases for a statement of overriding considerations. See Pub. Res. Code § 21081(b); 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15093(a). Accordingly, projects are regularly approved on the basis of policy considerations despite unmitigated environmental effects. See, e.g., *San Francisco Ecology Ctr. v. City & County of San Francisco* (1975) 48 Cal.App.3d 584, 596-97 (goals of making international airport more convenient, safe, efficient, and quiet were valid overriding considerations).

PHM00047 Polk, Dora**None Provided****6/9/2001****PHM00047-1****Comment:**

THE NAME IS DORA POLK. I REFER YOU TO PRESIDENT JAMES K. POLK, WHO BROUGHT CALIFORNIA INTO THE UNION.

I HAVE JUST A FEW SCATTERED THOUGHTS. I WANT TO CONCUR IN ALL THAT BRILLIANT AND SPLENDID ANALYSIS PUT OUT BY THE SUPPORTERS OF EL SEGUNDO'S POSITION: THE HEALTH PROBLEMS, THE POLLUTION, THE CIRCULATION OF TRAFFIC PROBLEMS, AND ALL THE REST THAT I DO NOT NEED TO REPEAT IN THIS SHORT TIME I HAVE AVAILABLE.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2, S-4, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHM00047-2**Comment:**

I CONCUR TOO IN THE CRITICISM OF THE BAD FAITH GESTURE OF SCHEDULING A NUMBER OF MEETINGS AT THE SAME TIME AND THE LOGORRHEA WORDS, MILLIONS OF WHICH HAVE BEEN CHURNED OUT IN THIS PROCESS BY THE LEVIATHAN, AND MAKES IT EXTREMELY DIFFICULT, IF NOT IMPOSSIBLE, FOR MOST PEOPLE WITH JOBS AND FAMILY TO GO TO THE LIBRARY AND READ THAT AMOUNT OF MATERIAL.

THOSE ARE ACTS OF BAD FAITH IN MY JUDGMENT. AND THE LEVIATHAN TOO, THE LARGE NUMBERS OF PEOPLE EMPLOYED OUTSIDE ON THE DESKS, THE LARGE AMOUNT OF MATERIALS DISPLAYED, ALL WITH US IN A VERY REDUCED POSITION.

Response:

The intent of the one hearing at three locations was to maximize the number of persons that could provide input and provide more access to the most convenient hearing site. A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAX has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PHM00047-3**Comment:**

NOW I WANT TO SAY TOO THAT THIS IS NOT NIMBY. I HAVE BEEN HERE FOR FOUR DECADES. AND WE HAVE WITH GREAT PATIENCE AND TOLERANCE SEEN THE GROWTH OF THIS AIRPORT. AND IN EVERYTHING THERE WILL BE A SATURATION FOR IT THAT IS REACHED. AND THIS IS IT.

I CAN ONLY ANALOGIZE TO A NEIGHBOR WHO COMES IN, BUYS A BUSINESS NEXT DOOR TO YOU, FILLS THE FIRST TOOL SHED, ADDS THE FIRST ADDITION, THEN THE NEXT STORY, THEN THE NEXT LEVEL, CUTS OUT MY SUN, MAKES OF MY TOLERANCE OVER THE YEARS SOMETHING THAT IS UNFORGIVABLE.

3. Comments and Responses

NOW, THE LAST TUG IS WHAT BREAKS THE CORD, BREAKS THE FRAYED CORD. THE LAST STRAW BREAKS THE CAMEL'S BACK. AND THIS IS IT. THE LAST GALLON OF RIVER WATER BREAKS THE LEVY. THIS IS IT.

Response:

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

PHM00047-4

Comment:

AND I HAVE BROUGHT YOU AS A FEAST IN SUPPORT OF THAT GENTLEMAN WHO BROUGHT THE PIECE OF PAPER FROM HIS WIFE'S VACUUM CLEANER. TWO DAYS AGO I CLEANED MY WINDOWSILL WITH A LITTLE GADGET I HAD TO WORK OUT. I WIPED IT DOWN TODAY AND THIS IS THE RESULT OF ONE DAY'S POLLUTION.

Response:

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

PHM00048	Kenton, Jack	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	---------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHM00048-1

Comment:

I'M JACK KENTON AND I LIVE ON DUNE STREET IN EL SEGUNDO. I TRIED READING YOUR EIR/EIS. YOU'VE GOT SEVERAL THOUSAND PAGES THERE, AND I THINK I GOT THROUGH A COUPLE OF HUNDRED AND GAVE UP. IT'S INFORMATION OVERLOAD AS THEY SAY IN THIS DAY AND AGE.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding the content, structure, and availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PHM00048-2

Comment:

SOMETHING I COULDN'T FIND OUT IS WHAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN TO MY ACCESS TO EL SEGUNDO FROM THE NORTH WITH THE PLANS FOR EXPANDING THE 105 HIGHWAY AND RUNNING INTO IMPERIAL HIGHWAY. THERE'S DISCUSSION THAT PERSHING WILL NOT BE AVAILABLE TO GET FROM EL SEGUNDO TO THE PLAYA DEL REY-WESTCHESTER AREA BECAUSE THAT WILL JUST BE FOR THE NEW WEST TERMINAL, IF THAT'S BUILT.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02274-3 regarding Pershing Drive.

PHM00048-3

Comment:

THE NOISE ISSUE. THEY SAY IT WILL NOT GET WORSE. WE'RE GOING TO MAKE QUIETER AIRPLANES SO WE WON'T GET MORE NOISE. BUT, YOU KNOW, YOU CAN TAKE A LOT OF NOISE FOR A BRIEF MOMENT IF YOU HAVE AN HOUR BETWEEN THE NEXT TIME IT HAPPENS. BUT WHEN IT COMES ONE AFTER ANOTHER AND THEY SEEM TO NEVER STOP UNTIL YOU GET TO SOMETIME AFTER MIDNIGHT, AND THEN YOU ONLY HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT THE CARGO FLIGHTS, IT GETS TO BE A BIT MUCH.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences for a discussion of the relationships between single noise events and cumulative noise levels and how they might change in the future. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 nighttime aircraft operations.

PHM00048-4

Comment:

THE BIG ISSUE THAT SEEMS TO KEEP COMING UP WITH THE AIRPORT IS WHENEVER YOU TALK TO ANYONE ABOUT THE NUMBER OF FLIGHTS COMING IN, THEY SAY WE'VE DEREGULATED THE AIRLINES. WE CANNOT STOP THEM. CONGRESS MANDATED THAT THE AIRPLANES CAN GO ANYPLACE THEY WANT TO.

WELL, CHICAGO, I THINK WASHINGTON NATIONAL, REAGAN NATIONAL, NEW YORK AREA STILL HAVE SLOT REQUIREMENTS BASED ON CONGRESS. IF WE CAN'T DO ANYTHING ELSE TO CONTROL THE LARGE VOLUME OF NOSE-TO-TAIL AIRCRAFT COMING AND GOING FROM THE AIRPORT, I THINK PERHAPS IT'S TIME TO TALK TO CONGRESS AND REREGULATE THE ACCESS TO THE AIRPORTS.

Response:

The High Density Rule (HDR), issued by the FAA in 1969, was a measure to reduce delays and congestion at five select airports including New York's LaGuardia, JFK International and Newark International, Washington-Reagan National and Chicago O'Hare International. The HDR provided for hourly arrival and departure caps for both commercial airline and general aviation operators for certain hours of the day. Contrary to public perception, the slot controls were not established to regulate capacity or for noise abatement. The implementation of certain improvements in technology has improved the efficiency of the airspace system and allowed the slot requirements to be phased out. The HDR was suspended indefinitely at Newark and eliminated effective July 2, 2002 at O'Hare. The HDR has been amended on several occasions, most recently in the AIR 21 legislation passed by the U.S. Congress in 2000 that eliminates slot restrictions at JFK and LaGuardia on January 1, 2007. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2, The Role of Deregulation in Aviation Planning for further discussion of slot controls.

PHM00048-5

Comment:

AS IT NOW STANDS, I DO NOT CARE TO SEE THE EXPANSION OF THE AIRPORT GO ON. I THINK SAFETY FACTORS COULD, WOULD BE BENEFICIAL TO INCREASE SOME OF THE WORK THERE AT THE AIRPORT. BUT RATHER THAN HAVE INCREASED SAFETY BY EXPANSION, I'D RATHER SEE NOTHING HAPPEN TO TRY TO FORCE THE AIRPORT NOT TO BRING MORE AIRCRAFT IN.

Response:

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

PHM00049 Money, Jess

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00049-1

Comment:

THIS HEARING IS A CHARADE. IT'S BEING HELD ONLY BECAUSE THE LAW REQUIRES. YOU KNOW THAT LITIGATION IS INEVITABLE AND YOU HAVE NO INTENTION OF ADDRESSING ANY OF OUR OBJECTIONS OR DROPPING THIS PLAN EXCEPT AS REQUIRED BY THE COURTS.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00049-2

Comment:

THIS EIR IS 12,000 PAGES OF DISTORTIONS, OMISSIONS, FALLACIOUS ASSUMPTIONS, FICTIONAL CONCLUSIONS AND OUTRIGHT LIES. YOU HAVE LIED TO US FROM THE BEGINNING AND YOU ARE LYING TO US NOW. WE KNOW YOU'RE LYING. YOU KNOW YOU'RE LYING.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00049-3

Comment:

HERE'S A FEW THINGS YOU DON'T KNOW. ONE, YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT THE MEANING OF "JIHAD" IS. YOU DON'T LIVE IN THE SOUTH BAY, SO YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT A WONDERFUL PLACE IT IS TO LIVE, RAISE CHILDREN AND RETIRE. THERE WILL BE A HOLY WAR BEFORE WE WILL LET YOU RUIN WHAT SO MANY OF US AND OUR PARENTS WORKED SO HARD FOR SO LONG TO ACHIEVE.

YOU DON'T KNOW WHERE AND HOW THIS BATTLE IS GOING TO BE FOUGHT. THIS IS PAINFUL AND PERSONAL FOR US. SO WE'RE GOING TO MAKE IT EVEN MORE PAINFUL AND PERSONAL FOR YOU AND FOR THE PEOPLE YOU ANSWER TO.

THE PROTESTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS WON'T JUST BE AROUND LAX. THEY'RE GOING TO BE IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOODS, AROUND YOUR HOUSES, AROUND THE SCHOOLS WHERE YOUR KIDS, YOUR GRANDKIDS AND YOUR NEIGHBORS' KIDS ATTEND SCHOOL. WHEN WE'RE DONE, YOU'RE GOING TO BE PERSONA NON GRATA IN YOUR OWN COMMUNITIES.

Response:

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

PHM00049-4

Comment:

THIS ISN'T ABOUT SAFETY OR JOBS OR THE REGIONAL ECONOMY. IT'S ABOUT KEEP A VICE GRIP ON TAX REVENUES FOR THE CITY OF L.A. THAT IS WHY THERE WILL ALSO BE PLENTY OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE AROUND THE HOMES OF CORRUPT AIRLINE SHILLS ON THE L.A. COUNCIL WHO FAVOR THIS EXPANSION. WE'LL GET THE LOBBYISTS AND THEIR FAMILIES TOO.

THIS EXPANSION IS GOING TO VISIT HELL ON OUR NEIGHBORHOODS. WE'RE GOING TO VISIT HELL ON YOUR NEIGHBORHOODS FIRST. AND THE BIG THING YOU DON'T KNOW IS WHAT LAX IS GOING TO BE LIKE WHEN THIS IS OVER.

Response:

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

PHM00049-5**Comment:**

YOU'RE ABOUT TO FALL VICTIM TO THE LAW OF UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES. WHEN WE'RE DONE WITH THE LAWYERS, THE CIVIL, RICO AND CLASS ACTION SUITS, THE PROTESTS AND SIT-INS, THE DISRUPTIONS, YOU'RE NOT GOING TO GET TO EXPAND LAX. YOU'RE GOING TO BEG FOR THE CHANCE TO CONTRACT IT, REDUCE AND CAP OPERATIONS AT 60 MILLION PASSENGERS A YEAR, AND SCALE BACK CARGO OPERATIONS COMMENSURATELY.

YOU'RE GOING TO BE FORCED TO DIVEST OWNERSHIP OF PALMDALE AND ONTARIO, AND YOU'RE GOING TO BE FORCED TO TRANSFER CONTROL OF LAX TO A COUNTY-WIDE BOARD HAVING REPRESENTATIVES FROM EVERY CITY IN THE COUNTY. WE ARE GOING TO STOP THIS EXPANSION. WE'RE GOING TO SHOOT IT WITH A SILVER BULLET AND PUT A STAKE IN ITS HEART. THERE WILL BE SMOKE ON THE WATER AND BLOOD ON THE MOON, BUT THERE WILL NOT BE ANY EXPANSION OF LAX.

WHEN WE GET DONE, AFTER YOU GUYS HAVE SUFFERED THE HEART ATTACKS, INSOMNIA, DEPRESSION, DIVORCES AND NERVOUS BREAKDOWNS, THE CLOSEST ANY OF YOU IS GOING TO COME TO OPERATING AN AIRPORT IS RUNNING A CROP DUSTING SERVICE IN MODESTO.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00050**Acevedo, Maurice****None Provided****6/9/2001****PHM00050-1****Comment:**

I'M MAURICE ACEVEDO. I LIVE IN EL SEGUNDO, AND I PREFACE MY STATEMENTS WITH THE FACT THAT I WORK FOR A VERY MAJOR WORLDWIDE CARGO FREIGHT COMPANY. I'LL LEAVE IT AT THAT. BUT I'VE LIVED IN EL SEGUNDO FOR OVER 30 YEARS.

FIRST QUESTION. HOW ARE YOU GOING TO MITIGATE MRS. POLK'S SOOT? YOU CAN MITIGATE SOUND BY IMPROVING THE WINDOW INSULATION. YOU CAN MITIGATE TRAFFIC BY LIGHT RAIL. HOW ARE YOU GOING TO MITIGATE THE SOOT? INCREASED AIRLINE ACTIVITY, INCREASED FLIGHT ACTIVITY, YOU DON'T ADDRESS THAT. OKAY.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01196-12 regarding air quality impacts and further mitigation measures. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PHM00050-2**Comment:**

SECOND POINT. HAVE ANY OF YOU BEEN TO EL TORO DOWN THE 405 WHERE THE 5 INTERSECTS? HAS ANYONE LOOKED AT THE POPULATION EXPLOSION OF RANCHO SANTA MARGARITA?

MY FREIGHT COMPANY BRINGS 30 TRACTOR-TRAILERS OF FREIGHT FROM ORANGE COUNTY TO LAX EVERY DAY. WE'RE BEGGING FOR EL TORO TO OPEN UP. WE COULDN'T WAIT. WE NEEDED IT FIVE YEARS AGO. BUT, NO, NOT IN MY BACKYARD. L.A.'S BACKYARD. WHY NOT? THEY GOT THE SOOT. THEY GOT THE TRAFFIC. THEY GOT THE POLLUTION. BESIDES, THEY'RE GREEDY. THEY LIKE THE REVENUE.

3. Comments and Responses

AND THAT'S WHAT IT'S ABOUT. IT'S ALL ABOUT MONEY. L.A. WANTS THE REVENUE.

MEANTIME, THOSE TRUCKS THAT COME UP THE 405, JUST LIKE THOSE TRUCKS THAT GO FROM THE HARBOR TO DOWNTOWN L.A. DOWN THE 710, BUT GEE, L.A. GOT SMART. THEY SUNK SOME MONEY IN THE ALAMEDA CORRIDOR. WELL, WHY DON'T YOU GET SMART? WHY DON'T YOU HOOK UP WITH ORANGE COUNTY AND SAY, YOU KNOW WHAT, WE'RE GOING TO CAP OUR CAPACITY AND YOU NEED TO BUILD OUT EL TORO.

Response:

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

PHM00050-3

Comment:

OR EVEN BETTER YET, WHY DON'T YOU GO TO SAN BERNARDINO AND SAY WE'RE GOING TO CAP OUR CAPACITY. YOU NEED TO BUILD OUT MARCH AIR FORCE BASE. THERE'S ALL KINDS OF ALTERNATIVES. YOU'RE JUST NOT LOOKING AT THEM.

Response:

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

PHM00050-4

Comment:

LAST AND FINAL POINT. I DON'T KNOW WHAT YOU'RE GOING TO DO WITH THAT GOLF COURSE ON THE NORTH SIDE, BUT I'D SURE LIKE TO SEE THAT GO THE LIGHT RAIL. PUT ALL YOUR CAR RENTAL PLACES AND YOUR TERMINALS OVER THERE. WHY DO YOU NEED A GOLF COURSE? GEE, I FORGOT. IT'S ABOUT REVENUE, HUH?

Response:

The golf course provides a much-needed buffer between the airport and the residential communities of Westchester. Also, the airport is located between the existing Green Line system and the golf course. Routing the Green Line around the airport to get to a north site would be inconvenient for transit riders, environmentally disruptive on the route between the sites, and cost prohibitive.

PHM00051 Lee, Lillie

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00051-1

Comment:

LILLIE LEE, MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIFORNIA.

MY WHOLE POINT WITH ALL OF YOU IS WHY FURTHER EXPANSION? YOU DON'T KEEP THE COMMITMENT WHEN YOU EXPANDED LAST TIME. YOU LIE TO US. YOU DON'T TAKE CARE OF THE PROBLEMS.

Response:

Comment noted. The purpose and need for the proposal action was described in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHM00051-2

Comment:

AND I WANT TO KNOW HOW MUCH MORE OF THE SOUTH BAY THAT YOU WANT TO CLAIM WITH NOISE AND POLLUTION SO THAT YOU CAN PUSH UP THE BUCK IN YOUR POCKETS, BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT THIS IS ALL ABOUT.

Response:

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

PHM00051-3

Comment:

I MOVED 27 YEARS AGO FROM EL SEGUNDO TO MANHATTAN TO GET AWAY FROM THE NOISE FROM THE AIRPORT BECAUSE IT MAKES ME VERY ILL. NOW I HAVE TO LISTEN TO CARGO BOOMING OFF THE RUNWAY EVERY NIGHT, WARMING UP THE RUNWAY. AND I GET THESE HORRIBLE THINGS FROM THE AIRPORT THAT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH WHAT I HAVE COMPLAINED ABOUT. AND THE NOISE IS THERE AND THE PLANES FLYING OVER.

Response:

Impacts associated with noise were described in Section 4.1, Noise (subsection 4.1.6), and Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For more information on noise impacts on the South Bay, see Response to Comment PC00552-2 and Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1. Please see Topical Responses TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand.

PHM00051-4

Comment:

LIKE THE LITTLE LADY WITH THE DUST, WE NOW HAVE DUST ALL OVER OUR PROPERTY. AND I'M APPROXIMATELY FOUR MILES FROM THE AIRPORT.

Response:

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

PHM00051-5

Comment:

HOW MUCH OF THE SKIES OVER OUR HOMES AND AROUND OUR PROPERTIES ARE YOU GOING TO CLAIM TO FLY ONE MORE PLANE IN AND OUT OF THAT AIRPORT? IT'S RIDICULOUS.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00051-6

Comment:

THEY HAD THE TRANSPORTATION SECRETARY ON TELEVISION LAST WEEK. THEY ASKED HER IF THE SKIES ARE GRIDLOCKED. SHE SAYS, WELL, NOT TOTALLY BUT ALMOST.

Response:

The content of this comment is similar to Comment PC01881-85. Please see Response to Comment PC01881-85 regarding the airspace capacity of the Master Plan alternatives.

PHM00051-7

Comment:

COME ON. GIVE US A BREAK. WE HAVE A BEAUTIFUL COMMUNITY. YOU ALREADY, ON JANUARY 1ST OF 2000, STARTED DESTROYING PALOS VERDES, MANHATTAN, REDONDO AND HERMOSA WITH FLY-OVERS AND THE NOISE COMING FROM THE GROUND AND THE AIRPORT FROM THE CARGO. WE GET NO SLEEP THREE OR FOUR NIGHTS OUT OF THE WEEK BECAUSE OF THIS. AND WE KNOW THAT NOISE AT TAKE-OFF IS LOUDER THAN LANDING.

Response:

The commentor is correct in identifying that departing aircraft are usually louder than arriving aircraft. The commentor may be affected by easterly takeoffs circling back to the west on their departures to Asia. LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction to alleviate that situation by making over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. During a recent 18-month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. As noted by the noise abatement procedures delineated in Subtopical Response TR-N-7.1, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are made when weather or wind conditions require east traffic flow. Nighttime single event noise impacts and mitigation for LAX Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting information in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1 regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. Additionally, for easterly arrivals at night, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-5.2 regarding east flow operations at night, Subtopical Response TR-N-5.3 regarding night run-up activity and Subtopical Response TR-N-5.4 regarding relationship of air cargo flights and night noise impacts.

PHM00051-8

Comment:

I'M OPPOSED TO THIS. YOU GUYS LIE. MY GREAT GRANDFATHER USED TO SAY, A BEAUTIFUL GERMAN MAN, HE WOULD SAY, "YOU CAN LOCK FROM A THIEF BUT YOU CANNOT LOCK FROM A LIAR." AND ALL YOU PEOPLE WANT TO DO IS STEAL THE SKIES OVER OUR PROPERTIES AND AROUND US AND MAKE OUR LIVES MISERABLE SO YOU CAN MAKE ANOTHER BUCK.

COME ON, LAX. YOU ARE NOT THE ONLY PLAYER IN THIS COMMUNITY AND YOU DO NOT DESERVE OR HAVE NOT DESERVED TO BE DOING WHAT YOU ARE DOING.

Response:

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

PHM00052 Hill, Teresa

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00052-1

Comment:

HI. MY NAME IS TERESA HILL AND I LIVE IN EL SEGUNDO. NOTHING I'M GOING TO SAY HASN'T BEEN SAID BY SOMEONE BEFORE, BUT THEY SAY REPETITION IS THE BEST WAY TO LEARN.

ONE OF THE SPEAKERS HAD SAID A LOT OF LAWSUITS AND STUFF. I HAVE TO SAY, WHEN I THINK AT NIGHT OF THE L.A. EXPANSION, I THINK OF PG&E. AND IF I WAS LAX, I DON'T KNOW IF I WOULD WANT TO BE THE NEXT PG&E. PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC, WE ALL KNOW THE STORY.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00052-2

Comment:

I LIVE IN EL SEGUNDO. ONE OF THE THINGS THE EIR REPORT DOES NOT ADDRESS IS THE DURATION OF THE NOISE. AGAIN, NONE OF THIS HASN'T ALREADY BEEN SPOKE ABOUT, BUT TODAY I CAN'T HOLD A CONVERSATION WITH MY NEIGHBORS WITHOUT PAUSING INTERMITTENTLY FOR PLANES TO GO BY. AND THEY GO BY EVERY FIVE MINUTES OR LESS.

Response:

Comment noted. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences.

PHM00052-3

Comment:

ALSO, I SPEND MANY SLEEPLESS NIGHTS BECAUSE OF THE AIRPLANE NOISE AND THE DURATION OF THIS NOISE. WE HAVE AIR CARGO PLANES THAT TAKE OFF ALL NIGHT LONG. I CALL MANY TIMES AND I GET THE SAME FORM LETTER EVERYBODY ELSE PROBABLY GETS WHEN THEY CALL.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP), how single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening are evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and how approval of the LAX Master Plan would revise the ANMP to include residential uses exposed to single event noise levels that are outside the current ANMP. Also see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PHM00052-4

Comment:

AGAIN, AIR QUALITY WAS ADDRESSED PREVIOUSLY AND I THINK IT WAS VERY WELL COVERED. BUT WE HAVE TO UNDERSTAND THAT THE PROXIMITY OF THE AIRPORT TO HEAVILY POPULATED AREAS DOES NOT PROVIDE FOR RESPONSIBLE EXPANSION. EAST WINDS DRIVE THE POLLUTANTS THAT COME OUT OF THOSE PLANES RIGHT BACK INTO OUR COMMUNITIES.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PHM00052-5

Comment:

ONE OF THE THINGS THE EIR TAKES CREDIT FOR IS NOISE LEVEL REDUCTION, BUT THIS IS REALLY NOT SOMETHING THAT AIRPORT EXPANSION IS ACCOMMODATING. IT'S REALLY A SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PRESSURE THAT HAS CAUSED THE PHASE-OUT OF SOME OF THESE PLANES. IT SHOULD NOT BE PUT AS PART OF THE BENEFIT TO EXPANSION.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR does not take credit for the reduction of aircraft noise associated with the phase-out of Stage 2 aircraft weighing more than 75,000 pounds, but rather reports the effects of that change relative to environmental baseline conditions. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR reported the degree of change relative to Year 2000 conditions, as well as the changes associated with proposed Alternative D. For further information on the effects of the Stage 2 phase out, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-7.6 regarding ANCA Phase-out of Stage 2 aircraft.

PHM00052-6

Comment:

WE ALSO TALK ABOUT VEHICLES AND HOW THE POLLUTANTS WILL BE REDUCED AS A RESULT OF THE EXPANSION. AGAIN, THIS IS JUST COMMON BUSINESS RESPONSIBILITY AND SHOULD NOT BE TAKEN AS A BENEFIT.

Response:

The preliminary list of mitigation measures included in the Draft EIS/EIR was modified in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR published in July 2003. See Section 4.6, Air Quality, and Technical Report S4, Supplemental Air Quality Technical Response. In accordance with Section 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, "an EIR shall describe feasible measures that could minimize significant adverse impacts." As such, the list of recommended mitigation measures includes a variety of components intended to reduce air quality impacts.

PHM00052-7

Comment:

AS HAS ALREADY BEEN STATED, THE LOCATION AND LAND MASS AT LAX DOES NOT FACILITATE EXPANSION. THERE WAS ONE INDIVIDUAL WHO TALKED ABOUT MOVING FORWARD AND HOW WE HAVE TO EXPAND HERE. ALL THAT'S GOING TO DO IS PROLONG A REGIONAL APPROACH. IF YOU'RE AN AIRLINE AND YOU CAN PLAN ALL YOUR FLIGHTS OUT OF LAX, WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO PLAN THEM? WE'RE NOT FACILITATING LONG-RANGE PLANNING HERE.

Response:

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

PHM00053**Mulligan, Richard****None Provided****6/9/2001****PHM00053-1****Comment:**

THE HANDOUTS YOU'VE GIVEN TO US, ONE ENTITLED LAX AND GROUND TRANSPORTATION, YOU HAVE A NUMBER OF ITEMS AND I WONDER WHY ONE OF THE ITEMS YOU DID NOT PUT ON HERE IS THE EXPANSION OF AVIATION BOULEVARD AND THE NUMBER OF LANES FOR AVIATION BOULEVARD.

ONE OF THE PRIMARY REASONS FOR THAT IS TO ACCOMMODATE A LARGER AMOUNT OF TRAFFIC. ANOTHER REASON FOR IT, ALTHOUGH PROBABLY NOT STATED, IS TO ACCOMMODATE THE LARGE NUMBER OF TRUCK TRAFFIC THAT IS NOW TRAVELING ALONG AVIATION BOULEVARD TO REACH THE CARGO TERMINALS AT THE AIRPORT.

THERE IS A TREMENDOUS NUMBER OF FREIGHT FORWARDERS LOCATED IN OUR COMMUNITY, AND THEY ARE USING SURFACE STREETS TO GET ACCESS TO THE AIRPORT. I'M RAISING A SAFETY ISSUE NOW BECAUSE ON AVIATION BOULEVARD IS A SCHOOL CALLED DANA MIDDLE SCHOOL, AND A NUMBER OF THE CHILDREN TRAVEL TO THE MIDDLE SCHOOL BY WALKING ALONG AVIATION BOULEVARD.

SO NOW WE'RE GOING TO HAVE AN EXPANDED NUMBER OF LANES. AND WITH AN EXPANDED NUMBER OF LANES WILL BE AN INCREASED NUMBER OF TRAFFIC AND TRUCKS AND ALSO AN INCREASED SPEED OF THOSE CARS AND TRUCKS. SO I HAVE NOT SEEN ANYTHING ANYWHERE IN THIS REPORT THAT ADDRESSES THE SAFETY ISSUE OF OUR CHILDREN THAT ARE GOING TO BE TRAVELING DAILY, MORNING AND AFTERNOON, TO THE SCHOOL.

Response:

The widening of Aviation Boulevard between Arbor Vitae Street and Manhattan Beach Boulevard, identified in Technical Report 3b, Table 2.3 as four separate projects, is included as a background transportation improvement. The decisions to implement these projects have been made previously by others, and the projects are fully funded. Comments in opposition to these improvements should be addressed to the local jurisdictions adjoining Aviation Boulevard. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PHM00053-2**Comment:**

ANOTHER THING IS ON ANOTHER HANDOUT, THE 2-1-A FOR THE MASTER PLAN, "WHAT WILL BE THE IMPACTS OF TRAFFIC PROBLEMS IN THE AIRPORT AREA?" QUOTE, THE MASTER PLAN INCLUDES MASSIVE CONGESTION RELIEF COMPONENTS AND THE DRAFT EIS/EIR STUDIES SHOW THAT THESE MEASURES CAN ELIMINATE ALL OF THE SURFACE STREET AND FREEWAY IMPACT OF MEETING LOCAL FUTURE AVIATION SERVICES DEMAND.

DO YOU EXPECT ME TO BELIEVE THAT? THAT IS JUST BALONEY. AND PLEASE DON'T INSULT OUR INTELLIGENCE BY WRITING SOMETHING TO THAT EFFECT. TELL THE TRUTH. TELL US WHAT YOU REALLY MEAN WHEN YOU SAY, "IMPACT TO THE LOCAL COMMUNITY BY THE EXPANSION OF THE AIRPORT UPON OUR LOCAL TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE," AND DON'T TELL US THAT YOU CAN MITIGATE ALL OF THE INCREASED TRAFFIC THAT WE'RE GOING TO EXPECT FROM AN EXPANDED AIRPORT.

TELL THE TRUTH, PLEASE, AND DON'T INSULT OUR INTELLIGENCE.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The proposed mitigation plan would mitigate, to the extent feasible, all impacts from the proposed project. For traffic, this does not mean that the mitigations will improve the current conditions of area roads (although several areas would operate better than today, such as in the airport's CTA). When comparing the traffic conditions with the project to those in the Adjusted Environmental Baseline alternative for that same year, any decline in traffic conditions caused by the project would be mitigated to the extent feasible by the mitigation plan. In essence, this ensures that area traffic conditions would be no worse with the project, than it would be under the Adjusted Environmental Baseline scenario. This was further discussed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHM00054

Meyers, Linda

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00054-1

Comment:

I'M LINDA MEYERS AT 815 MAIN STREET IN EL SEGUNDO. THAT'S LIKE ABOUT THREE BLOCKS FROM THE RUNWAY. AND I'M NOT USED TO GETTING UP AND SPEAKING PUBLICLY, BUT THIS BOTHERED ME SO MUCH I HAVE TO SAY SOMETHING.

I'M VERY GLAD EVERYBODY IS TALKING ABOUT THE POLLUTION. THAT'S THE THING THAT BOTHERS ME THE MOST. I HAD MY PLACE CARPETED NOT TOO LONG AGO, WHICH MEANS YOU HAVE TO MOVE ALL YOUR FURNITURE OUTSIDE. IT WAS OUT THERE ABOUT FOUR HOURS. I WIPED EVERYTHING OFF AND CLEANED IT UP BECAUSE I WAS LOOKING FORWARD TO GETTING NEW CARPET.

WHEN I BROUGHT IT BACK IN, I HAD TO WIPE EVERYTHING OFF. THE SPONGE WAS BLACK WITH ALL THE BLACK FUEL THAT WAS ON THE FURNITURE. I HAD TO VACUUM EVERYTHING. THAT'S WHAT WE'RE BREATHING. THAT'S POISON THAT WE'RE BREATHING. I HAVE TO WIPE UP MY KITCHEN FLOOR EVERY DAY WITH THIS BLACK SOOT.

I WOULD LIKE TO INVITE YOU SUPPORTERS OF THE LAX EXPANSION. WE HAVE A GREEN BELT ALONG IMPERIAL AVENUE. I'D LIKE YOU TO COME, CAMP OUT FOR ABOUT TWO WEEKS THERE. EAT YOUR FOOD THERE. BRING YOUR ELDERLY PARENTS. BRING YOUR CHILDREN AND BREATHE DEEPLY THIS BLACK SOOT THAT COMES OFF THE AIRPORT EVERY DAY, ESPECIALLY IN SANTA ANA WINDS WOULD BE BETTER FOR YOU TO COME DOWN BECAUSE THAT BRINGS IT RIGHT THROUGH.

Response:

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

PHM00054-2

Comment:

YOU CAN SMELL THE FUEL PERMEATING THROUGH EL SEGUNDO WHEN WE HAVE SANTA ANA WINDS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors and Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PHM00054-3**Comment:**

I THINK MAYOR GORDON WILL PROBABLY ALLOW YOU TO COME AND CAMP OUT IN THAT GREEN BELT. I'D LIKE YOU TO STAY THERE ABOUT TWO WEEKS AND BREATHE DEEPLY. LEAVE YOUR FOOD OUT AND THEN EAT YOUR FOOD. SEE WHAT IT'S LIKE LIVING WITH THAT EVERY DAY. TRY TO SLEEP AND LISTEN TO THE CARGO PLANES GO BY. YOU WILL SEE WHAT WE'RE GOING THROUGH. MAYBE GET THAT TOUCH OF WHAT IT'S LIKE.

Response:

Please see Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, and Technical Report 14a, Human Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR regarding air pollutant exposure pathways. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR regarding sleep disturbance associated with existing aircraft noise.

PHM00055**Palmer, Stacy****None Provided****6/9/2001****PHM00055-1****Comment:**

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS STACY PALMER AND I LIVE AT 808 MARYLAND STREET IN EL SEGUNDO, WHICH IS PROBABLY ABOUT A BLOCK AWAY FROM IMPERIAL WITH RESPECT TO ITS NORTHERN BOUNDARY. AND, YES, THERE IS AN INCREDIBLE PROBLEM WITH AIRPLANE TRAFFIC ALREADY.

I CAME DOWN HERE TODAY KNOWING THAT IT WAS IMPORTANT TO SPEAK UP, AND I THOUGHT PROBABLY THE EASIEST THING TO DO WOULD BE JUST TO WRITE THIS OUT AND PUT IT IN A BOX. BUT THE WHOLE THING IS RIDICULOUS. IT'S CUMBERSOME. IT'S NOT FAIR. IT'S INAPPROPRIATE AND SO FORTH. SO I BROUGHT MY PUBLIC COMMENTS WITH ME. I PLAN TO READ FROM THEM PRETTY MUCH.

Response:

Public comments have been accepted in both written and oral form and will be responded to.

PHM00055-2**Comment:**

MY INITIAL THOUGHT IS YOU HAVE BEEN NONRESPONSIVE AND NON ACCOUNTABLE WITH RESPECT TO CURRENT OPERATIONS. I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY TIMES I HAVE SPECIFIC OVER FLIGHT INCIDENTS. AND, YES, I TOOK IT SERIOUS INITIALLY THAT I OUGHT TO RESPOND TO THOSE WHEN THEY HAPPENED.

Response:

Comment noted. The commentor resides near the Imperial Highway at the west end of El Segundo. 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). For further information about these overflights, please see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX. Please see Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.12, for additional information of filing noise complaints and LAWA's handling of noise complaints.

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00055-3

Comment:

AFTER A FEW SITUATIONS WITH PEOPLE EITHER SORT OF DISCOUNTING TOTALLY WHAT YOU HAD TO SAY, OR WHEN YOU ASKED FOR A LETTER, YOU CAME BACK WITH SOME STUPID FORM LETTER RESPONSE THAT HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH ANSWERING THE ISSUES AND CONCERNS, THAT'S NUMBER ONE UNDER THE CATEGORY OF YOU BEING NONRESPONSIVE AND NONACCOUNTABLE.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, particularly Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.12 for additional information about filing noise complaints and how such complaints are handled by LAWA.

PHM00055-4

Comment:

A SECOND SITUATION IS THAT I UNDERSTAND THE CURRENT PASSENGERS SERVED IS SOMEWHERE AROUND 70 MILLION, AND APPARENTLY THE ORIGINAL SENSE WAS THAT THAT WAS TO HAVE BEEN 40 MILLION. DOESN'T TAKE A ROCKET SCIENTIST TO UNDERSTAND THAT YOU'VE NOW PROPOSED 98 MILLION. THEREFORE, IT'S PROBABLY CLOSER TO BEING 170 MILLION.

Response:

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

PHM00055-5

Comment:

AND IF MY VOICE SOUNDS A LITTLE BIT EXERCISED, IT'S BECAUSE I'M A LITTLE BIT ANGRY ABOUT THIS ISSUE. AND IF IT WAS TRUE THAT YOU COULD TRUST POLITICIANS, THEN THE FACT THAT ALL OF THE PREVIOUS LAX MAYORAL CANDIDATES SAYING WE'RE AGAINST IT WOULD BE ENOUGH FOR US TO JUST SAY, OH, OKAY, THEY'RE AGAINST IT. WE DON'T NEED TO COME SPEAK UP. IT'S NOT GOING TO HAPPEN.

BUT I DON'T TRUST THE POLITICIANS. I DON'T TRUST WHAT THEY SAID. AND I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO STAND UP AND SPEAK UP, AND THAT'S WHY I'M HERE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00055-6

Comment:

I BELIEVE THAT YOUR EIR IS LIKEWISE IN SERIOUS RESPECTS NONACCOUNTABLE. IT SEEMS ACCEPTABLE TO YOU APPARENTLY TO TRIPLE THE NITROUS OXIDE EMISSIONS WHILE THEN PROPOSING TO MITIGATE ONLY 30 PERCENT OF THE AMOUNT YOU TRIPLED. AGAIN, IT DOES NOT TAKE A ROCKET SCIENTIST BASICALLY TO UNDERSTAND YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT DOUBLING THE EXISTING NITROUS OXIDE EMISSION, THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

Response:

Comment noted. Air quality impacts associated with nitrogen oxides (NOx) emissions were acknowledged in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR as being significant and

unavoidable impacts of the project. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increases.

PHM00055-7

Comment:

THE PLAN NEEDS TO BE REJECTED FOR MANY REASONS. AND I DIDN'T TRY TO WAX VERBOSE. I PROBABLY COULD HAVE FILLED OUT SEVERAL MORE SHEETS. BUT I SUSPECT THAT EVEN THOUGH I'VE BEEN HERE A SHORT AMOUNT OF TIME, THE COMMENTS I'VE HEARD HAVE BEEN RESPONSIVE TO WHAT YOU ALREADY HEARD.

THE PLAN NEEDS TO BE REJECTED FOR MANY REASONS. IT'S INAPPROPRIATE TO TAX THIS CITY AND AREA OF THE POPULATION TO TAKE CARE OF THE TRAVEL NEEDS FOR MULTIPLE OTHER REGIONS AS IN ORANGE, RIVERSIDE, SAN BERNARDINO. THIS PLAN IS AN OUTRAGE. IT'S A FRAUD AND YOUR ATTEMPT TO PERPETUATE IT BOARDS ON FORCED AGGRESSION.

Response:

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

PHM00056 Dupree, Andrew None Provided 6/9/2001

PHM00056-1

Comment:

HI. THANK YOU. I DID NOT COME PREPARED WITH A SPEECH LIKE THIS WONDERFUL LADY JUST PREPARED. BUT THE THOUGHTS THAT GO THROUGH MY MIND ABOUT WHAT LAX AND THE FAA AND THE ATA IS TRYING TO DO HERE I FIND OUTRAGEOUS.

I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW THE FAA AND THE ATA HAD HEARINGS DOWN IN SEAL BEACH TO ASK THOSE PEOPLE IF IT WAS OKAY TO HAVE FLIGHTS FLY OVER THE PALOS VERDES PENINSULA. WHY WEREN'T THERE HEARINGS IN PALOS VERDES?

Response:

There were 21 public hearings conducted, several in outlying communities that have the potential to be impacted by the regional planning nature of the proposed project. Residents from Palos Verdes area had the opportunity to attend several times and locations to provide their input. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PHM00056-2

Comment:

I'D ALSO LIKE TO EXPRESS THAT, JUST FOR THE SHORT TIME THAT I'VE BEEN HERE, EVERYONE DOES NOT WANT THIS EXPANSION. WE DON'T WANT AIRPLANES AND JETS FLYING OVER OUR HOMES AT 2:00 A.M. IN THE MORNING.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00056-3

Comment:

YOU TRY TO HARVARDIZE THIS THING BY PUBLISHING BOOKS TWO TO THREE HUNDRED PAGES LONG THAT NO ONE IS GOING TO READ. WHY CAN'T WE AS CITIZENS SAY, LOOK, WE JUST DON'T WANT IT? WHATEVER HAPPENED TO CITIZENS GETTING RESPECT FROM GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES? WE JUST DON'T WANT IT, PLAIN OUT AND SIMPLE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00057 Polk, Dora

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00057-1

Comment:

DELLA BEAL HAS FILLED IN A FORM. SHE HAS A CHRONIC CHEST CONDITION. SHE ASKED ME TO READ THIS.

THERE HAS BEEN LITTLE SAID ON THIS POINT AND I WISH TO BE SURE IT IS EXPRESSED BEFORE WE LEAVE. WHAT YOU HAVE DONE IS FORCE US INTO BAD-MOUTHING OUR OWN BEAUTIFUL CITY. YOU HAVE FORCED US IN EFFECT TO DEPRECIATE OUR OWN PROPERTY BY POINTING OUT ITS DEFECTS.

YOU HAVE HEARD AN OUTPOURING OF THESE NEGATIVES. YOU HAVE HEARD US BAD-MOUTHING OUR OWN PROPERTY WHEN WE SHOULD BE SINGING ITS PRAISES FOR IT HAS MANY BEAUTIES TO BE PRAISED. IT IS A DESPERATE ENDEAVOR WE ARE IN WHEN WE ARE FORCED TO PUT OUR WORST FOOT FORWARD.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00058 Freeman, Edna

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00058-1

Comment:

I'M EDNA FREEMAN AND I LIVE IN EL SEGUNDO. I'VE LIVED IN EL SEGUNDO EVER SINCE I MOVED TO AMERICA IN ABOUT SINCE 1957.

WHEN WE CAME HERE, FIRST THE AIRPORT WAS EAST OF SEPULVEDA, IT WAS JUST A LITTLE SHACK, BUT I WANT TO TALK ABOUT PRIOR TO 1975, MY HUSBAND AND I HAD APARTMENTS ON ARBOR VITAE. WE HAD TO CHANGE THE CARPETS CONSTANTLY THERE AND BUY NEW DRAPES BECAUSE OF THE POLLUTION. IT WAS ON THE WALKWAYS, IT WAS JUST GREASE AND SOOT. NOW, THAT WAS BEFORE 1975. YOU KNOW NOW IT'S EVEN WORSE. IF THE AIRPORT EXPANDS, IT'S GOING TO BE EVEN WORSE. AT THAT TIME IT WAS DREADFUL. THAT'S ALL I'VE GOT TO SAY.

Response:

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

PHM00059 Meyers, Linda None Provided 6/9/2001

PHM00059-1

Comment:

HI, LINDA MEYERS FROM 815 MAIN STREET. I JUST WANTED TO MENTION ONE OTHER THING THAT IS A BIG CONCERN. OF COURSE, THE POLLUTION, AS I MENTIONED, WAS ONE OF MY BIGGEST CONCERNS, BUT ANOTHER THING, THE MORE CROWDED THE AIRPORT IS, EVEN NOW WHAT WORRIES ME, THE PLANES GOING OVER, THEY MAKE THE EARLY TURNS. THEY'RE SUPPOSED TO GO STRAIGHT UP, THEY ALL MAKE EARLY TURNS. THEY'RE FLYING DIRECTLY OVER THE HYPERION PLANT. IF ONE OF THOSE PLANES WAS TO CRASH INTO THE HYPERION PLANT, CAN YOU EVEN IMAGINE WHAT WOULD HAPPEN TO THE L.A. COUNTY SEWAGE? AND THAT KIND OF THING IS WHAT REALLY WORRIES ME.

WE HAVE ELECTRICAL, WE HAVE EDISON, WE HAVE ALL KINDS OF MAJOR INDUSTRIAL TYPE THINGS ALONG THE SHORE THERE THAT THE AIRPLANES FLY OVER. SO I'M WANTING TO KNOW, WHAT TYPE OF THING ARE YOU TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION IF YOU EXPAND THE SAFETY OF THAT AREA, IF YOU'RE MAKING SURE THAT THERE WOULD BE NO EARLY TURNS? THAT NOW SHOULD BE SOMETHING YOU'RE CONSIDERING AS IN NO EARLY TURNS.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PHM00060 Freeman, Edna None Provided 6/9/2001

PHM00060-1

Comment:

THIS HAS JUST BEEN BROUGHT TO MY ATTENTION, IF SOMEBODY CAN SUE THE TOBACCO COMPANIES FOR \$3 BILLION, WHY CAN'T WE SUE THE AIRPORT FOR WHAT THEY'VE DONE TO US WITH OUR LUNGS AND EVERYTHING AND HEALTH?

Response:

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

PHM00061 Sabin, Helen None Provided 6/9/2001

PHM00061-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS HELEN SABIN, I LIVE AT 28402 QUAIL HILL DRIVE, Q-U-A-I-L H-I-L-L DRIVE, RANCHO PALOS VERDES. I WANTED TO SHOW UP TODAY TO STATE THAT I AM AGAINST THE EXPANSION OF THE AIRPORT. I AM VERY UNHAPPY ABOUT THE FLIGHTS THAT COME OVER THE PALOS VERDES PENINSULA. I THINK THAT IT WILL CAUSE A TREMENDOUS DECLINE IN PROPERTY VALUES IF THE AIRPORT IS ALLOWED TO EXPAND.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1 regarding impacts to residential property values and Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHM00061-2

Comment:

IF YOU'RE GOING TO EXPAND AND YOU HAVE TO MEET THE NEED AND THE DEMAND, THEN I SUPPORT THE REGIONAL PROJECT AS I SEE IT PROPOSED OUTSIDE AS I HAVE BEEN READING ABOUT IT. THAT'S MY COMMENTS.

Response:

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

PHM00062

Womack, Faith

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00062-1

Comment:

HELLO, MY NAME IS FAITH WOMACK AND I'M LIVING AT 935 MAIN STREET IN EL SEGUNDO. I LIVE VERY CLOSE TO THE AIRPORT, RIGHT NEAR THE IMPERIAL HIGHWAY, AND I WANT TO SAY THAT THE VERY FIRST NIGHT I SLEPT IN EL SEGUNDO, I WOKE UP IN THE MIDDLE OF THE NIGHT AND I ACTUALLY THOUGHT I WAS SLEEPING ON THE RUNWAY AND THAT A SPACESHIP WAS TAKING OFF RIGHT OVER ME. THAT'S HOW LOUD IT WAS, AND OVER TIME, I KNOW MY HEARING MUST BE DEADENING BECAUSE I HARDLY HEAR SOME OF THESE SOUNDS, BUT I'M NOT SURE WHAT FLIGHT PATTERN IS GOING ON AT NIGHTTIME.

IT SEEMS LIKE WE'RE NOT HAVING THE VERY BIGGEST PLANES FLYING ON THE SOUTHERN SIDE OF THE AIRPORT AT NIGHT, BUT EVERY ONCE IN A WHILE YOU HEAR A REALLY BIG ONE TAKING OFF, AND I JUST SHUDDER TO THINK THAT THEY MIGHT INCREASE THAT OR MAYBE HAVE MORE OF THE BIGGER PLANES TAKING OFF ON OUR SIDE AT NIGHT, BECAUSE IT'S VERY DISTURBING TO TRY TO SLEEP WHEN THERE'S A PLANE TAKING OFF EVERY FIVE MINUTES. IT SEEMS LIKE EVERY THREE TO FIVE MINUTES A PLANE IS TAKING OFF.

Response:

The principal departure runway during over-ocean procedures is the inboard runway in the south airfield complex. It is expected to remain so in future years. The procedural departure path for these operations is to proceed along runway heading until beyond the coastline, and in the future, additional navigational guidance will be installed to improve this procedure. LAWA has conducted an evaluation of sleep disturbance caused by single event noise that was reported in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting information in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. Its mitigation program includes implementation of restrictions on easterly departures during over-ocean procedures at night and sound insulation of significantly impacted properties that are not mitigated by that action (please see Mitigation Measures MM-N-5 and MM-LU-2 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR). The commentor lives about as near the departure end of the south runway complex as possible, and well within the area eligible for sound insulation under all LAWA guidelines. Sound insulation programs are administered by the surrounding communities. The conditions the commentor describes will continue throughout the length of the planning period. For further information about night operations, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PHM00062-2**Comment:**

AND ANOTHER THING IS THAT I ALSO WORK IN EL SEGUNDO AT THE LOS ANGELES AIR FORCE BASE AND MY CAR IS CONSTANTLY COVERED WITH THIS JUNKY STUFF. EVERY WEEK THE CAR HAS TO BE WASHED AND WAXED, IT'S JUST REALLY DISGUSTING, AND I THINK, WHAT CAN MY LUNGS BE LIKE? I'VE BEEN IN AND OUT OF THIS, WALKING AROUND BREATHING THAT AIR, AND IT'S TERRIBLE.

Response:

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

PHM00062-3**Comment:**

I WOULD SUPPORT THE EXPANSION OF OTHER AIRPORTS TO SHARE THE LOAD. I UNDERSTAND THAT IT'S A SERIOUS ISSUE, THAT PEOPLE NEED TO FLY, I KNOW I FLY. I APPRECIATE BEING ABLE TO GO OVER THERE AND TAKE AN AIRPLANE, BUT I JUST REALLY DON'T LIKE THE IDEA THAT THE L.A. AIRPORT WILL BE THE ONLY ONE EXPANDED. THAT'S ALL.

Response:

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

PHM00063 Price, David

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHM00063-1**Comment:**

MY NAME IS DAVID PRICE, I'M A HOMEOWNER, RESIDENT HERE IN MANHATTAN BEACH. JUST FOR THE RECORD, I HAPPEN TO LIVE JUST SOUTH OF ROSECRANS AVENUE, JUST WEST OF SEPULVEDA, AND GENERALLY YOU'RE GOING TO HEAR THAT I'M OPPOSED TO THE EXPANSION OF THE AIRPORT.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00063-2

Comment:

I'M NOT AGAINST THE AIRPORT, I DON'T DENY ITS RIGHT TO EXIST, I THINK IT'S A WONDERFUL THING TO HAVE IN THE COMMUNITY AND IT SERVES IT WELL, BUT MY PERSONAL EXPERIENCE HAS BEEN THAT THE PLANES DO FLY OFF PATH, THEY MAKE A LOT OF NOISE. DESPITE THE FACT THAT I LIVE RIGHT NEXT TO A REFINERY, I STILL HEAR THE AIRPORT MORE THAN I HEAR THE REFINERY.

Response:

On occasion aircraft do deviate off of the designated flight path. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

PHM00063-3

Comment:

CERTAIN TIMES OF THE YEAR, THE ODORS THAT I EXPERIENCE FROM MY FRONT DOOR ARE GENERALLY WHAT I WOULD CALL KEROSENE TYPE SMELL WHICH I WOULD EQUATE WITH THE EXHAUST FROM THE JETS, AND I'M JUST CONCERNED THAT ANY MORE FLIGHTS COMING IN AND OUT OF THERE IS JUST GOING TO ADD TO WHAT'S ALREADY GOING ON AND I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THAT THESE BE MAINTAINED, IF NOT REDUCED.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00045-4 regarding odors.

PHM00063-4

Comment:

I'VE WRITTEN TO REPRESENTATIVE HARMAN AND ASKED THAT SHE CONTINUE HER EFFORTS TO PUSH FOR A MORE REGIONAL APPROACH WHICH WOULD INCLUDE NOT JUST THE THREE AIRPORTS SUBJECT TO, YOU CALL YOURSELVES LAWA, BUT ALSO MAYBE TO INCLUDE THE AIRPORTS IN THE ORANGE COUNTY AREA, SAN BERNARDINO AREA, IF POSSIBLE, AND JUST TO LOOK AT THIS OVERALL STRUCTURE HERE, WHAT WE CALL GREATER L.A., WHICH SERVES A QUIANT COASTAL COMMUNITY OF ABOUT 13 MILLION PEOPLE AND THINK OF IT IN THE BIGGER TERMS THAN JUST WHAT CAN WE DO FOR LAX. AND I KNOW YOU'D LIKE TO MAKE IT A BIGGER, BETTER PLACE, BUT IT DOESN'T REALLY HELP.

Response:

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

PHM00063-5**Comment:**

SO THERE'S A LOT OF TECHNICAL ISSUES IN THE EIR. I HAVE THE GREAT PLEASURE OF DEVELOPING EIR'S MYSELF FOR MY COMPANY, I'M NOT USED TO DEALING WITH THEM ON A BUSINESS END SUCH AS WHAT YOU'RE DOING HERE. I KNOW A LOT OF PEOPLE SPOKE ABOUT THAT EIR/EIS, I GUESS IT'S CALLED ALSO, AS BEING INSUFFICIENT, AND I'M SURE I'LL PROBABLY PERUSE IT MYSELF, AND I WANT TO SEE WHAT TYPES OF DEFICIENCIES THEY'RE TALKING ABOUT, SEE IF THERE'S ANY MERIT.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHM00063-6**Comment:**

I REALLY HOPE THAT THIS WHOLE PROCEEDING ISN'T A SHAM, THAT YOU'RE SITTING HERE GOING, "YES, WE HEAR YOUR CONCERNS," AND THEN WALKING OUT OF THE ROOM AND DOING WHAT YOU ALREADY HAD YOUR MINDS MADE UP TO DO; THAT THE COMMENTS EXPRESSED HERE AND IN THE OTHER TWO MEETINGS THAT ARE GOING ON SIMULTANEOUSLY AREN'T IGNORED AND ARE LISTENED TO WITH GREAT AND SERIOUS INTEREST. I APPRECIATE THE TIME TAKEN HERE AND FOR EVERYBODY ELSE LISTENING. THANK YOU.

Response:

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

PHM00064**Beiting, Pat****None Provided****6/9/2001****PHM00064-1****Comment:**

MY NAME IS PAT BEITING. I LIVE IN MANHATTAN VILLAGE, WHICH IS IN MANHATTAN BEACH, AND I'M ALSO A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS THERE OF THAT HOMEOWNER ASSOCIATION. AND I DIDN'T REALLY COME PREPARED TO SPEAK, BUT SINCE YOU ASKED FOR MY OPINION, IT CERTAINLY IS MY OPINION THAT IN A GREAT METROPOLITAN AREA LIKE LOS ANGELES, WE NEED AREAS WHICH ARE REALLY HOMEOWNER FRIENDLY AND WONDERFUL RESIDENCES THAT PEOPLE CAN LIVE IN AND MAKE THEIR HOMES WHILE THEY WORK IN L.A. OR OTHER AREAS NEARBY.

AND IT'S JUST SO IMPORTANT TO KEEP THE QUALITY OF LIFE UP; THAT WE DON'T WANT TO JUST HAVE A SITUATION WHERE ONLY IN THE SUBURBS ARE PEOPLE ABLE TO FIND GREAT HOUSING AND A WONDERFUL LIFE-STYLE AND ALL OF THE THINGS THAT WE ALL JUST YEARN TO HAVE IN OUR DAILY ENVIRONMENT.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHM00064-2

Comment:

SO IT ALSO STRIKES ME THAT IT WOULD BE ADVANTAGEOUS TO PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN AREAS LIKE POMONA AND 29 PALMS AND THAT SORT OF THING TO HAVE SERVICE ENHANCED. SO IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IF WE DON'T CONGREGATE EVERYTHING IN JUST ONE AREA LIKE THE LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, IT SERVES A LOT OF PEOPLE BETTER AND IN DIFFERENT RESPECTS.

Response:

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

PHM00064-3

Comment:

I GUESS I -- I HAD ONE MORE IDEA THAT WAS JUST ON THE TIP OF MY TONGUE, I FORGOT IT JUST NOW, BUT I THINK WE WILL -- I THINK WE WILL -- I THINK WE'LL -- I DON'T THINK, YOU KNOW, THAT THERE'S ANY -- WE'RE ALL SORT OF IN THE SAME BOAT IN WANTING WONDERFUL RESIDENTIAL AREAS AND ALL OF THE THINGS THAT WE ALL LOVE AND TAKE FOR GRANTED, AND WE ARE JUST HERE TO ASK YOU TO CONSIDER THAT. THANK YOU.

Response:

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

PHP00001 Brathwaite Burke, County of Los Angeles 6/9/2001
Yvonne

PHP00001-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS YVONNE BRAITHWAITE BURKE, AND I AM A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. I LIVE WITHIN THE AREA, WITHIN ABOUT SIX MINUTES OF THE AIRPORT.

WE ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE AIRPORT IS VITAL TO THE ECONOMY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. HOWEVER, WE BELIEVE THAT THE AIRPORT NEEDS TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THEY HAVE VERY SERIOUS, IF NOT DEVASTATING, IMPACTS ON THE COMMUNITIES THAT SURROUND IT, AND WHAT REALLY MUST BE DONE IS TO CORRECT SOME OF THOSE PROBLEMS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED.

WE HAVE LAZZARETTO & ASSOCIATES, WHO YOU WILL HEAR FROM, WHO HAVE BEEN RETAINED TO IDENTIFY THE CONCERNS AND ALSO POSITIVE ASPECTS OF THIS PLAN, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO PASS TO -- PASS ON TO YOU SOME OF THOSE CONCERNS THAT WE HAVE IDENTIFIED.

ENVIRONMENTAL EXPERTS IN THE AREA OF TRAFFIC, AIR QUALITY, NOISE, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND THE NEPA AND CEQA PROCESSES HIRED BY THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES HAVE FOUND THAT THE DRAFT EIS/EIR IS FATALLY FLAWED AND THAT THE PROBLEMS WITH THE DOCUMENT ARE SO PERVASIVE AND SYSTEMIC THAT THE ONLY PRACTICAL REMEDY IS TO START THIS PROCESS OVER AGAIN.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comment Letter AL00022 for responses to the individual comments provided by the County's environmental consultants.

PHP00001-2

Comment:

SPECIFICALLY, ONE OF OUR CONSULTANTS SAID THERE WAS REALLY NO ADDRESSING OF THOSE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ISSUES THAT ARE NECESSARY AND REQUIRED BY THE FEDERAL PROCESS; THAT THERE ARE A NUMBER OF VERY SPECIFIC DEFICIENCIES.

Response:

Comment noted. The analyses contained in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice and Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice and Appendix D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provide extensive information (over 125 pages of narrative, maps and tabular data) pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, and consistent with Executive Order 12898 and DOT Order 5610.2, that is more than sufficient to support informed decision making. It should also be noted, as was indicated in subsection 4.4.3.5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, that the environmental justice analysis focuses on those issues with potential for disproportionate effects on minority or low-income communities and also draws on extensive quantitative analyses contained in the other technical sections of these documents.

PHP00001-3

Comment:

HOW CAN AN EIS/EIR FOR A PROJECT OF THIS MAGNITUDE IGNORE THE CUMULATIVE IMPACT OF AIR POLLUTANTS ON THE HEALTH OF THE RESIDENTS BY SAYING THERE IS NO DATA AVAILABLE?

Response:

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

The Draft EIS/EIR evaluated the broader-scale, cumulative impacts of LAX emissions on air quality, both with and without implementation of the LAX Master Plan, using data collected for and analyzed in the MATES-II study recently completed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. MATES-II provides a general evaluation of cancer risks associated with TAPs from all sources within the South Coast Air Basin. Results of the cumulative quantitative analysis were presented in Section 4.24.1.7, Cumulative Impacts, of the Draft EIS/EIR. As was shown on Figure 4.24.1-2 (Cancer Risks, Inclusive of Environmental Baseline, for the Build Alternatives and the No Action/No Project Alternative, East-Northeast Projection 2015 pre-Mitigation) of the Draft EIS/EIR, increases in potential cancer risks near the LAX fence line, where impacts are greatest, would be only a small fraction of cumulative risks associated with existing air pollution in the South Coast Air Basin.

Please refer to Section 4.24.1.7, Cumulative Impacts, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for an evaluation of cumulative non-cancer impacts. In response to public comment, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated cumulative non-cancer impacts including cumulative chronic and cumulative acute impacts. Additional detail regarding the evaluation of cumulative impacts for health hazards other than cancer is presented in Section 6, Risk Characterization, of S-9a, Supplemental Human Health Risk Assessment Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also discussed in Section 7 of this technical report are uncertainties associated with the evaluation of cumulative non-cancer impacts.

In addition, please refer to Response to Comment PC02214-56 for additional information regarding cumulative impacts.

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00001-4

Comment:

THIS IS TRUE ALSO IN TERMS OF THOSE ISSUES OF WHETHER OR NOT IT IMPACTS MINORITY COMMUNITIES. THE STATEMENT IS SIMPLY MADE: THE DATA AND INFORMATION IS NOT AVAILABLE. THERE IS A BODY OF INFORMATION THAT IS AVAILABLE THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN PART OF THIS ENTIRE PROCESS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PHP00001-2 above and 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.

PHP00001-5

Comment:

WHY IS IT THAT ONLY A LIMITED NUMBER OF INTERSECTIONS OF AN UNINCORPORATED AREA OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES HAVE BEEN ANALYZED WHEN THERE ARE AT LEAST SEVEN AREAS WITHIN ONE MILE OF THE AIRPORT, ALL OF WHICH WILL HAVE AND -- WILL BE IMPACTED BY THIS PROCESS.

Response:

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

PHP00001-6

Comment:

WHY DID THE SCOPING INFORMATION RELEASED IN 1996 INCLUDE SIX ALTERNATIVES FOR STUDY AND THE DRAFT EIS/EIR RELEASED IN JANUARY 2001 RECOMMENDED A PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE THAT WAS NOT EVEN MENTIONED IN THE ORIGINAL SCOPE OF THE EIR AND EIS?

Response:

The Notice of Intent and Notice of Preparation published in June 1997 identified four build alternatives and the No Action/No Project Alternative. 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. A Supplemental Notice regarding the preparation of an EIS/EIR for the LAX Master Plan was circulated identifying the new alternatives. 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.

PHP00001-7

Comment:

WHY DOES THE PHASING OF THE PROJECT APPEAR TO MAKE ACCESS CIRCULATION IMPROVEMENTS IN PHASE II AND DO THE ACTUAL DEVELOPMENT IN PHASE I, WHEN REALLY WHAT SHOULD HAVE HAPPENED IS SOME OF -- SOME OF THIS SHOULD HAVE BEEN HAPPENING OVER A PERIOD OF YEARS, AND CERTAINLY THE ACCESS AREAS SHOULD BE

INSTALLED PRIOR TO THE TIME OF ACTUALLY PUTTING THOSE TERMINALS IN AND ALL OF THOSE REQUIREMENTS WHERE PEOPLE WILL HAVE TO COME IN AND OUT OF THE AIRPORT.

Response:

Comment noted. It is desired to construct as much of the ground transportation improvements as possible as early as possible, including most of the ring road. This would result in getting most of the large improvements in place in Phase I, although there simply would not be enough construction resources available to get everything done in Phase I. Also, the disruption to the area street system would be too large if all of the ground transportation improvements were to be construction at one time. Therefore, while the LAX Expressway would be started in Phase I, but would probably not be operational until Phase II. Also, the Green Line extension is not anticipated to have a major impact on the road system. Therefore, its construction would occur after 2015. Also please see Response to Comment AL00022-59 regarding project phasing.

PHP00001-8

Comment:

I KNOW THAT MY TIME IS EXPIRING, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THIS PROCESS SHOULD START AGAIN.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00002 Chon, James County of Los Angeles 6/9/2001

PHP00002-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS JIM CHON, C-H-O-N. MAILING ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 1460, ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA, 91802-1460.

I REPRESENT THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS. I AM A TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER FOR THE DEPARTMENT AND ADDRESS MY COMMENTS TO THE TRAFFIC INFORMATION PORTION OF THE EIS AND EIR.

THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY FOR THIS HEARING TO EXPRESS OUR COMMENTS.

FIRST OF ALL, THE L.A. EXPANSION PROJECT COMES WITH COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS THAT WILL PROVIDE DIRECT ACCESS TO THE AIRPORT BY THE PROPOSED LAX EXPRESSWAY. GENERALLY, WE BELIEVE THAT SUCH SYSTEM WILL PROVIDE DIRECT ACCESS FROM THE FREEWAYS TO THE AIRPORT AND WILL BE BENEFICIAL IN TERMS OF TRAFFIC CIRCULATION.

HOWEVER, THE PROBLEM IS THAT THIS SYSTEM WAS NEEDED TEN YEARS AGO AND IS OBVIOUSLY MUCH NEEDED FOR TODAY'S CONDITIONS.

AS FAR AS THE DOCUMENT IS CONCERNED, WE FEEL THAT THE DOCUMENT IS TOTALLY INCOMPLETE AND INADEQUATE. WE HAVE MAJOR CONCERNS WITH IT, AND I HAVE SOME SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON IT.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00002-2

Comment:

FIRST OF ALL, ONLY ONE COUNTY INTERSECTION THAT IS TOTALLY WITHIN COUNTY JURISDICTION WAS ANALYZED AND THERE WERE 11 OTHER COUNTY/CITY INTERSECTIONS ANALYZED. WE FEEL THAT IS NOT SUFFICIENT TO ADDRESS THE IMPACT OF THE COUNTY ON EQUAL AREAS, AS SUPERVISOR BURKE ALREADY MENTIONED, OF THOSE EIGHT UNEQUAL AREAS IN THE AREA.

JUST TO GIVE YOU A PERSPECTIVE, PLAYA VISTA, WHICH IS LESS THAN HALF OF THE PROJECT IN TERMS OF TRIP GENERATION, COVERED A MUCH BROADER AREA IN TERMS OF STUDY AND ANALYSIS OF THE PROJECT IMPACT AND MANY MORE INTERSECTIONS.

THEY ANALYZED 220 -- 220 INTERSECTIONS FOR THEIR IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS, AND THE LAX TRAFFIC STUDY ANALYZED 75, THAT BEING 12 -- ONE COUNTY INTERSECTION AND 11 THAT ARE SHARED COUNTY/CITY INTERSECTIONS. OBVIOUSLY, THAT IS NOT ENOUGH, AND IT IS DEFICIENT.

COUNTY GUIDELINES WERE NOT USED TO ANALYZE COUNTY INTERSECTIONS. DATA USED IN THE TRAFFIC STUDY WERE OLD, OUTDATED. IT WAS DONE IN 1996. THINGS HAVE SINCE CHANGED. THAT IS FOUR YEARS. WE FEEL THAT NEEDS TO BE UPDATED.

ALSO, THE TRAFFIC MODEL THAT WAS USED TO ANALYZE THE STUDY IS PARTIALLY VALIDATED, AND WE FEEL THAT IS NOT GOOD, IT MAY RESULT IN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE, AND WE FOUND INCONSISTENCY IN THE TRIP GENERATION INSIDE THE PROJECT AS OPPOSED TO OUTSIDE.

MY TIME IS RUNNING OUT, SO I AM GOING TO COVER THE HIGHLIGHTS. WE ALSO HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT THE SURFACE STREETS NORTH OF THE EXPRESSWAY, L.A. EXPRESSWAY, AND ALSO SOUTH OF THE AIRPORT, AND THE COMMUNITIES AROUND THE AREAS HAVE EXPRESSED THAT. I WOULD LIKE THAT TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE EIS/EIR.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please refer to the Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology. Section 3.2.2 of that topical response includes a comparison of the guidelines used for the impact analysis to the County's guidelines. Since this Master Plan is being processed in the City of Los Angeles, a Memorandum of Understanding was executed with LADOT specifying the methodology to be used in the traffic impact analysis. The LAX Ground Access Model was fully validated, as documented in Technical Report 2b.

PHP00002-3

Comment:

I HAVE OTHER COMMENTS, BUT OBVIOUSLY MY TIME IS OUT.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00003 Lazzaretto, Dominic County of Los Angeles

6/9/2001

PHP00003-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS DOMINIC LAZZARETTO. I AM A RESIDENT OF BURBANK. MY ADDRESS IS 550 EAST SANTA ANITA AVENUE. I AM HERE TO REPRESENT THE L.A. COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

AFTER CAREFUL REVIEW OF THE DRAFT EIS/EIR WE HAVE CONCLUDED THAT THE ERRORS, OMISSIONS AND INACCURATE ASSUMPTIONS IN THE DOCUMENT ARE SO PERVASIVE THAT ITS VALIDITY IS WHOLLY COMPROMISED. AS A RESULT, THE ONLY APPROPRIATE ACTION IS TO SUBSTANTIALLY REVISE AND RECIRCULATE THE DOCUMENT.

WE BASE THESE CONCLUSIONS ON THE FOLLOWING FACTORS:

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments PHP00003-2 through PHP00003-11 below for responses to the specific issues raised by the commentor.

PHP00003-2

Comment:

CONSIDERING ONLY THREE ALTERNATIVES FOR A PROJECT OF SUCH MAGNITUDE IS UNUSUALLY LIMITED.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHP00003-3

Comment:

THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE CONTAINS THE MOST SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS YET MEETS THE LEAST NUMBER OF OBJECTIVES SET FORTH IN THE EIS/EIR.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00022-3 regarding the number and severity of impacts associated with Alternative C compared to Alternatives A and B and Response to Comment AL00022-43 regarding Alternative C's fulfillment of the project objectives.

PHP00003-4

Comment:

THE DOCUMENT REPEATEDLY ACKNOWLEDGES THAT LAX IS A PART OF A REGIONAL SYSTEM, BUT THE SCOPING OUTREACH DID NOT REACH A SINGLE AGENCY WITHIN SAN DIEGO, ORANGE, RIVERSIDE OR VENTURA COUNTY, AND NONE OF THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED ANY FORM OF A REGIONAL SOLUTION.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00007-1 regarding the scoping undertaken for the LAX Master Plan. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no

3. Comments and Responses

expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PHP00003-5

Comment:

THE BASELINES THAT WERE USED WERE INCONSISTENT AND OUTDATED, WHICH SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCES THE IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments AL00022-12, AL00022-55, and Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues.

PHP00003-6

Comment:

THE PROJECT HORIZON YEAR IS 2015, YET THE PROJECT CANNOT BE COMPLETED BEFORE THAT DATE. THIS ALSO SKEWS THE POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-26 regarding the construction period for the proposed build alternatives.

PHP00003-7

Comment:

AIR QUALITY IS KNOWN TO BE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT BOTH BEFORE AND AFTER MITIGATION; THEREFORE, THE MITIGATION DOES NOT APPEAR TO BE SUFFICIENT.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a revised air quality mitigation measure with many components, that describes in greater detail those efforts being carried forward and their associated emission reductions. LAWA intends to adopt and implement all feasible mitigation measures. It is important to note the mitigation measures for some types and sources of pollutants are more readily available than others. There are very few available and feasible mitigation measures to reduce NOx. Those measures which are currently available are insufficient to mitigate the NOx-related impacts of the project to below a level of significance.

PHP00003-8

Comment:

THE POPULATION THAT IS SHOWN WITHIN THE 65 CNEL NOISE CONTOUR IS HALF OF WHAT LAWA REPORTED IN THE SAME PERIOD, FOURTH QUARTER 1996. THIS UNDERMINES THE VALIDITY OF THE DOCUMENT AND MISREPRESENTS THE IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT.

Response:

Please see Section 2.2, Comparison of Environmental Baseline to Quarterly Noise Report, of Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR, Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach, in particular Subtopical Response TR-N-1.2 regarding modeled vs. measured baseline year and Subtopical Response TR-N-1.3, regarding the use of 1996 baseline noise levels from which to measure increases associated with proposed alternatives, and Response to Comment PC00109-5.

PHP00003-9**Comment:**

THERE ARE NO NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES IN THE DOCUMENT EVEN THOUGH THE NOISE WAS DETERMINED TO HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS. THIS GOES AGAINST CEQA REQUIREMENTS.

Response:

The content of this comment is identical to comment PC01957-9; please refer to Response to Comment PC01957-9.

PHP00003-10**Comment:**

THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE SECTION FAILS TO MEET NEPA REQUIREMENTS. AS A RESULT, VALID REVIEW IS NOT POSSIBLE.

Response:

The comment is essentially the same as PC01957-10; please see Response to Comment PC01957-10.

PHP00003-11**Comment:**

AND, FINALLY, THE EIS/EIR SOMEHOW CONCLUDED THAT SHORT DISTANCE FLIGHTS WOULD GO TO OUTLYING AIRPORTS, BUT THERE IS NO COMMITMENT TO INSURE THAT IT HAPPENS. THE DOCUMENT EITHER NEEDS TO EXPLORE THE IMPACTS OF THESE FLIGHTS STAYING AT LAX OR NEEDS TO INCLUDE AN ALTERNATIVE THAT PROPERLY IDENTIFIES A PLAN FOR A REGIONAL SOLUTION.

Response:

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

PHP00003-12**Comment:**

WE WOULD LIKE TO SUBMIT OUR PRELIMINARY COMMENTS AND FINDINGS INTO THE RECORD OF THIS HEARING, AND WE WILL STATE OUR FINAL WRITTEN COMMENTS PRIOR TO THE JULY 25TH DEADLINE.

Response:

Comment noted. The comment period on the Draft EIS/EIR was extended two times and ended on November 9, 2001. Also, please see Response to Comment PHL00007-5 regarding the public review/hearing process.

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00004 **Lester, Tim** **African American Chamber of Commerce** **6/9/2001**

PHP00004-1

Comment:

LESTER. TIM LESTER.

I AM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE AFRICAN-AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AND I HAVE A STATEMENT FROM MY BOARD, WHICH READS: OUR ORGANIZATION, WITH A MEMBERSHIP OF 500 INDIVIDUALS, WAS ESTABLISHED TO PROMOTE BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES BY AFRICAN-AMERICANS AND TO EXPAND THESE AFRICAN-AMERICAN OWNED BUSINESSES INTO THE INTERNATIONAL ARENA.

OUR BUSINESS PROGRAMS WERE DESIGNED TO HELP SMALL BUSINESSES TO GROW AND PROSPER. WE SUPPORT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PLAN, ALTHOUGH IT IS FLAWED. WE REALIZE THAT AT SOME POINT EXPANSION WILL HAVE TO TAKE PLACE IN L.A. IF THE CITY IS GOING TO CONTINUE TO GROW AND PROSPER AND IF BUSINESS IS GOING TO CONTINUE TO GROW.

AS ANYONE WHO USES LAX KNOWS, THE SITUATION IS GETTING WORSE EVERY DAY. DELAYS ARE CAUSING BUSINESSES MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, NOT JUST HERE IN LOS ANGELES, BUT IN THE OTHER CITIES AS WELL, SINCE DELAYS CAUSE RIPPLE EFFECTS.

THE PLAN IS ABSOLUTELY GREAT, BUT RIGHT AT THE MOMENT THAT PLAN IS SO FAR AWAY AND, AS WE ALREADY HEARD, ALL THE PLANS SO FAR HAVE BEEN FLAWED.

IN THE MEANTIME THE PROPOSAL TO MODERNIZE LAX WE BELIEVE SHOULD BE SUPPORTED, AND WE ARE IN SUPPORT OF THAT MODERNIZATION PROGRAM.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00005 **Dickerson, Esq., Charles** **City of Inglewood** **6/9/2001**

PHP00005-1

Comment:

I AM AN ATTORNEY FOR THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD, CALIFORNIA. I AM HERE TODAY IN MY OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS ITS COUNSEL AND ON BEHALF OF ONE OF OUR COUNCILMEMBERS, JUDY DUNLAP. SHE HAD COMMENTS FOR YOU AS WELL. I HAVE BEEN ASKED TO CONVEY THE COMMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE CITY, AS WELL AS THOSE OF ASSEMBLYMAN JEROME HORTON, WHO ALSO REPRESENTS THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD IN THE STATE ASSEMBLY. THEY ASKED TO BE ASSOCIATED WITH MY COMMENTS TODAY.

INGLEWOOD IS THE JURISDICTION IMMEDIATELY EAST TO LOS ANGELES AIRPORT. ALL FLIGHTS THAT GO INTO LAX HAVE TO PASS DIRECTLY OVER AT VARYING HEIGHTS OF ANYWHERE FROM 3,000 FEET TO 300 FEET. INGLEWOOD IS MOST SEVERELY IMPACTED -- IT IS THE MOST SEVERELY IMPACTED JURISDICTION BY OPERATIONS AT LAX, BOTH PRESENTLY AND IN THE FUTURE, BECAUSE THE FLIGHT PATHS THAT GO INTO LAX DIRECTLY PASS OVER THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD.

Response:

Comment noted. The altitudes of arriving and departing aircraft vary and can range in the 3,000 foot to 300 foot range as noted by the commentor. 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 over their community. For more information on community impacts related to aircraft noise please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and 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.

PHP00005-2

Comment:

AS AN INITIAL POINT, AS CITY RESIDENTS OF THE CITY AND OFFICIALS OF INGLEWOOD, WE WOULD LIKE TO STATE WE ALL OPPOSE EXPANSION OF LAX. WE WANT THAT TO BE UNEQUIVOCAL. WE HAVE INCREASED AIR TRAFFIC OVER INGLEWOOD -- INCREASED GROUND TRAFFIC THROUGH INGLEWOOD AND INCREASED AIR TRAFFIC AND POLLUTION IN THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD.

Response:

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

PHP00005-3

Comment:

INGLEWOOD SEEKS TO BE A RESPONSIBLE NEIGHBOR WHO RECOGNIZES THAT WE ARE AN INSEPARABLE PART OF THE FABRIC, THE ECONOMIC FABRIC OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA THAT WILL FLOW INTO THE REGION AS A RESULT OF INCREASED BUSINESS FLOWING THROUGH OUR LOCAL AIRPORTS.

WE ALSO RECOGNIZE THAT THE ECONOMIC BENEFITS WILL AFFECT AND IMPACT POSITIVELY THE ENTIRE REGION AND, THEREFORE, WE BELIEVE THAT THE ENTIRE REGION SHOULD BEAR THE BURDENS THAT WILL BE IMPOSED BY THE INCREASE OF AIR FLIGHTS.

TO THE EXTENT THAT INGLEWOOD WILL RECEIVE BENEFIT, WE ARE WILLING TO TAKE ON A PORTION OF THE BURDEN. BUT WE BELIEVE IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT MOST OF THE BURDEN WILL-- MOST OF THE BENEFIT WILL BE RECEIVED BY OTHERS, THOSE OTHER JURISDICTIONS SHOULD ALSO ACCEPT THE BURDENS OF INCREASED FLIGHTS AT LOS ANGELES -- LAX.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00005-4

Comment:

MY TIME IS VERY SHORT. I WANT YOU TO KNOW THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD HAS PREPARED A LONG RESPONSE TO THE EIS/EIR, AND IT IS ACCOMPANIED BY TWO OR THREE HUNDRED PAGES OF EXHIBITS.

BUT THERE ARE SEVERAL POINTS I WANT TO GIVE YOU VERY QUICKLY.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PHP00005-5

Comment:

THE EIS FAILS TO SATISFY ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE REQUIREMENTS.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed environmental justice in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The analyses contained in these documents provided extensive information (over 125 pages of narrative, maps and tabular data) pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, and consistent with Executive Order 12898 and DOT Order 5610.2, that is more than sufficient to support informed decision making. It should also be noted, as was indicated in subsection 4.4.3.5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, that the environmental justice analysis focuses on those issues with potential for disproportionate effects on minority or low-income communities and also draws on extensive quantitative analyses contained in the other technical sections of these documents. 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. Also please see Response to Comment PC02236-14.

PHP00005-6

Comment:

IT FAILS TO ADEQUATELY CONSIDER ALTERNATIVES TO THE EXPANSION OF LAX.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHP00005-7

Comment:

IT FAILS TO MEASURE SOOT IMPACTS.

Response:

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

PHP00005-8

Comment:

IT FAILS TO CONFORM TO OTHER RELEVANT PLANS.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed conformance to relevant plans in Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and in Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHP00005-9

Comment:

IT FAILS TO ADEQUATELY ADDRESS THE IMPACT OF AIR POLLUTION, OF TRAFFIC, IMPACTS OF NOISE INCREASES.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PHP00005-10

Comment:

IT FAILS TO CONFORM TO LOCAL TRAFFIC PLANS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00018-58 and PC01835-65 regarding conformity to local plans.

PHP00005-11

Comment:

IT FAILS TO PROPERLY ANALYZE THE HEALTH EFFECT OF AIRCRAFT NOISE TO OUR CHILDREN PARTICULARLY.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments AL00017-52 and AL00038-11 regarding the health effects of aircraft noise and the impact of high noise levels on children, respectively.

PHP00005-12

Comment:

ALL OF THESE ISSUES WILL BE ADDRESSED IN OUR WRITTEN COMMENTS, AND WE THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE ORAL COMMENTS TO YOU TODAY.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00006

Conerly, Dontre

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHP00006-1

Comment:

DONTRE CONERLY. DONTRE, D-O-N-T-R-E, LAST NAME C-O-N-E-R-L-Y, 4455 WEST 126TH STREET IN THE CITY OF HAWTHORNE, CALIFORNIA.

WHILE I THINK THAT MOST UNDERSTAND THAT THERE IS A NEED FOR EXPANSION OR POSSIBLE MODIFICATION OF THE LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, IT IS SOMEWHAT UNCLEAR THAT THERE WERE CERTAIN THINGS OVERLOOKED AND NOT CLEARLY EXPLAINED IN REVIEWING THE WORKSHOP TODAY. I NOTICED THAT ALL OF THE PRESENTERS WERE A LITTLE BIT VAGUE ON THEIR DETAILS.

NO ONE WAS ABLE TO OFFER CERTAIN SPECIFICS AS TO WHETHER OR NOT TRAFFIC WOULD BE DECREASED AND WHETHER OR NOT AIR POLLUTION WOULD BE DECREASED BY CERTAIN PERCENTAGES. THOSE NUMBERS WERE NOT OFFERED BY THOSE THAT ATTENDED THE WORKSHOPS. THEY WERE BRUSHED OFF, AS I AM SURE IT WOULD HAPPEN, AS TO A CERTAIN PLAN OR WHEREAS CERTAIN NUMBERS AND CERTAIN PERCENTAGES WERE NOT GIVEN.

Response:

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

PHP00006-2

Comment:

ADDITIONALLY, ALL OF THESE PRESENT POSED METHODS THAT WERE THERE TO OFFSET THE INCREASE OF TRAFFIC THAT WAS OPEN TO THE EXPANSION OF LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, AND THERE ARE TRAFFIC DECREASES AND TRAFFIC DELAYS THAT WE ARE CURRENTLY FACING, AND INSTEAD OF IMPLEMENTING THESE PARTICULAR PLANS AS AN OFFSET OF INCREASED EXPANSION OF LOS ANGELES, WHY NOT IMPLEMENT THESE PLANS TO HELP OFFSET THE TRAFFIC PROBLEMS THAT WE ARE CURRENTLY FACING ON OUR COMMUTE TO LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT?

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00006-3

Comment:

I THINK THERE IS SOMETHING ELSE OVERLOOKED, AND IT MAY NOT BE PRIMARILY A MAJORITY RULE. THE BLUE BUTTERFLY HABITAT THAT LIES DIRECTLY WEST OF THE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, WAS BARELY MENTIONED. THE EXPANDED LOS ANGELES AIRPORT WILL BE SHIFTED TO THE WEST. IN SHIFTING THOSE EMISSIONS TO THE WEST, THAT WOULD BE DIRECTLY OVER THE HABITAT FOR THIS ENDANGERED SPECIES.

NOW IT IS CLEARLY KNOWN THAT LOS ANGELES WILL NOT BE ALLOWED TO BUILD IN THAT PARTICULAR AREA. HOWEVER, THERE WILL BE SOMEWHAT OF ADVERSE EFFECTS FROM THE EXPANSION OF LOS ANGELES AIRPORT TO THE HABITAT OF THE ENDANGERED BUTTERFLY SPECIES THAT PRETTY MUCH KIND OF THROWS OUT THE FACT THAT WE ARE

ENDANGERING AN ENDANGERED SPECIES; THAT IF WE ARE GOING TO HAVE EXPANSION, THAT THREATENS THEIR VERY HABITAT.

Response:

Potential indirect impacts (jet exhaust emissions, fugitive dust, and light emissions) to the El Segundo blue butterfly were addressed in Section 4.11, Endangered and Threatened Species of Flora and Fauna, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHP00006-4

Comment:

I WOULD LIKE TO SAY AS A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CITY OF HAWTHORNE AND AS A RESIDENT OF THE CITY OF HAWTHORNE, I THINK THIS EXPANSION HAS NOT BEEN WELL-THOUGHT-OUT AND HAS NOT TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION THE NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY AND HAS NOT BEEN SENSITIVE TO THE DEMANDS OF THE COMMUNITY, NOR THOSE THAT WERE PREPARED BY COUNTY SUPERVISORS OR OTHER PERSONS, AND I THINK IT SHOULD BE REDONE AND REVISED.

Response:

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

PHP00007 Jeffe, Jerry Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce 6/9/2001

PHP00007-1

Comment:

I REPRESENT THE LOS ANGELES AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, WHICH REPRESENTS FIVE COUNTIES IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF SAN DIEGO AND IMPERIAL COUNTIES, SO WE ARE THE ONLY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN THE REGION THAT HAS A REGIONAL APPROACH.

THE SPELLING IS J-E-F-F-E AND THE ADDRESS IS 350 SOUTH BIXEL STREET, LOS ANGELES, 90017.

THE LOS ANGELES AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE COMPLIMENTS LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORTS ON THEIR INITIATIVE IN DEVELOPING VARIOUS ENHANCEMENT PLANS FOR LAX. THIS SHOWS PROGRESSION TOWARD A SOLUTION THAT WILL KEEP OUR REGION ECONOMICALLY IN THE NEW MILLENNIUM.

LOS ANGELES IS THE MAIN ENTRYWAY FOR GOODS SENT FROM THE PACIFIC RIM NATIONS. WITHOUT A STRONG EPA INFRASTRUCTURE HERE, THE ENTIRE NATION SUFFERS.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA IS THE HOME TO NEARLY 6,000 EXPORT AND IMPORT BUSINESSES, WHICH EXPORT NEARLY 110 BILLION DOLLARS IN MANUFACTURED GOODS. THE MAJORITY OF THOSE EXPORTERS AND IMPORTERS ARE SMALL BUSINESSES -- THE HEART BLOOD OF OUR ECONOMY. WITHOUT WORLD-CLASS AIRPORTS IN THE LOS ANGELES REGION, MANY OF THESE SMALL BUSINESSES WILL NOT BE ABLE TO COMPETE ON A WORLD-CLASS LEVEL.

THE CHAMBER PIONEERED AVIATION IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS THROUGHOUT THE 21ST CENTURY. IN FACT, THE CHAMBER CHAMPIONED PALMDALE AS A SITE FOR AEROSPACE AND AVIATION IMMEDIATELY AFTER WORLD WAR II. FOX FIELD IN THE ANTELOPE VALLEY WAS NAMED AFTER THE CHAMBER MEMBER WHO LEAD THE EFFORT TO OPEN UP PALMDALE TO AVIATION.

3. Comments and Responses

WE LOOK FORWARD TO LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORT'S FUTURE MASTER PLAN STUDIES FOR ONTARIO AND PALMDALE AIRPORTS TO CREATE A REGIONAL, 21ST CENTURY SOLUTION TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S AIR TRANSPORTATION DEFICIENCIES.

WE ALSO RECOGNIZE THAT IF LAX IS THE CROWN JEWEL OF AIRPORTS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, IT MUST BE MODERNIZED WITH REAL GROWTH IN POPULATION AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00008 Jackson, Eric None Provided 6/9/2001

PHP00008-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS ERIC JACKSON. I WOULD LIKE TO READ A LETTER. "WE ARE SENDING THIS LETTER TO EXPRESS OUR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAX MODERNIZATION. WE HIGHLY ENDORSE THE RECOMMENDED MASTER PLAN FOR LAX AIRPORT, INCLUDING ALTERNATIVES A, B, OR C.

"WE ARE A BUILDING TRADES UNION OF 4,500 MEMBERS FROM THE PLUMBING AND PIPING INDUSTRY. THIS MEMBERSHIP AND OUR FAMILIES ARE A PROUD PART OF THIS COMMUNITY AND ITS ECONOMY. WE ARE NOT ONLY EXCITED ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF 86,000 JOBS, CONSTRUCTION JOBS, BUT ALSO THE COMMERCE IT WILL BRING TO OUR CITY.

"AS HIGHLY TRAINED CRAFTSPEOPLE, WE ARE LOOKING FORWARD TO A POSITIVE AND REWARDING PARTNERSHIP. WE WILL NOW HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SHOW YOU WHY WE SAY 'WE DO IT RIGHT THE FIRST TIME.' WE LOOK FORWARD TO HELPING WITH THE MODERNIZATION OF LAX.

"HOWEVER, IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT WE DO OPPOSE THE 'NO ACTION/NO PROJECT' ALTERNATIVE. WE BELIEVE THIS APPROACH WOULD TURN LAX AIRPORT INTO AN AIRPORT LIKE NEW YORK, BOSTON, SAN FRANCISCO AND WASHINGTON, D.C. THESE AIRPORTS ARE ALREADY AT THEIR MAXIMUM CAPABILITY AND SOME ARE PLAGUED WITH GRIDLOCK IN THEIR SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES.

"IN CLOSING, WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO KNOW THAT WE ARE NOT JUST EXCITED FOR OURSELVES, BUT FOR ALL OF LOS ANGELES AND BEYOND. THE FLYING PUBLIC AS WELL THE BUSINESSES OF THE WORLD, SHIPPING CARGO THROUGH LAX, WILL ALSO GAIN GREATLY FROM THE PROPOSED MODERNIZATION."

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00009 Scott, Swinton None Provided 6/9/2001

PHP00009-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS SWINTON SCOTT. S-W-I-N-T-O-N, AND SCOTT. I LIVE AT 516 EAST ELLIS AVENUE, NO.3. IN INGLEWOOD. I AM OPPOSED TO THE THREE ALTERNATIVES.

Response:

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

PHP00009-2**Comment:**

THE ARBOR VITAE INTERCHANGE IS A LINKAGE TO THE AIRPORT FROM THE SAN DIEGO FREEWAY AND RATHER THAN SOLVE ANY PROBLEMS FOR AIR TRAVELERS, AS THEY SAID, IT HAS CAUSED ONLY OVERCROWDING AND POLLUTION.

Response:

Comment noted. Improvements to the Arbor Vitae interchange are proposed separate from the Master Plan, and the Master Plan does not rely on those improvements.

PHP00009-3**Comment:**

AFTER THE OVERCROWDING AND POLLUTION ON THE FREEWAY AND ON THE SURFACE STREETS, I DO NOT THINK ALTERNATIVES A, B OR C ARE ACCEPTABLE, AND I FIND IT UNACCEPTABLE TO SOLVE THE AIR TRAFFIC PROBLEMS IN THE AREA WITHOUT CAUSING A CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER TO OURSELVES AND TO OUR QUALITY OF LIFE.

Response:

Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PHP00009-4**Comment:**

A REGIONAL AIRPORT SYSTEM IN AN OUTLYING AREA IS TO OUR BEST ADVANTAGE FOR A SAFE AND, IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS, A MORE BALANCED APPROACH TO AIR TRAVEL RESOURCES AND THE ENVIRONMENT.

Response:

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

PHP00010**Miller, Dawn****None Provided****6/9/2001****PHP00010-1****Comment:**

MY NAME IS DAWN MILLER. I LIVE AT 516 EAST ELLIS AVENUE, NO. 3 IN INGLEWOOD.

3. Comments and Responses

AFTER READING THE DIFFERENT ANALYSIS AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC OF THE EIR/EIS, LEARNING WHAT I COULD ABOUT HOW THE ALTERNATIVE PLANS WOULD OPERATE AND REVIEWING WHAT YOU HAVE UP HERE, I AM OPPOSED TO THE LAX EXPANSION, FIRSTLY, BECAUSE THE VIABLE ALTERNATIVES OF EL TORO AND PALMDALE AND OTHER SITES EXIST TO TAKE CARE OF THE EXPANDING NEED IN THIS REGION AND BECAUSE OF THE OUTLINED EXPANSION EASTWARD INTO INGLEWOOD.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. It should be noted that, while the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts associated with airport expansion under Alternatives A, B, and C, as well as the No Action/No Project Alternative, the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the impacts of Alternative D, which is designed for a future (2015) capacity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHP00010-2

Comment:

EACH OF THE ALTERNATIVES MAY BE ABOUT EXPANSION TO YOU, BUT TO THOSE OF US WHO LIVE IN INGLEWOOD, IT IS ALL ABOUT POLLUTION, POLLUTION IN THE FORM OF JETS FLYING OVER US FROM ALL DIRECTIONS, POLLUTION IN THE FORM OF DIESEL TRUCKS TRAVERSING INGLEWOOD STREETS TO BRING IN CARGO, AND POLLUTION FROM THE ADDED AUTOMOBILE TRAFFIC BRINGING MANY MORE PASSENGERS BY WAY OF THE ARBOR VITAE INTERCHANGE AND THE EXPRESSWAY.

Response:

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

PHP00010-3

Comment:

OTHER THAN THESE TYPES OF EXTRA POLLUTION, IF THEY WERE NOT ENOUGH, THESE ALTERNATIVES WILL ALLOW RUNWAYS TO BE ADDED OR LENGTHENED TO SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD AND THE AIRPORT EXTENDING ALL THE WAY TO THE 405 FREEWAY. THAT MEANS, IN ADDITION TO ALL THE ADDED POLLUTION FROM JETS, TRUCKS AND CARS THAT WOULD BE SPEWING POLLUTION INTO INGLEWOOD, JETS WOULD BE TAKING OFF AND LANDING LOWER AND LOWER TO OUR HOMES AND CREATING NOISE POLLUTION.

Response:

Depending on the alternative, there may be additional runways added or moved; however, not to the I-405. These changes are thoroughly discussed in Section 3 in Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR. With the lengthening of the runway(s) to the east there will be an adjustment in the ILS approach and the potential for aircraft operating at a lower altitude. For additional information please see Section 7 and subsection 7.2.2 in Appendix D of the Draft EIS/EIR and Topical Response TR-AQ-3. Please see Section 3.1 in Appendix S-C, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a discussion of runway changes.

PHP00010-4

Comment:

IS THIS EXPANSION ALL SO NECESSARY THAT WE MUST DESTROY A PERFECTLY WONDERFUL CITY, FURTHER DETERIORATING THE AIR WE BREATHE, ENDANGERING OUR CHILDREN, QUITE POSSIBLY OUR LIVES?

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety.

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

PHP00010-5

Comment:

THERE IS AN ALTERNATIVE. I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST ALTERNATIVE D, WHICH IS WHERE LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORTS GOES INTO A JOINT VENTURE WITH THE CONTROLLING BODIES OF ORANGE COUNTY AND DEVELOPS EL TORO.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, that discusses the El Toro conversion, constraints at John Wayne Airport, and the Ontario Master Plan.

PHP00011 Hill, Tamara Lennox School District 6/9/2001

PHP00011-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS TAMARA HILL. T-A-M-A-R-A, LAST NAME HILL, H-I-L-L. I AM THE PRESIDENT OF THE LENNOX SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION.

OUR DISTRICT HAS 7,000 STUDENTS. THE LENNOX SCHOOL DISTRICT AND THE LENNOX COMMUNITY IS DEFINED BY CENTURY BOULEVARD TO THE NORTH, IMPERIAL BOULEVARD TO THE SOUTH AND PRAIRIE AVENUE TO THE EAST AND LA CIENEGA TO THE WEST. THE TOWN OF LENNOX IS DIRECTLY ADJACENT TO LAX.

WE ARE YOUR IMMEDIATE NEIGHBORS, AND WE ARE DIRECTLY UNDERNEATH THE FLIGHT PATH OF LANDING PLANES. WE KNOW THERE ARE MANY SURROUNDING CITIES THAT WILL BE AFFECTED BY THE LAX EXPANSION, AND NO OTHER SCHOOL DISTRICT IN THE COUNTY IS TRULY EXPOSED TO A GREATER LEVEL OF NOISE AND AIR POLLUTION THAN THE CHILDREN OF LENNOX.

NO OTHER SCHOOL DISTRICT IN THE LAX AREA WOULD BE MORE ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY THE EXPANSION OF LAX THAN LENNOX SCHOOL DISTRICT.

NEEDLESS TO SAY, OUR DISTRICT AND OUR COMMUNITY AT LARGE CONTINUALLY HEAR THE PLANS AND FEAR POLLUTING THE MOST DUE TO OUR PROXIMITY TO LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, land use impacts in Section 4.2, Land Use, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and impacts to schools in Section 4.27, Schools, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, and 17 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C, S-E and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4.

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00011-2

Comment:

THIS HAS AFFECTED THE LENNOX SCHOOL CHILDREN. THE UCLA SCHOOL OF MEDICINE HAS CONDUCTED HEALTH CARE SCREENING, SCREENING MORE THAN 3,500 STUDENTS AND ADULTS. IT SHOULDN'T BE A SURPRISE WHEN I TELL YOU THAT THE UCLA MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS FOUND A HIGH AMOUNT OF ASTHMA AND ALLERGY SYMPTOMS IN OUR COMMUNITY.

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment AF00001-36; please refer to Response to Comment AF00001-36.

PHP00011-3

Comment:

OUR CHILDREN BEING EXPOSED TO THE TERRIBLE NOISE OF AIR POLLUTION IS UNACCEPTABLE, AND WHAT IS EVEN MORE UNACCEPTABLE IS HOW THE LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY OVERLOOKS THE LENNOX COMMUNITY. WE WANT OUR VOICE TO BE HEARD AT THE HEARINGS, AND THE THREE MINUTES I AM GIVEN TO SPEAK IS NOT ENOUGH TIME TO COMPARE CONCERNS AND TO TELL YOU HOW PASSIONATE WE FEEL ABOUT THIS ISSUE.

Response:

The three minute limit is an attempt to permit as many participants as possible to provide comment at the 18 hearings conducted on this project. A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org. Written comments may also be submitted.

PHP00011-4

Comment:

ON BEHALF OF THE SCHOOL BOARD AND THE LENNOX COMMUNITY, I WOULD LIKE TO INVITE YOU TO VISIT LENNOX, COME AND SEE HOW OUR CHILDREN LIVE AND ARE AFFECTED BY THE ALREADY WELL OVER 65 DECIBEL CNEL MEASUREMENT OF NOISE POLLUTION. COME AND SEE. WE WOULD LIKE TO PROTECT OUR STUDENTS FROM THE NOISE OF THE DESCENDING PLANES SO THEY CAN LEARN.

LENNOX IS EXPOSED TO THE PLANS FOR EXPANSION. IF YOU INSIST ON DOING SO, COME TO OUR COMMUNITY AND SIT DOWN WITH US AND ADDRESS OUR CONCERNS AND OUR NEEDS.

LENNOX IS SMALL, BUT MIGHTY, AND WE ARE PASSIONATE ABOUT PROTECTING OUR CHILDREN FROM THE AIR AND NOISE POLLUTION. WE WILL NOT BE DISMISSED OR OVERLOOKED.

Response:

Thank you for your comments, LAWA is concerned about the health of neighborhoods. The 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.

PHP00012 Price, Curren**City of Los Angeles****6/9/2001****PHP00012-1****Comment:**

CURREN PRICE, COUNCILMAN OF CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 1. I REPRESENT AN AREA THAT IS DIRECTLY IMPACTED AND AFFECTED BY THE AIRPORT, ROUGHLY THE AREA BOUNDED BY VAN NESS ON THE EAST, LA BREA ON THE WEST, 76TH STREET ON THE NORTH AND IMPERIAL ON THE SOUTH. THOSE AREAS, AS I MENTIONED BEFORE, ARE AFFECTED BY TRAFFIC AND ACTIVITY ASSOCIATED WITH LAX.

I SHARE THE CONCERNS THAT HAVE BEEN EXPRESSED REGARDING THE FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO ADDRESS EXPANSION SCENARIOS IN SOME OF THE OUTLYING AREAS. I CERTAINLY BELIEVE THAT THE EXPANSION HAS TO BE A REGIONAL APPROACH, AND THAT IS SORELY MISSING FROM THE EIR.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR dealt only with the development of LAX. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. The recommendation that the FAA conduct a comprehensive analysis of various regional scenarios is beyond the scope of the subject EIS/EIR. Surface transportation impacts were addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHP00012-2**Comment:**

FOR MOST OF THE CITIZENS I REPRESENT, AND I HEAR COMPLAINTS ON A WEEKLY BASIS, THEY ARE ABOUT TRAFFIC OR NOISE OR EXPANSION OR SOMETHING NEW WITH THE PROJECT. FOR MOST, THE CURRENT LEVEL OF TAKEOFFS AND LANDINGS IS DISRUPTIVE.

WE HAVE HAD ISSUES PREVIOUSLY REGARDING THE HEIGHT, THE NOISE. THEY ARE BURDENSOME TO MANY WHO LIVE IN THIS IMMEDIATE AREA. THE PROSPECT OF 40 OR 50 MORE FLIGHTS A DAY, AS PROJECTED IN THE EIR, IS -- I THINK MOST OF US FIND THIS TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE.

Response:

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

PHP00012-3**Comment:**

THE MAJOR TRAFFIC ARTERIES OF THE 405 AND SEPULVEDA ARE ALREADY CLOGGED DURING RUSH HOUR BECAUSE OF TRAFFIC, AND AGAIN THE PROSPECTS OF ADDING ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC ON THESE ARTERIES IS GOING TO BE TOTALLY BURDENSOME.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PHP00012-4

Comment:

IN ADDITION TO NOISE AND TRAFFIC, OF COURSE, THERE ARE ISSUES OF POLLUTION, AND THAT HAS BEEN REFERRED TO BY MANY SPEAKERS AND, AGAIN, IS AN ADDITIONAL CONCERN FOR THOSE WHO LIVE IN OUR COMMUNITY.

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.

PHP00012-5

Comment:

SO WHILE WE UNDERSTAND EXPANSION IS A NECESSARY EVIL, WE FEEL THAT THERE SHOULD BE A MORE BALANCED APPROACH.

THE IDEA OF THE THREE SCENARIOS BEING LAID OUT WITHIN THE EIR, MEMBERS OF MY COMMUNITY FIND IT UNACCEPTABLE, AND I AM CONFIDENT IF WE WORK TOGETHER, WE CAN FIND AN ALTERNATIVE PLAN.

BUT I THINK WE NEED TO START OVER, GET EVERYBODY TO THE TABLE AND THEN ROLL UP OUR SLEEVES TO MAKE THAT HAPPEN.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PHP00013 Kirschenstein, Joel None Provided

6/9/2001

PHP00013-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS JOEL KIRSCHENSTEIN. I AM SPECIAL CONSULTANT TO THE SCHOOL DISTRICT AND COUNSEL FOR THE DISTRICT.

OUR COMMENTS ARE SPECIFICALLY TO ADDRESS THE EIS AND EIR, AND I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT FOR US TO KNOW -- BY THE WAY, WE HAVE HAD MEETINGS WITH STAFF, AND WE APPRECIATE THE MEETINGS WE HAVE HAD WITH THE LAX STAFF ON SOME OF THESE ISSUES.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00013-2

Comment:

WE THINK THAT THE SECTION ON SCHOOLS IS MORE THAN FLAWED, IT IS NONEXISTENT, AS FAR AS AN INTERPRETATION OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION ON THE INGLEWOOD SCHOOL DISTRICT.

FOR SOME REASON THE REPORT ADDRESSES LA-USC AND GOES INTO KIND OF A RAMBLING ANALYSIS OF SOME TYPE OF IMPACTS THAT THE AIRPORT WOULD HAVE ON THE L.A. UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, AND IT DOESN'T REALLY ADDRESS THE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION.

WE WILL BE SUBMITTING A WRITTEN RESPONSE. IT MAKES IT VERY DIFFICULT TO RESPOND, FOR THE DISTRICT TO RESPOND, WHEN WE DON'T HAVE THE TECHNICAL IMPACT SECTION IN THE REPORT TO ADDRESS. WE WANT TO MAKE NOTE OF THAT.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed impacts on schools in Section 4.27, Schools. The Draft EIS/EIR also describes existing conditions and impacts on schools in Inglewood Unified School District under Alternatives A, B, and C, in Technical Report 17.

As was discussed on page 4-1220 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the schools section addresses the project-generated changes in public school enrollment in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) and the extent to which such changes could cause overcrowding of schools. Where the project would have direct impacts on public schools, rather than impacts through changes in enrollment, these effects were analyzed in other sections of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR which pertain to those impacts (e.g., 4.1, Noise; 4.2, Land Use; 4.3, Surface Transportation; 4.6, Air Quality and 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment) and were summarized in Section 4.27, Schools. Technical Report 17, Schools Technical Report, contains information regarding existing conditions associated with public schools in the vicinity of LAX as well as a discussion of enrollment impacts on public schools outside of the LAUSD under Alternatives A, B, and C. Technical Report 17 addresses impacts on schools outside of Los Angeles Unified School District, including Inglewood Unified School District.

PHP00013-3

Comment:

WE WOULD HAVE TO NOW RESPOND FROM THE STANDPOINT OF WHAT THE OMISSIONS ARE IN THE REPORT, WHAT IS NOT THERE.

WHAT WE WILL BE FOCUSING ON, OUR RESPONSE WILL BE PRIMARILY IN THREE AREAS. WE WILL HAVE TO DESCRIBE WHAT THE EXISTING FACTS ARE OF LAX, AND WE REALIZE THAT LAX IS GOING TO BE HERE. IT IS NOT GOING TO GO AWAY. SO THERE WILL ALWAYS BE IMPACTS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00013-4

Comment:

THEN WE WILL DISCUSS THE IMPACTS OF THE FLIGHT PATHS ON THE EXPANSION AND THE DIFFERENT EXPANSION SCENARIOS UP TO A CERTAIN DEGREE. AGAIN, WE DO NOT HAVE A FULL DETAILED TECHNICAL IMPACT ON THE HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE ISSUES, WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED IN THE REPORT OF THE STUDENT POPULATIONS.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Health, safety, and welfare issues as they pertain to schools were addressed in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As was discussed on page 4-1220 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the "schools section addresses the project-generated changes in public school enrollment in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) and the extent to which such changes could cause overcrowding of schools. Where the project would have direct impacts on public schools, rather than impacts through changes in enrollment, these effects were analyzed in other sections of the Draft EIS/EIR which pertain to those impacts (e.g., 4.1, Noise; 4.2, Land Use; 4.3, Surface Transportation; 4.6, Air Quality and 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment) and were summarized in this section. Technical Report 17, Schools Technical Report, contains information regarding existing conditions associated with public schools in the vicinity of LAX as well as a discussion of enrollment impacts on public schools outside of the LAUSD." Also see Section 4.27, Schools (subsection 4.27.9), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for a summary of direct impacts on schools for all of the build alternatives, as identified in other sections of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Also note that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHP00013-5

Comment:

THEN THE THIRD PART WILL BE THE GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS IN AND AROUND INGLEWOOD SCHOOLS THAT WILL OCCUR FROM THE LAX EXPANSION THEMSELVES. AGAIN, THERE IS NO PARTICULAR FOCUS.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed growth-inducing impacts in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement), and impacts on schools in Section 4.27, Schools. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHP00013-6

Comment:

BY WAY OF EXAMPLE, THERE IS A SCHOOL CALLED OAK STREET SCHOOL IN WHICH THE ARBOR VITAE OFFRAMP IS JUST PART OF THE EXPRESSWAY EXPANSION. IT BASICALLY DOES AWAY WITH -- WE HAVE ALREADY RESPONDED THAT THAT IS GOING TO HAVE TO BE RELOCATED, AND THAT IS NOT ADDRESSED IN THE REPORT EITHER.

Response:

Impacts associated with the LAX Expressway were addressed in Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR. Also see Topical Responses TR-APPK-1 and TR-APPK-2 regarding the LAX Expressway and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding the surface transportation analysis methodology. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway component.

PHP00013-7

Comment:

SO THOSE ARE SOME OF THE ISSUES WE WANTED TO BRING TO YOUR ATTENTION TODAY. WE WANT TO BE ON RECORD AND LET YOU KNOW THAT WE HAVE SPECIFIC DETAILS ABOUT THE OMISSIONS IN THE REPORT.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PHP00013-2 through PHP00013-6 above.

PHP00014 Marshall, Claudia None Provided 6/9/2001

PHP00014-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS CLAUDIA MARSHALL, CLAUDIA M-A-R-S-H-A-L-L, 2118 WEST 81ST STREET, LOS ANGELES, 90047.

I AM NOT HERE TO SPEAK ON POLITICAL PURPOSES, JUST AS A HOUSE OWNER, HOMEOWNER, LIVING IN SOUTH CENTRAL L.A.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00014-2

Comment:

NO ONE SEEMED TO HAVE THOUGHT OF US, HOW THE INCREASE OF AIR FLOW WILL AFFECT US. THE PLANES TRAVEL DIRECTLY OVER MY HOME NOW: COMING IN, LANDING. THEY ARE SO LOW AT THIS POINT THAT YOU CAN READ THE LOGOS ON THE AIRPLANES.

Response:

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

PHP00014-3

Comment:

I WAS TOLD WITH THE PROPOSALS, THAT AIR TRAFFIC IS GOING TO INCREASE, AND IT WILL BE -- AND THE PLANES WILL BECOME LARGER. THAT IS NOT ACCEPTABLE BECAUSE AT THIS POINT WE ARE HAVING MAJOR PROBLEMS WITH HEARING. YOU CANNOT TALK ON THE TELEPHONE IF A PLANE, ONE OF THE BIG JUMBO JETS OR CARGO PLANES, ARE PASSING OVER. YOU HAVE TO WAIT UNTIL THEY FINISH, AND THEN YOU CAN CONTINUE YOUR CONVERSATION.

Response:

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

PHP00014-4

Comment:

I WAS BLESSED WITH A GRANDCHILD, AND SOMETIMES I JUST GO TO BED, AND THE PLANES COME OVER, AND THEY WAKE HER. THIS MIGHT NOT BE SIGNIFICANT TO SOME OF YOU, BUT IT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO US.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings in homes associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PHP00014-5

Comment:

THEREFORE, I AM HERE TO JUST SPEAK TO YOU ABOUT THE COMMON EVERYDAY PROBLEMS THAT WE ENCOUNTER.

I HAVE BEEN LIVING HERE SINCE 1963 SO I HAVE BECOME ACCUSTOMED TO THE AIRPLANE NOISE. IF I HAVE OUT-OF-TOWN GUESTS HERE, AND THEY ASK ME: HOW CAN YOU DEAL WITH IT, YOU SAY YOU JUST BECOME ACCUSTOMED TO IT.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00014-6

Comment:

AND ESPECIALLY DURING THE PEAK HOURS, MORNING AND EVENING, THIS IS BECOMING UNBEARABLE IF YOU ARE OUTSIDE IN YOUR YARD OR IN THE BACK PORTION OF YOUR HOUSE.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PHP00014-7

Comment:

TO BE SPECIFIC, I LIVE, I GUESS YOU WOULD SAY, ON THE NORTHEAST PART OF SOUTH CENTRAL, JUST AT THE DIVIDING LINE OF VAN NESS AND INGLEWOOD. EVERYTHING I HEAR IS INGLEWOOD, INGLEWOOD. WE ARE THE FORGOTTEN NEIGHBORS. THE PLANES HAVE TO GET TO INGLEWOOD. IN ORDER TO GET TO INGLEWOOD, THEY HAVE TO FLY OVER SOUTH CENTRAL L.A.

Response:

Noise impacts on South Central Los Angeles were graphically depicted in Section 4.2.6 and Technical Report 1, Land Use Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.2.6 and Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report. As was shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, portions of South Central (now referred to as South Los Angeles) are eligible for noise insulation under the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour and portions are within the 65 CNEL under 1996 baseline conditions. See Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program for a description of the ANMP.

As was described in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, noise-sensitive uses would be considered significantly impacted in South Los Angeles based on the following thresholds: newly exposed to the 65 CNEL, experience an increase of 1.5 CNEL within the 65 CNEL, or newly exposed to the 94 dBA SEL. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-5 for additional discussion of how noise-sensitive uses are identified, how thresholds of significance are determined, and how noise impacts are mitigated.

Portions of South Los Angeles would be newly exposed to high noise levels under Alternatives A, B, and C, with the greatest area of impact occurring under Alternative B. As was shown on Figures S4.2-7

of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and S4 of the Land Use Technical Report, under Alternative A compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, portions of South Los Angeles would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL and increases of 1.5 CNEL within the 65 CNEL. As was shown on Figures S4.2-10 and S6, under Alternative B compared to 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions, portions of South Los Angeles would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL and increases of 1.5 CNEL within the 65 CNEL. As was shown on Figures S4.2-13, under Alternative C, compared to 1996 baseline conditions, portions of South Los Angeles would be newly exposed to the 65 CNEL. Also under Alternative C, a small portion of South Los Angeles (generally bounded by Arbor Vitae to the north, Haas Avenue to the east, 96th Street to the south, and Van Ness Avenue to the west) would be newly exposed to high single event noise levels compared to both 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions. Under Alternative D no areas of South Central would be newly exposed to high noise levels, significant noise increases, or high single event noise levels, compared to both the 1996 baseline and Year 2000 conditions.

See Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding noise mitigation measures that would be implemented under the LAX Master Plan for noise-sensitive uses that are determined to be significantly impacted.

PHP00014-8

Comment:

I WOULD LIKE FOR US TO BE CONSIDERED AND THOUGHT ABOUT, AND WHEN YOU -- OKAY. SOME OF THE HOMES IN THE AREA, IN THE ADJACENT AREA, DID GET, I THINK, SOME WINDOWS OR SOMETHING -- WE WASN'T EVEN CONSIDERED FOR THAT.

SO I WOULD APPRECIATE THAT BEFORE YOU PROCEED ANY FURTHER, THINK ABOUT THE OTHER PEOPLE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD, AND I THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

Response:

The noise impact area which determines residential uses eligible for sound insulation under the ANMP is described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4, and is based on the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour. Although the area within the 65 CNEL noise contour has decreased compared to the 1992 fourth quarter 65 CNEL noise contour, it still defines the eligibility boundary for sound insulation. This is a comment on existing noise levels and conditions, the general focus of the document, pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, is to evaluate the potential future environmental effects of the project and to provide feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts. See Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.14 for a description of revisions proposed to the ANMP under the LAX Master Plan, which include fulfilling existing commitments to owners wishing to participate within the current ANMP boundaries prior to proceeding with newly eligible properties. See also Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PHP00015

Gardner, Theola

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHP00015-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. I AM THEOLA GARDENER. I AM A LONG-TIME RESIDENT OF INGLEWOOD. I HAVE BEEN IN MY HOME FOR 40 YEARS AT 9426 FOURTH AVENUE. BEING A LONG-TIME RESIDENT OF INGLEWOOD, I HAVE SEEN MANY CHANGES TAKE PLACE.

NOW THAT I AM HEARING ABOUT THE BIG CHANGES THAT ARE SUPPOSED TO TAKE PLACE WITH LAX, IT HAS REALLY BEEN TERRIFYING, AND IT HAS CHANGED, SO TO SPEAK, MY LIFESTYLE OF PEACE AND COMFORT IN MY HOME.

YOU SPEAK OF L.A. -- LAX SPEAKS OF PURPOSE AND NEED, AND THESE PURPOSES AND NEEDS ARE SATISFYING TO LAX ONLY. THE NEEDS FOR THE RESIDENTS OF INGLEWOOD ARE COMPLETELY IGNORED IN ALL RESPECTS.

YOU SPEAK OF ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTS, CONCEPT A, CONCEPT B, CONCEPT C. ALL CONCEPTS WILL ONLY SUPPORT LAX'S NEEDS AND CAUSE FURTHER DETERIORATION OF

3. Comments and Responses

SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES WITH THE LOUD NOISE, BEING HAZARDOUS TO YOUR HEALTH AND CAUSING STRUCTURAL DAMAGE TO THE STRUCTURES OF OUR HOMES, NOT TO MENTION THE CONGESTION OF TRAFFIC.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS/EIR regarding the purpose and need for the proposed project. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, land use impacts in Section 4.2, Land Use, traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and health and safety impacts in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life and Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The impacts of Alternative D were addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHP00015-2

Comment:

I FEEL THAT LAX NEEDS TO THINK VERY CAREFULLY AND GIVE SOME CONSIDERATION TO THE RESIDENTS OF INGLEWOOD AND SURROUNDING AREAS. THESE PLACES ARE OUR HOMES.

THIS IS YOUR BUSINESS, AND THIS BUSINESS SERVES THE COMMUNITIES OF MANY PERSONS OTHER THAN JUST INGLEWOOD, AND I FEEL THAT PERSONS THAT ALSO ARE RECIPIENTS OF THE SERVICES OF LAX SHOULD TAKE A RESPONSIBLE SHARE.

Response:

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

PHP00016	Sligh, Aldene	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHP00016-1

Comment:

ALDENE SLIGH, A-L-D-E-N-E, S LIKE SAM, L-I-G-H. I LIVE AT 9500 FOURTH AVENUE IN INGLEWOOD.

AND I WOULD LIKE TO FIRST SPEAK ON ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, WHICH I CONSIDER LAX'S MASTER PLAN AS ENVIRONMENTAL INJUSTICE. FROM EVERYTHING I OBSERVED HERE AND AT ONE OF THE WORKSHOPS, WHICH WAS POORLY ADVERTISED, BECAUSE VERY FEW CITIZENS SHOWED UP -- THAT LAX HAS NOT EVEN CONSIDERED THE CITIZENS OF THE SURROUNDING -- INGLEWOOD OR THE SURROUNDING AREAS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00178-2 and Topical Response TR-EJ-2.

PHP00016-2

Comment:

LAX CANNOT HAVE AN EXPANSION BECAUSE THEY CANNOT MITIGATE THE PROBLEMS THAT ALREADY EXIST WITHOUT THE EXPANSION.

Response:

Comment noted. Although existing conditions are described throughout Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Consequences and Mitigation Measures, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the

Draft EIS/EIR, the primary focus of the document is on potential impacts associated with the proposed Master Plan alternatives as determined by changes between the environmental baseline and future 2015 conditions.

PHP00016-3

Comment:

WE ARE VERY IMPACTED. IT IS AFFECTING OUR HEALTH. IT IS AFFECTING OUR LIFESTYLE. AND WE ARE NOT IN AN AREA OF LEAST RESISTANCE, AND I WOULD LIKE MS. KENNARD TO KNOW THAT. SHE WROTE IN AN ARTICLE THAT THEY WEREN'T GOING TO GO SOUTH BECAUSE THEY WOULD IMPACT WELL-DEVELOPED COMMUNITIES. I WOULD LIKE HER TO KNOW THAT INGLEWOOD IS A BEAUTIFUL, WELL-DEVELOPED COMMUNITY, AND WE TAKE GREAT PRIDE IN WHERE WE LIVE.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the regulatory framework and impacts on minority and low income communities in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice. Such analyses address the degree to which the Master Plan alternatives would comply with federal and state regulations and policies pertaining to environmental justice, specifically Executive Order 12898, U.S. Department of Transportation Order 5610.1, California Public Resources Code Section 72000-72001, and California Environmental Protection Agency policy as described in Section 4.4.3.1, Introduction, of the Draft EIS/EIR. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D, which is designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to what would occur if the project were not approved, as described under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D would have the least impact on the environment of the build alternatives, including reduced air quality and noise impacts on the City of Inglewood.

PHP00016-4

Comment:

THE NEXT AREA IS THE AREA OF TRANSPORTATION. THE PROPOSED RING ROAD WILL MAKE MORE TRAFFIC AND WILL ONLY SERVE TO MAKE IT MORE CONVENIENT FOR THE 20 PERCENT COMING FROM ORANGE COUNTY AND OUTLYING AREAS.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology, Section 7 regarding the Ring Road. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHP00016-5

Comment:

THIS WILL INVOLVE THE DESTRUCTION OF AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND MANY OF THE HOMES. THAT MEANS THAT IT WILL BE THE TOTAL DESTRUCTION OF A NEIGHBORHOOD AS WE KNOW IT TODAY.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR discussed the potential impacts on the neighborhood in Section 4.4.4, Community Disruption and Alteration of Surface Transportation Patterns. See subsection 4.4.4.6.2, Alternatives A, B, and C, on Page 4-442, under the heading "Acquisition - Potential Division or Disruption or Losses of Access to Essential Community Services". In addition, Section 5.1, Land Use, of Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR discloses the number of homes, commercial businesses, public and community facilities that would potentially be impacted by either the proposed LAX Expressway or SR-1 Improvement projects. Please note that Alternative D, now the preferred alternative, does not include the proposed LAX Expressway as a project component. In the event that the LAX Expressway is selected for implementation as a component of the LAX Master Plan, the residences, businesses and various

3. Comments and Responses

facilities impacted by the proposed LAX Expressway would qualify for compensation and relocation assistance under the Preliminary Relocation Plan described in Chapter 5, Appendix P of the LAX Master Plan. Refer to Topical Response TR-APPK-2 for a description of the conceptual nature of the proposed LAX Expressway alignment and next steps regarding LAX Expressway property acquisition and relocation issues.

PHP00016-6

Comment:

RATHER THAN FOLLOWING THE DICTATES OF THE EIR AND EIS AS IT IS PRESENTED TO US IN THE SURROUNDING AREAS IN LAX, WE DEMAND THAT THE PRESENT PROBLEMS BE MITIGATED IN ALL SURROUNDING AREAS, PRESENTLY, BEFORE YOU EVEN BEGIN TO THINK EXPANSION.

Response:

This is not a requirement or means under CEQA or NEPA to mitigate environmental conditions that are not the result of a "project" or "action" as defined by those laws. The currently proposed Master Plan meets those definitions and, as a result of the EIS/EIR completed for the proposed Master Plan, numerous mitigation measures are recommended to address the impacts of the improvements and activities associated with the new Master Plan. Those mitigation measures address impacts both within the limits of the airport as well as in the affected communities around the airport. In conjunction with approval of the Master Plan, LAWA and FAA will be required to implement those measures, again, both on the airport and in the surrounding communities. Without the Master Plan and the EIS/EIR mitigation measures, LAWA and FAA are restricted by federal law in the expenditure of airport funds within off-airport areas for addressing existing environmental impacts. One notable exception, however, is the ongoing implementation of the residential soundproofing program as part of the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) for areas exposed to aircraft noise levels of 65 CNEL or greater. Aside from that, LAWA's ability to mitigate impacts to the surrounding communities is more indirect, through the control of on-airport facilities or activities in a manner that reduces impacts to surrounding areas. LAWA has implemented a number of programs to reduce the environmental impacts of existing operations, such as carpool and vanpool programs to reduce traffic and air quality impacts, conversion of ground service equipment and LAWA fleet vehicles to alternative fuels to reduce air quality impacts, and electrification of aircraft gates to reduce air pollutant emissions associated with aircraft auxiliary power units.

PHP00016-7

Comment:

THIS PLAN SEEMS TO BE FRAUDULENT TO ME BECAUSE IT DOES NOT HAVE A SATISFACTORY AIR QUALITY COMPONENT TO IT. I DON'T EVEN THINK YOU CAN CONSIDER IT A REAL AIR QUALITY COMPONENT.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01881-149 regarding the reference documentation for the data and assumptions used in the air quality analyses.

PHP00016-8

Comment:

SO I AM NOT IN FAVOR OF THIS EXPANSION.

Response:

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

PHP00017 Warr, Clara**None Provided****6/9/2001****PHP00017-1****Comment:**

CLARA WARR. I LIVE AT 9207 SOUTH THIRD AVENUE IN INGLEWOOD.

MY NAME IS CLARA WARR.

FIRST OF ALL, I WAS SURPRISED THAT LAWA WOULD EVEN GIVE THIS 12:00 TO 2:30 TIME FOR A WORKSHOP. I HAVE NEVER EXPERIENCED SUCH A WORKSHOP BEFORE IN MY LIFE.

Response:

It is the intent of LAWA to provide a variety of times, locations and setting to foster a full spectrum of comments on the LAX Master Plan proposals.

PHP00017-2**Comment:**

AS I LOOK THROUGH THE VOLUME ON THE TABLE, THE EIR/EIS, I CAME TO PAGE 1040, AND ON THAT PAGE IT STATED THAT THE POLLUTANTS WOULD PRIMARILY GO EASTWARD. POLLUTANTS FROM THE AIRPORT WILL PRIMARILY GO EASTWARD TO INGLEWOOD AND TO COMMUNITIES EAST OF INGLEWOOD.

AND AN EXCERPT FROM AN ARTICLE THAT I READ IS CALLED "EXPOSING AIRPORTS POISON CIRCLES," THAT SAYS IF YOU LIVE WITHIN SIX MILES OF AN AIRPORT, YOU ARE AT HEIGHTENED RISK OF DYING PREMATURELY FROM ENVIRONMENTALLY INDUCED CANCER FROM JET AIRCRAFT, GROUND VEHICLES AND AIRPORT MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS.

I TRIED TO RAPIDLY PERUSE THAT EIR/EIS TODAY TO SEE IF I COULD RECOGNIZE OR FIND THE STUDY THAT WAS DONE AT -- BY THE WASHINGTON HEALTH DEPARTMENT CENSUS INVOLVING THE SEATTLE/TACOMA AIRPORT. I COULDN'T FIND IT. BUT THERE WERE A LOT OF OTHERS THAT REALLY DOWNPLAYED POLLUTION AND NOISE.

BUT I WANT TO CITE WHAT IS SAID IN THIS ARTICLE, AN EXCERPT FROM THAT WASHINGTON HEALTH DEPARTMENT CENSUS STUDY AT THE SEA-TAC AREA.

BY MOUNTING -- A MOUNTING NUMBER OF STUDIES CLEARLY SUGGEST THAT AIRPORT POLLUTANTS HAVE BECOME CHEMICAL GRIM REAPERS GRADUALLY SICKENING AND KILLING NEARBY RESIDENTS.

DATA FROM THE WASHINGTON HEALTH DEPARTMENT CENSUS WHICH COMPARED 1991 TO 1995 ILLNESS AND MORTALITY RATES FOR RESIDENTS NEAR THE SEATTLE/TACOMA AREA FOUND INFANT MORTALITY NEAR THE AIRPORT WAS 50 PERCENT GREATER, HEART DISEASE WAS 50 PERCENT GREATER, CANCER DEATHS 36 PERCENT GREATER, AND DEATHS FROM ALL CAUSES WERE 48 PERCENT GREATER.

DID ANYONE BOTHER TO FIND THAT PARTICULAR STUDY?

Response:

We have reviewed the article and study referenced in this comment. The quote regarding "chemical grim reapers" is from the article "Exposing Airports Poison Circles" by Skolnick (1), is not from the Washington State Department of Health (WSDOH) study (2). The article "Exposing Airports Poison Circles" did not provide references for information cited; however, information presented in the Skolnick article does not correspond with information presented in the WSDOH study (2) or in the Health Profile prepared by the Seattle-King County Department of Public Health (SKCDOPH) (3). For example, the Skolnick article stated that heart disease for residents near SeaTac was 57 percent greater than Seattle

3. Comments and Responses

overall (1). However, the Health Profile indicated that death rates for heart disease and stroke for the SeaTac community were not significantly different than King County, Washington. Comparisons were not provided for Seattle (2 and 3). Infant mortality was not reported in the WSDOH study or the Health Profile. The article indicated that the average life expectancy for airport neighbors was 70.4 years (1); however, the Health Profile indicated that the average life expectancy for residents near the airport was 77 years (3). The article indicated that death from all causes was 48 percent greater for residents near SeaTac (1); however, the Health Profile indicated that death from all causes was 9 percent greater for SeaTac residents compared to King County (3). The overall death rate includes deaths from firearms (50% greater in the SeaTac area than in King County) and death from accidents (3).

The article failed to include pertinent information necessary to understand the WSDOH study results. For example, women from the SeaTac Airport Community giving birth were significantly more likely to have smoked during pregnancy and were more likely to have had late prenatal care. In addition, the birth rate among adolescents aged 15 to 17 was almost twice as high near SeaTac compared to King County as a whole. Other data on behavioral risk factors were not available specifically for SeaTac; however, a greater percentage of adults smoked or were overweight in the south King County region, where SeaTac is located, than in King County overall. More women in the south county region had not had a recent pap smear (2 and 3).

The Skolnick article stated that cancer deaths were 36 percent greater for SeaTac residents (1). The WSDOH study indicated that incidence of cancer was not significantly higher for the SeaTac area; however, the Health Profile indicated that the rate of cancer deaths for residents near the SeaTac area was 9% higher than King County (2 and 3). This finding may indicate that there was an increase in cancer incidence prior to 1993, given that there is generally some period of time between diagnosis and death. This result is currently being studied by the WSDOH (2). The results raise the question as to whether the economic status, greater incidence of smokers, and/or other factors for people living in the SeaTac area played a role in the cancer death rate. The Health Profile indicated that a higher percentage of persons below the federal poverty level live in the SeaTac area than in the county as a whole (3). Individuals living near SeaTac, thus, might have had less access to medical care, such that even though the incidence of cancer was not significantly different, observed cancers were slightly more likely to result in death. The observations might also reflect the short study duration, movement of people between communities, or personal and lifestyle habits (e.g., smoking, overeating) that may themselves cause cancer or may reduce the body's disease-fighting capability. Important risk factors for chronic diseases, including cancer, include cigarette smoking, alcohol misuse, high blood pressure, obesity, physical inactivity, high blood cholesterol, and high fat/low fiber diet.

The results of a short-term epidemiological study are difficult to relate to specific causes and are a poor basis for determining whether observations are actually significant or a result of the study design. For example, preliminary results of the WSDOH study suggested that the number of cases of all cancer were higher than expected for SeaTac. However, subsequent studies that added a year of data did not find an elevation of total cancer cases in any of the areas evaluated (2). In addition, all factors that may lead to an adverse effect must be carefully considered and understood before conclusions can be drawn. The population studied may have lived in the area for many years or just a few years. They may have had exposure to chemicals from other sources. The people may have engaged in behavior that increased their risk of adverse health effect, such as smoking or overeating as discussed above. Further, many observations concerning the Sea-Tac area and King County may affect interpretation of results in unknown fashion. For example, teens and young adults in the SeaTac area had higher hospitalization for illicit drug use and had higher incidence rates of sexually transmitted diseases than their King County counterparts. The rate of hospitalization for motor vehicle crashes was significantly greater in the SeaTac area between 1992 and 1996 than in King County. The average rate of alcohol-related hospitalizations was higher in the SeaTac area than in King County (3).

The information presented in the cited article, the WSDOH study, and the SKCDOPH Health Profile does not present a defensible case that living near an airport is associated with significantly increased disease incidence caused by airport activities. No changes to the methods and conclusions of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are warranted.

(1) Skolnick. 2001. Exposing Airports Poison Circles. Earth Island Journal. Winter 2000-2001. Volume 15, No. 4.

(2) Washington State Department of Health. Office of Epidemiology. 1999. Cancer Rates in the Proximity of SeaTac International Airport (Questions 1 and 2 of the August 1998 Work Plan). February.

(3) Seattle-King County Department of Public Health. Epidemiology, Planning, and Evaluation Unit. 1999. Health Profile for the SeaTac Airport Community. February.

PHP00017-3

Comment:

ALL OF OUR LIVES HAVE BECOME DISPENSABLE AND DISPOSABLE FOR THE BUSINESS AND ECONOMY DRIVEN L.A. WORLD AIRPORTS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00018 Stevens, Mike LAX Expansion No! 6/9/2001

PHP00018-1

Comment:

YES. MY NAME IS MIKE STEVENS.

I'M A RESIDENT OF INGLEWOOD, ALSO PRESIDENT OF AN ORGANIZATION CALLED LAX EXPANSION NO.

YOUR COMMUNITY OUTREACH, AS YOU CAN SEE HERE TODAY, HAS FAILED. I SUGGEST THAT YOU CONDUCT ANOTHER OUTREACH, A SINCERE ATTEMPT TO GET THE PEOPLE OF INGLEWOOD, SOUTH CENTRAL LOS ANGELES, PEOPLE WHO ARE GOING TO CARRY THE BRUNT OF THIS PROPOSED EXPANSION SO THAT THEY CAN UNDERSTAND WHAT'S ABOUT TO HAPPEN. MANY PEOPLE DO NOT KNOW.

NOW, IF YOU EXPECT LAX EXPANSION NO TO DO YOUR OUTREACH FOR YOU, THEN MAYBE YOU SHOULD GIVE IT A SYSTEM TO DO THAT. BUT TO PUT THE BLAME ON US, THAT WELL, YOU SHOULD HAVE CONTACTED YOUR OVER 3,000 MEMBERS, IS UNFAIR.

Response:

LAWA has conducted extensive outreach through media, newsletter, and community meetings. There were 21 public hearings during the review periods for the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PHP00018-2

Comment:

NOW, ANOTHER PROBLEM IS THIS, WITH THE DOCUMENT ITSELF. IT IS NOT YOUR FORMULAS FOR YOUR FLEET MIX. YOUR FLEET MIX, IF YOU TAKE ONE PLAN AND CHANGE THAT, LET'S SAY, FROM DC-10 TO A 747, AUTOMATICALLY, ALL YOUR CALCULATIONS ARE AUTOMATICALLY OFF. SO YOUR DOCUMENT IS BASED UPON A FORMULA, NUMBER ONE, THAT YOU DON'T DOCUMENT IN THE DOCUMENT.

Response:

Please refer to Response to Comment PHF00079-2 for a discussion of the formulas used to derive the fleet mix.

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00018-3

Comment:

NUMBER TWO, IT'S NOT A PRACTICAL WORKING DOCUMENT, NOR DID YOU MAKE IT READILY AVAILABLE. THE CD DISK THAT YOU PROVIDED FOR COMMUNITY OUTREACH IN EXCESS OF \$60, 65, I BELIEVE IT IS, THAT COULD BE PRODUCED FOR AS LITTLE AS \$5, MASS-PRODUCED, WITH THE COLOR LOGO AND EVERYTHING. SO YOU IN EFFECT ARE LIMITING THE PEOPLE WHO ARE ABLE TO EVEN RESPOND TO THE DOCUMENT, WHICH IS WHAT THIS IS ALL ABOUT. IT'S NOT COMMUNITY OUTREACH.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding the content, structure, and availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PHP00018-4

Comment:

WHAT THIS IS IS BASICALLY YOU'RE NOT EVEN LOOKING TO APPROVE, IN MY OPINION, THAT DOCUMENT SO FAR. THAT'S JUST FROM A LAYMAN'S POINT OF VIEW. YOU'RE LOOKING TO APPROVE PORTIONS OF IT, AND THEN YOU'LL TAKE A PORTION OF A, B, AND C, AND THEN YOU'LL BRING TOGETHER YOUR CONCEPT THAT YOU'RE GOING TO USE.

Response:

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

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

PHP00018-5

Comment:

BUT YOU NEED TO HAVE AN EIR IN ORDER TO EXTEND ANY RUNWAY. AND ALL THREE OF YOUR ALTERNATIVES IDENTIFY A RUNWAY GOING ACROSS SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD AND COMING EASTWARD TOWARDS INGLEWOOD. AND THAT'S MY BIGGEST PROBLEM WITH YOUR DOCUMENT, IS THAT YOU ARE GOING TO BE BRINGING RUNWAYS CLOSER TO INGLEWOOD, BECAUSE WHEN YOU TURN THE AIRPORT AROUND BECAUSE OF WEATHER CONDITIONS, THAT MEANS NOW THE TAKEOFF IS GOING TO BECOME A LOT LOWER. THAT MEANS TAKEOFF IS GOING TO BECOME A LOT NOISIER. AND THOSE PLANES TAKE OFF OVER INGLEWOOD.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternatives A, B, and C do include the extension of Runway 6R/24L eastward across Sepulveda Boulevard. During westerly approaches, the altitude of the aircraft would be approximately 160 feet lower than it is currently. During easterly departures, the altitude of the aircraft would be unchanged or slightly lower than they are now. The altitude of an aircraft in the final stages of approach or in the initial stages of takeoff is related to the location at which the aircraft first or last touches the ground. During arrivals, the touchdown position would be relocated eastward under each alternative. However, the takeoff position would change only relative to the west end of the runway, which is unchanged under Alternative A, and would be shifted by between 475 and 900 feet to the east under

3. Comments and Responses

Alternatives B and C. The easterly shift of the west end of the runway would result in aircraft being approximately 100 to 150 feet lower along the departure path to the east. These differences in altitude would not result in significant changes in noise levels. For example, at a location three miles from the landing threshold, the difference of 160 feet on approach would result in a noise level change of approximately 1.5 decibels. During departure, at the same location, the noise level difference would be approximately 1 decibel.

Under Alternative D, Runway 6R/24L would be extended by 1,280 feet to the east, but would not cross Sepulveda Boulevard. That extension would result in arrivals being approximately 60 feet lower and departures being about 15 feet higher than is currently the case. There would be no perceptible change in the noise levels associated with departures and less than a decibel of change in the approach noise at a point three miles east of the Runway 24L landing threshold.

PHP00018-6

Comment:

SO YOUR WHOLE PROCESS IS FLAWED, YOUR DOCUMENTS ARE FLAWED, EVERYTHING ABOUT THIS IS FLAWED. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. AND HAVE A GOOD DAY.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00018-7

Comment:

AND THE REST OF YOU, I WANT TO LEAVE EARLY, BECAUSE TODAY IS MY DAUGHTER'S BIRTHDAY, SO I WILL NOT BE HERE TO CARRY ON WITH YOU. BUT LET'S HOPE THAT THEY HAVE ANOTHER COMMUNITY OUTREACH MEETING SO THAT OUR NEIGHBORS AND FRIENDS CAN PARTICIPATE.

Response:

Several subsequent public hearings have been conducted. Please refer to Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PHP00019 Cole, Walter

**Congressmember Maxine
Waters' Office**

6/9/2001

PHP00019-1

Comment:

HI, MY NAME IS WALTER COLE, C-O-L-E. I'M REPRESENTING CONGRESSWOMAN MAXINE WATERS.

FIRST OF ALL, I HAVE A STATEMENT ACTUALLY FROM THE CONGRESSWOMAN, WHO UNFORTUNATELY CAN'T BE HERE TODAY -- SHE IS IN D.C. -- TO TAKE CARE OF MIKE STEVENS AND THE PITIFUL AMOUNT OF OUTREACH THAT LAWA HAS DONE TO ADVERTISE THESE EVENTS. THE WORKSHOPS DON'T SEEM TO, YOU KNOW, COINCIDE WITH OTHER TYPES OF WORKSHOPS I'VE SEEN BEFORE, AND THE LOW TURN-OUT THAT OBVIOUSLY WE SEE HERE AND AT OTHER EVENTS. AND THEY ALWAYS SCHEDULE IT ON THE DAY WHEN

3. Comments and Responses

ONE OF THE LARGEST SPORTING EVENTS AT HOLLYWOOD PARK IS ALSO HAPPENING. I THINK IT'S NOT A COINCIDENCE.

Response:

The intent of the one hearing at three locations was to maximize the number of persons that could provide input and provide more access to the most convenient hearing site. A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PHP00019-2

Comment:

FIRST OF ALL -- WELL, I'LL JUST READ THE CONGRESSWOMAN'S STATEMENT. TODAY THE CITIZENS OF INGLEWOOD, WESTCHESTER, SOUTH CENTRAL LOS ANGELES, AND OTHER COMMUNITIES SURROUNDING LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT WILL MAKE THEIR COLLECTIVE VOICES HEARD. THEY WILL SPEAK LOUD AND CLEAR TO THE OFFICIALS OF LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORTS THAT THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AND REPORT, THE EIS/EIR, IS A TERRIBLY FLAWED DOCUMENT.

LAWA HAS PUT FORTH SEVERAL ALTERNATIVES THAT ARE SO HORRIBLE IN THEIR IMPACTS THAT THEY CAN ONLY HELP MAKE THEIR PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE, ALTERNATIVE C, LOOK WONDERFUL BY COMPARISON. BUT ALTERNATIVE C IS NOT AN ANSWER TO THE ALL OF WOES THAT THE NEIGHBORHOODS SURROUNDING LAX FACE. IT IS NOTHING BUT A NIGHTMARE FOR THE FUTURE.

Response:

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

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

PHP00019-3

Comment:

LAX IS ALREADY AN ENVIRONMENTAL MONSTER. IT IS THE SINGLE GREATEST PRODUCER OF TOXIC AIR POLLUTANTS AND SMOG-INDUCING PARTICULATE MATTER IN THE LOS ANGELES BASIN. IF THIS EXPANSION PLAN IS APPROVED, THE SITUATION WILL ONLY GET FAR WORSE.

Response:

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

PHP00019-4**Comment:**

NITROUS OXIDE EMISSIONS FROM LAX WILL INCREASE BY 1,500 TONS ANNUALLY BY 2015. THIS IS ACCORDING TO YOUR DOCUMENTS.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-7 regarding NOX emissions.

PHP00019-5**Comment:**

AND 7,000 PEOPLE WILL ALSO BE EXPOSED -- AN ADDITIONAL 7,000 PEOPLE WILL BE EXPOSED TO NOISE FROM JET AIRCRAFT OF 65 CNEL OR ABOVE.

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment PC01953-4; please refer to Response to Comment PC01953-4.

PHP00019-6**Comment:**

TO HANDLE THE INCREASED AMOUNT OF CARGO THAT WILL ENTER LAX WILL REQUIRE 156 18-WHEELERS A DAY.

THESE LARGE DIESEL TRUCKS WILL ADD TO THE POLLUTION IN OUR AIR AND CLOG UP THE STREETS OR OUR NEIGHBORHOODS.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Alternative D, which was addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, would not increase cargo handling facilities at LAX. As was indicated in Table S3-2 (page 3-23) of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, cargo operations are projected to increase to about 3,120,000 tons/year at LAX by 2015 under the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternative D. The traffic impacts of this level of cargo activity were described in Section 4.3.2.6.1 (beginning on page 4-293) of the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Report 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHP00019-7**Comment:**

THE EIS/EIR STATES AGAIN AND AGAIN THAT THERE ARE SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE NEGATIVE IMPACTS FROM NOISE AND AIR POLLUTION AND INCREASED AUTOMOBILE TRAFFIC, BUT GIVES NO WORKABLE SOLUTIONS TO MITIGATE THESE IMPACTS. LAWA CLAIMS THAT THESE MITIGATION PROGRAMS WILL BE DEVELOPED IN TIME AFTER THE PROJECT IS FINALLY APPROVED.

THIS IS A COMPLETELY UNACCEPTABLE APPROACH. HOW CAN RESIDENTS FULLY ANALYZE A PROJECT THAT WILL HAVE SUCH AN OVERWHELMING IMPACT ON THEM WHEN THEY ARE NOT GIVEN THE FULL DETAILS.

Response:

The comment is similar to Comment PC01953-6; please see Response to Comment PC01953-6.

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00019-8

Comment:

LAWA OFFICIALS REJECTED THE NEED TO UTILIZE THE WEALTH OF REGIONAL AIRPORT FACILITIES IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. THIS IS ESPECIALLY TROUBLING GIVEN THAT LAWLA HAS AT ITS DISPOSAL MULTIPLE FACILITIES THAT ARE, OR CAN BE, EQUIPPED TO HANDLE THE EXPECTED FUTURE INCREASES IN AIR TRAVEL DEMAND. NEARLY ONE HUNDRED CITIES HAVE JOINED A COALITION URGING THE USE OF CURRENT AIRPORTS AT PALMDALE AND ONTARIO. LAWLA MUST REALIZE THAT THEY CANNOT IGNORE THE WISHES OF THESE CITIES AND THEIR CITIZENS.

ALREADY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES SUCH AS THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS, THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, AND A BI-PARTISAN COALITION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVES, MYSELF INCLUDED, HAVE SPOKEN IN SUPPORT OF A REGIONAL APPROACH. MOST OPERATIONS AT THESE FACILITIES WILL HAVE NONE OF THE IMPACT ON RESIDENTS, SCHOOLS, CHURCHES AND BUSINESSES THAT ARE EXPERIENCED BY THOSE LIVING UNDERNEATH THE FLIGHT PATH OF LAX.

Response:

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

PHP00019-9

Comment:

MOST DISTURBING OF ALL IS THE LACK OF ANY ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE PLAN. THE MAJORITY OF THOSE WHO ARE AFFECTED BY LAX EXPANSION ARE AFRICAN AMERICAN AND LATINO. THOSE COMMUNITIES ALREADY FACE A LACK OF ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE AND PREVENTION. THEY ALSO ALREADY FACE HIGH RATES OF ASTHMA AND OTHER RESPIRATORY AILMENTS. TO ASK THESE RESIDENTS TO EXPOSE THEMSELVES TO EVEN HIGHER HEALTH RISKS IS UNACCEPTABLE AND IMMORAL.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments PC01953-8 and AL00017-190.

PHP00019-10

Comment:

I SEE MY TIME IS UP. I WOULD JUST LIKE TO SAY THE CONGRESSWOMAN WILL ALSO BE SUBMITTING COMMENTS BEFORE THE JULY 25 DEADLINE.

Response:

Comment noted. The comment period on the Draft EIS/EIR was extended two times and ended on November 9, 2001. Also, please see Response to Comment PHL00007-5 regarding the public review/hearing process and Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PHP00020 Berardi, Josephine None Provided 6/9/2001

PHP00020-1

Comment:

I'M JOSEPHINE BERARDI, 711 SOUTH EUCALYPTUS AVENUE IN INGLEWOOD. I'M A STONE'S THROW FROM LA CIENEGA AND ARBOR VITAE.

I'D LIKE TO BRING OUT FOUR POINTS CONCERNING MANCHESTER SQUARE AND WHAT LAWA IS DOING THERE. 14 YEARS AGO THE MANIPULATION OF CITIZENS OF MANCHESTER SQUARE BEGAN. PEOPLE WERE OFFERED 30 PERCENT OVER MARKET PRICE FOR THEIR HOMES. I KNOW A GENTLEMAN WHO LIVED THERE, HAD A DUPLEX WITH ANOTHER FAMILY, AND OF COURSE, IT WAS A GOOD THING FOR HIM, SO HE SOLD HIS DUPLEX AND MOVED TO NORTH INGLEWOOD.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00020-2

Comment:

ACCORDING TO YOUR STATISTICS, THERE WILL BE 2,000 FLIGHTS A DAY LANDING AT THE AIRPORT. DIVIDE THAT BETWEEN FOUR RUNWAYS, THAT WILL BE 500 A DAY GOING OVER MY HOUSE.

Response:

The projected activity at LAX is over 2,000 operations which includes arrival and departure operations. The number of arrival operations would be approximately the half of the projected activity. Please see Figures V-J.56 to V-J.62 in Appendix J of the Draft LAX Master Plan for runway use assumptions.

PHP00020-3

Comment:

I LIVE IN THE PATTERN OF THE NORTH RUNWAY. THE NORTH RUNWAY IS GOING TO BE COMING CLOSER TO MY HOUSE. THE PLANES WILL BE LANDING SOONER, AND THE BENZENE HALF BURNT WILL BE FALLING ON MY HOME AS IT DOES NOW, BUT EVEN MORE NOW. BENZENE IS A CARCINOGEN.

Response:

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

PHP00020-4

Comment:

YOU'RE PUSHING THE ENVELOPE OF THE AIRPORT EAST OF SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD, ENDING UP AT LA CIENEGA, WHERE YOU'RE BUILDING CARGO AND MAINTENANCE SHACKS. THIS IS WHY YOU WANTED MANCHESTER SQUARE. THOSE PLANES ARE GOING TO BE LANDING OR AT LEAST TAXIING.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Following the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, LAWA developed a new alternative that, consistent with public comments calling for a regional approach alternative, is designed to accommodate passenger and cargo activity at LAX that would approximate those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, has fewer environmental impacts, and improves airport safety and security. No eastward expansion of the airfield is proposed in Alternative D.

PHP00020-5

Comment:

THE CARGO INDUSTRY WORKS MOSTLY AT NIGHT. THAT NOISE I CAN HEAR NOW WHEN YOU'RE WEST OF SEPULVEDA. CAN YOU IMAGINE TRYING TO SLEEP AT NIGHT WITH THE ROAR NOT ONLY OF THE 405, BUT ALSO YOUR CARGO TERMINALS?

Response:

Approximately half of the daily cargo operations occur at night. Nighttime single event noise impacts and mitigation for LAX Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting information in Appendix SC and Technical Report S-1. Also please see TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PHP00020-6

Comment:

A FEW WEEKS AGO OUR PRESIDENT BUSH HAD A PARTY ON THE WHITE HOUSE LAWN ENCOURAGING PEEWEE BASEBALL.

WHAT WE WOULD LIKE IS TO MAKE MANCHESTER SQUARE A PARK FOR PEEWEE BASEBALL, NOT A BIG CARGO. NOT ONLY THAT, I SUGGEST IT WOULD BE THE LEGACY OF MAYOR RICHARD RIORDAN, AND WE CAN CALL IT RICHARD RIORDAN PARK.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00021	Slaughter, Velma	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	-------------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHP00021-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS VELMA SLAUGHTER. THE LAST NAME IS SPELLED S-L-A-U-G-H-T-E-R. I'M A LONG-TIME RESIDENT OF INGLEWOOD. I'M AT 10420 SOUTH THIRD AVENUE, AND THAT'S BETWEEN 108TH ON THE SOUTH AND 104TH ON THE NORTH. THE AIRPLANES COME DIRECTLY OVER MY HOUSE, AND WHEN THEY COME, LET ME TELL YOU, YOU THINK IT'S AN EARTHQUAKE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00021-2

Comment:

I AM TOTALLY OPPOSED OF ANY EXPANSION OF LAX. I WOULD LIKE TO SEE IT CAPPED RIGHT NOW WHERE IT'S AT. I'M 100 PERCENT FOR THE ORIGINAL PLAN.

Response:

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

PHP00021-3

Comment:

A LOT OF PEOPLE MAY THINK THAT THIS WILL BE TAKING JOBS FROM LAX. I DON'T THINK SO. WHAT IT WILL BE DOING IS PUTTING, IF THEY GO WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN TO PUT AN AIRPORT SOMEPLACE ELSE LIKE IN PALMDALE OR ORANGE COUNTY OR EL TORO, IS TO ONLY ALLOW THOSE COUNTIES TO TAKE THEIR SHARE. THAT'S ALL WE ASK.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PHP00021-4

Comment:

WHERE I LIVE, YOU CANNOT ENJOY YOUR BACK YARDS. WE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE A GARDEN. YOU CAN'T GARDEN ANYMORE.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PHP00021-5

Comment:

WE HAVE CRACKED WINDOWS. YOU DON'T REALLY NEED NO ALARM CLOCK, BECAUSE 4 OR 5 O'CLOCK EVERY MORNING YOU GOT THESE CARGO PLANES COMING OVER WAKING YOU UP. YOU GOT CAR ALARMS IN MY AREA GOING OFF, YOUR HOUSE ALARM. MY ALARM HAS GONE OFF TWICE.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Also, please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, Subtopical Response TR-N-5.4 regarding cargo night noise impacts, Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration, and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PHP00021-6

Comment:

AND THE INTERCHANGE AND THE RING ROAD IS JUST ANOTHER THING FOR LAX TO EXPAND THAT AIRPORT. AND WE WOULD BE GETTING MORE TRAFFIC, MORE POLLUTION, MORE NOISE INTO OUR COMMUNITIES.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; 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,

3. Comments and Responses

Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road.

PHP00021-7

Comment:

AND I WOULD JUST LIKE TO FINISH BY SAYING THIS IS THE WORST WORKSHOP THAT I HAVE EVER WENT TO IN MY ENTIRE GROWN-UP LIFE. I DO NOT CONSIDER THIS BEING A WORKSHOP, NOR THAT IT IS AN OUTREACH ALLOWED TO INFORM THE PEOPLE, MEANING L.A., ALL SOUTH BAY CITIES, LENNOX, WESTCHESTER, AND FOR OUR OWN. BECAUSE IF THERE HAD BEEN OUTREACH, THIS ROOM SHOULD HAVE PEOPLE STANDING IN IT.

SO I SAY ANOTHER MEETING/WORKSHOP SHOULD BE BROUGHT UP AND GET OUT THERE TO THE PEOPLE, BECAUSE A LOT OF PEOPLE DON'T KNOW ABOUT THIS. I FOUND OUT, IT WASN'T BY NO MAIL COMING THROUGH THE MAIL. I FOUND OUT BY HEARSAY, BEING IN THE RIGHT PLACE AT THE RIGHT TIME.

Response:

A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PHP00021-8

Comment:

SO ON THAT NOTE, I WOULD LIKE TO SAY NO EXCHANGE, NO EXPRESSWAY, NO MORE HOMES, NO MORE DISMANTLING OUR COMMUNITIES. PUT THE OVERFLOW SOMEPLACE ELSE. WE CAN'T CARRY IT ALL. LIKE I MENTIONED IT BEFORE, IT'S LIKE TRYING TO PUT ALL OF L.A. INTO BAKERSFIELD. IT WILL NOT WORK. SO YOU GOT TO GO BACK TO YOUR DRAWING BOARD AND WORK YOUR PLANS OVER AGAIN.

BECAUSE WHAT YOU HAVE IS NOT GOING TO WORK WITH US.

WHEN IT COMES TO, YOU KNOW, TALKING ABOUT MONEY, YOU BETTER THINK ABOUT PEOPLE'S LIVES FIRST.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition.

PHP00022 Chan Wong, Ada Chinese Chamber of Commerce 6/9/2001

PHP00022-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS ADA CHAN WONG, A-D-A, C-H-A-N, W-O-N-G, AND I'M THE PRESIDENT OF THE CHINESE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

WE ARE ONE OF THE OLDEST CHINESE AMERICAN BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS IN LOS ANGELES. WE WERE ESTABLISHED IN 1955 BY A GROUP OF CHINESE-AMERICAN BUSINESSMEN IN CHINATOWN. BUT IN 1976, OUR NAME HAS BEEN CHANGED TO THE

CHINESE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FROM CHINATOWN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE TO INCORPORATE THE MANY MEMBERS OF OUR ORGANIZATION THAT LIVE OUTSIDE OF CHINATOWN.

WE HAVE 30 BOARD OF DIRECTORS WHICH CONSISTS OF MANY PROMINENT BUSINESS PEOPLE IN OUR COMMUNITY, ALL OVER SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. WE HAVE ALMOST 500 MEMBERS AND OVER 3,000 INDIVIDUALS AND CORPORATIONS ON OUR CURRENT MAILING LIST. THEY REPRESENT THE OWNERS OF ALL DIFFERENT TYPES OF BUSINESSES, WHETHER THEY'RE RESTAURANT OWNERS OR HIGH-TECH COMPANIES, MANUFACTURING TO THE SERVICE INDUSTRY.

WE OF THE CHINESE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SUPPORT THE LAX MASTER PLAN, BECAUSE WE UNDERSTAND THAT MODERNIZATION OF THIS AIRPORT AND THE AVAILABILITY OF AVIATION SERVICES ARE A NECESSARY PART OF BEING ABLE TO CONTINUE TO DO BUSINESS FOR OUR HUNDREDS OF MEMBERS AND THOUSANDS OF COMPANIES IN THE LOS ANGELES AREA. IF YOU ARE WEARING A TIE THAT IS MADE IN ITALY OR A T-SHIRT THAT'S MADE IN TURKEY OR A SHIRT THAT'S MADE IN ITALY OR SHOES THAT ARE MADE IN CHINA, ANY PIECE OF CLOTHING THAT YOU'RE WEARING TODAY, IF THEY'RE NOT MADE IN THE USA, THEY ARE MOST LIKELY IMPORTED.

AVIATION IS ONE WAY OF THESE PRODUCTS GETTING IMPORTED. AND MANY OF OUR MEMBERS DO IMPORT AND EXPORT. BECAUSE OF OUR MANY BUSINESS PEOPLE WHO DO BUSINESS IN ASIA OR OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD, AVIATION TRAVEL IS VERY, VERY IMPORTANT TO OUR MEMBERS.

LAX HAS NOT BEEN MODERNIZED IN NEARLY 20 YEARS. ANYONE WHO USES THE AIRPORT, WHETHER YOU GO TO SAN FRANCISCO OR TO SAN DIEGO OR TAKE A FLIGHT TO LAS VEGAS AND YOU USE THE AIRPORT, YOU REALIZE THERE'S A LOT OF CONGESTION.

AND SO THEREFORE WE KNOW THAT WITH A MODERNIZATION PLAN WHICH ALLEVIATES SOME OF THE PROBLEMS AND THE CONGESTION THAT WE SEE TODAY, BECAUSE AFTER REVIEWING THE PROPOSED MASTER PLAN, WE SEE THAT THERE IS MITIGATION STEPS LIKE EXTENDING THE GREEN LINE AND THE EXPRESS LANE FROM THE 405 FREEWAY DIRECTLY INTO THE AIRPORT, THESE ARE WAYS FOR THEM TO MITIGATE THE TRAFFIC TO MAKE THE TRAVEL EXPERIENCE FOR THE TRAVELERS TO LAX, MAKE IT A MORE PLEASANT ONE.

SO THEREFORE WE ARE HAVING TO HEAR THAT THIS MASTER PLAN DOES NOT INCLUDE ADDING ADDITIONAL RUNWAYS BUT A MODERNIZATION PLAN THAT IS EFFICIENT AND INCLUDES A VERY SMALL NUMBER OF INCREASED FLIGHTS TO MAKE IT MORE EFFICIENT FOR MANY OF OUR BUSINESS PEOPLE AND OUR MEMBERS OF THE CHINESE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE TO DO BUSINESS HERE IN THE REGION.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00023

Price, Stephen

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHP00023-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS STEPHEN PRICE WITH A P-H. I LIVE AT 920 EAST ALPHA STREET, INGLEWOOD 90302. IT'S THE VERY NORTHERN BOUNDARY OF INGLEWOOD. I'M ACTUALLY QUITE A WAYS AWAY FROM THE AIRPORT.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00023-2

Comment:

THE DOCUMENTS THAT I SEE POSTED AROUND THE BOARD, THE VIDEO THAT I SAW, MADE A BIG DEAL WITH JOBS, SAFETY, EFFICIENCY, INCREASES IN EFFICIENCY, BEING A GOOD NEIGHBOR, BEING GOOD ON THE ENVIRONMENT. AND I HEAR THE LOCAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE TYPE PEOPLE, THEY'RE HAPPY TO GET MORE BUSINESS AND JOBS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00023-3

Comment:

HOWEVER, IT'S NOT OBVIOUS TO ME THE AIRPORT ONLY SERVES PEOPLE IN L.A. CITY. IT SERVES PEOPLE FROM RIVERSIDE, ORANGE COUNTY. WHAT'S MISSING FROM THIS WHOLE THING IS IT'S LAX FIRST. LET'S JUST GET THIS GOING AND THEN WE'LL FIGURE OUT THE MITIGATION, THEN WE'LL SEE IF WE CAN DO SOMETHING ABOUT EL TORO, MAYBE WE'LL DO SOMETHING VERY MINIMAL, LOOKS LIKE, IN PALMDALE. IT'S ALL MAYBE, MAYBE, MAYBE. IT'S ALL BAIT AND SWITCH.

Response:

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

PHP00023-4

Comment:

LAX IS SURPRISINGLY ONE OF THE SMALLEST AIRPORTS. FOR A COMPETITIVE CITY LIKE L.A., IT'S A SMALL AIRPORT. IT'S PHYSICALLY SMALL FOR AN AIRPORT OF ITS SIZE THAT HAS THE CLOSEST IMPACT ON THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITY, HIGHEST NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01790-3 for a discussion of how the size of an airport relates to activity levels. The Federal Aviation Administration recognizes that regional and local interests often conflict and sometimes local impacts occur. When those impacts are significant, appropriate mitigation measures are considered to the extent possible. Mitigation for this project was discussed in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHP00023-5

Comment:

ALL ANOTHER AIRPORTS, EXCEPT PROBABLY JOHN WAYNE, WHICH WAS A LITTLE AIRPORT IN A BAD AREA, ALL THE OTHER AIRPORTS ARE MUCH, MUCH LARGER IN ACREAGE. THEY'RE MUCH SAFER. THEY'RE MUCH FURTHER AWAY FROM THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES. THERE ARE MUCH FEWER SCHOOLS, HOSPITALS, OTHER IMPACTS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00023-6**Comment:**

ALL THE FLOW THAT COMES INTO LAX CAN GO OUT BY TRAIN, OUT BY TRUCK. NOT EVERYTHING THAT GOES INTO LAX GOES TO DOWNTOWN L.A. IT'S GOING ON TRUCKS TO RIVERSIDE, GOING OUT TO ONTARIO, GOING TO ALL THESE LITTLE PLACES.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00023-7**Comment:**

THIS PLAN DOESN'T SEEM TO CARE THAT YOU COULD REVERSE THE FLOW AND REVERSE AIRPLANES COMING INTO ALL THE OTHER REGIONAL AIRPORTS AND COME BACK THE OTHER WAY. THERE'S NO REASON THAT YOU HAVE TO SQUEEZE TEN POUNDS INTO THE LITTLE PIECE OF AIRPORT THAT WE CALL LAX. IT'S A PHYSICALLY SMALL AIRPORT WITH A VERY HIGH NEGATIVE IMPACT.

Response:

Market forces and the regulatory structure of the commercial air transportation industry favors and promotes the continued development and use of primary airports such as LAX. Please see Response to Comment PC00260-1 regarding the addition of Alternative D to the Master Plan process. Please see Section 3.1.1.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 1.3, Regional Impact of Alternative D and Appendix C, Los Angeles Region's Airports, of the Draft LAX Master Plan Addendum for further discussion on the use of other airports.

PHP00023-8**Comment:**

IF YOU REALLY WANT TO BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR, YOU CAN CAP THE SIZE OF THE AIRPORT NOW, YOU CAN DO ALL THESE MITIGATIONS, YOU CAN FIX THE TRAFFIC FLOW, YOU CAN PUT UP THE BARRIERS FOR SOUND, YOU CAN DO A LOT OF THINGS TO MAKE YOURSELF A BETTER NEIGHBOR WITHOUT GROWING THE AIRPORT, IF YOU REALLY WANT TO BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR.

Response:

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

PHP00023-9**Comment:**

I GUESS ANOTHER STATISTIC THAT I WOULDN'T FIND IN THE PLAN WOULD BE ACTUAL SIZE, THE RELATIVE SIZE OF THE AIRPORT. BUT IT'S VERY OBVIOUS IT'S ANOTHER THING THAT'S MISSING FROM THE AIRPORT STATISTICS. WE DON'T SEE THE RELATIVE SIZES AND THE RELATIVE POSITIONING OF ALL THE OTHER REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES TO THIS EXPANSION. SO I THINK IT'S A SOLUTION THAT'S MOVING MUCH TOO FAST FOR THE WRONG REASONS AND IGNORING THE OTHER POSSIBILITIES.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. This new option - Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and,

3. Comments and Responses

instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. A Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment. Although the conclusion of the Draft EIS/EIR is that Alternative C would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region, that conclusion has been superseded by the conclusion of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D is now considered to be the Environmental Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region. Please see also Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the EIS/EIR for information regarding the differences among the alternatives.

PHP00024 Hough, Marcus None Provided 6/9/2001

PHP00024-1

Comment:

THANK YOU. MY NAME'S MARCUS HOUGH, 10820 SOUTH BURL, IN THE COMMUNITY OF LENNOX. 90304 IS OUR ZIP CODE. I WAS RAISED IN LENNOX AND I AM ALSO NOW A TEACHER IN LENNOX AS WELL AS A RESIDENT.

THERE'S THREE POINTS THAT I WANT TO POINT OUT REALLY QUICK. TWO OF THEM ARE FROM THE EIR. THERE ARE SOME FLAWS IN THE BASELINES ANALYSIS. A THRESHOLD ISSUE AND ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS IS THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BASELINE. THE FUNCTION OF A BASELINE IS TO PROVIDE A BENCHMARK OF EXISTING CONDITIONS AGAINST WHICH THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF A PROJECT MAY BE MEASURED. IF THE BASELINE IS INCORRECTLY DESIGNATED AT A HIGH LEVEL OR TOO HIGH OF A LEVEL, THE IMPACT OF THE PROJECT WILL BE ARTIFICIALLY MINIMIZED.

IN THIS CASE, LAX OR LAWA USES A -- WHATEVER BASELINE THEY CHOOSE. EACH IS EMPLOYED SELECTIVELY WHERE IT WILL SERVE TO MINIMIZE THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT AT ISSUE. SPECIFICALLY, THE DRAFT EIR USES SEPARATE AND DISTINCT BASELINES FOR ANALYZING THE IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT.

THE FIRST IS, IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE, IS TO USE THE 1996 AIRPLANES THAT THEY HAD. THOSE AIRPLANES EVERYBODY KNOWS WERE A LOT LOUDER AND WERE A LOT MORE ENVIRONMENTALLY POLLUTANT. SO THEY USE THAT TO GAUGE, WELL, OUR AIRPLANES HAVEN'T GOTTEN THAT MUCH WORSE. WELL, YOU USED TERRIBLE AIRPLANES BACK IN 1996. WHY NOT USE THE 2000 JETS AS A BASELINE?

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding the baseline used in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AR00003-6 regarding baseline issues pertaining to the air quality analysis and Response to Comment AL00022-96 and Subtopical Response TR-N-1.3 regarding baseline issues pertaining to the noise analysis. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided information and analysis of Year 2000 conditions compared to the 1996 baseline and all of the Master Plan alternatives for noise and air quality (see Section 4.1, Noise, Section 4.2, Land Use, and Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data provided in Appendices S-C and S-E, and Technical Reports S-1 and S-4).

PHP00024-2

Comment:

SECOND IS THE DRAFT EIR DOES NOT CONSIDER EMISSIONS FROM THE AIRCRAFT REVERSE THRUST OPERATIONS. ALL THE DRAFT CLAIMS, THAT BECAUSE OF SHORT REVERSE THRUST OPERATION TIMES, EMISSIONS FOR THIS MODE IS ASSUMED TO HAVE MINIMAL IMPACT. THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE. EVEN OPERATING PERIODS AS SHORT AS 10 TO 15 SECONDS PER LANDING CAN GENERATE SIGNIFICANT NITROUS OXIDE EMISSIONS RELATIVE TO OTHER AIRPORT OPERATING MODES. THIS EMISSION WILL IMPACT THE SOUTH BAY COMMUNITIES, ESPECIALLY LENNOX AND INGLEWOOD, AND SHOULD BE ADDRESSED.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AF00001-21 regarding the use of reverse thrust in air quality emissions estimates.

PHP00024-3

Comment:

THE THIRD THING THAT I JUST WANT TO BRING UP IS, I COULD HAVE SWORN THAT LAWA WOULD HAVE SAID TODAY'S OUR PR DATE, LET'S MAKE SURE WE RUN ON SCHEDULE. I WAS WOKEN UP IN MY HOME THIS MORNING AT 5:00 FROM A LOUD, LOUD JET. LET'S PLEASE HAVE LIKE SOME TYPE OF TIMING WHEN WE CAN SLEEP. THAT'S ANOTHER THING THE EIR DOES NOT TALK ABOUT, IS SLEEPING DISORDERS TO THE RESIDENTS SURROUNDING THE AIRPORT. SO PLEASE DO THAT.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings in homes associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PHP00025

Dunlap, Judy

City of Inglewood

6/9/2001

PHP00025-1

Comment:

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I REPRESENT THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD, AND I WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TO THIS ISSUE BEFORE US TODAY.

OBVIOUSLY, I AM OPPOSED TO ANY EXPANSION OF THE AIRPORT, AND I'D LIKE TO MAKE A COUPLE OF QUICK COMMENTS WITH REGARD TO EIR/EIS, AND OF COURSE, I'D LIKE TO SHARE IN ALL THE COMMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE WITH REGARD TO THE INCOMPLETE AND INADEQUATE. CERTAINLY THE DRAFT DATA AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ARE NOT ADDRESSED AS IT AFFECTS MY COMMUNITY, THAT IS, THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD.

Response:

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

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

PHP00025-2

Comment:

BUT I'D LIKE TO SPEND A LITTLE MORE TIME, AND AS ONE WHO HOLDS PUBLIC HEARINGS, I THINK I CAN VERY EFFECTIVELY ADDRESS THAT. AND THE REASON ONE HAS PUBLIC

3. Comments and Responses

HEARINGS IS TO PROVIDE INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC. AND I WOULD LIKE TO STATE THAT YOU FAILED IN THIS THIS AFTERNOON.

ONE OF THE REASON ONE HAS MORE THAN ONE PUBLIC HEARING IS IF SOMEONE IN THE PUBLIC WHO'S INTERESTED CANNOT ATTEND ONE, THEY CAN PLAN TO ATTEND ANOTHER. SO THEN WHY IS IT THAT YOU HAD ALL THREE OF THEM ON THE SAME DAY? THIS DOES NOT ACCOMMODATE THE COMMUNITY.

Response:

The intent of the one hearing at three locations was to maximize the number of persons that could provide input and provide more access to the most convenient hearing site.

PHP00025-3

Comment:

IN ADDITION TO THAT, WITH REGARD TO YOUR FORMAT, THIS WORKSHOP THAT YOU HAVE HERE, THE TITLES, I WENT BACK AND LOOKED AT THEM WITH REGARD TO ALL OF YOUR CHARTS AND DIAGRAMS. IT SAYS NOISE, LAND USE, AIR QUALITY, HUMAN HEALTH, GROUND TRANSPORTATION, SOCIOECONOMIC ISSUES, AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, JOBS, AND BENEFITS.

WELL, PART OF A WORKSHOP IS WHEN ONE ACTUALLY TALKS ABOUT THESE THINGS. WHEN ONE ACTUALLY HOLDS A WORKSHOP, ONE TALKS AND INFORMS THE PUBLIC ABOUT EACH OF THESE ISSUES, INDIVIDUALLY PRESENTS DATA, PRESENTS THE INFORMATION, AND THEN THE INDIVIDUALS HAVING BEEN WITNESS TO THIS DISCUSSION CAN THEN ASK INTELLIGENT QUESTIONS.

WHAT I HEARD FROM THE ORGANIZERS WAS THAT YOU ANSWERED QUESTIONS WHEN ASKED. THIS IS NOT DISSEMINATING INFORMATION. DIAGRAMS DOES NOT DO IT.

Response:

The workshops were held in an open house format so that there could be direct interaction between the public and staff and consultants. This format has been a very effective approach where there is a large amount of information and audience. The open house format is then followed by the public hearing. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PHP00025-4

Comment:

BUT I'M ALSO VERY CURIOUS THAT THERE IS NO VIDEOTAPING OF THIS EVENT. IS THIS SO THERE IS NO PROOF OF WHAT ACTUALLY WENT ON? THE WRITTEN RECORD DOES NOT TELL THE WHOLE STORY ABOUT WHAT'S GONE ON HERE TODAY AND WHAT HAS NOT GONE ON TODAY. I AM OFFENDED AND I WANT THIS AS A PART OF THIS RECORD.

Response:

Comment noted. The public record, including response to comments, for each of the numerous public hearings are available to interested parties for review.

PHP00025-5

Comment:

I'M HIGHLY OFFENDED AS A MEMBER OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD WITH REGARD TO THIS ENTIRE EVENT TODAY. IT HAS NOT BEEN ADEQUATELY ADVERTISED. THAT'S WHY THERE'S NO ONE HERE.

EVERYONE IN THIS COMMUNITY AND THE NEIGHBORING COMMUNITIES SHOULD HAVE BEEN SENT A PERSONAL INVITATION WITH REGARD TO HOW THIS IMPACTS THEIR LIFE SO

THEY'LL HAVE A CHANCE TO -- THE PUBLIC HEARINGS SHOULD HAVE BEEN ON THREE DIFFERENT DATES, AND IN ADDITION TO ACCOMMODATING INDIVIDUAL SCHEDULES, MAYBE AFTER SOMEONE ATTENDED THE FIRST ONE, THEN THEY'D WANT TO GO TO THE SECOND ONE SO THEY'D BECOME EVEN MORE INFORMED. IT'S A LEARNING PROCESS.

Response:

A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PHP00025-6

Comment:

I'M HIGHLY DISTURBED THAT THERE'S NO VIDEOTAPING, THERE IS NO RECORDS OF WHAT'S BEEN INFORMED, SO ANY MEMBER HERE CANNOT HAVE ANY DOCUMENTATION AS TO WHAT THEY LEARNED FROM THIS WORKSHOP. THERE IS NO DOCUMENTATION, NOTHING THAT'S BEING RECORDED AS TO WHAT KIND OF INFORMATION WAS GIVEN TO OUR COMMUNITY. AND I WANT THAT DULY NOTED FOR THE RECORD, THAT WE HAVE NOT BEEN INFORMED, WE ARE ONLY ALLOWED TO ASK QUESTIONS.

Response:

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

PHP00026 Gaines, John City of El Segundo 6/9/2001

PHP00026-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS JOHN GAINES. I AM A COUNCILMEMBER FROM THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO. MY ADDRESS IS 441 KANSAS STREET. THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO, LIKE MANY COMMUNITIES REPRESENTED HERE TODAY, WILL SUBMIT DETAILED AND EXPANSIVE COMMENTS TO THE EIR. I WANT TO TAKE JUST A FEW MINUTES TO HIGHLIGHT SOME OF OUR OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED EXPANSION.

ONE, THE REPORT HAS NOT CONSIDERED A REASONABLE RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE EXPANSION OF LAX.

Response:

The comment letter submitted by the City of El Segundo is identified as Comment Letter AL00033. Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHP00026-2

Comment:

TWO, THE NUMBER OF ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED IS UNUSUALLY LIMITED.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00026-3

Comment:

THREE, THIS REPORT NEVER SERIOUSLY CONSIDERS APPROPRIATE USE OF AVAILABLE AIRPORTS IN THE REGION.

Response:

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

PHP00026-4

Comment:

FOUR, THIS REPORT DOES NOT CONSIDER ALTERNATIVES THAT WOULD RESULT IN IMPACTS LESS SEVERE THAN THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE C.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment PC01094-4; please see Response to Comment PC01094-4.

PHP00026-5

Comment:

FIVE, NO REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF AIR QUALITY IMPACT IS INVOLVED.

Response:

This comment is essentially the same as Comment PC01956-5. Please see Response to Comment PC01956-5.

PHP00026-6

Comment:

SIX, THERE ARE NO NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES IN THIS REPORT.

Response:

Noise impacts and mitigation measures were presented in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Topical Response TR-LU-5, Topical Response TR-N-4, and Response to Comment AL00022-28 regarding noise mitigation.

PHP00026-7

Comment:

SEVEN, THE REPORT CONCLUDES THAT INCREASED TRAFFIC AND ACTIVITY LEVELS WILL RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT INCREASED TOXIC AIR EMISSIONS IN ALL EXPANSION SCENARIOS. HOWEVER, THE REPORT FAILS TO DESCRIBE HOW THE HUGE INCREASE IN TOXIC EMISSIONS WILL BE ADEQUATELY MITIGATED.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G, and Technical Reports 2, 3, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

Please see Topical Response TR-HRA-4 regarding human health mitigation strategies. Mitigation measures currently proposed differ from those under consideration during the preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR. Recommended mitigation measures were identified in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to reduce impacts from airport operations and construction as well as from regional vehicular traffic under Alternatives A, B, C, and D. These recommended mitigation measures would also reduce impacts to human health associated with exposure to toxic air pollutants (TAPs). The following mitigation measures considered in the analysis include: continued conversion of GSE to alternative fuel, multiple construction-related measures including use of alternative fuels and add-on emission control devices on construction equipment, and expansion of flyaway bus service between LAX and other locations in the South Coast Air Basin using alternative-fueled buses. These mitigation measures, in combination with other proposed mitigation measures, would reduce emissions of TAPs during LAX operations and construction primarily by reducing exhaust emissions from mobile sources and reducing traffic congestion near the airport.

PHP00026-8

Comment:

EIGHT, THROUGHOUT THIS REPORT, BASELINES HAVE BEEN INCONSISTENT AND INAPPROPRIATE, SELECTED ALTERNATIVES HAVE NOT MET CEQA AND/OR NEPA MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS, AND THE DEPTH OF ANALYSIS HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENT TO SUPPORT THE ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED MASTER PLAN.

Response:

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

PHP00026-9

Comment:

NINE, THE PROJECT'S STATED OBJECTIVES HAVE NOT BEEN MET THROUGH THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVES, AND THE BIASES OF THE PROPONENTS OF LAX EXPANSION ARE BLATANTLY EVIDENT. ONE OF THE FUNDAMENTAL REQUIREMENTS OF THIS PROCESS IS FOR THE LEAD AGENCY TO PURSUE ALTERNATIVES THAT WOULD AVOID OR SUBSTANTIALLY LESSEN THE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT. THIS REQUIREMENT HAS NOT BEEN MET IN THIS REPORT.

Response:

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

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00026-10

Comment:

THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO EXPECTS YOU TO ISSUE AN ENTIRELY NEW EIS/EIR THAT PROPERLY AND EFFECTIVELY EXPLORES VIABLE ALTERNATIVES AND IDENTIFIES APPROPRIATE MITIGATION MEASURES TO LESSEN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PHP00026-9 above. Please see Topical Response TR-ALT-1 regarding range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHP00026-11

Comment:

BEFORE YIELDING THE PODIUM TO THE OTHER SPEAKERS, LET ME EXPRESS MY OUTRAGE WITH LAWA AND THE FAA FOR THE UNDERHANDED, ADVERSARIAL, AND COUNTERPRODUCTIVE MANNER IN WHICH THESE HEARINGS ARE BEING CONDUCTED. IT'S LITTLE WONDER THAT THE CITIZENS OF OUR COMMUNITIES, LIKE CITIZENS ACROSS THIS LAND, HARBOR SUCH DEEP DISTRUST FOR AND DISLIKE OF THE BUREAUCRACIES LIKE YOU THAT HIDE BEHIND AND DISTORT GOVERNMENTAL PROCESS IN ORDER TO ACCOMPLISH SELF-SERVING OBJECTIVES. BATTALIONS OF PR CONSULTANTS COSTING TAXPAYERS TENS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, PERSONAL ATTACKS ON LOCAL OFFICIALS, BUREAUCRATIC OBFUSCATION AND LEGAL SHENANIGANS WILL NOT MAKE THIS EXPANSION ACCEPTABLE TO US.

Response:

The FAA and LAWA have conducted several hearings on both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 for a listing of all public hearings. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PHP00026-12

Comment:

REST ASSURED, EL SEGUNDO AND OVER 100 CITIES AND AGENCIES COVERING FIVE COUNTIES IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA THAT HAVE JOINED IN FIGHTING THIS EXPANSION WILL USE ALL, AND I WANT TO REPEAT ALL, THE ADMINISTRATIVE, LEGAL, AND POLITICAL MEANS AT OUR DISPOSAL TO ENSURE THE PROPOSED EXPANSION DESCRIBED IN THIS MISERABLE PLAN NEVER TAKES PLACE.

Response:

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

PHP00027	Smith, Cecil	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	---------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHP00027-1

Comment:

THANK YOU. I'M CECIL SMITH. I LIVE AT 3513 WEST 83RD STREET HERE IN INGLEWOOD, A RESIDENT.

IN ORDER TO ELIMINATE REPETITION, I SAY DITTO TO ALL THAT HAVE GONE FORTH TO STOP THE LAX EXPANSION.

I NOTED A FEW ITEMS HERE, AND I'M GOING TO LIST THESE, RIGHT TO THE POINT.

Response:

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

PHP00027-2

Comment:

LAX IS ALREADY ON A COURSE WITH DISASTER, MAJOR, NOT TO MENTION HEALTH QUALITY AND DETERIORATION OF LIFE AND THINGS OF THAT SORT. AIR AND GROUND FLIGHT SPACE IS UNSAFE. YOU DON'T HAVE A VALID FACTOR OF SAFETY. IT SHOULD BE AT LEAST FIVE WITH WHATEVER FORMULA THAT YOU USE. NO ONE HAS SHOWED US ANY FACTS OR ANY FIGURES.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, and Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PHP00027-3

Comment:

THE THIRD ITEM IS ALL ALTERNATIVES FOR AIRPORT EXPANSION IS NOT ACCEPTABLE. SCAG VOTED TO CAP THIS EXPANSION AND USE ALTERNATIVE METHODS. EL TORO IS THE MOST LIKELY. IT WOULD BE EASY TO IMPLEMENT, AND IT WOULD BE QUICKER TO ACTIVATE. AND LET'S CONSIDER HERE, NOW, MODERNIZATION OF THE AIRPORT AND UPKEEP OF THE AIRPORT, YES. BUT EXPANSION, NO.

Response:

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

PHP00027-4

Comment:

ALL RIGHT, LISTEN HERE NOW, THE MOTIVATION FOR LOS ANGELES, NOT JUST LAX, BUT THE CITY, TO EXPAND THIS AIRPORT AND DESTROY OUR CITIES IS THE MIGHTY DOLLAR. LAWA, YOU'RE ONLY DOING YOUR JOB TRYING TO IMPLEMENT THEIR PROGRAM AND APPROVE THEIR APPROVALS. THE CITY HALL FLIPPED POLITICAL FOOTBALL. IT'S LAX OR LAWA. YOU SUPPLY US A FINANCIAL PIPELINE FOR THEM TO CAUSE THE POOR TO GET POORER AND THE RICH TO GET RICHER. SO YOUR MOTIVATION IS THE MIGHTY DOLLAR.

Response:

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

PHP00027-5

Comment:

NOW, THESE MEETINGS SHOULD BE HELD AT A TIME WHEN WE RECEIVE ADEQUATE NOTICE, ESPECIALLY ON SATURDAY, IN TIME TO GET READY. SO THOSE ARE JUST A FEW OF THE FACTS.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Eighteen public hearings were held at various times, locations and venues in order to afford the widest possible amount of public input into the project and environmental documents.

PHP00028

Hayward, Joyce

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHP00028-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS JOYCE HAYWARD. I'M A RESIDENT OF INGLEWOOD, 3500-233 WEST MANCHESTER BOULEVARD, 90305.

I HAVEN'T HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW THE 12,000 PAGES OF THE MASTER PLAN. FROM WHAT I HAVE OBSERVED, HOWEVER, AT VARIOUS MEETINGS, SCAG AND MTA, AND LOCAL MEETINGS, I AM LEFT WITH AN UNSETTLING FEELING IN MY GUT.

I AM AGAINST ALTERNATIVES A, B, AND C. RECENTLY ENTERING RETIREMENT, A TIME TO ENJOY FACILITIES AS OPPOSED TO ZIPPING BY THE SITES TO AND FROM WORK FOR THE PAST 12 YEARS IN THE INGLEWOOD COMMUNITY, I'M BECOMING FULLY AWARE THAT THE SITES ARE IN CONTRADICTORY JARGON. AS THEY DECREASE ON THE ONE HAND AND ARE REPLACED INCREMENTALLY HERE AND THERE AND BY LAND ACQUISITIONS WITH ALL ROADS LEADING TO THE AIRPORT AND ACQUISITIONS PERHAPS TO BECOME CONVENIENT LOCATIONS FAR CARGO STORAGE AREAS AND SO ON, THAT SPACE, CONVENIENT LOCATION FOR RENT-A-CARS, I FORESEE MORE GRIDLOCK IN OUR ALREADY OVERUSED STREETS.

Response:

Comment noted. Acquisition was addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Traffic was addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-2a and S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHP00028-2

Comment:

NOW, HOW ELSE CAN YOU EXPECT ME TO VIEW WHAT IS HAPPENING IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD AS UNHEALTHY, BRINGING MORE TRAFFIC TO ALREADY GRIDLOCKED FREEWAYS? WILL OPENING AIRPORT BOULEVARD TO BECOME A THOROUGHFARE WITH THE POURING IN OF AUTO TRAFFIC HELP OUR COMMUNITY?

Response:

Airport Boulevard would not become a thoroughfare under any of the alternatives. Under Alternatives A and C, access to Airport Boulevard from the proposed ring road would be maintained via a full interchange in Alternative A and a partial interchange in Alternative C. Under Alternative B, Airport Boulevard would terminate at the northern boundary of the airport. Under Alternative D, Airport Boulevard would not be altered.

PHP00028-3

Comment:

YOU KNOW THAT THESE PROJECTS POINT TO ALL ROADS LEADING TO LAX. WHAT WILL BENEFIT US IN THE NAME OF COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT? WHAT WILL LESSEN TRAFFIC ON THE ROADS IN OUR COMMUNITY, WHICH HAVE BECOME LIKE FREEWAYS WITH ADDED DISCOURTEOUS HONKING-HORN DRIVERS IF ONE DOESN'T MAKE A DASH AT AN ANTICIPATED TRAFFIC LIGHT CHANGE?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Traffic was addressed in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. As indicated in that section, the build alternatives are designed to improve the overall quality of traffic flow throughout the airport area and reduce congestion on local streets. Where the project design would not avoid significant traffic impacts, mitigation measures are proposed that would reduce significant impacts at almost all affected intersections to a less-than-significant level.

PHP00028-4

Comment:

WHAT WILL BENEFIT OUR COMMUNITIES IS AN AREA PARK DESIGNED TO HELP RECOVER FROM THE DETERIORATING INFRASTRUCTURE IN OUR COMMUNITY. WE CAN DEVELOP HELPFUL COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES TO HELP IN THE HEALING OF DEEP WOUNDS THAT WE REALLY FEEL IN OUR COMMUNITY BY WHAT IS HAPPENING.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00028-5

Comment:

OF THE GREATEST DEVASTATING FINANCIAL RAPES, ONE OF THE GREATEST FINANCIAL RAPES TO OUR CITY WAS THE LOSS OF THE GREAT WESTERN FORUM, PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES TO STAPLES CENTER, TO THE MORE BEAUTIFUL DEVELOPING DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES. ONE HAS TO WONDER WHY IT TOOK APPROXIMATELY TWO YEARS IN THE DOWNTOWN INGLEWOOD AREA, WHERE PEDESTRIANS AND BUSINESSES WERE INCONVENIENCED, TO RECONSTRUCT THAT AREA'S STREETS AND SO FORTH THERE, TWO YEARS. IN OTHER PROJECTS THAT I'VE BEEN AWARE OF, YOU HAVE WALKWAYS PUT UP TO CONVENIENCE THE PEOPLE WHO ARE GOING TO BE SHOPPING IN THAT AREA.

Response:

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

PHP00029	Johnson, Nancy	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHP00029-1

Comment:

THANK YOU. MR. KESSLER AND MS. BAIN AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, I'D LIKE TO EXPRESS MY CONCERNS AS A CITIZEN. MY NAME IS NANCY JOHNSON. I LIVE UNDER THE FLIGHT PATH, AND I'VE LIVED HERE FOR 41 YEARS. AND I DISAGREE WITH ONE OF THE PEOPLE THAT SPOKE WHO SAID TO GET USED TO IT. I STILL HAVEN'T GOTTEN USED TO THE NOISE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00029-2

Comment:

AS FAR AS THE PLAN IS CONCERNED, I FIND THE ENTIRE PLAN FLAWED AND UNACCEPTABLE. IN FACT, I THINK THERE SHOULD BE NO PLAN FOR EXPANSION OF LAX. AND IF YOU DO PLAN ANY KIND OF PLAN, THERE SHOULD BE ONE MORE: ELIMINATION OF

3. Comments and Responses

LAX. I THINK IT HAS EXCEEDED ITS USEFULNESS. AND I'D LIKE TO READ TO YOU JUST A BRIEF NOTE THAT I INTEND TO SEND TO YOUR MASTER PLAN OFFICE, AND IT GOES:

Response:

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

PHP00029-3

Comment:

DEAR SIR: DO YOU KNOW WHAT IT IS LIKE TO HEAR THE ROARING SOUND OF AN AIRPLANE AWAKEN YOU AT 12:30 OR 1 O'CLOCK IN THE MORNING? AND THEN TO ENDURE 20 YEARS PLUS OF AIRPLANES FLYING OVER YOUR HOUSE EVERY THREE TO FIVE SECONDS? NOT MINUTES. SECONDS. ALL DAY LONG. I DO. I THINK IT IS TIME TO FURTHER DEVELOP AND UTILIZE THE AIRPORTS IN PALMDALE, ONTARIO, THE INLAND EMPIRE, AND ANY OTHER NUMBER OF PLACES.

Response:

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

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendices D and G and Technical Reports 2, 3 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendices S-C and S-E and Technical Reports S-2 and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHP00029-4

Comment:

APPROXIMATELY 90 PERCENT OF THE PEOPLE WHO USE THE AIRPORT, LAX, DO NOT LIVE IN THIS AREA. THEY DON'T REALLY WANT TO COME INTO THIS AREA, BUT ARE WILLING TO MAKE THE SACRIFICES TO AVOID THE EROSION OF THEIR ENVIRONMENTS BY THE NOISE, AIR POLLUTION, TRAFFIC CONGESTION, PROPERTY DEVALUATIONS, DRUG TRAFFICKING, TRANSIENCE, PROSTITUTION, SMUGGLING, AND ANY NUMBER OF OTHER NEGATIVES.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00029-5**Comment:**

THE NEIGHBORS IN THE PERIMETERS OF LAX HAVE SUFFERED LONG ENOUGH. AND NOW YOU WANT TO RUB OUR NOSES IN IT BY EXPANDING THE PLACE. PLEASE GIVE OTHERS, INCLUDING YOURSELVES, A TURN. INSTEAD OF EXPANDING, ESTABLISH AIRPORTS CLOSE TO WHERE YOU LIVE, LIKE THE STAPLES CENTER WAS DEVELOPED, CLOSER TO HOME, INSTEAD OF GOING AWAY FROM THE L.A. FORUM. THERE ARE PLENTY OF JOBS AROUND. IF OUR COMMUNITIES NEED AIRPORT EMPLOYMENT, WE WILL GLADLY GO SOMEWHERE, ANYWHERE, OTHER THAN LAX.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PHP00029-3.

PHP00029-6**Comment:**

I AM SURPRISED THAT BECAUSE OF THE PRIME LOCATION OF LAX PROPERTY, IT HASN'T BEEN ABANDONED AS AN AIRPORT AND TAKEN OVER FOR BUSINESSES, HOUSING, LARGE APARTMENT DEVELOPMENTS, OR EVEN A WEST COAST WASHINGTON, D.C. IT WOULD BRING IN FAR MORE REVENUE FOR THE CITY OF L.A. THAN A BLOATED, RUPTURED, LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00029-7**Comment:**

THE EXPANSION OF LAX WOULD BE AN ENVIRONMENTAL DISASTER. WITH ANY NEW JOBS THAT MIGHT BE CREATED, THE EMPLOYMENT WOULD BE OF SHORT DURATION. WITH MORE AIR TRAFFIC, OUR ALREADY POLLUTED ENVIRONMENT, LUNG CANCER, STRESS, AND OTHER ILLNESSES WOULD SEVERELY LIMIT THE CAPACITY OF THE LABOR FORCE.

Response:

The content of this comment is essentially the same as comment PC00214-15; please refer to Response to Comment PC00214-15.

PHP00030**Khoury, Elizabeth****LAXEN****6/9/2001****PHP00030-1****Comment:**

ELIZABETH KHOURY, K-H-O-O-U-R-Y, 2402 VAN WICK STREET, INGLEWOOD 90303. I AM A MEMBER OF LAXEN.

THE EIR/EIS HAS TAKEN OVER FIVE YEARS IN THE MAKING, BUT THE EIR CAME OUT IN JANUARY. WHY DID LAWA AND FAA WAIT UNTIL JUNE TO HAVE A PUBLIC HEARING? THIS ONE PUBLIC HEARING IS AT THREE DIFFERENT LOCATIONS AND IS VERY INADEQUATE FOR THE COMMUNITY SURROUNDING LAX. VERY POOR OUTREACH. AS YOU CAN SEE, LESS THAN ABOUT 50 PEOPLE HERE, MAYBE 50 OR MORE. WE HAVE MORE PEOPLE AT LAXEN MEETINGS THAN YOU HAD ALL DAY TODAY. IT'S A TERRIBLE SHAME THAT YOU CAN'T SEEM TO OUTREACH MORE.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PHP00030-2

Comment:

LAWA SAYS IT WANTS TO BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR. THEN BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR AND NOT EXPAND ANY FURTHER. EXPAND OTHER AIRPORTS SUCH AS EL TORO, PALMDALE, ONTARIO.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PHP00030-3

Comment:

INGLEWOOD AND SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES ALREADY ARE SATURATED WITH NOISE, POLLUTANTS, TRAFFIC, AND THE PLANES. THE LAST EIR WAS DONE IN 1974 WITH 40 MILLION PASSENGERS. I HAVE A CHART HERE THAT SAYS NOW 2000, WE'LL SAY 2001, PLUS 68 MILLION PASSENGERS, AIR CARGO VOLUME 2,249,000, AIRCRAFT OPERATION 783,423.

ENOUGH'S ENOUGH. WE NEED RELIEF, AND THAT MEANS NO MORE EXPANSION, THE END OF IT, FINISHED. WE WANT LAX TO CAP IT AT ITS PRESENT LEVEL.

Response:

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

PHP00030-4

Comment:

WE DON'T NEED MORE CARCINOGENS DUMPING DOWN ON US. THREE NEIGHBORS ACROSS THE STREET FROM ME DEVELOPED CANCER IN THE LAST THREE YEARS.

Response:

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

PHP00030-5

Comment:

IN THE LAST YEARS, THOSE PLANES ARE COMING LOW, AND MORE, AND NOISIER. DO US ALL A FAVOR. BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR AND DON'T EXPAND. WE WOULD LOVE TO HAVE YOU AS A GOOD NEIGHBOR. BUT THE WAY YOU'RE DOING IT, YOU WILL NOT HAVE MANY GOOD FRIENDS.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, newly elected Mayor James Hahn directed the Los Angeles Board of Airport Directors to develop a new LAX Master Plan alternative that, consistent with public comment calling for a regional approach alternative, would be designed to accommodate passenger and cargo activity levels at LAX that would approximate those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, have fewer environmental impacts than the No Action/No Project Alternative and, in light of the events of September 11, 2001, would be designed to enhance airport safety and security. This new alternative - Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment.

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

PHP00031 Honda, David

**Asian Business Association of
Los Angeles 6/9/2001**

PHP00031-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS DAVID HONDA. I'M THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASIAN BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF LOS ANGELES. I COME BEFORE YOU TODAY ON BEHALF OF OUR 500 MEMBER ORGANIZATION IN LOS ANGELES REPRESENTING SMALL AND MEDIUM SIZED BUSINESSES.

WE HAVE A STATEMENT WITHIN OUR ORGANIZATION THAT "DIVERSE TALENTS INSPIRE UNLIMITED PROSPERITY." ALL ASIANS, WHETHER THEY'RE CHINESE, JAPANESE, KOREAN, FILIPINO, INDONESIAN, VIETNAMESE, OR INDIAN ARE BOTTOM-LINE ORIENTED. OUR MEMBER PROFILE COVERS OWNERS OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE, CONSTRUCTION, ARCHITECTURAL, ENGINEERING, RESTAURANTEURS, AND SERVICES COMPANIES.

OUR FOCUS TODAY IS TO SUPPORT THE MODERNIZATION OF LAX TO ACCOMMODATE INCREASE OF CARGO AND PASSENGERS ANTICIPATED FOR THE FUTURE GROWTH OF LOS ANGELES.

OUR MEMBERS HAVE TWO REASONS FOR THIS MODERNIZATION. ONE IS THAT OUR MEMBERS WILL BENEFIT FROM THE INCREASE IN CONSTRUCTION AND ENGINEERING BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES AND TWO, THE INCREASE IN PRODUCTION OF CARGO FACILITIES, I.E., PERISHABLE FOODS, THAT PASS THROUGH THE TERMINALS FOR FOOD SERVICE. RESTAURANTEURS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADERS. PERISHABLE ITEMS CANNOT BE BROUGHT IN BY SHIP. AS ONE CAN SEE, WE ARE BOTTOM-LINE ORIENTED.

LOS ANGELES HAS A VAST EXPANDING POPULATION OF ASIANS AND INCREASING DAILY, NECESSITATING FUTURE PASSENGERS FROM ASIA. OUR LEADERS AT LAX DEMONSTRATE WISDOM, WILL, AND VISION AND SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO MOVE FORWARD CAREFULLY AND THOUGHTFULLY BUT POST HASTE FOR A 21ST CENTURY FACILITY.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00032 Moxley, Tom None Provided 6/9/2001

PHP00032-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS TOM MOXLEY. MY MAILING ADDRESS IS 2057 SOUTH ATLANTIC AVENUE, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90040. I REPRESENT SOME 6,000 INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BRIDGE, STRUCTURAL, AND IRONWORKERS THAT LIVE IN EVERY COMMUNITY HERE IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.

WE ARE IN SUPPORT OF THE ALTERNATIVE PLAN C MODERNIZATION OF LAX. IT'S TIME THAT LAX INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT COMES INTO THE YEAR 2001 AND ABOVE. IT'S A DINOSAUR THAT HAS BEEN NEGLECTED AND NEEDS TO BE MODERNIZED.

WHEN THEY BUILT THE GREEN LINE, THE GREEN LINE SHOULD HAVE CAME INTO LAX TO ALLEVIATE TRAFFIC AND TO IMPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION IN AND OUT OF THE AIRPORT. THIS IS ONE OF THE PARTS OF THE PLAN OF ALTERNATE C.

THERE'S AN ECONOMIC ENGINE HERE IN PLACE, I'VE HEARD THE COMMUNITY SPEAK, THAT PROVIDES JOBS. LAX HAS TO BE THE HUB OF A REGIONAL PLAN. WE HAVE TO START WITH LAX.

I'M ALSO IN MANY MEETINGS THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITIES. ONE OF THEM IS EL TORO, ONE OF THEM IS MARCH, AND ALSO PALMDALE. THESE ARE BEING LOOKED AT, STUDIED, REVIEWED. BUT LAX IS THE HUB OF THAT WHEEL. NOW IS THE TIME TO MODERNIZE, TO BRING IT INTO THE 21ST CENTURY AND TO GO FORWARD WITH THAT. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00033 Adams, Jim Los Angeles Building & Construction Trades Council 6/9/2001

PHP00033-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS JIM ADAMS. I'M COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE LOS ANGELES/ORANGE COUNTIES BUILDING CONSTRUCTION TRADE COUNCIL. OUR ADDRESS IS 1626 BEVERLY BOULEVARD, LOS ANGELES 90026-5784.

I'M HERE TODAY TO PROVIDE A VERY SIMPLE MESSAGE FOR AN ISSUE THAT I ACKNOWLEDGE IS VERY COMPLEX. IT IS CLEAR TO ME AND THE TENS OF THOUSANDS OF MEN AND WOMEN IN THE CONSTRUCTION TRADES THAT LAX NEEDS TO BE MODERNIZED. IT NEEDS TO BE MODERNIZED FOR A NUMBER OF REASONS. THIS AIRPORT IS THE CRITICAL ECONOMIC ENGINE FOR OUR CITY, OUR REGION, OUR STATE, AND FOR THE COUNTRY. OVER 400,000 JOBS IN OUR REGION ARE ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF LAX. LOS ANGELES COUNTY BENEFITS FROM OVER \$50 BILLION IN ECONOMIC OUTPUT RELATED TO THE AIRPORT.

THE AIRPORT IS A FUNDAMENTAL PART OF OUR PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE THAT HAS BEEN LEFT TO DETERIORATE, HAS BEEN SURPASSED BY GROWTH IN POPULATION AND IS NO

LONGER CAPABLE OF ADEQUATELY DEALING WITH THE ADVANCES IN TRANSPORTATION TECHNOLOGY THAT HAVE TAKEN PLACE OVER THE LAST DECADE.

THOUSANDS OF CONSTRUCTIONS WORKERS, CONSTRUCTION-RELATED JOBS WILL BE CREATED BY THE MODERNIZATION PROGRAM. THOSE JOBS PROVIDE LIVELIHOOD FOR FAMILIES, WILL HELP SEND OUR CHILDREN TO COLLEGE AND WILL BRING CONSUMER DOLLARS INTO EVERY CITY IN THIS REGION.

BUT THE MODERNIZATION OF LAX IS NOT A JOBS PROGRAM. THE MODERNIZATION OF LAX IS CRITICAL BECAUSE IT WILL MAKE OUR AIRPORT SAFER. IT WILL PRESERVE ITS ROLE AS A GATEWAY TO ASIA AND IT WILL MAKE IT A CRITICAL GATEWAY TO GROWING ECONOMIES IN SOUTH AMERICA, CENTRAL AMERICA, AND MEXICO. AND IT WILL SERVE AS A TEST CASE IN HOW A COMPLEX SOCIETY DEALS WITH THE LONG-TERM INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING THAT IS ESSENTIAL TO PREPARE FOR THE DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIAL CHANGES THAT ARE PART OF THE FUTURE FOR THIS WHOLE REGION.

THE PEOPLE OF LOS ANGELES HAVE A CHOICE TO MAKE ABOUT LAX. IF WE DO NOTHING, DELAYS WILL INCREASE, THE RUNWAYS WILL BECOME LESS SAFE, AIRLINE TRAFFIC WILL CONTINUE TO INCREASE, AND WE WILL LOSE JOBS TO OTHER REGIONS WHO ARE MORE WILLING AND READY TO ACT. THESE ARE INDISPUTABLE FACTS OF OUR SITUATION, AND THESE FACTS WILL NOT BE ALTERED BY FANTASIZING ABOUT QUICK-FIX SOLUTIONS OR PIE-IN-THE-SKY IDEAS ABOUT HOW WE WILL UNILATERALLY DEMAND THAT OUR CARRIERS FLY TO OTHER AIRPORTS.

WE CAN'T CONTROL ALL OF THE ECONOMIC DECISIONS OF OUR AIRLINE INDUSTRY, BUT WE CAN CONTROL OUR PLANNING, OUR CREATIVITY IN SOLVING PROBLEMS AND OUR VISION AS TO WHAT LAX CAN BE. IT CAN BECOME A TOP-LEVEL AIRPORT FOR THIS NEW CENTURY. RIGHT NOW IT'S NOT. WE CAN HAVE A REGIONAL SOLUTION TO INCREASING DEMANDS FOR AIR TRAVEL AND CARGO. BUT THAT SOLUTION WILL NOT OCCUR WITHOUT LAX TAKING ITS FAIR SHARE OF THAT INCREASE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00034	Phillips Thompson, Betty	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHP00034-1

Comment:

HELLO. MY NAME IS BETTY PHILLIPS THOMPSON. MY ADDRESS IS P.O. BOX 90372, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 9009. I'M AN INGLEWOOD RESIDENT, I'VE BEEN AN INGLEWOOD RESIDENT FOR OVER 25 YEARS, AND MY CONCERN IS WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00034-2

Comment:

MRS. JOHNSON HAD PUT SOME VERY GOOD POINTS IN THE AREA, WHERE THE PLANES ARE UNBEARABLE AT NIGHT THAT YOU CANNOT SLEEP, AND THE CARGO PLANES FLY SO LOW THAT IT VIBRATES YOUR HOUSE. I CANNOT PUT THINGS UP HIGH OF VALUE. THEY WILL FALL OFF THE SHELF. SO I HAVE TO PUT IT LOW ENOUGH SO IT DOESN'T AFFECT IT.

Response:

A new analysis of nighttime activity has been added to the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to address the concerns about sleep disturbance produced during single operations. Please see Topical Response

3. Comments and Responses

TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration. The Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D, Aircraft Technical Noise Report.

PHP00034-3

Comment:

AND THEY DON'T HAVE A TIME FRAME ON FLYING. THE CARGO PLANES FLY ANY TIME THAT THEY DECIDE THAT THEY WANT TO COME INTO LAX.

SO MY CONCERN IS THAT SOME OF THE OTHER PEOPLE SAY THOSE CARGO FLIGHTS CAN COME IN AT ANOTHER LOCATION SO THAT WE CAN GET TO SLEEP AT NIGHT. MOST OF THE PLANES, WHEN I FIRST BOUGHT MY HOUSE, I CAME INTO THE NEIGHBORHOOD TO RESEARCH THE AREA TO MAKE SURE THAT I DIDN'T HEAR ALL OF THESE. WHEN I FIRST BOUGHT MY HOUSE, ALL OF THESE PLANES WERE NOT COMING INTO LAX. IT WAS MINIMIZED.

NOW IT'S LIKE SHE SAID, IT'S EVERY MINUTE OR LESS THAT ONE IS COMING IN.

Response:

There are no nighttime restrictions at LAX, therefore, all aircraft including cargo aircraft are allowed to operate during the nighttime hours. The commentor is a resident of Inglewood. As part of a recent MOU signed by the City of Los Angeles (LAWA) and City of Inglewood, LAWA will be pursuing Federal approval of a restriction to make over-ocean procedures mandatory when they are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m. During a recent 18-month period, 82 jets departed to the east when over-ocean procedures were in effect, an average of about one per week. As noted by the noise abatement procedures delineated in Topical Response TR-N-7, exceptions to the over-ocean procedures are available when weather or wind conditions require east traffic flow. Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PHP00034-4

Comment:

AND IF YOU WATCH ON TV OR DO ANYTHING ELSE, YOU GOT TO KEEP THE REMOTE CONTROL IN YOUR HAND AND TURN THE TV UP OR TURN IT DOWN.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, please see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PHP00034-5

Comment:

AND YOU GO GET YOUR CAR WASHED ONE DAY, YOU GOT TO GO GET IT WASHED THE NEXT DAY. YOU PAINT YOUR HOUSE, YOU HAVE TO PAINT YOUR HOUSE EVERY YEAR BECAUSE OF THE POLLUTION IN THE AIR THAT COMES DOWN ON YOUR PROPERTY AND THINGS LIKE THIS HERE.

Response:

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

PHP00034-6**Comment:**

SO I'M OPPOSED TO LAX EXPANSION.

Response:

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

PHP00035 Smith, III, Theodore None Provided**6/9/2001****PHP00035-1****Comment:**

MY NAME IS THEODORE SMITH III. I REPRESENT THE LAX ADVISORY COMMITTEE. MY ADDRESS IS 11260 OVERLAND AVENUE, UNIT 11B, CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA, FOR A CHANGE OF PACE THERE, 90230.

I WANT TO SAY FIRST OF ALL OUR COMMITTEE REPRESENTS THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE AREA OF THE AIRPORT. WE WANT TO HAVE YOU UTILIZE PALMDALE AND ONTARIO MORE. WE'RE ALSO SUPPORTING THE NO-ACTION, NO-PROJECT SCENARIO IN THE EIR BECAUSE WE, OUR SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES, AND LOS ANGELES HAVE TAKEN IN OUR FAIR SHARE, OVER 70 MILLION PASSENGERS AND OVER 2 MILLION TONS OF CARGO.

Response:

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

PHP00035-2**Comment:**

NUMBER THREE, WE ARE AGAINST THE RING ROAD AND THE EXPANSION OF THE WEST END TERMINAL. WE DO NOT WANT TO SEE AN INCREASE IN TRAFFIC AND ALSO NOISE AND AIR QUALITY PROBLEMS.

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 Appendices D and G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Appendices S-C and S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road.

PHP00035-3**Comment:**

AS TO THE EIR, SOME OF OUR QUESTIONS ARE, WHY HAVE NO SINGLE EVENT NOISE SCENARIO AND MEASURES.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Single events were presented in Appendix D, Airport Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR. Footprints of single event contours, as well as maximum noise levels reported at hundreds of locations in the airport environs are included in that document. In addition, Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR included a discussion of single event noise.

PHP00035-4

Comment:

NUMBER TWO, AIR QUALITY MODELING DATA AND ASSUMPTIONS ARE MISSING FROM THE EIR. WHEN WILL THEY BE ABLE, HOW CAN WE ASSESS THE ACCURACY OF ANYTHING WITHOUT THIS, AND WILL YOU EXTEND THE COMMENT PERIOD TO INCLUDE COMMENTS REGARDING THIS INFORMATION ONCE IT'S AVAILABLE?

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR discussed air quality modeling data and assumptions in Section 4.6.2, 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.

PHP00035-5

Comment:

WHAT ARE THE SPECIFIC FLIGHT PATHS FOR EASTERLY AND WESTERLY TAKEOFFS? WITHOUT THAT INFORMATION, NOBODY CAN ASSESS NOISE OR ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS. THIS WAS ASKED DURING THE SCOPING PROCESS BUT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE EIR. WILL YOU MAKE THIS INFORMATION AVAILABLE AND WILL YOU EXTEND THE COMMENT PERIOD?

AND WHAT MEDIATION MEASURES WILL YOU DO FOR THE INCREASE IN THIS AREA?

Response:

Detailed information regarding flight paths at LAX was provided within the Draft Master Plan, which was made available for public review in conjunction with the public review of the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR contained numerous mitigation measures. These measures address the environmental impacts of each of the build alternatives currently being considered relative to future increases in activity at LAX.

PHP00035-6

Comment:

AS TO THE ARBOR VITAE OFF-RAMP, THE EIR DOES NOT STATE CLEARLY WHY OR HOW THIS WILL MITIGATE TRAFFIC CONGESTION IN AND AROUND THE AIRPORT. THERE IS NO ANALYSIS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS NOR THE COMMUNITY EFFECT ABOUT THIS OFF-RAMP.

FURTHER, YOU ARE ASSUMING THAT YOU'RE GOING TO RECEIVE FEDERAL FUNDS FOR THE ARBOR VITAE OFF-RAMP. IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE FEDERAL FUNDS, YOU WILL PAY FOR THIS OFF-RAMP WHEN AIRPORT OPERATION FUNDS CAN ONLY BE USED EXCLUSIVELY FOR ON-SITE PROPOSALS THAT YOU HAVE OR ON-SITE THINGS THAT YOU NEED TO DO.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology. As this interchange is not part of the Master Plan proposal, funding is irrelevant. Subsequent to the publication of the 2001 Draft EIS/EIR, the FHWA withdrew its support for a half interchange at Arbor Vitae. The

interchange is not part of the LAX Master Plan. FHWA policy is only to consider full proposed interchanges, not partial ones.

PHP00035-7

Comment:

FURTHERMORE, IN ALL OTHER MITIGATION MEASURES THAT YOU DO, HOW CAN YOU UTILIZE, YOU ASSUME THAT THE STATE OR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL PAY FOR THEM. THE STATE OR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DOES NOT PAY FOR THEM, AND AIRPORT OPERATION FUNDS CAN ONLY BE USED ON THE AIRPORT.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00008-6 regarding funding.

PHP00035-8

Comment:

HOW WILL YOU MAKE GOOD ON THESE MEASURES? FOR INSTANCE, ON THE RING ROAD, YOU MAKE AN ASSUMPTION THAT PEOPLE FOLLOWING ON A NORTH-TO-SOUTH DIRECTION WILL TAKE THE 405 FREEWAY AS IT EXPANDS AND NOT SEPULVEDA THROUGH MY COMMUNITY. HOW DO YOU MAKE THIS ASSUMPTION? WHAT MODELING TECHNIQUES DO YOU USE TO MAKE THAT DETERMINATION? RIGHT NOW EVERYBODY TAKES SEPULVEDA.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PHP00035-9

Comment:

HAVE YOU CONSIDERED WHAT THIS DOES TO THESE COMMUNITIES? PLEASE, REVAMP YOUR STUDY AND DO IT AGAIN.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land use impacts in Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life. 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.

PHP00036 Hetrick, Effie

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHP00036-1

Comment:

I AM EFFIE HETRICK, E-F-F-I-E, H-E-T-R-I-C-K. EXCUSE MY THROAT. I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THAT ON THE L.A. EXPANSION, NO, NO, NO. I HAVE THREE OBJECTIONS.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00036-2

Comment:

POLLUTION IS EXTREME. POLLUTION IN THIS CITY, IN OUR 16 OR 18 AROUND LAX CITIES, HAS GOTTEN SO BAD THAT MY DRIVEWAY IN MY APARTMENT HAS TO BE HOSED DOWN EVERY DAY BECAUSE PEOPLE CAN'T WALK OUTSIDE IN THE DRIVEWAY AND COME IN ON THE CARPETS.

Response:

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

PHP00036-3

Comment:

THE NOISE HAS BECOME SO BAD. ONE OF THE WORST NOISES WE GET IN THE EVENING IS WHEN THERE'S A FLIGHT ABORTED, AND YOU HAVE TO POWER UP OUR LARGER PLANES WITH A TREMENDOUS ROAR. PV TOLD YOU WHAT TO DO. THEY TOLD YOU, GET THEM OUT OVER THE OCEAN AND DON'T FLY THEM OVER PV ANYMORE. NOW THE NOISE POLLUTION HAS ONE OF THE MOST DISASTROUS EFFECTS, AND LAX IS RESPONSIBLE FOR A GOOD 80 OR 90 PERCENT OF IT.

Response:

Comment noted. For information on flight patterns over Palos Verdes and other South Bay communities, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PHP00036-4

Comment:

THE WAY YOU'RE KILLING OUR CHILDREN, KILLING OUR OLDER PEOPLE, KILLING OUR MIDDLE CLASS, KILLING PEOPLE IN THIS CITY IN EVERY AGE WITH CANCER, LEUKEMIA, ALL KINDS OF LUNG DISEASES. NOBODY CAN PAY TO RESTORE THESE PEOPLE'S HEALTH, I DON'T CARE HOW MUCH MONEY YOU'RE MAKING.

Response:

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

PHP00036-5

Comment:

I KNOW, AS GEORGE PUTNAM USED TO SAY, JUST FOLLOW THE MONEY TRAIL AND YOU'LL SEE THE REASON. WE KNOW WHY YOU WANT TO EXPAND. GET UP TO PALMDALE. GET UP TO VICTORVILLE. YOU'VE GOT GEORGE AIR FORCE BASE. YOU'VE GOT ALL KINDS OF EL TOROS AND ALL KINDS OF GOOD AIRCRAFT AROUND THE AREA. JUST START SHARING IT WITH SOME OTHER PEOPLE AND SAVE THE LIVES OF OUR CHILDREN AND THE LIVES OF OUR BABIES. BECAUSE WE CANNOT BUY, WE CANNOT BUY NEW LUNGS.

Response:

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

Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The environmental impacts specific to Alternative D are fully addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR dealt only with the development of LAX. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. The recommendation that the FAA conduct a comprehensive analysis of various regional scenarios is beyond the scope of the subject EIS/EIR. Human health impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts.

PHP00036-6

Comment:

AND THESE OVERCROWDED SKIES, I CAN LOOK OUT EAST IN THE EVENING, I CAN COUNT 20 AIRCRAFT FLYING INTO LAX, 20 AIRCRAFT JUST COMING DOWN IN STEPS. NOW, YOU TELL ME THAT'S SAFE.

FAA HAS NO SAFETY. FAA DOESN'T HAVE ANY IDEA THAT IT -- AND IT SHOULD BE STOPPED.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety. As indicated in Topical Response TR-SAF-1, the FAA is charged with ensuring the aviation safety into and out of LAX and would ensure that LAX would continue to operate safely under any of the Master Plan alternatives.

PHP00036-7

Comment:

AND I SAID, LET'S CAP THIS RIGHT NOW AND LET 18 OR 20 CITIES IN THIS SOUTH BAY TELL YOU ALL ON THE MASTER PLAN, LAX, STOP NOW, BECAUSE WE'RE GOING TO STOP THIS. IT'S NOT GOING TO GO ON.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00037 Baker, Doris

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHP00037-1

Comment:

I'M DORIS BAKER, A CITIZEN OF INGLEWOOD FOR OVER 40 YEARS, AND TAUGHT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM.

I THINK FIRST WE SHOULD GAVE PRAISE TO GOD TO LEAD US AND GUIDE US THE CORRECT WAY. MAN DOES NOT KNOW, BUT GOD KNOWS THE FUTURE. WE DON'T KNOW IT. THAT'S UP TO SOMEBODY WHO CAN TELL US WHAT TO DO THAT WILL HELP OUR PEOPLE.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00037-2

Comment:

WHEN I SIT IN MY YARD, AND I TOLD AT THE LAST MEETING, I INVITE YOU, I DON'T LIVE HERE, I CAN'T DO THAT. I INVITE YOU, I GOT MY FIVE CHAIRS ON THE PATIO. SIT THERE AND COUNT AIRPLANES. AND BEFORE THIS ONE LEAVES, THE NEXT ONE IS COMING, AND THEN BY THAT TIME THE THIRD ONE'S COMING, THEN THREE MORE COME IN, FOR HOURS AT A TIME. AND THEN AT NIGHT, WHERE I LIVE, YOU'RE TWO BLOCKS TOO FAR FROM THE DEADLINE TO HAVE YOUR HOUSE REDONE BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SO IT WILL NOT SHAKE AND THE NOISE COME THROUGH.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00037-3

Comment:

WE ARE ALL GOD'S PEOPLE, AND UNLESS WE TRUST HIM, WE CAN LOOK UP THAT NOTHING GOOD WILL HAPPEN.

BECAUSE THROUGH HIM, ALL THINGS ARE POSSIBLE. AND IF HE DESIRES AN AIRPORT, HE WILL SHOW YOU THE CORRECT WAY TO STOP AND DO THE THING RIGHT.

AND IF HE LEADS YOU TO MOVE AIRPORTS OUT SOMEWHERE -- BECAUSE BEFORE MANY PEOPLE STARTED FLYING, I WAS FLYING. I WAS IN NEW YORK, AND I WENT UP IN THE COCKPIT, AND THE MAN TOLD US ABOUT THESE PLANES COMING IN AND EVERYTHING. AND WHEN I CAME TO L.A., "YOU FLEW OUT HERE ON AN AIRPLANE?" I SAID, "I SURE DID." "OH." EVERYBODY IN THE DORMITORY BUT TWO PEOPLE CAME OUT BY TRAIN OR BUS. AND I FLEW OUT BECAUSE AT THAT TIME, THAT WAS THE SAFEST MODE OF TRANSPORTATION. NOT NOW.

SO WE GOT TO THINK ABOUT OUR FUTURE. AND THESE ARE OUR PEOPLE. IF THE PLANE'S COMING OVER YOUR HOUSE, YOU'LL SAY SOMETHING. AND IF YOU LIVE OUT IN HOLLYWOOD, BEVERLY HILLS, AND NO PLANES COMING OVER YOUR HOUSE, DON'T MAKE PLANS FOR THESE PEOPLE. LET THEM HAVE A SAY-SO, PLEASE. RESPECT PEOPLE AND GOD WILL RESPECT YOU. LET'S PUT GOD FIRST IN THIS PLAN.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00038 Verduzco, Maria Lennox Coordinating Council 6/9/2001

PHP00038-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON, MY NAME IS MARIA VERDUZCO. I LIVE AT 10927 GREVILLEA AVENUE IN LENNOX. I AM HERE ON BEHALF OF THE LENNOX COORDINATING COUNCIL, THE INFORMAL GOVERNING BOARD OF THE UNINCORPORATED AREA OF LENNOX. THE LAX EXPANSION WILL HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE COMMUNITIES LIKE LENNOX SURROUNDING THE AIRPORT. LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORTS, IN AN EFFORT TO ADDRESS THE CONCERNS OF THE COMMUNITIES ON THE PERIPHERY OF THE AIRPORT, HAS HIRED A CONSULTING GROUP TO CONVENE PUBLIC FORUMS TO INFORM RESIDENTS ABOUT THE IMPACT OF THE AIRPORT EXPANSION PLANS.

OUR CONCERN IS THAT THESE PUBLIC FORUMS, WHICH ARE BEING BILLED AS ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MEETINGS, WILL NOT PRESENT INFORMATION TO THE

COMMUNITY IN AN UNBIASED AND OBJECTIVE MANNER. AS YOU KNOW, THE PROPOSED EXPANSION HAS SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS FOR THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY FOR THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES SUCH AS LENNOX. AS A RESULT, THERE IS A GREAT DEAL OF COMMUNITY CONCERN AND INTEREST IN THESE PROPOSALS.

IT IS THEREFORE VITAL THAT EVERY EFFORT BE MADE TO INFORM AND PROVIDE LOCAL RESIDENTS WITH ACCURATE AND OBJECTIVE INFORMATION SO THAT THEY IN TURN MAY FULLY PARTICIPATE IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS.

WE BELIEVE THAT THE MANNER IN WHICH THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE GROUP IS DOING THEIR COMMUNITY OUTREACH IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMUNITY OUTREACH SPELLED OUT IN THE LAWA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT. THE EIR STATES THAT, QUOTE, "THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROCESS WILL INVOLVE AN INTERACTIVE AND ONGOING PROGRAM TO ASSURE AN EFFECTIVE DIALOG WITH MINORITY AND LOW-INCOME COMMUNITIES AFFECTED BY LAX. TO INITIATE THIS PROCESS, MEMBERS OF LAWA'S ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE TASK FORCE AND OTHER LAWA REPRESENTATIVES WILL MEET WITH ELECTED OFFICIALS AND OTHER COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES, AND COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS WILL BE HELD." END QUOTE.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC00178-2 and PC00178-3.

PHP00038-2

Comment:

THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MEETING ON MAY 19 AT INGLEWOOD HIGH SCHOOL DID NOT ALLOW RESIDENTS TO SHARE THEIR CONCERNS AND QUESTIONS PUBLICLY. INSTEAD, THE FORMAT OF THE MEETING ONLY ALLOWED RESIDENTS TO VOICE THEIR CONCERNS OR ASK QUESTIONS INDIVIDUALLY TO VARIOUS CONSULTANTS STAFFING A BOOTH.

WE BELIEVE THIS INFORMATION IS NOT CONDUCTIVE TO CREATING AN EFFECTIVE DIALOG WITH THE COMMUNITY. INSTEAD, IT FOSTERS INDIVIDUAL DIALOG WITHOUT ALLOWING OTHER RESIDENTS A CHANCE TO HEAR COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS THAT MIGHT BE OF IMPORTANCE TO THEM. WE HAVE MET WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE GROUP CONVENED BY LAWA IN A GOOD-FAITH EFFORT TO REQUEST THAT CERTAIN CONDITIONS BE MET IN ORDER TO PRESENT THE WORKSHOPS IN AN UNBIASED MANNER.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00178-3.

PHP00039

Saunders, Patt

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHP00039-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS PATT SANDERS, TWO BLOCKS WEST OF THE DIVIDER FOR LOS ANGELES CITY. SO I'M NOT COUNTED IN LAX'S PLAN OR ANYTHING, BUT I STILL HAVE PLANES FLYING OVER MY HOUSE 24/7, AND I'M DEALING WITH NOISE AND POLLUTION.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00039-2

Comment:

I JUST WANT TO SAY, LOOKING AT THE EIR/EIS, THIS DOCUMENT IS SO FLAWED, IT'S PATHETIC. BUT I'M JUST GOING TO READ THIS PART OUT FROM YOUR OWN DOCUMENT. YOU SAID THE PURPOSE OF THE LAX MASTER PLAN IS TO SUPPORT THE FUTURE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND VITALITY OF THE FIVE-COUNTY LOS ANGELES REGION.

WELL, BUT YOU LEFT OUT THE COUNTIES OF SAN BERNARDINO, RIVERSIDE, VENTURA, AND ORANGE OUT OF THE SCOPING PROCESS.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00007-1 regarding the scoping undertaken for the LAX Master Plan.

PHP00039-3

Comment:

THEN YOU GOT ALTERNATIVES -- SOMEBODY GOT UP AND SAID, OH, ALTERNATIVE C, I'M FOR IT. ALTERNATIVE C HAS JUST AS MANY SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECTS AS ALTERNATIVES A OR B.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00022-3 regarding the number and severity of impacts associated with Alternative C compared to Alternatives A and B.

PHP00039-4

Comment:

THEN WE'RE GOING TO JUMP ONTO THIS HEALTH AND NOISE MITIGATION HERE. READING YOUR DOCUMENTATION, LOOKING AND REVIEWING ALL YOUR ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS, I COME TO THE CONCLUSION THAT THE RESIDENTS OF INGLEWOOD AND OTHER COUNTIES ARE GOING TO GET SCREWED. THAT'S ALL THERE IS TO IT.

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

PHP00039-5

Comment:

YOU KNOW, I'M A 32-YEAR RETIRED EMPLOYEE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES. I'VE HEARD UNIONS GET UP AND SAY, OH, YOU CAN GET MORE JOBS. I WAS ALSO, WELL, PROBABLY THE FIRST AND THE ONLY AFRICAN-AMERICAN PRESIDENT OF ENGINEERS AND ARCHITECTS EMPLOYEES IN EVERY CITY DEPARTMENT. SO I UNDERSTAND LABOR ISSUES.

THESE PEOPLE GETTING UP HERE AND SAYING, "OH, YEAH, YOUR PLAN IS ALL GOOD," THEIR CHILDREN ARE NOT DEALING WITH THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF THESE PLANES FLYING OVER HERE. THEY'RE NOT DEALING WITH RELATIVES. MY FATHER HAS LOST HIS HEARING AFTER HE MOVED TO CARLTON SQUARE, IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, DUE TO

3. Comments and Responses

THOSE AIRPLANES. THE DOCTOR FINDS NO OTHER EXCUSE. WE HAVE HEALTH EFFECTS. YOU ARE KILLING US. THIS PLAN IS NOT GOING TO HELP THAT.

SO I'M COMING TO THIS CONCLUSION. I'M EITHER GOING TO BE DEAF, DUMB, CRAZY, CANCER RIDDEN FROM THE POLLUTION. SO I TELL YOU THIS. LAX, YOU CAN WRITE ME A CHECK FOR 1.5 MILLION, AND I'LL SIT OUT THERE WITH EARPHONES IN MY EARS. I CAN'T SIT IN MY YARD. I CAN'T EVEN TALK ON THE PHONE. MY HEAD IS SO HEAVY NOW, BECAUSE I FEEL LIKE THEY'VE BEEN PISSING IN MY EARS ALL DAY AND TRYING TO TELL ME IT'S RAINWATER.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 4, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-4, S-9a and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PHP00039-6

Comment:

THIS WAS AN INSULT FOR YOU TO BRING THIS TO US. AND THE REASON WHY IT'S NOT WELL ATTENDED, I GOT NO NOTICE. YOU SHOULD HAVE HAD ONE MEETING, NOT A SERIES OF THREE BEING DONE CONSECUTIVELY, OVER ALL THE OTHER COUNTIES, IF THAT'S WHAT YOU WANT.

Response:

The intent of the one hearing at three locations was to maximize the number of persons that could provide input and provide more access to the most convenient hearing site. A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PHP00039-7

Comment:

BUT OF COURSE, BIG MONEY TALKS. YOU'RE JUST TRYING TO ROLL OVER THESE CITIZENS HERE. AND TO JUST PARAPHRASE ONE OF THE CITY COUNCILMEN, IF YOU CAN SEND A MAN TO THE MOON, WHY CAN'T YOU SEND HIM TO PALMDALE, ET CETERA?

Response:

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

PHP00040	Sambrano, Diane	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	------------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHP00040-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS DIANE SAMBRANO. I AM GOING TO START OUT AND SAY WHAT THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT SAYS, IT IS ENVIRONMENTAL INJUSTICE. THIS IS YOUR DOCUMENT YOU PRODUCED THAT THE AIRPORT IS TO BE MODERNIZED WITH. YOU ARE GIVING ME THREE MINUTES TO RESPOND. YOU HAD HOW MANY MONTHS?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

In addition to public hearing testimony, comments may be submitted in writing or on the web site, www.laxmasterplan.com. The intent of the three minute limit was to allow as many to be able to provide comment at the hearings as possible.

PHP00040-2

Comment:

I HAVE ANOTHER DOCUMENT HERE PRODUCED ALSO BY LAX NOISE HOTLINE. LAWA HAS A 24-HOUR INCIDENT LINE STAFFED BY OPERATIONS PERSONNEL TO SEEK SOLUTIONS. ANOTHER FALSEHOOD. IT IS A RECORDING THAT RINGS, NOT A HUMAN BEING, AND THEY ARE VERY RARELY RESPONSIVE TO OUR COMPLAINTS.

Response:

Comment noted. LAX does keep records of the noise complaint and complainant. In the event that a complainant does request a written response and includes a mailing address, LAWA's Noise Management staff policy is to provide them with written response. However, no more than five noise events will be investigated on a monthly basis. LAWA has also recently incorporated a policy to place the complainant on a monthly mailing list where all incoming identified noise complaint calls are put on a monthly log, are addressed by LAWA Noise Management staff, and then the responses (broken down by date, time and block address) are sent to the requesting community members. LAWA has recently installed a PASSUR system to assist the community in tracking aircraft operations. By going to the LAWA website www.lawa.org and entering the Noise Management section community members can specifically identify LAX operations that cross their community. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PHP00040-3

Comment:

MOVING ON TO THE EIR/EIS. WE HAVE HEARD A GREAT MANY PEOPLE TALK ABOUT BURDEN AND BENEFIT, AND WHAT IT SEEMS IS THIS EIR PRESENTS A BURDEN TO THOSE WHO LIVE NEAR IT AND A BENEFIT TO THOSE WHO DO NOT. IT IS FORMULATED AT THE EXPENSE OF THE LIVES OF THOSE WHO LIVE IN THE COMMUNITY SURROUNDING IT.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00040-4

Comment:

THERE IS NO PLACE THE SINGLE EVENT NOISE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE NIGHT IS ADDRESSED. DO YOU ACTUALLY BELIEVE THERE IS A MEDICAL REPORT THAT SAYS THAT THE RESIDENTS OF INGLEWOOD AND SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES NEED LESS SLEEP? I THINK NOT.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings in homes associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PHP00040-5

Comment:

MUCH IS MADE OF CARGO TRANSPORT AND THE BENEFITS OF THAT INDUSTRY, AND YET NO ONE HAS BOTHERED TO THINK ABOUT HOW THE CARGO GETS FROM THE AIRPLANE TO ITS FINAL DESTINATION OR FROM ITS PLACE OF ORIGIN TO THE AIRPLANE. THAT INVOLVES TRAFFIC, GROUND TRAFFIC, WHICH RESULTS IN POLLUTION, WHICH THE EIR/EIS DOES NOT ADDRESS.

Response:

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

PHP00040-6

Comment:

WE HEAR ABOUT JOBS, AND YET I FIND IT VERY INTERESTING THAT JOBS ARE PRESENTED AS THE SAVE-ALL FOR OUR COMMUNITY, AND THAT MAY VERY WELL BE BECAUSE THE RETIREMENT PLANS WON'T BE. WE WILL BE DEAD AFTER IT KICKS IN.

THE ALTERNATIVES A, B AND C STAND FOR ALTERNATIVES: A, ASTHMA, B, BLUDGEONING OF OUR EARS, OR C, CANCER.

Response:

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

PHP00040-7

Comment:

THERE IS NO WAY THAT THE CARGO CULT CAN GENUINELY SAY IT IS WILLING TO ACCEPT THE BURDENS AS WELL AS THE BENEFITS.

NO. THERE IS NO CREATIVITY IN THIS DOCUMENT.

THE WISDOM, THE WILL AND THE VISION WE HEARD OF IS THE WISDOM TO NOT PRESENT ALTERNATIVES, THE WILL TO RUN OVER THE TOP OF US, AND THE VISION TO ESSENTIALLY ELIMINATE US.

WE CAN LOOK TO MANCHESTER SQUARE AND SEE WHAT THE PLANS YOU HAVE FOR US ARE. YES. IT IS BOTTOM-LINE ORIENTED, WHERE PRODUCTS AND INANIMATE OBJECTS ARE MORE IMPORTANT TO THE LAWA PLANNERS THAN ANY HUMAN BEING. THE HUMAN FACTOR IS SIMPLY NOT ADDRESSED.

WE CAN TALK ALL WE WANT ABOUT DOLLARS, BUT SOMEWHERE A PERSON SHOULD HAVE A COUNTING VOTE.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PHP00041

Caprio, Cecil

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHP00041-1

Comment:

RIGHT HERE. THANK YOU. MY NAME IS CECIL CARPIO. I LIVE AT 407 EXTON AVENUE, NO. 4, INGLEWOOD, 90302, AND I AM AN AVIATION CONVENTIONEER FOR THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD.

MANCHESTER SQUARE IS VACANT. THAT IS WHAT I SEE ON THE EASELS. I THOUGHT THERE WERE STILL PEOPLE LIVING THERE, AND ONCE IT WAS VACATED, IT WOULD TURN INTO A PARK, ACCORDING TO RUTH GALANTER.

Response:

Comment noted. The drawings to which the commentor is referring depict Manchester Square in 2015, by which time the current voluntary acquisition program will be completed.

PHP00041-2

Comment:

AGAIN, I HEAR ABOUT JOBS, AND THERE WILL BE JOBS NO MATTER WHERE THE EXPANSION OCCURS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00041-3

Comment:

JUST FOR THE RECORD, I AM AGAINST THE EXPANSION OF LAX. AS A MATTER OF FACT, MY FAVORITE SONG IS: WHATEVER HAPPENED TO 40 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS? WE ARE A LITTLE BIT ABOVE THAT NOW.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHP00041-4

Comment:

WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE MASTER PLAN'S PROPOSED PROJECT PHASE-IN? CARGO CAPACITY, PROPERTY ACQUISITION, THE AIRFIELD EXPANSION, RUNWAY EXTENSION AND TERMINAL EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER THE MITIGATION OF IMPACTS THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES ARE ALREADY EXPERIENCING.

THE HISTORIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LAX AND ITS NEIGHBORS HAS ALREADY PROVEN THAT MITIGATION OF THE EFFECTS OF LAX'S EXPANDED OPERATIONS TAKES LOW PRIORITY. LAWA HAS BEEN PROMOTING THE MASTER PLAN AS THE ONLY VIABLE WAY TO ADDRESS TODAY'S TRAFFIC, NOISE AND AIR QUALITY IMPACTS. THE PROPOSED PHASE-IN WILL ONLY EXACERBATE THOSE IMPACTS.

WHAT I AM TRYING TO SAY IS PHASE I IS WHERE ALL THE IMPROVEMENTS ARE DONE. PHASE II IS WHEN THE MITIGATION MEASURES WILL TAKE PLACE. THE FIRST TEN, SIX TO TEN YEARS, IS DEVOTED TO IMPROVEMENTS. THE LAST PHASE ISN'T -- IS DEVOTED TO MITIGATION.

WE HAVE ALREADY BEEN THERE. WE HAVE ALREADY BEEN THERE.

Response:

This is not a requirement or means under CEQA or NEPA to mitigate environmental conditions that are not the result of a "project" or "action" as defined by those laws. The currently proposed Master Plan meets those definitions and, as a result of the EIS/EIR completed for the proposed Master Plan, numerous mitigation measures are recommended to address the impacts of the improvements and activities associated with the new Master Plan. Those mitigation measures address impacts both within the limits of the airport as well as in the affected communities around the airport. In conjunction with approval of the Master Plan, LAWA and FAA will be required to implement those measures, again, both on the airport and in the surrounding communities. Without the Master Plan and the EIS/EIR mitigation measures, LAWA and FAA are restricted by federal law in the expenditure of airport funds within off-airport areas for addressing existing environmental impacts. One notable exception, however, is the ongoing implementation of the residential soundproofing program as part of the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP) for areas exposed to aircraft noise levels of 65 CNEL or greater. Aside from that, LAWA's ability to mitigate impacts to the surrounding communities is more indirect, through the control of on-airport facilities or activities in a manner that reduces impacts to surrounding areas. LAWA has implemented a number of programs to reduce the environmental impacts of existing operations, such as carpool and vanpool programs to reduce traffic and air quality impacts, conversion of ground service equipment and LAWA fleet vehicles to alternative fuels to reduce air quality impacts, and electrification of aircraft gates to reduce air pollutant emissions associated with aircraft auxiliary power units.

PHP00041-5

Comment:

GIVEN THE 2015 PLANNING HORIZON, WHY WAS THE HIGH-END POTENTIAL AT PALMDALE EXTRAPOLATED TO 2010? WHAT DID THE HAGLER-BAILEY STUDY DETERMINE PALMDALE'S 2015 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS COULD BE?

Response:

The Hagler Bailly study was prepared to answer the question, What is the maximum theoretical long-term potential of Palmdale Airport without regard to costs to improve access or develop airport facilities? The study concluded that the high-end potential was 4 million annual passengers (MAP) in 2010 and 7.3 MAP in 2020. The 2015 forecast would be interpolated to be 5.4 MAP. The study noted: The projections presented in this report are not, therefore, most likely estimates of potential demand at Palmdale. The actual results will almost certainly be lower, potentially significantly lower. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PHP00041-6

Comment:

AS STATED IN THE EIR/EIS, AN OVERARCHING CONSIDERATION DURING THE PLANNING PROCESS HAS BEEN TO ACHIEVE THE PROJECT OBJECTIVES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND MANNER. WHY, THEN, WAS ALTERNATIVE C INTRODUCED AS THE PREFERRED PROJECT?

ALTERNATIVE C HAS -- ALTERNATIVE C HAS JUST AS SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE EFFECTS AS ALTERNATIVES A OR B.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00022-3 regarding the number and severity of impacts associated with Alternative C compared to Alternatives A and B and Response to Comment AL00022-43 regarding Alternative C's fulfillment of the project objectives.

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00041-7

Comment:

IN THE SUMMARY COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FROM ALTERNATIVES A, B AND C, WHY WASN'T "NO ACTION/NO PROJECT" INCLUDED FOR COMPARISON?

Response:

The summary table in the Executive Summary identifies Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures related to each individual impact as well as the level of significance of the impact following the implementation of these measures. Pursuant to Section 16126.2(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the identification of significant impacts only applies to the proposed project, in this case, the build alternatives. Accordingly, the consideration of mitigation measures also applies only to the proposed project. Were the No Action/No Project Alternative to have been included in this table, no information would have been able to be provided. Note that a comparison to the No Action/No Project Alternative was provided for each environmental discipline in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHP00042

Kirkley, Lawrence

City of Inglewood

6/9/2001

PHP00042-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS COUNCILMAN LAWRENCE KIRKLEY FROM THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD. I CAME HERE FROM THE SOUTH BAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS, WHICH IS A JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY OF THE 15 SOUTH BAY CITIES PLUS THE HARBOR GATEWAY/SAN PEDRO AREA OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES.

WHILE WE WILL BE PROVIDING MORE DETAIL AND COMMENTS, I WOULD LIKE TO HIGHLIGHT A FEW ITEMS.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PHP00042-2

Comment:

ONE IS CAPACITY. IN THE EIR AND IN THE DRAFT MASTER PLAN IT TALKS ABOUT 2,000 DAILY OPERATIONS. WELL, LAX ALREADY ACCOMMODATES OVER 2,000 DAILY OPERATIONS. THE IMPLICATION HERE IS THAT THERE IS GOING TO BE EXPANSION, BUT THERE IS GOING TO BE NO MORE OPERATIONS. SINCE THAT IS THE BASIS FOR THE REST OF THE STUDY, IT BASICALLY INVALIDATES THE STUDY.

Response:

Comment noted. Satisfying the increasing regional demand for global air transport of passengers and cargo was not the only objective of the Master Plan. LAX Master Plan goals also included ensuring safety for all airport users, operating more efficiently, operate LAX in an environmentally sensitive and responsible manner, improve ground access and to maximize the compatibility of LAX with the surrounding communities. The number of design day operations would remain under 3,000 daily operations for each of the build alternatives, but the projected fleet mix would consist of larger aircraft. The larger aircraft would be able to accommodate a larger number of passengers serving more of the projected passenger demand at LAX. The expansion of LAX under each of these build alternatives would allow LAX to handle the maximum size increase in aircraft and increase in volume of passengers and services for those passengers the limited increase in land area could allow. Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been added and is addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR in light of the events of September 11, 2001, and is

specifically designed to protect airport users and crucial airport infrastructure, and to incorporate federal security recommendations as they are developed to the greatest extent possible.

PHP00042-3

Comment:

THE DRAFT VIOLATES BOTH THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT AND THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT BECAUSE IT DOESN'T DISCLOSE TO THE DECISION MAKERS AND THE PUBLIC THE PROJECT'S REASONABLY FORESEEABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS, AND THE PROJECT ISN'T ANALYZED IN ITS ENTIRELY.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00042-4

Comment:

ALSO, THE BASELINES -- THERE ARE ACTUALLY THREE DIFFERENT BASELINES. IT APPEARS AS THOUGH IN THE REPORT THAT THE BASELINES ARE USED TO THE ADVANTAGE OF THE REPORT IN ORDER TO SHOW THE MITIGATION.

Response:

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

PHP00042-5

Comment:

I WILL SUBMIT A DOCUMENT THAT GIVES MORE INFORMATION. IN THREE MINUTES I CAN'T GO INTO ALL THE DETAILS.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00042-6

Comment:

NOISE IMPACT. THE DRAFT DOESN'T ANALYZE NOR DISCLOSE ANY CUMULATIVE NOISE IMPACTS THAT THE PROJECT WILL HAVE ON THE SOUTH BAY COMMUNITIES OTHER THAN INGLEWOOD AND EL SEGUNDO. IT LOOKS LIKE THERE IS NO EFFECTS TO RESIDENTS SOUTH OF THE INGLEWOOD/EL SEGUNDO AREA.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PHM00011-3 regarding cumulative impacts on South Bay communities.

PHP00042-7

Comment:

THE DRAFT ONLY FOCUSES ON THE 65 DB CNEL SIGNIFICANT NOISE AREA AND DOES NOT ADDRESS ANY OF THE AREAS OF CONCERN IN THE SOUTH BAY AREAS OTHER THAN INGLEWOOD AND EL SEGUNDO.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PHP00042-6, regarding use of the 65 CNEL contour and South Bay.

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00042-8

Comment:

THE DRAFT BARELY CONSIDERS TRAFFIC IN THE SOUTH BAY COMMUNITIES AT ALL. IN FACT, OUT OF THE 61 EVALUATED INTERSECTIONS AND THE ADDITIONAL 15 INTERSECTIONS SELECTED FOR FOCUSED ANALYSIS, ONLY NINE OF THE 76 INTERSECTIONS WERE SOUTH OF THE 105.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PHP00042-9

Comment:

THE DRAFT CLAIMS THAT PEOPLE DRIVING TO LAX FROM THE SOUTH USE THE FREEWAY MORE THAN THE SURFACE STREETS. THAT IS NOT TRUE. WE ARE NOT SURE WHERE IT CAME FROM. WHAT ANALYSIS GAVE YOU THAT INFORMATION?

Response:

The approach analysis used in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR used empirical data from SCAG's traffic model and traffic engineering surveys conducted specifically for this study. These studies were discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.3.2, and in Technical Report 3b, Off-Airport Ground Access Impacts and Mitigation Measures. The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHP00042-10

Comment:

THE DRAFT RECOGNIZES THE EXISTENCE OF SPECIFIC IMMUTABLE AIR QUALITY IMPACTS, BUT PROPOSES TO DELAY A COMPLETE ANALYSIS OF THESE IMPACTS UNTIL THE FINAL EIS/EIR, WHICH MAKES IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR THE PUBLIC TO FULLY ANALYZE THE PROJECT'S AIR QUALITY IMPACTS.

Response:

The analyses provided in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a complete analysis of the air quality impacts, as described in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of both documents. An updated analysis of air quality mitigation measures can be found in Section 4.6.8, Mitigation Measures, and Appendix S-E of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These sections provide a detailed discussion of mitigation measures as well as analyses of the resulting air quality impacts.

The commentor may be referring to the Conformity Analysis, which documents the conformity of the preferred alternative (Alternative D) with the Clean Air Act by comparing project air quality impacts already addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with the State Implementation Plan budgets. The Draft General Conformity Determination for Alternative D was issued on January 9, 2004, pursuant to federal law. The Final General Conformity Determination will be published prior to the publication of the Final EIS/EIR that will be approved by the FAA.

PHP00042-11**Comment:**

THE DRAFT ERRONEOUSLY ASSUMES THE AMOUNT OF AIRCRAFT ACTIVITY WILL BE VIRTUALLY IDENTICAL WHETHER OR NOT THE PROJECT IS ELIMINATED OR IMPLEMENTED.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR accounted for changes in aircraft fleet mix under each of the five alternatives. Detailed information regarding fleet mix assumptions is provided in the Draft Master Plan and the Draft Master Plan Addendum.

PHP00042-12**Comment:**

THE LAST AREA I WANT TO TALK ABOUT IS AIRSPACE. THE DRAFT TREATS OVERFLYING THE SOUTH BAY COMMUNITIES AS IF THE AIRCRAFT IMMEDIATELY ENTER INTO A BLACK HOLE OR DROP OFF THE RUNWAY AFTER TAKEOFF.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the changes to the environment (i.e., impacts) associated with the proposed Master Plan actions. In the case of the South Bay communities beyond El Segundo, there are no changes to aircraft noise levels that exceed the established thresholds of significance. However, changes to the air traffic patterns in the area were made at about the same time as the completion of the Draft EIS/EIR. These changes are addressed in Subtopical Response TR-N-3.1, regarding flight routes relative to areas of the South Bay. For more information on noise impacts on the South Bay, please see Response to Comment PC00552-2.

PHP00042-13**Comment:**

NOT ONLY DOES THE DRAFT IGNORE IMPORTANT AIRSPACE ISSUES, BUT ALSO WHEN IT DOES SUPPLY IT, IT USES INACCURATE, OUTDATED SOURCES AND CONSULTANT OPINION RATHER THAN WHAT WE CALL GOOD FACTS.

AS MY TIME IS UP, I WILL SUBMIT THIS AND PUT IT INTO THE RECORD.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00043	Springs, Lawrence	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	--------------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHP00043-1**Comment:**

MY NAME IS LAWRENCE SPRINGS. MY ADDRESS IS 501 FIFTH AVENUE, 90305.

I HAVE BEEN A RESIDENT OF INGLEWOOD FOR THE LAST 28 YEARS. IN THAT 28 YEARS LIVING IN INGLEWOOD I NOTICED AN INCREASE OF AIR TRAFFIC FOR THE CITY WITHIN THE LAST TEN YEARS.

CURRENTLY LAX HAS THE CAPACITY TO SERVE 78.7 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS AND 3,120,000 ANNUAL CARGO TONS. THE MASTER PLAN FORECASTS INDICATE IT WILL NEED TO SERVE 97.9 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS AND 4,172,000 TONS, AND LAX IS WILLING TO SPEND \$12 MILLION TO DO THIS ANNUALLY.

3. Comments and Responses

MY QUESTION IS: WHY WOULD LAX WANT TO DO THAT?

Response:

The purpose and need for the proposed action were presented in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHP00043-2

Comment:

I WANT THIS TO BE ON RECORD THAT I AM OPPOSED TO THE ALTERNATIVES A, B AND C, AND THE REASON BEING IS WHAT THEY ARE DOING IS EXTENDING THE AIRPORT EASTWARD, EAST OF SEPULVEDA.

WHEN YOU START GOING EASTWARD, YOU HAVE THE TENDENCY TO GET PEOPLE INVOLVED, WHEREAS IF IT WAS A BAD DAY, RAINING OR SO FORTH, NOW THE PLANES ARE GOING TO TAKE OFF GOING EASTWARD, AND YOU HAVE -- WHEN YOU GO EAST, YOU HAVE SEPULVEDA -- YOU HAVE PLANES THAT ARE ONLY PARKED EAST OF SEPULVEDA, WHICH ARE AVAILABLE FOR MORE POLLUTION EASTWARD AND, IN TURN, FOR THE COMMUNITIES EAST OF SEPULVEDA AND HARBOR COMMUNITIES.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land use impacts in Section 4.2, Land Use, and air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 1 and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase. 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.

PHP00043-3

Comment:

YOU HEARD A LOT OF PEOPLE HERE. ONE OF THE REASONS I CAME HERE PRIMARILY WAS BECAUSE SOMEONE TOLD ME ABOUT IT. I DID NOT RECEIVE A LETTER IN THE MAIL INDICATING THERE WAS GOING TO BE A PUBLIC HEARING. I JUST HEARD ABOUT IT THROUGH A NEIGHBOR WHO SAID: LARRY, YOU NEED TO BE THERE. I SAID: GREAT. I WILL BE THERE, AND I WILL TAKE TALK ABOUT NO ON THIS EXPANSION.

Response:

A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process. Also, please visit the web site, www.laxmasterplan.org.

PHP00043-4

Comment:

I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH LAX MODERNIZING THEIR AIRPORT. I HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THEM EXPANDING. LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT IS A SMALL AIRPORT. THERE IS NO ROOM TO EXPAND UNLESS YOU ARE GOING TO EXPAND TO THE EAST. IF YOU EXPAND TO THE EAST SIDE, YOU ARE AFFECTING MORE COMMUNITIES AND MORE FAMILIES.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed land use impacts in Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 1 of

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

PHP00043-5

Comment:

THEY HAVE OTHER ALTERNATIVES, AND THE ALTERNATIVES ARE OTHER COMMUNITIES, SUCH AS ORANGE COUNTY, WHICH THEY DON'T WANT IT. IF ORANGE COUNTY DOESN'T WANT IT, THAT IS TELLING YOU SOMETHING.

ORANGE COUNTY DOESN'T WANT IT, SO YOU PUT IT IN LOS ANGELES, AND YOU AFFECT THE COMMUNITIES OF INGLEWOOD AND ITS SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES. THINK ABOUT IT.

Response:

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

PHP00043-6

Comment:

THESE PEOPLE HAVE COME HERE ASKING YOU NOT TO DO IT. THERE MUST BE A REASON WHY THEY DON'T WANT YOU TO DO IT. PLEASE, DON'T EXPAND LAX.

Response:

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

PHP00044 Motan, Nancy LAX No Expansion Committee 6/9/2001

PHP00044-1

Comment:

HOWDY, NANCY MOTAN -- MY NAME IS NANCY MOTAN. I AM A MEMBER OF THE LAX NO EXPANSION COMMITTEE. MAX STEVENS IS PRESIDENT. AND I LIVE AT 10503 THIRD AVENUE IN INGLEWOOD, AND I DON'T GO OUTSIDE. I CAN HARDLY GO OUTSIDE ON ACCOUNT OF LIKE GROWING MY OWN FOOD AND FRUIT TREES, MY FRUIT TREES BEAR FRUIT, BUT I CAN'T EAT IT BECAUSE IT IS ALL WHITE ON ONE SIDE.

Response:

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

PHP00044-2

Comment:

WHEN YOU TALK ABOUT EXPANDING TO EL TORO AND OTHER PLACES, THEY HAVE PLENTY OF DESERT. WHAT HAPPENED TO THE PEOPLE THAT BUILD THESE AIRPORTS? ARE THEY DENSE OR SOMETHING? THEY CAN'T BUILD HERE. FIND A PLACE IN THE DESERT AND BUILD SOME MORE AIRPORTS SO PEOPLE WON'T HAVE TO CROWD IN ON US.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

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

PHP00044-3

Comment:

I HAVE BEEN IN INGLEWOOD FOR 32 YEARS. SO PLEASE DON'T EXPAND THE AIRPORT.

Response:

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

PHP00045

Stanford, Hilda

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHP00045-1

Comment:

GOOD AFTERNOON. HILDA MAE STANFORD. I LIVE IN SOUTHWEST LOS ANGELES. THE REASON I USE "WEST" IS BECAUSE I AM TWO BLOCKS EAST OF INGLEWOOD.

I WAS INVITED TO THIS MEETING BY MY CONGRESSWOMAN, MAXINE WATERS; THEREFORE, I AM HERE NOT ONLY BECAUSE OF THAT, BUT I HAD TWO OTHER INVITATIONS IN THE MAIL TO BE AT THIS MEETING.

I NOTICE IN ALL OF YOUR TALKING YOU DO NOT TALK ABOUT PEOPLE THAT LIVE IN LOS ANGELES, IN THIS SAME AREA. HOWEVER, THAT IS SOMETHING THAT YOU SHOULD KNOW AS PEOPLE ON THIS BOARD THAT IS SUPPOSED TO BE DOING THE EXPANSION.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00045-2

Comment:

IF YOU WERE TO WALK 89TH STREET, THAT CURVES INTO 90TH STREET WHEN IT GETS INTO INGLEWOOD, THAT CORRIDOR HAS PLANES FLYING ON EACH SIDE OF THAT STREET BECAUSE EACH MORNING I GET UP AND I WALK ABOUT THREE MILES AND SOMETIMES IF I AM WALKING BY MYSELF I WILL LOOK UP IN THE AIR AND I WILL COUNT THE PLANES ON MY WALK. IN 30 MINUTES I CAN COUNT ABOUT 75 PLANS COMING INTO THE AIRPORT, AND THAT IS BETWEEN 7:00 AND 8:00 A.M.

I KNOW SOME YEARS AGO THERE WAS AN ORDINANCE MADE THAT SAID PLANES WERE NOT SUPPOSED TO FLY IN OVER THE RESIDENTIAL AREAS BETWEEN 11:00 P.M. AND 7:00 A.M., BUT THE PLANES DO NOT PAY ATTENTION TO THAT.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-N-7 regarding noise abatement measures/enforcement.

PHP00045-3

Comment:

THERE IS SOMETHING ELSE THAT BOTHERS ME VERY MUCH. SINCE YOU ARE DETERMINED, ACCORDING TO ALL OF YOUR INFORMATION, TO EXPAND, WHY IS IT NECESSARY THAT THE PEOPLE THAT LIVE IN THESE AREAS HAVE TO MAKE PETITIONS FOR YOU TO COME OUT AND SOUNDPROOF HOMES? I KNOW YOU DON'T WANT TO TALK ABOUT THAT IN YOUR EXPANSION. BUT YOU NEED TO ADJUST THE THINGS THAT ARE HURTING THE PEOPLE THAT ARE LIVING IN THE AREA, AND THAT IS SOMETHING THAT HURTS.

SEVERAL PEOPLE MENTIONED WE CAN'T HEAR OUR TELEVISIONS. I LOOK AT THE TELEVISION, BUT THAT IS NOT THE MOST IMPORTANT THING. BUT IF I AM GETTING A LONG DISTANCE CALL AND SOMEONE IS SPENDING LOTS OF MONEY TO TALK TO ME AND A PLANE FLIES OVER, I CAN'T HEAR THEM. THEY CAN'T HEAR ME. ALL I CAN HEAR IS ALL THIS NOISE.

SINCE YOU ARE GOING TO DO SOUNDPROOFING, WHY DO WE HAVE TO COME TO YOU? YOU SHOULD HAVE PEOPLE GOING OUT AND INVESTIGATING THESE COMMUNITIES, MAKING DETERMINATIONS AND TAKING CARE OF BUSINESS AND STOP WASTING TIME.

Response:

Please see Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4 for a description of how eligibility for residential soundproofing is determined, Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.7 for how participation is initiated, and Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.12 regarding how complaints are handled and filed. 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 accelerate existing commitments to current participants of the ANMP prior to proceeding with newly eligible properties. Refer to Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels. The noise impact boundary (defined by the 65 CNEL) is continually monitored as described in Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.4.

PHP00045-4

Comment:

WE NEED YOU TO CONSIDER HUMAN BEINGS AND NOT GREED, BECAUSE GREED IS WHAT THIS IS ALL ABOUT WHEN IT COMES TO EXPANSION, WITHOUT CONSIDERING THE PEOPLE.

WE WERE LIVING THERE LONG BEFORE MUCH OF THE EXPANSION THAT IS ALREADY THERE EVER TOOK PLACE. NOW YOU WANT TO EXPAND MORE BECAUSE WE ARE NOT THE ELEMENT -- WE ARE MIDDLE CLASS AND LOW INCOME PEOPLE, BUT WE HAVE AS MUCH RIGHT TO GOD'S GOOD AIR AND GOD'S GOOD EARTH AS ANYONE ELSE ON THIS EARTH, AND IF YOU DO NOT BELIEVE IN THAT, YOU WILL PAY THE PENALTY LATER ON.

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. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please note that LAX is not run as a for-profit organization. It is a public service and the fees collected are

3. Comments and Responses

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.

PHP00046

Jarvis, Jean

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHP00046-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS JEAN JARVIS. I AM A WESTCHESTER RESIDENT AND A BUSINESS TRAVELER, AND MY OFFICE ADDRESS IS 8726 SOUTH SEPULBEDA BOULEVARD, LOS ANGELES, 90045.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00046-2

Comment:

I BELIEVE LOS ANGELES DOES NOT NEED MORE AIR TRAFFIC CAPACITY. WE HAVE MORE THAN ENOUGH TO SERVE ALL OF LOS ANGELES.

BUT WE DO NEED TO RECAPTURE THE FULL CAPACITY OF LAX FOR LOS ANGELES AND WE DO NEED TO ELIMINATE THE 15 MILLION ORANGE COUNTY FREE-LOADERS WHO ARE USING OUR AIRPORT, YET WHO CONTRIBUTE NOTHING TO OUR CITY OR OUR COUNTY, AND WE DO NEED TO ESTABLISH EFFICIENT FLIGHT PRIORITIES WHICH WORK FOR LOS ANGELES.

EVERY WEEK LAX WASTES 208 TAKEOFF AND LANDING SLOTS ON TINY PROPELLER PLANES, NOT EVEN JETS, INTO AND OUT OF ORANGE COUNTY. WE WANT FLIGHTS TO TAIWAN, NOT TO TUSTIN. WE WANT FLIGHTS TO COSTA RICA, NOT COSTA MESA, AND WE WANT FLIGHTS TO NEW YORK, NOT NEWPORT BEACH.

IT IS RIGHT AND JUST THAT WE WITHHOLD APPROVAL OF ANY EXPANSION PLAN FOR LAX WHICH MAKES IT EASIER FOR ORANGE COUNTY TO USE OUR RESOURCE.

IS IT RIGHT AND JUST THAT LOS ANGELES WORK TO TRY TO PENALIZE ORANGE COUNTY FLYERS WHO SEEK TO USE LAX AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR PROVIDING THEIR OWN AIRPORT SERVICES. LAX MUST NOT BE A SLAVE TO RICH WHITE SOUTHERNERS IN SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY WHO ARE NOT WILLING TO PAY THE FREIGHT.

BEFORE THESE REPORTS ARE SUBMITTED TO THE COMMISSION AND THE CITY COUNCIL, PLEASE ISOLATE FOR US THE NUMBER OF CURRENT LAX PASSENGERS WHO ARE RESIDENTS OR VISITORS TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY AND THEN TELL US THE NUMBER OF LAX PASSENGERS WHO ARE RESIDENTS OR VISITORS TO ORANGE COUNTY.

NEXT, PLEASE QUANTIFY IN SPECIFIC DOLLAR AMOUNTS THE BENEFITS WHICH ACCRUE TO THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES FROM THESE ORANGE COUNTY FREE-LOADING FLYERS.

WE DO NOT NEED TO EXPAND OUR AIRPORT. WE NEED TO USE IT MORE EFFICIENTLY. IT IS TIME TO TELL ORANGE COUNTY TO GET OUT. IT IS TIME TO TELL ORANGE COUNTY TO GO TO HELL, AND IT IS TIME TO TELL TO TELL ORANGE COUNTY: GO FLY YOURSELF.

Response:

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

PHP00047 White, Bobby

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHP00047-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS BOBBY G. WHITE. I LIVE AT 3926 107TH STREET. I AM ALREADY DEAF, AND WHAT HAS HAPPENED, I AM DISABLED.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00047-2

Comment:

THEY SAID THEY COULD -- THEY WERE GOING TO SOUNDPROOF IT A LONG TIME AGO. BEFORE THAT THEY SAID WE HAD TO MOVE, SO NOW THEY SAY THEY CAN'T FIX IT BECAUSE YOU ENTER AN AREA WHERE THEY CAN'T SOUNDPROOF IT, AND NOW YOU WANT TO MAKE THIS AIRPORT BIGGER.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. As was stated in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.8), of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, under mitigation measures MM-LU-1 and MM-LU-2, the ANMP would be revised to include those residential uses newly exposed to high noise levels and high single event noise levels that result in nighttime awakening, respectively. Mitigation measure MM-LU-1 would also accelerate existing commitments to current participants of the ANMP prior to proceeding with newly eligible participants.

PHP00047-3

Comment:

I REALLY SEE A PROBLEM, BUT PROGRESS HAS TO BE MADE. YOU CAN'T SIT BACK AND THINK THIS POLLUTION IS GOING TO LEAVE YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD AND YOUR KIDS BECAUSE YOU DON'T WANT THE AIRPORT THERE.

SUPPOSE THEY CLOSE THE AIRPORT? I MEAN, THINK ABOUT IT -- CLOSE THE AIRPORT. WE HAVE GOT MAYBE 200,000 PEOPLE THAT MOVED INTO INGLEWOOD LATELY, THE LAST TEN YEARS, ALL KIND OF THUGS. I DON'T CARE. I CALL THE POLICE ABOUT TEN TIMES A WEEK. LITTLE KIDS COME HOME FROM SCHOOL AT MORNINGSIDE, WE HAVE TO RUN GUYS AWAY FROM THEM. IT DON'T MAKE SENSE. I REPORTED IT. THAT IS ALL I COULD DO. I DON'T CARE WHAT YOU DO, YOU CAN'T CHANGE THAT PART OF INGLEWOOD. YOU TAKE THE CHANCE TO RAISE YOUR KIDS THERE. THERE IS NO WAY IT IS GOING TO GO AWAY. IT IS ALREADY THERE.

MODERNIZING THE AIRPORT IS NOT GOING TO HELP. YOU CAN'T CHANGE THE POISON OF WHAT IS COMING IN. IT COMES OUT OF WHERE I LIVE FOR 20 YEARS. IT COMES DOWN AND WAKES YOU UP EVERY MORNING. SO I AM STUCK WITH IT. THAT IS THE BREAKS.

THERE IS NO WAY YOU CAN CHANGE IT, AND IF YOU CLOSE THE AIRPORT, IT WON'T HELP. IF YOU MODERNIZE THE AIRPORT, THERE IS GOING TO BE MORE POLLUTION ANYWAY, TOO MANY PEOPLE COMING IN. SO I CAN'T SEE A CHANGE BEING MADE.

NOW JUST LIKE CALLING A CAB. YOU CALL A CAB, AND YOU ARE HANDICAPPED AND A SENIOR, IT IS KING CAB FROM INGLEWOOD. THEY TALK TO YOU LIKE YOU ARE CRAZY.

I AM TRYING TO SHOW YOU IT IS JUST NOT ONE THING, POLLUTION NOT GOING AWAY, AND THERE IS MORE PEOPLE COMING INTO INGLEWOOD, AND IT IS NOT GOING TO CHANGE AND

3. Comments and Responses

THE POLICE AND CITY HALL, THEY CAN'T COUNT ON THESE PROBLEMS. IF YOU DON'T MOVE, YOU ARE ON YOUR OWN.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00048

Bello, Mario

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHP00048-1

Comment:

I HAVE SEVERE EMPHASIS ON EACH AND EVERY WORD RIGHT HERE THAT MENTIONED EL TORO, AND I MEAN SEVERE EMPHASIS.

I AM A RESIDENT OF INGLEWOOD, AND I STRONGLY OPPOSE ANY EXPANSION OF LAX. IT IS VERY WONDERFUL FOR THE PEOPLE WHO DO NOT LIVE NEAR LAX EITHER TO -- OR IN THE FLIGHT PATHS TO BE IN FAVOR OF EXPANSION. CERTAINLY, THEY ARE NOT SUFFERING. I AM SUFFERING.

Response:

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

PHP00048-2

Comment:

IT IS OKAY TO SAY: WELL, CONSTRUCTION THIS, JOBS THAT, AND BY THE WAY, MICKEY MOUSE JOBS, \$5 AN HOUR, \$10 AN HOUR. THAT DOESN'T HELP ANYBODY. THAT IS NOT A JOB.

Response:

In addition to construction jobs, Master Plan implementation would generate numerous long-term employment opportunities. Please see Response to Comment PC02204-14 regarding the types of jobs and associated wages that will be generated under each of the alternatives.

PHP00048-3

Comment:

THEY HAVE NO IDEA WHATSOEVER WHAT IT IS LIKE NOT TO BE ABLE TO SLEEP AT NIGHT, YOU KNOW, WHILE A 747 IS ROARING ABOVE, DIRECTLY ABOVE YOUR HOUSE AT 1:00 A.M., 2:00 A.M., 3:00 A.M., 4:00 A.M. AND THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS NO FLIGHTS BETWEEN MIDNIGHT AND 6:00 A.M. NO ONE CAN SLEEP.

MANY TIMES WE ARE AWAKE AT 2:00 OR 4:00. IT IS HARD TO GET A SOLID NIGHT'S SLEEP BECAUSE OF DEPRESSION.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings in homes associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PHP00048-4

Comment:

ALL THE PEOPLE IN FAVOR, LET THEM MOVE NEXT TO ME. OR THEY CAN HAVE MY HOUSE, AS A MATTER OF FACT.

THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD AND THE SURROUNDING AREAS CARRY THE SOLE BURDEN OF THOUSAND OF TONS OF CARGO BEING FLOWN INTO LAX AND/OR FOR THE BENEFIT OF MILLIONS AND MILLIONS OF PASSENGERS THAT GO TO LAX, ALL OF IT AT MY EXPENSE -- MIND YOU, MY EXPENSE. NOT LUFTHANSA, AMERICAN -- IT DOESN'T MATTER.

TO ALL THE PEOPLE IN INGLEWOOD, IT IS VERY, VERY, VERY UPSETTING. IT IS VERY EASY TO MAKE -- THESE BIG PLANES CAUSE SEVERE DAMAGE TO THE PEOPLE THAT LIVE IN THESE AREAS OF IMPACT BY THE FLIGHTS COMING IN.

THE RESIDENTS SAY BAD THINGS ABOUT DEVELOPING EL TORO. CERTAINLY. I AM AGAINST DEVELOPING LAX. THEY ARE AGAINST DEVELOPMENT AT EL TORO. NO ONE LISTENS TO THEM. NO ONE LISTENS TO US.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed economic impacts in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, and health and safety impacts in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Technical Reports 5 and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Reports S-3 and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand, Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic, Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life, Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County transportation demand.

PHP00048-5

Comment:

IS IT POSSIBLE BECAUSE THE PEOPLE IN THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES HERE, A LOT OF THEM ARE BLACK AND BROWN? COULD THAT HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH IT? YOU KNOW - - AND ALSO I DON'T EVEN KNOW WHO THIS PERSON IS, LYDIA KENNARD. THERE WAS AN ARTICLE SHE WROTE IN A PAPER ABOUT EXPANSION WILL MOST LIKELY OCCUR TO THE EAST OF LAX, BECAUSE SOUTH AND -- SOUTH AND NORTH ARE WELL DEVELOPED AND THE BLUE BUTTERFLY LIVES THERE.

HOW DARE THAT WOMAN PRESUME THAT I AM LESS THAN A BUTTERFLY OR THE PEOPLE THAT LIVE TO THE SOUTH ARE LESS THAN A BUTTERFLY?

YOU HAVE MY NAME AND ADDRESS. I WANT THAT WOMAN TO WRITE ME AN APOLOGY.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed potential disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations in Section 4.4.3, Environment 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.

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00049

Mego, Gordon

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHP00049-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS GORDON MICHAEL MEGO. I LIVE AT 4535 WEST 141ST STREET IN HAWTHORNE, AND I AM A NATIVE AND RESIDENT OF HAWTHORNE SINCE 1952, SO I HAVE -- I HAVE SEEN -- I SHOULD ALSO SAY I AM A MECHANICAL ENGINEER BY TRADE. I WORKED IN THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY IN THE 70'S AND 80'S, AND I HAVE SEEN THE AREA OF THE SOUTH BAY, YOU KNOW, GROW UP AROUND ME BY LEAPS AND BOUNDS OVER THE DECADES AND, YOU KNOW, A LOT IS GOOD AND OTHER IS NOT SO.

BUT, YOU KNOW, AS THE SAYING GOES: TOO MUCH OF A GOOD THING CAN BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE WELL-BEING OF WHOMEVER OR WHATEVER, WHICH BRINGS ME TO THE THOUGHTS OF THE CURRENT POPULATION IN CALIFORNIA, WHICH IS 34 MILLION, AND CALIFORNIA -- AND LOS ANGELES ENCOMPASSES A THIRD OF THAT AMOUNT.

PROJECTIONS HAVE IT THAT WE ARE LOOKING AT SOMEWHERE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD OF A 50 PERCENT INCREASE, ABOUT 16 OR 17 MILLION, OVER THE NEXT 30 YEARS. WE ARE TALKING ABOUT 50 MILLION POPULATION IN THAT COURSE OF TIME, AND THE AIRPORT EXPANSION REALLY WILL ONLY ACCELERATE THAT PROCESS, WHICH I DON'T EXACTLY FEEL COMFORTABLE WITH, AND I SHOULD SAY ALSO THAT THE CURRENT LEVEL OF 63 MILLION PEOPLE AT LAX AIRPORT AND 2001 IS ALREADY OVERTAXING THE SURROUNDING AREAS WITH HEAVY TRAFFIC, NOISE, LOUD NOISE, AIR POLLUTION, SO ON.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed population growth in Section 4.5, Induced Socio-Economic Impacts (Growth Inducement), traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHP00049-2

Comment:

AND I BELIEVE THAT WHAT REALLY NEEDS TO GET APPROACHED IN IMPROVING THE OVERALL AIRPORT IS NOT EXPANSION. RATHER I BELIEVE THAT WE SHOULD DO EVERY OTHER MEASURE TO IMPROVE THE EFFICIENCY OF THE CURRENT LEVEL OF THE AIRPORT, WHICH IS APPROXIMATELY ABOUT 63 MILLION, BALLPARK.

ANYWAY, WE NEED TO GET THE ROADWAYS CONNECTED UP TO THE AIRPORT. WE NEED TO GET THE MASS TRANSIT CONNECTED, ROLLING THROUGH THE AIRPORT, MUCH LIKE YOU SEE AT DIFFERENT AIRPORTS ACROSS THE COUNTRY.

Response:

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

PHP00049-3**Comment:**

WE NEED TO REALLY MAKE THE AIRPORT THAT EXISTS NOW WORK MUCH, MUCH BETTER, AND THAT IS WHY WE NEED TO TAKE THE LOAD, THE PROJECTED INCREASE -- WE NEED TO DIVIDE IT UP AMONGST THE OTHER REGIONS OF EITHER L.A., ORANGE COUNTY, SAN DIEGO AREAS, SO THAT THE BRUNT OF ALL THESE INCREASES DO NOT BEAR UNREASONABLY SO ON THE SURROUNDING POPULATIONS, WHICH ARE ALREADY AFFECTING US -- WELL, TOO MUCH.

Response:

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

PHP00049-4**Comment:**

THE OVERFLIGHTS ARE INCREASING, AS SOME HAVE ALREADY SPOKEN ABOUT, AND I DO NOT ENJOY IT.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00050 **Delahoussaye-
Bonds, Sandra**

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHP00050-1**Comment:**

I AM SANDRA DELAHOUSSAYE-BONDS. I RESIDE ON SECOND AVENUE, AND I AM A RETIRED INTERN CITY COUNCILWOMAN FOR THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD AS WELL AS FORMERLY ON THE CITY'S AVIATION COMMISSION.

I AM HERE TO SPEAK AGAINST THE EXPANSION. IT HAS BEEN TALKED ABOUT OVER AND OVER, AND I WAS HOPING THIS MEETING WOULD HELP. UNFORTUNATELY, IT IS NOT MEETING THE NEED OR THE TRUE SPIRIT OF WHAT THE EIR/EIS STATES IT SHOULD BE: A MEETING OF THE COMMUNITIES THAT ARE IMPACTED BY THE PROPOSED EXPANSION AND THE OFFICIALS INVOLVED IN LAX. THAT IS NOT HAPPENING, AS YOU CAN SEE FROM THE ATTENDANCE TODAY.

Response:

A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Response to Comment

3. Comments and Responses

AL00033-255 regarding availability of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for public review.

PHP00050-2

Comment:

MY HOPE IS THAT THE INCOMING MAYOR, THAT HE WILL STAND UP FOR WHAT HE HAS SAID IN HIS POLITICAL CAMPAIGNING; THAT HE WAS NOT IN FAVOR OF THE EXPANSION OF LAX. I THINK TO TEST THE TRUE METTLE OF WHAT THIS MAN IS ABOUT, MR. HAHN WILL HAVE TO STAND UP AND BE COUNTED, AND HE HAS SAID HE WAS NOT IN FAVOR OF THIS EXPANSION; REGIONAL EXPANSION IS THE WAY TO GO.

Response:

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

PHP00050-3

Comment:

AS WE HAVE HEARD FROM RESIDENT AFTER RESIDENT, WE ARE IMPACTED NEGATIVELY BY WHAT IS GOING ON RIGHT NOW AND WE WILL BE IMPACTED TO A GREATER DEGREE IF THE EXPANSION GOES THROUGH.

Response:

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

PHP00050-4

Comment:

WE ARE TALKING ABOUT AIR QUALITY. OUR CARS ARE EATEN -- THE PAINT IS EATEN OFF OUR CARS. TO SAY IT IS GOING TO BE IMPROVED -- IT CAN IMPROVE. ONE WOMAN IS TALKING ABOUT HER GARDEN. THESE ARE THE REALITIES.

Response:

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

PHP00050-5

Comment:

WE HAVE POCKETS OF OUR CITY HERE IN INGLEWOOD THAT HAVE A HIGHER CONCENTRATION OF LUNG CANCERS AND DIFFERENT TYPES OF RESPIRATORY PROBLEMS. OUR CHILDREN AS WELL.

Response:

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

PHP00050-6**Comment:**

THESE NEED TO BE ADDRESSED, AND IT IS TIME THAT MONEY TAKES A BACK SEAT. IF THE POWERS-THAT-BE DIRECT THE AIRLINES TO GO WHERE THERE IS A PLACE FOR THEM TO MAKE MONEY, THEY WILL GO. PALMDALE WILL LOOK AWFULLY GOOD IF THIS IS WHERE THE AIRPORT IS LOCATED.

Response:

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

PHP00051**Clay, Tyrone****None Provided****6/9/2001****PHP00051-1****Comment:**

I LOVE MY NEIGHBORHOOD. I HATE THE NOISE. THE NOISE IS IN THE MORNING, IN THE EVENING AND IN THE AFTERNOON AND AT NIGHT. WHEN I ARISE IN THE MORNING AT 3:30, THE AIRPLANES ARE STILL FLYING, OR THEY WILL WAKE ME OUT OF A SLEEP.

I AM A BUS OPERATOR. IF I DON'T HAVE ENOUGH SLEEP, I MIGHT RUN OVER SOMEBODY.

THERE ARE A LOT OF PEOPLE HERE IN INGLEWOOD WHO WORK AT NIGHT OR WORK IN THE MORNING THAT DON'T GET ENOUGH SLEEP. THAT IS A PROBLEM. I AM TIRED OF THE NOISE.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings in homes associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PHP00052**Schneider, Denny****LAX Community Noise
Roundtable****6/9/2001****PHP00052-1****Comment:**

GOOD AFTERNOON. I AM DENNY SCHNEIDER. I LIVE AT 7929 BREEN IN WESTCHESTER.

I HAVE HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK FREQUENTLY ABOUT THE AIRPORT BECAUSE I AM ON THE LAX ROUND TABLE, COMMUNITY ROUND TABLE.

I WILL GIVE YOU A SUMMARY BECAUSE WE WILL BE PROVIDING SOME VERY DETAILED COMMENTS. BUT THE REAL ISSUE IS TWOFOLD. ONE IS THE LOCAL RESIDENTS ARE GETTING INUNDATED AND THE SECOND HAS TO DO WITH MORE OF THE LARGER REGIONAL IMPACTS.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PHP00052-2

Comment:

THE EIR ITSELF IS BASED ON A 1996 BASELINE, AND A LOT OF THINGS HAVE CHANGED SINCE THEN. TRAFFIC IS HORRENDOUS SINCE THEN. THE ASSUMPTION THAT PEOPLE WILL DRIVE ONLY ONE HOUR TO THE AIRPORT, OF COURSE, THAT IS LIKE FROM MY HOUSE IN WESTCHESTER.

Response:

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

PHP00052-3

Comment:

BUT, SERIOUSLY, EVEN WITHOUT THE EXPANSION, WE ARE GOING TO HAVE SO MANY CARS ON THE SAN DIEGO FREEWAY IT IS GOING TO CONSTANTLY COME TO A DEAD STOP AT MANCHESTER, BETWEEN MANCHESTER AND LA TIJERA, AND THE ENORMOUS AMOUNT OF TRAFFIC IS A MAJOR ISSUE.

Response:

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

PHP00052-4

Comment:

I WOULD ENCOURAGE MORE PARTICIPATION -- OBVIOUSLY, I AM PREACHING TO THE CHOIR HERE -- TO ATTEND, FOR INSTANCE, THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MEETING ON JULY -- ON JUNE 16TH, I BELIEVE, AT LENNOX. ALL OF THIS WILL BE AVAILABLE AT OUR WEBSITE. BUT WE NEED TO MAKE PEOPLE AWARE.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00052-5

Comment:

THE LAST AND MOST IMPORTANT COMMENT I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE HAS TO DO WITH MODERNIZATION VERSUS EXPANSION. RIGHT NOW THE SITUATION IS THAT THE FAA AND DEREGULATION DEFINES FOR US HOW MANY PLANES CAN COME TO LAX. THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO DIFFERENCE. EVEN THOUGH A LOT OF THE MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES MAKE SENSE, THERE IS A TREMENDOUS OUTGROWTH OF THE COMMUNITY AGAINST THEM BECAUSE IT, IN FACT, TRANSLATES TO EXPANSION.

SO UNTIL WE CAN HOLD THE LINE WITH WHAT WE HAVE, WE ARE GOING TO KEEP FACING THE SAME THING.

Response:

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

PHP00052-6

Comment:

OF COURSE, EVERYBODY HAS TALKED ABOUT THE EIR AND ALL OF THE DEFICIENCIES, BUT THE REAL PROBLEM IS NOT THE EIR, BUT IT IS HOW ALL OF THESE IMPROVEMENTS AND/OR EXPANSIONS ARE AFFECTING THE PEOPLE OF THE WHOLE AREA.

Response:

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

PHP00053

Smith, Joyce

None Provided

6/9/2001

PHP00053-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS JOYCE SMITH. I AM A 30-YEAR RESIDENT OF THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD. I AM ALSO ON THE AVIATION COMMISSION FOR THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD.

I WAS VERY, VERY CONCERNED WHEN I FIRST HEARD ABOUT THE LAX EXPANSION A FEW YEARS AGO. I LOVE THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD, BUT THE AIRPORT IS WHAT REALLY SPOILS IT.

WHEN I FIRST MOVED HERE THE -- THERE WERE SOMETHING LIKE 40 MILLION ANNUAL PASSENGERS, WHICH OF COURSE IS CLIMBING, CLIMBING, CLIMBING, AND IS EXPECTED TO REACH MUCH HIGHER.

I DID LOOK AT THE EIR/EIS REPORT IN THE LIBRARY, AND I DID NOTICE THAT IT SAID IN THERE THAT EVEN WITH THE NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES THE NOISE WILL STILL BE SIGNIFICANT AND DATA WAS UNAVAILABLE. HOWEVER, I SEE NOTHING THAT INDICATES THAT LAX PLANS TO NOT EXPAND THE AIRPORT.

Response:

LAWA has four build alternatives under consideration. Three of the build alternatives would allow for increased capacity at LAX. One alternative, Alternative D, would serve a level of future (2015) airport activity that could be accommodated even if none of the build alternatives is undertaken, i.e., the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHP00053-2

Comment:

I REMEMBER YEARS AGO MY FATHER TOLD ME THAT SOME PLANNERS BUILT A BRIDGE IN LOUISIANA, AND BY THE TIME IT WAS BUILT, IT WAS OUT OF DATE BECAUSE THE PLANNERS HAD NO FORESIGHT INTO THE FUTURE NEEDS.

OTHER CITIES HAVE HAD THIS PROBLEM. IN DENVER THEY HAD -- THEY BUILT UP A GREAT BIG BEAUTIFUL STATE-OF-THE-ART AIRPORT OUTSIDE OF THE CITY OF DENVER.

IN DALLAS THERE IS A GREAT BIG BEAUTIFUL AIRPORT OUTSIDE OF THE CITY OF DALLAS. THERE IS A SMALLER AIRPORT THAT IS NO LONGER USED BECAUSE OF THEIR NEEDS.

AND ALSO THE AIRPORT OF CHICAGO IS OUTSIDE THE CITY OF CHICAGO.

3. Comments and Responses

I DON'T KNOW WHY YOU WANT TO KEEP JAMMING MORE PLANES INTO THIS SMALL SPACE. TO ME IF YOU REALLY WANT TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM OF EXPANSION, BUILD A BIG BEAUTIFUL STATE-OF-THE-ART AIRPORT OUTSIDE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES.

Response:

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

PHP00053-3

Comment:

THERE ARE MANY ALTERNATIVES, AND I DON'T UNDERSTAND -- PEOPLE COME UP HERE, MANY SAYING: DON'T DO THIS TO US. I CAN'T SLEEP. THERE IS NOISE POLLUTION.

I LOVE MY YARD. I DO. THE PLANES HAVE RUINED MY YARD, THE ENJOYMENT OF MY YARD, WITH MY GRANDCHILDREN.

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-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PHP00053-4

Comment:

WHY DO YOU KEEP ON PLANNING THIS? TO ME IT IS AN ARROGANCE I DO NOT UNDERSTAND.

PLEASE DO SOME INTELLIGENT PLANNING AND REALLY PLAN FOR THE FUTURE NEEDS OF L.A. BY BUILDING AN AIRPORT OUTSIDE OF THE CITY.

Response:

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

PHP00054	Crowder, Tessie	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	------------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHP00054-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS TESSIE CROWDER. I LIVE AT 9622 SEVENTH AVENUE. I OPPOSE A, B AND C OF THE EXPANSION PLAN. I BELIEVE THE PLANES SHOULD BE CONVERTED TO ONE OF THE OTHER AREAS, ORANGE COUNTY OR PALMDALE.

Response:

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

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

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PHP00054-2

Comment:

PREFERABLY ORANGE COUNTY AT EL TORO BECAUSE THEIR RUNWAYS ARE ALL RIGHT AND THAT WOULD CUT DOWN ON THE EXPANSE OF THE EXPANSION AND CUT THE POLLUTION, AS 20 PERCENT OF THE CARGO THAT COMES INTO LAX GOES ON TO ORANGE COUNTY. THEY COULD JUST DROP IT OFF THERE, AND THAT WOULD -- SINCE THE ASIAN COMMUNITY IS WORRIED ABOUT THE INCOMING IMPORTS, IF ORANGE COUNTY TOOK THEIR SHARE, THEN WE WOULD HAVE MORE COMING FROM THE ASIAN COMMUNITIES.

Response:

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

PHP00055	Smith, Opal	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	--------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHP00055-1

Comment:

OPAL SMITH. I AM THE BLOCK CLUB CAPTAIN FOR THE PENNEY AVENUE, CASIMIR AND CULLIVAN BLOCK CLUB IN INGLEWOOD, AND I'M SORRY I AM LATE, BUT I JUST CAME FROM SAN DIEGO FROM MY GRANDSON'S GRADUATION.

NOW I AM VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE L.A. EXPANSION AND NOT BEING ABLE TO PROGRESS BECAUSE OF THE FACT THAT I HAVE BEEN IN INGLEWOOD FOR 30 -- OCTOBER IT WILL BE 32 YEARS. AND WITH THE INCREASE OF THE CARGO PLANES, I CAN READ THE FINE PRINT NUMBERS ON THE TAIL END AS THEY GO OVER MY BEDROOM WINDOW AND THEN WHEN THEY GO OVER THE -- OVER MY BACK YARD.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00055-2

Comment:

WHEN THERE IS A WIND SHIFT, THEY TAKE OFF FROM THE WEST, HEADED SOUTH. AT MIDNIGHT I AM AWAKE THE REST OF THE MORNING UNTIL AT LEAST 5:00 OR 8:00 IN THE MORNING.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings in homes associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

3. Comments and Responses

PHP00055-3

Comment:

I AM ACCUSTOMED TO PUTTING THE CLOTHES ON THE LINE TO DRY THEM, ESPECIALLY MY WHITE CLOTHES, SHEETS AND THINGS LIKE THIS. WHEN I BRING THEM IN, I CAN SHAKE THE SOOT FROM THEM FROM THE AIRLINES -- FROM THE AIRPLANES. THIS IS FROM THE SMOKE OR WHATEVER YOU CALL IT OR THE EXHAUST WHEN THEY CUT THEIR MOTOR OFF AND THEN THEY PUT THE LANDING GEAR DOWN.

THE WHEELS ARE DOWN WHEN THEY COME OVER MY YARD. THEY ARE ALREADY DOWN, AND IT IS UNCOMFORTABLE.

AND WHEN I GO OUT TO TALK TO MY ROSES OR MY PLANTS IN THE MORNING, I JUST GO OUT WITH WET PAPER TOWELS TO WIPE THE SOOT FROM THE LEAVES, AND YOU SHOULD SEE IT. YOU SHOULD REALLY SEE IT.

Response:

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

PHP00055-4

Comment:

AND I HAVE HAD A VERY SERIOUS ALLERGY PROBLEM FROM THIS KIND OF INHALING ALL OF THIS FROM THE AIR, FROM THESE AIRPLANES. MY DOCTOR TOLD ME TWO WEEKS AGO, HE SAID: PERHAPS YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE TO MOVE OUT OF INGLEWOOD. AND I SAID: I WOULDN'T WANT TO.

Response:

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

PHP00055-5

Comment:

AND I SAID: I AM JUST HOPING THAT SOMETHING WILL BE DONE IN THE NEAR FUTURE; IT WILL BE MOVING TO LANCASTER OR WHEREVER, SIMI VALLEY OR WHEREVER, EVEN AROUND NEAR EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE, ANY PLACE TO GET THEM OUT OF THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD AND THE NEARBY -- WHERE THEY ARE PRESENTLY, THE LAX PASSENGER FLIGHTS.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

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

PHP00055-6

Comment:

I THANK YOU, AND I HOPE SOMETHING WILL BE DONE SOON. THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHP00056	Phillips Thompson, Betty	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHP00056-1

Comment:

MY NAME IS BETTY PHILLIPS THOMPSON. MY MAILING ADDRESS IS POST OFFICE BOX 90372, LOS ANGELES, 90009. MY ADDRESS, IF YOU WANT IT, I CAN GIVE THAT ALSO. IT IS 9809 SIXTH AVENUE IN INGLEWOOD. AND AS I STATED BEFORE, I HAVE BEEN AN INGLEWOOD RESIDENT FOR OVER 25 YEARS, AND I WAS A LITTLE NERVOUS WHEN I WAS UP HERE BEFORE SO I WANT TO ADD SOMETHING TO A COMMENT I SAID, WHICH I HAVE HEARD A LOT OF THE THINGS THAT WAS GOING ON, LIKE MONEYS ARE AVAILABLE FOR INSULATION IN CONNECTION WITH THE EXPANSION OF LAX AND ALL OF THAT.

INGLEWOOD RESIDENTS SHOULDN'T HAVE TO FIGHT OR FILL OUT FORMS AND THINGS IN ORDER TO GET THE MONEY. THEY SHOULD TAKE ONE NEIGHBORHOOD AT A TIME AND INSULATE IT REGARDLESS WHAT THEIR DECISION FOR LAX IS. SO WE SHOULDN'T HAVE TO FIGHT ABOUT IT AND THINGS RIGHT AT THE MOMENT WE REPLACE THEM DUE TO THE AIRPLANES FLYING OVER AND THINGS LIKE THAT. I FEEL LIKE WE SHOULDN'T HAVE TO FILL OUT FORMS AND THINGS TO GET THE MONEY.

THEY JUST SHOULD TAKE ONE NEIGHBORHOOD AT A TIME AND INSULATE ALL THE HOMES THAT ARE AFFECTED IN THE AREA OF THE NOISE.

Response:

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

PHP00057	Koza, Nick	None Provided	6/9/2001
-----------------	-------------------	----------------------	-----------------

PHP00057-1

Comment:

I AM NICK KOZA, AND I AM A REPRESENTATIVE OF LENNOX, A SCHOOLTEACHER.

I LIVE ON THE BIKE PATH -- CAN YOU HEAR ME? I LIVE ON THE BIKE PATH. I AM HERE TO MAKE SEVERAL POINTS.

FIRST OF ALL, I FEEL THAT YOU HAVE NOT PROPERLY MADE AVAILABLE TO ALL CITIZENS OF THE LAX REGION, PRIMARILY LENNOX, WHICH IS PRIMARILY HISPANIC -- I DON'T SPEAK SPANISH, BUT I KNOW MY FELLOW NEIGHBORS DO, AND MOST OF THE TIME THERE IS A LANGUAGE -- I DOUBT MANY OF THEM READ ENGLISH. A SMALL SON OR DAUGHTER PROBABLY WOULD NOT READ THE BILINGUAL IMPACT REPORT, THAT IS WRITTEN IN

3. Comments and Responses

ENGLISH AND NOT SPANISH, WHICH MEANS EQUAL ACCESS IS BEING DENIED TO PEOPLE WHO ARE TRULY AFFECTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES AND CONCERNS THAT YOU TRY TO ADDRESS.

Response:

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

PHP00057-2

Comment:

SECONDLY, THE WEBSITE YOU HAD POSTED, IT WAS ALMOST -- IT WAS ALMOST LIKE IT WAS WRITTEN BY A CAR SALESMAN VERSUS AN ENVIRONMENTALIST, LIKE YOU ARE TRYING TO SELL A REALLY GOOD DEAL TO THE COMMUNITY BUT ALSO VERY CONCERNED THAT BASICALLY IT IS A WHITEWASH AND HASN'T BEEN THOROUGHLY INVESTIGATED.

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.

PHP00057-3

Comment:

SO MANY PEOPLE POINTED OUT TODAY THAT THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY IS ALREADY OBSOLETE, ANTIQUATED AND NEEDS TO BE REINVESTIGATED, NOT JUST FOR MY COMMUNITY, BUT YOUR SAKE AS WELL.

I WOULD HATE TO SEE A WHOLE GENERATION OF PEOPLE GROWING UP WITH RESPIRATORY ILLNESS, LUNG CANCER, DISABILITIES AND OTHER SORTS OF HEALTH RELATED ISSUES, AND I HATE TO SEE THESE PEOPLE RUNNING AROUND THE COMMUNITY NOT ABLE TO FULLY PARTICIPATE BECAUSE YOU FAIL TO DO A FAIR, ADEQUATE AND UNBIASED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY.

YOU REALLY NEED TO READDRESS -- READDRESS THE ISSUE, GO BACK AND MAYBE REWRITE THE ENTIRE THING. MAYBE TAKE -- IF IT TAKES A FEW MORE YEARS, THAT IS FINE BY ME. IT IS A SMALL PRICE TO PAY TO PROTECT OUR CHILDREN, OUR ELDERLY FOLKS, WHO ARE PROBABLY MORE PRONE AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO THESE TYPES OF UNNECESSARY EXPOSURES, WHETHER IT IS THROUGH THE AIR, NOISE, GROUND POLLUTION.

EXCUSE ME. IT HAS BEEN A LONG DAY.

YOU NEED TO REINVESTIGATE THIS ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT. THANK YOU.

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.

Subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. This new option - Alternative D-Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive analysis of Alternative D and was circulated for public review and comment. Although the conclusion of the Draft EIS/EIR is that Alternative C would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region, that conclusion has been superseded by that of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D is now considered to be the Environmental Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region. Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-1 regarding baseline issues, and Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for more information regarding environmental impacts.

PHP00057-4

Comment:

IT HAS BEEN A LONG DAY. I THINK WE GET THE POINT. I AM DEFINITE: MAKE IT IN SPANISH. I THINK A LARGE PART OF OUR CONSTITUENTS OR OUR PEOPLE HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO READ THIS OR BE EXPOSED TO INFORMATION WHERE THEY ARE TRYING TO ENDORSE THEIR IDEAS OR HAVE A CHANCE TO SPEAK OUT AGAINST IT.

Response:

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. 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.

PHMP00001 Hahn, James

City of Los Angeles

10/30/2001

PHMP00001-1

Comment:

Thank you, Mr. Kessler, Mr. Ritchie, as Mayor of the City of Los Angeles I'm appearing before you this evening to reaffirm my request that you fully develop a fifth alternative to the LAX Master Plan that focuses on increased safety and security at LAX.

As you know, I've historically supported a regional approach to accommodating growth in aviation demand. In order for a regional plan to work, other airports in the region must also take their fair share of air traffic. However, the tragic events of September 11th have shown us our nation's aviation system continues to be a vulnerable target. Those events have caused me to focus my attention first and foremost on, the issue of security to see if we can change it to make LAX as safe as we can.

As the third busiest airport in the country, LAX is a unique and vital asset for the Southern California region. More than 400,000 regional jobs have been associated with the airport. LAX has generated \$60 billion dollars of economic activity annually. However, since the tragedy of September 11th we have seen hundreds of Angelenos finding themselves out of work or in real danger of losing their jobs. Although I'm sure everyone had some sense of LAX's value to our region, the events of mid-September made clear that its contribution to our livelihoods can never be disputed.

In the aftermath of those terrorist attacks and after conferring with federal authorities, we took some immediate steps to protect the safety of passengers and employees at LAX. We made the difficult decision to keep the Central Terminal area, parking structures closed. That resulted in the loss of jobs. We now, thankfully, have been able to reopen that after conferring with federal authorities.

As airport employees return to their jobs, I think we need to continue to protect LAX. That's why I announced a new alternative a few weeks ago that I would like the commission to focus on, that would create a safe and secure terminal as well as a safer airfield that would accommodate no more than 78 million annual passengers. I would like to tell you what I would like to do.

3. Comments and Responses

First, make our terminals as safe and secure as we can possibly make them. My vision is to move traffic -- ticketing and baggage check in to a location away from existing terminals. This would allow people to park, check their bags, get tickets, check-in in security checkpoints far away from the terminal areas. Once they were checked, they would be taken securely to the terminals and gates themselves. Second, I think the concerns of airport communities need to be addressed. I would oppose continuing the idea of a ring road. I don't think we need that anymore and, that, also, I think will help the surrounding communities.

Third, I think the airfield itself needs to be reconfigured to increase safety. Airfield safety problems that existed before September 11th continue to plague us. I would like to reduce so-called "runway incursions" and create safer alternatives on the airfield.

I'm hopeful that this new alternative to the Master Plan would not move any runways closer to the communities surrounding the airport so we can address issues of noise surrounding our airport. We need to restore confidence in our nation's air transportation system, restore confidence at LAX. And I think we need to make Los Angeles, again, a destination of choice for travelers.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC03568-1 for a response to Mayor Hahn's remarks.

PHMP00002 Parks, Bernard

City of Los Angeles

10/30/2001

PHMP00002-1

Comment:

Good evening. I really appreciate Mr. Kessler and Mr. Ritchie the opportunity to come and speak to you on this important issue. As you probably already know, the Los Angeles Police Department has had a long-term history of working with the LAX and its police department in developing strategy and plans that relate in dealing with security in and around the airport. Since September 11th those relationships have been renewed and strengthened as we look forward to developing continuous evaluations of the current and future safety plans. The fact that just 11 days ago that the Central Terminal was opened is an indication of a consideration that the planning and new security measures are in place that gave confidence in order to allow that Central Terminal to reopen to the public.

We also know that in dealing with safety and security in the airport, it's everyone's responsibility, including those who come there to travel. They have to be as vigilant as those who are being paid to perform that security service. We also rely on the different layers of responsibility. The FAA certainly has a responsibility of the overall operation of the airfield. But we have other law enforcement agencies dealing with DEA or the immigration or U.S. Customs. We also have the U.S. Marshal involved in a variety of functions and including, again, LAX and L.A. Police Department.

Between the LAPD and LAX Police Department, we have a very specific responsibility for safety in and around the terminal and for those who are approaching the terminal in the area and the facility in and around the exterior of the terminal. We also know that with the current L.A. World Airport, they are currently going through a process of completely re-evaluating the current safety measures at which this LAPD has been a partner in.

Mayor Hahn has given some very specific direction as it relates to looking at this fifth alternative. And we believe that you cannot have an operating airport without the security and the comfort that the passengers will feel along with the convenience that they believe they are also responsible for. We believe that in looking at the plan, we've offered some suggestions, some of which dealt with the exterior in the areas of surveillance around the 12-square-mile plant, but we believe that security, like many other things, should be an evolving process, things we've learned from other cities, issues that we've learned from other countries, should constantly be placed into security and the safety net so we can come up with the most secure airport in this region and in this country.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00003 Gordon, Mike

City of El Segundo

10/30/2001

PHMP00003-1

Comment:

Thank you very much, Mr. Ritchie, Mr. Kessler. Let me begin by saying, those of us who for the last four and a half years have fought against Mayor Riordan's Master Plan want to applaud Mayor James Hahn for his commitment to limit growth to 78 million passengers, eliminating the ring road, a new west terminal and new cargo facilities. We believe all of these steps are in the right direction.

We support, again, and applaud Mayor Hahn in his efforts to make this airport more secure and safe, and we look forward to being his partner as we go forward.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00003-2

Comment:

And looking at the issues of security, we think it's critical to understand increasing aviation demand at LAX is not going to make this airport more secure. It is only going to make this airport more inviting for terrorists.

Response:

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

PHMP00003-3

Comment:

In addressing issues of safety, it doesn't make sense when this airport already leads the nation in runway incursions to continue to allow airplanes to cross as taxiways. Instead, we need to bring into this system the end around taxiway system that will take planes out of the way and out of the sight of those crossing that airfield.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments AL00037-16 regarding the end-around taxiway, and PC00543-1 regarding aviation safety.

PHMP00003-4

Comment:

Let's address the specific concerns we have with what now is being discussed by Mayor Hahn. First and foremost, we need a commitment. The communities around L.A., cities of Southern California, the 78 million passengers is a real figure, a figure that we will live with, a figure we will not go past and we will have 78 million as our absolute cap. Unfortunately, the new plan that is being discussed thus far is short on specifics. So, therefore, it's difficult for us to comment on the specifics of the fifth plan. However, the extension of the runway on the northern side is about expansion. It is not about making this airport more secure. Additional steps with respect to runways and gates and increasing capacity at those runways and gates for larger planes is about expansion. It is not about making this airport more safe or more secure.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC03569-5.

3. Comments and Responses

PHMP00003-5

Comment:

Rest assured, the 100 cities who are part of our coalition will continue to fight the expansion at every step of the way, and we will not fall for safety and security being the ruse to bring about airport expansion.

Response:

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

PHMP00003-6

Comment:

Now, we are in communities today that are under this flight path and have grave concerns. Over 80 percent of the folks that are under the flight path of LAX come from minority communities. Many of these folks are coming from low income communities. The environmental justice issues continue to be as strong today as they have been for the last four and a half years.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00003-7

Comment:

We can build a regional system, one that is fair, one that is safe and one that is secure for all of Southern California. We have 12 airports in this region that need to handle this demand. And we need to spread this demand in a way that is fair so that those people under this flight path, many, again, coming from minority and low-income communities are not negatively impacted.

Response:

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

PHMP00003-8

Comment:

We want to thank Mayor Hahn for his leadership on this issue. We want to say to the City of Los Angeles that we are ready and prepared to be your partner as you go forward in this endeavor. But the most important piece of this we want you to understand is that the public -- we, the public expect and deserve the opportunity to review the details of this new plan once it is completed and to have the opportunity to comment in its entirety on the environmental impact review. We look forward to testifying on the new plan and we look forward to testifying when the new EIR is completed.

Response:

Thank you for your attendance and comment. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public participation process.

PHMP00004 Wilson, Bernard

**Los Angeles International
Airport**

10/30/2001

PHMP00004-1

Comment:

Thank you. I'm Bernard Wilson. I'm the Chief of Airport Police, Los Angeles International Airport. I've been in law enforcement for 26 years, 22 of those years with LAX. I've also been a member of the aviation community since I was 16 years old and a licensed pilot since I was 17. I'm not here to endorse any particular option of the LAX Master Plan. I'm just here to talk about -- give an update of major security issues at LAX and talk about some concerns of the future.

I'm sure you're aware of the stepped-up security measures that have been implemented since September 11th. I'll go through them very briefly. There is an increased scrutiny of carry-on baggage. The ban on curbside check in continues to apply to private vehicles, although, buses, shuttles, limos and taxis may unload passengers curbside. After a period of closure, we have reopened all but one of the parking structures inside the Central Terminal area while keeping the open-air parking lots and one other parking structure closed. Private vehicles may only enter LAX from Century and Sepulveda Boulevards. Commercial vehicles must use the 96th Street entrance where there is a security checkpoint. Random vehicle searches may be conducted. LAPD police canine patrols capable of detecting explosives are deployed at LAX with additional canine units for -- now under review by Airport Police.

California National Guard troops are monitoring baggage check in and have been requested to be used for patrol and other duties at LAX. There is an increase in the presence of LAPD officers beyond our normal complement in and around the airport. These steps and others have been taken to make LAX safe and secure for its passengers, employees and visitors. The leadership at Los Angeles World Airports is determined to do its part to make this airport the safest in America so passengers will again feel comfortable flying again. But we fully expect new federal regulations relating to safety and security to be issued in the coming weeks and months, and much more needs to be done looking to the long term.

We expect in the coming months to be working even more closely with Federal agencies including U.S. Customs, Immigration and Naturalization, U.S. Marshal Service and the FBI regarding possible new security procedures.

Chief Parks has raised the issue of better technological surveillance of the perimeter of LAX. We are engaged in daily dialogue with LAPD about security measures at our airport.

Mayor Hahn has asked LAWA to review all the parking structures in Central Terminal in the long-term and new terminal built east of the current facility that would serve as the check point for all passengers and luggage. The Airport Police stands ready to work with all the agencies to make LAX the safest airport in America.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHMP00005 Stanford, Dick

City of Azusa

10/30/2001

PHMP00005-1

Comment:

Thank you. My name is Dick Stanford. I'm a member of the Azusa City Council. My address is 1023 Lakeview Terrace, Azusa. Hearing Officers, thank you for the opportunity to testify tonight. I'm a member of the Southern California Association of Governments', Regional Council and Transportation Committee. But my testimony this evening is solely from my position as Azusa city councilmember.

Azusa is one of some 100 cities and other entities that respectfully request the City of Los Angeles to terminate plans for LAX expansion and concentrate instead on developing a truly regional airport system.

I hope I speak with some credibility. I helped build D/FW. I coordinated friends of Mueller Airport in Austin, Texas. I was on City of Ontario's Blue Ribbon Airport Committee, and I am a former Marine Corps fighter pilot.

In 1998 my friend Don Ameche, now deceased, starred in a movie called "Things Changed." In the movie his life was changed during the movie. Well, since we have last met things have changed considerably. Mayor Hahn, whom I believe is no friend of LAX expansion, has replaced Mayor Riordan who champions LAX expansion. The events of September 11, by extension, ended our trust in major airport hubs. We're now well aware that grouping our air transportation assets makes it easier for terrorists to impact them than if our air transportation assets are spread over a regional system.

Quite simply, if you put your eggs all in one basket and drop that basket, you are really out of luck. The local example is overpowering. LAX is still trying to deal with security issues. Yet ONT almost overnight implemented its hard and soft security systems and is now working well. That is one of the results that almost all of Southern California air travelers would be enjoying today had regionalization been enacted sometime ago.

Response:

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

PHMP00005-2

Comment:

It was specifically because of the exclusion of the alternative of regionalization that the original Draft EIR/EIS for the LAX expansion was inadequate. All alternatives are to be considered and considered seriously in an EIR. Regionalization was not.

Response:

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

PHMP00005-3

Comment:

Now, as terribly disappointing that even though LAX expansion has been pronounced DOA, there are still projects that are part and parcel of expansion that keep popping up. Hydra is alive and well right

here in Los Angeles. You cut off the LAX-expansion head only to turn around and find another head that is Sepulveda widening, or another head that is changing rules to reinstate the Arbor Vitae intersection.

We respectfully ask Mayor Hahn to indicate to his many staffs that no LAX expansion means no LAX expansion.

Response:

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

PHMP00005-4

Comment:

Remember, the Ontario Airport serves a population mass that would make that airport much more profitable for many more airlines that presently operate there. Many more passengers would spend considerably less time on the freeway and concurrently less time fouling the air if their ground travel was to ONT instead of LAX.

Response:

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

PHMP00005-5

Comment:

But the beautiful terminal there tends to be a ghost town because the flights are not there because of preferable and convenient scheduling of LAX and because relative fare pricing deliberately forces passengers to use LAX.

Response:

Actually, the average fare for domestic flights from LAX is higher than for Burbank, Long Beach, Ontario, and Orange County. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale that discusses multi-airport markets, airline economics and passenger choice. Since passage of the federal Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, the airlines make the decision about which airports they will serve. As a general rule, airlines will choose to serve the airports near the highest concentrations of conveniently located customers. Within this general framework, however, airlines must make strategic decisions about air service to maximize their investments and gain competitive advantages. For instance, in regions with multiple airports, airlines tend to concentrate their air service at a single, well-located primary airport for reasons of economic efficiency. Concentrating service at a dominant airport also facilitates connecting service, which can significantly increase an airline's market and allow even greater frequencies to more destinations. International service in particular relies on the availability of domestic connecting flights to a wide range of destinations. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning for discussions of airline deregulation and airport regulation.

PHMP00006 Lau, Dick

City of Monterey Park

10/30/2001

PHMP00006-1

Comment:

Thank you for the opportunity to speak in front of you. My major concern is, number one, the proposal on the Master Plan of a piece to be focused mainly on the areas within the four-mile radius from the LAX. So the -- and the environmental impacts on the San Gabriel Valley areas has not been addressed.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The study area considered for each of the 27 environmental disciplines presented in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR varied depending on the nature of the relevant issues and the potential for significant impacts to occur within a defined area. Section 4.4.4 focused primarily on the area west of the San Diego Freeway because that area is most likely to be significantly affected by alteration of surface transportation patterns, changes in land use, or from other related activities or development. Such impacts would not be significant in more distant areas. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR evaluated other potential impacts, such as traffic (Section 4.3.2), noise (Section 4.1), air quality (Section 4.6), human health and safety (Section 4.24), and more, that more relevant to areas in close proximity to LAX and areas that are more distant.

PHMP00006-2

Comment:

Number two, the transportation issue for the San Gabriel Valley cities also has not been, you know, covered. For instance, the plan appears to be addressing the, you know, Freeway 405. And I believe it's critical to also include freeways number 10 and number 60 in the study.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PHMP00006-3

Comment:

Number three, I think the noise levels caused by the airplanes, especially for cities like Monterey Park and Montebello, has not been adequately addressed.

Response:

The commentor is affected by the base leg (perpendicular) segment of the westerly approaches to the airport. This approach is used by all traffic arriving from west coast, Pacific and European origins. Under heavy traffic conditions, the base leg moves eastward over Monterey Park and Montebello to better increase the separations between arriving aircraft and to safely sequence them into the arrival flows coming directly from the east. This eastward extension of the base leg approach results in the conditions described by the commentor. Air Traffic Control management has evaluated modifications of the approaches to the north and south runway complexes to increase aircraft altitude over Monterey Park, resulting in noise level decreases of several decibels. It is not likely that the procedures can be changed to remove the traffic entirely from over the area. Any modifications to the base leg approach to reduce the impacts of flights over communities under them beyond the 65 CNEL contour will be undertaken independent of the Draft EIS/EIR process. For further information on the effect of these approaches, also see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.5 regarding the effects of elevation on noise contours.

PHMP00006-4

Comment:

Finally, I think in view of the 9/11 incidence, it's critical to include these new security measures for the airport to ensure LAX is a safer and more secure airport for all of us.

Response:

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

PHMP00007 Alonso, Francisco City of Monterey Park 10/30/2001

PHMP00007-1

Comment:

Good evening. I'm Francisco Alonso, the mayor of Monterey Park. We are all here in Monterey Park this evening at the Luminarias. The city of Monterey park has had the misfortune to be in the pathway of the approaching airplanes when weather conditions exist and the citizens have been tormented for many, many years with unacceptable noise levels. The planes come in and approach at a 2,500-foot altitude from the sea level, but our city, of course, has an altitude of some of the hills being up to 700 feet high. So, obviously, they have a greater impact. The residents are horrified at the idea that the volume of flights over their city would be increased.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments AL00051-3 and AL00051-4.

PHMP00007-2

Comment:

Consequently, we on the city council unanimously recommend that the burden of any increased air traffic be shared on a regional basis.

Response:

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

PHMP00008 Jeffers, Chris City of Monterey Park 10/30/2001

PHMP00008-1

Comment:

As stated, my name is Chris Jeffers from the City of Monterey Park. First of all, we welcome you to our humble city. We hope you enjoy the time with us.

A couple of issues we would like to draw to the attention of the Board is traffic, as stated in the EIR, cargo traffic is expected to increase four fold from 1.9 million tons to 4.2 million tons. Again, we feel that due to a lack of regionalization study, this will have a greater impact on the San Gabriel Valley, particularly Monterey Park, as it borders both the 60 Freeway and the 10 Freeway as to traffic congestion. And the document itself, again, fails to analyze, as stated earlier, the impacts of that cargo impact on those freeways and what it will do to the San Gabriel Valley, in general.

Response:

This comment is concerned about the broader regional impacts of increased truck traffic associated with higher cargo levels at LAX. The comment especially is concerned with impacts in the San Gabriel Valley and Monterey Park. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding cargo truck traffic. Also, please see Response to Comment AL00051-51 regarding regional truck impacts.

PHMP00008-2

Comment:

In addition, as just stated by the mayor of the city, emphasizing the average height of the airplanes reaching over our highest points of our area in our city means that a 747 is flying about 1,600 feet

3. Comments and Responses

above ground. It's not MSL. Again, they are at 2,500 MSL minimum, but due to our topography, it means they are only 1,600 feet above.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00051-4.

PHMP00008-3

Comment:

And the residents have no quality of life when it comes to nighttime or weekend activities as those airplanes are going through.

Response:

The City of Monterey Park is outside areas exposed to significant noise levels (defined as 65 CNEL or greater) as was shown on Figure 4.2-5 of the Draft EIS/EIR. The City of Monterey Park is also outside the 65 CNEL contours for Year 2000 and single event noise contours of 94 dBA SEL as was presented in Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Therefore, no significant noise impact from aircraft noise have been identified for the City of Monterey Park. Please see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.5 regarding the effect of elevation on noise contours. Also please refer to Response to Comment AL00051-3, regarding the effect of aircraft operations on Monterey Park.

PHMP00008-4

Comment:

In addition, we have questions as to how the airport would actually cap passenger traffic at either the 95 million level or the 78 million that the mayor of Los Angeles is asking for. As already stated, the current and past EIR envisioned 40 million. Current numbers reflect that 67 million people are using LAX. Clearly there's no attempt to stop or cap or limit the activity and, thereby, not trying to be a regional partner in all this.

Response:

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

PHMP00008-5

Comment:

Again, the document fully does not consider the regionalization of other airports, Ontario, Palmdale, El Toro, John Wayne, and so forth, that need to be put into this because those would dramatically affect the consideration and the numbers analyzed in this. And we would encourage the airport to go back and FAA to go back and scrap the document that is now before you, start anew, encourage and include the mayor of L.A.'s document and request you to start from the beginning as we go through this.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The environmental impacts specific to Alternative D are fully addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR dealt only with the development of LAX. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. The recommendation that the FAA conduct a comprehensive analysis of various regional scenarios is beyond the scope of the subject EIS/EIR.

PHMP00009 Harrington, Lee

**Los Angeles County Economic
Development Corporation**

10/30/2001

PHMP00009-1

Comment:

Good evening, and thank you. I'm here tonight on behalf of the Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation. The LAEDC has had for some time an airport task force of business people with years of experience in the airport industry taking a look at the solutions for the region. I think I can agree with a lot of things said here tonight. I want to make sure we test some of them a little more carefully.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00009-2

Comment:

First we need the regional plan. There's no question about it. The air traffic that we expect for the future cannot be handled at one airport. It needs to be distributed around Southern California. We need the Ontarios. We need the El Toros. We need the other options available in a working part of a regional system. We need to meet the future growth demands of this region one way or the other. I think we've learned on the incident of 9/11 how important visitors and business visitors, in particular, are to this economy and the livelihood of the people here.

Response:

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

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

PHMP00009-3

Comment:

We also need long-term solutions, solutions that are well thought out that could serve us over the long term to meet the future growth needs. What we don't want to do right now is make near-term decisions in a crisis mode and not thoroughly think about what the right answers are here. When we did that on the energy crisis, we paid a dear price. We don't want to pay that in Southern California.

I think we have to recognize that under any scenario, LAX remains the front door to our community. It is in fact how the international visitor gets here, LAX is the busiest airport in the world in terms of arrivals and departures. It's a very important part of our economy. So we need to put the best minds together to figure out how we make LAX work while we make the whole system work.

3. Comments and Responses

I would like to suggest that the new proposal by the Mayor deserves a good look, a good level of support, but good critical analysis. For example, the 78 map limit can work if we have an El Toro Airport. Without an El Toro Airport we may be constrained.

Response:

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

PHMP00009-4

Comment:

Second, off-site check-in may be a benefit from the security standpoint. I think that needs to be looked at closely, but it also does speak to ease or lack of ease of access to LAX. If airports like San Francisco continue to allow curbside drop off in that convenience and also can address the security issues, then we may be displaced relative to an off-site alternative for check-in at LAX. We need to look at that carefully. I think it deserves a close look. The Airport Taskforce and the LAEDC is ready to take a look at that and offer the best recommendations we can come up with.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, PC02131-5, and PC02284-17.

PHMP00010 Rodine, Robert

**Aviation Committee of Valley
Industry and Commerce
Association**

10/30/2001

PHMP00010-1

Comment:

Thank you. I'm Robert Rodine. I live at 14649 Tustin Street in Sherman Oaks. I'm speaking before you tonight as the chairman of the Aviation Committee of Valley Industry and Commerce Association, a business advocacy organization representing approximately 325 major and regional companies.

In 1999 following numerous analyses, expert presentations and extensive discussion, VICA adopted a position supporting a Master Plan for LAX ensuring the capacity for 92 million annual passengers. With all due respect, for those who hold visions for the need of less we must impose upon you to recognize two immutable facts.

We are a resilient and resourceful society, and with our economy intact, we have rebounded from far worse disasters than the Al-Qaeda threat. And the demographic factors fueling the need for improved facilities at LAX are ever present and will relentlessly challenge the capacity of that facility into the future.

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

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

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00011 Benner, Mark

**National Air Traffic Controllers
Association**

10/30/2001

PHMP00011-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Mark Benner. I'm an FAA air traffic controller at L.A. Tower. I'm here on the behalf of the National Traffic Controllers Association.

The controllers at the Los Angeles Tower are not here to support any plan thus far put forth. We are here to discuss the safety and delay problems that have existed for a long time, and it will not go away until something is done. We clearly understand the context that surround these remarks, that air traffic has been dramatically curtailed since September 11th. And we endorse Mayor Hahn's focus on safety and security at the airport. But the public and elected and appointed officials have to understand that as air traffic into and out of Los Angeles returns to normal, as it undoubtedly will, the problems that existed prior to September 11th will remain the same.

LAX was built to handle aircraft that no longer utilize the airport. These aircraft were smaller, slower and there were far fewer of them. The aircraft today do not fit on the airport. Several types do not fit on the runways while some are so long that the tails stick out on the taxiways.

Several aircraft that have actually -- correction. Several aircraft could have actually been hit on the taxiways because of insufficient taxiway widths. The next generation of aircraft will not be able to taxi on this airport. This day is coming soon. Last year 26 aircraft crossed the runways when they were not supposed to. Only eight were termed "runway incursions." The fact is that every time an aircraft crosses when they should not, it is a potential accident. Luck will determine how many of these incidents will become runway incursions and inevitably accidents. Last year we were lucky. So far this year the incursion rate is much higher. How much longer can we be at or near the top of runway incursion -- incursions and continue to be lucky. There are many problems with the airport configuration that lead to our safety problems. The runways and taxiways are too close together. We have far too few gates to accommodate the traffic. LAX has added ways that force one aircraft to block several as they push off the gates and cause traffic jams in the taxiways and runway-exiting problems. These problems are too numerous to discuss them all at this time.

The controllers at L.A. Tower look forward to meeting with the FAA, the Airport Commission and Mayor Hahn to discuss these and other safety issues. Threats from terrorists are on everyone's mind including controllers. While I cannot go into details publically, we have recommendations to make that will reassure the security of the air traffic security system and the flying public. We look forward to beginning the discussion immediately, safety first.

Response:

Comment noted. As indicated in Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety, under each of the Master Plan build alternatives, changes to the taxiway system configuration would be implemented to reduce the potential for runway incursions and to enhance the safety of aircraft operations at LAX. The specific changes to the taxiway system configuration under Alternatives A, B, and C were described and illustrated in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Draft EIS/EIR. The specific changes to the taxiway system configuration under Alternative D were described and illustrated in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues.

3. Comments and Responses

PHMP00012 Venti, Benjamin

City of Monterey Park

10/30/2001

PHMP00012-1

Comment:

Good evening. Thank you for being here in Monterey Park, the great city in Southern California, but I have to tell you something. "But it's not in my backyard" is what we're hearing a lot about. We know that safety is very important for all the people who are going to take those flights and those airplanes that are coming in and out.

Response:

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

PHMP00012-2

Comment:

What I'm here about tonight is not just safety at the airport and the traffic on how to get there and get back. It's the traffic over our heads that we hear daily from aircraft coming in, the big 747s lumbering over us, the noise it causes, the vibration it causes in our community in Monterey Park. It's totally unacceptable.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration. The Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix D, Aircraft Technical Noise Report. Please see Section 4.1, Noise and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for detailed information on and comparisons of noise and noise-related land use impacts under the baseline and Year 2000 conditions and the various Master Plan alternatives including new Alternative D.

PHMP00012-3

Comment:

We're saying, "Not in our backyard," but we know that we're not going to be able to stop the airlines from having flight patterns. I'm also a helicopter pilot. I understand the flight patterns. I think they can be changed. I would much rather drive out to Palmdale and catch an airplane than I would to go into LAX if, in fact, that's going to solve our air traffic over Monterey Park and our area.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments AL00051-3, PC03575-1 and PC03579-1. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PHMP00012-4

Comment:

The safety issues that we're all talking about tonight are very important to us, not just on the ground but in the sky. I know. I live on top of one of the hills the city manager and the mayor alluded to being about 700 feet up. I know that I personally have looked out my window and seen a 747. I could almost wave at that pilot. I'm not exaggerating. I've seen that. I'm saying to you tonight, in this EIR you do, take into consideration our problems, that is, the flights that come over low at 2,500. Sometimes I've seen them. I know they haven't been any higher than that over this community, the noise it makes to our community, the distortion it has on our community and traffic above us.

I would ask that you take that into consideration as you go forward with this EIR.

Response:

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

PHMP00013 Gross, Aaron

**Councilmember Ruth Galanter's 10/30/2001
Office**

PHMP00013-1

Comment:

My name is Aaron Gross. And I'm sorry Councilmember Galanter couldn't be here, but she asked me to make a statement on her behalf.

Thank you very much everyone for being here tonight. In light of the events of September 11th the entire Master Plan is most likely obsolete. The assaults on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon have demonstrated that airports must operate differently or they may not be able to operate at all.

Even before September 11th trends within the airline industry were unclear. While the Los Angeles World Airports' proposed Master Plan includes in all of its alternatives runways to accommodate planes carrying 600 passengers or more, airlines have, in fact, been flying and buying more 757s and 767s. Certainly since September 11th, demand has fallen off the charts and the demand forecasts that the entire Master Plan is based on are no longer useful. In fact, the EIS/EIR is so flawed in its conception and current relevance that the environmental assessment is inherently flawed as well.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93.

PHMP00013-2

Comment:

I'm concerned that we're now being asked to comment on a Fifth Alternative that is conceptual, at best, with no opportunities to inspect any analysis on its impacts on the surrounding communities, businesses and residents.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan alternative, and was circulated for public review and comment.

PHMP00013-3

Comment:

I'm concerned that as long as the EIR process is on the table, the door is still open for incremental expansion later in this decade.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHMP00013-4

Comment:

I am also concerned that nowhere on the existing plan document nor in the proposed fifth alternative is there an overarching plan to address projected aviation demand in the Southern California region using LAWA's other airports, Palmdale and Ontario.

I urge you to reject this planning process and begin anew with a true regional plan assessed with a new environmental document that adequately addresses impacts on a regional basis.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR dealt only with the development of LAX. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. The recommendation that the FAA conduct a comprehensive analysis of various regional scenarios is beyond the scope of the subject EIS/EIR.

PHMP00014 Bruesch, Bob

City of Rosemead

10/30/2001

PHMP00014-1

Comment:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify. I am from the City of Rosemead, and I live in the same hills that Councilmember Venti alluded to. My community participated in the sound level studies a few years ago. We have a vested interest in seeing that the growth that is surely going to come in the MAP is fairly distributed throughout the whole region.

Response:

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

PHMP00014-2

Comment:

I am hoping that this growth is distributed fairly between all airports, Ontario, El Toro, Palmdale and March for two additional reasons and that being that it would distribute jobs to those who are in house-rich areas who would have the additional use of being able to alleviate -- ameliorate the imbalance in job-housing ratios in those areas. It also would be evenly distributing the cost of the security and safety issues that was alluded to by Mayor Hahn.

I also think that if certain areas in our region promote developments which pull in tourists, that those certain areas should be responsible for accepting the additional air passengers that those developments cause.

Response:

Comment noted. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys Airports. The decision to develop any airport is the responsibility of local government. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added to the range of alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. That alternative was evaluated in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D, developed pursuant to the direction of Mayor Hahn, provides an emphasis on safety and security improvements and is designed to serve a future (2015) airport activity level comparable to that

of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Alternative D approach of not expanding the capacity of LAX is consistent with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy framework, which is intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. In spring 2002, the voters of Orange County rejected the use of El Toro for a commercial airport. The Department of the Navy is disposing of the property for non-airport uses.

PHMP00014-3

Comment:

Finally, if a truly regional airport approach must be developed, then also the ground level connections between those airports must be improved. First, we must correct the mistake that we made many years ago by not having a terminal for the Green Line at LAX. That has to be part of the new Master Plan.

Secondly, let's make all of our light-rail system more passenger and baggage friendly so that the passengers have an alternative of getting down there rather than the freeway.

Response:

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

PHMP00014-4

Comment:

And, finally, I'm hoping that the plan promotes a regional high-speed rail system which will interconnect the regional airports and also provide state air passengers another mode of transportation to go within the region and within the state.

Response:

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

PHMP00015 Campbell, R. Doyle County of Los Angeles 10/30/2001

PHMP00015-1

Comment:

Thank you. I'm representing Sheriff Lee Baca tonight. He is currently on a plane bound for LAX coming back from New York where he spent the better part of the day touring ground zero with Governor Gray Davis. He asked me to come here this evening and share some comments about LAX security.

LAX may be within the boundaries of L.A. City, but a safe and secure airport is everyone's responsibility. At times like these, in particular, the geographic boundaries that separate the City of Los Angeles from Los Angeles County or the incorporated cities for which we provide law enforcement responsibilities are never an issue.

The Los Angeles Sheriff's Department work closely with the LAPD and federal law enforcement agencies on improving safety and security of all major institutions in the region during these difficult times. We will continue to do so in the months and in the years ahead.

I'm not here today to suggest specific new security procedures for LAX, neither for the near term or the long term. You already have excellent people looking into that. I am here to offer the assistance of our

3. Comments and Responses

department that we could provide in the coming months if you develop new security procedures and make changes to LAX to greatly discourage, if not, prevent future acts of terrorism.

While people may differ precisely on what needs to be done at LAX, I don't think anyone could disagree with Mayor Hahn's goals of making the L.A. Airport the safest in the nation. We owe that to the public, to the nearly 60,000 employees that work at LAX and all the communities that surround the airport.

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to Response to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-3, and PC02131-5.

PHMP00016 Miera, Tony

None Provided

10/30/2001

PHMP00016-1

Comment:

My name is Tony Miera. I'm a resident of Monterey Park. I reside at 551 Taylor Drive in Monterey Park. Just to give you a few notes about me.

44 and a half years ago I was recruited from out of state to come here to live in this area. And I looked at all the cities around here, and I selected Monterey Park because it's clean, nice and quiet. Well, I'm here to protect the turf of my neighbors who have talked to me about this for a long time.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00016-2

Comment:

Our neighbors have made thousands of improvements here in the city. We were hoping that things would be better, but before the 9/11 problem, disaster in New York, we sat down and we counted how many airplanes were coming. For three weeks it was a constant flow of airplanes. I live up in the 700 and 21 feet level. So you could imagine seeing these planes coming in all evening long. They are not very quiet. But this city used to be extremely quiet, nice, clean city.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PHMP00006-3 regarding flights over Monterey Park.

PHMP00016-3

Comment:

It has turned out, I have a 93-year-old mother-in-law who has a hard time sleeping right now with all the planes coming in.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings in homes associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PHMP00016-4**Comment:**

Since 9/11 I have traveled to Ontario, taken a plane out of there. There's a lot of possibilities in Ontario. I'll tell you, I'll never go to LAX. I used to go to LAX about seven times a year. I'll never travel down that way. That's too far, too much traffic first of all.

Response:

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

PHMP00016-5**Comment:**

But I hope that you consider that the traffic of the planes coming over at one time had to go over the 60 Freeway. Now they are encroaching way beyond one and a half miles over my house. You can see them right over us. All evening long you could just see those flights. It's not fair for the residents that have spent a lot of money, a lot of improvements because we felt Monterey Park was a proper place for us to raise our family.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PC02586, PC03575-1, PC03579-1, and AL00051-03.

PHMP00016-6**Comment:**

So my recommendation is that we start expanding the security at LAX, but also at Ontario. Let's make some improvements in Ontario so people will be more apt to drive down to Ontario because I think it's a lot better facility there than LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00016-7**Comment:**

I'll just tell you about me. I'm the ex-chief deputy controller for the City of Los Angeles. I worked for James Hahn for four years. I know the expenditures that were done in all facilities. I think you should consider expanding Ontario and come up with some security issues.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHMP00017 Russell, Jon

Airline Pilots Association

10/30/2001

PHMP00017-1

Comment:

Good evening. Thanks for having me. Because I'm a pilot, I'll start with the aircraft. It sits parked on the tarmac. Who has access to a parked aircraft? As it turns out, a lot of people, caterers, cleaning crews and mechanics among others. Many of these individuals are neither airline nor airport employees nor do they have to pass through the same security screening points that I or my crew or passengers have to go through. For obvious reasons, I'm not going to discuss the details of these concerns, however, I will say that access to aircraft is an area where we need major improvement.

Another aspect of access is identification. Restricting access to authorized persons is only as good as the means we use to identify the persons seeking access.

Some of you may remember the PSA incident in the late 1980's where a fired employee used his ID card to smuggle a gun around the security checkpoints and used that same gun to kill the pilots while the aircraft was airborne. At that time it called for a universal access system using identification cards that would be scanned and checked by a computer against the central database.

Since then we have developed so-called "smart cards" which incorporate a small computer chip that can store information such as a photo of the holder and a PIN number that would have to be entered by the employee whenever he passes through a controlled checkpoint. This would eliminate the use of fraudulent, expired, lost or stolen cards. It would also reduce or eliminate the need for pilots and others to carry multiple ID cards for use at different airports.

Moving away from the airplane, we need to talk about baggage and freight. Bombs on board -- excuse me. Bombs on board the aircrafts still are a security concern. To provide maximum protection we're going to have to move toward screening freight and checking luggage using the best detection technologies. This is going to be neither easy or cheap. We need to do it sooner rather than later. Purchasing these machines is the easy part. They must then be integrated into the flow of baggage and freight streams.

The other area that needs improvement is the matching of checked bags to passengers onboard the aircraft. This is done on many international trips. We need to expand this to cover domestic flights as well. As with screening freight and checking baggage, this will not be cheap or free, especially if we do not want this to become a major bottleneck to anti-performance. I have to hurry up.

I do not want my next point to be taken as a criticism or a call to end the project. I understand there is a proposal to create a centralized security check-in facility for passengers away from the main terminals. I am not clear as to what all the benefits of such a facility might be. I would raise the following question: Given the cost of a particular project, would the net increase in security be more than the increase in security that might be realized by spending the same money on improvements in other areas such as the ones I've mentioned here?

Given there is enough money to do all the things we want to do, we must be judicious in prioritizing our needs and expenditures. I hope the planners and security experts will have done the math, so to speak, before moving ahead with this particular project.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments PC02177-5, AL00051-93, and AL00033-253.

PHMP00018 Moxley, Tom**Ironworkers Local 433****10/30/2001****PHMP00018-1****Comment:**

My name is Tom Moxley. I represent some 4,000 ironworkers here in Southern California across the entire basin, their wives, their husbands and their families.

We want to see a regional airport created. We also want to see a modernization of LAX. It means jobs. It means construction jobs. It means permanent jobs. Wherever there is an airport, there are jobs. Businesses traditionally come to where the airports are. Our desire is for security, for safety, but also this economic engine needs to keep going. Today I listened to the news -- and Mayor Hahn says we're going to go into three quarters of deficit recession. Some 79,000 jobs are going to be lost in the next year. This LAX modernization, the Regional Airport Plan addresses some 450,000 permanent jobs, good-paying jobs, here in Southern California. There isn't a city that doesn't have an ironworker that lives in Southern California.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00019 Williams, Douglas**Ironworkers Local 433****10/30/2001****PHMP00019-1****Comment:**

I'm Douglas Williams, 2057 South Atlantic Boulevard. I'm also an agent with the ironworkers. There are a couple of things that have been brought up that we really need to address, first the safety of the airport, all people flying out of it. I, too, come in and out of there all the time for two reasons, the availability of cheaper flights and the way that flights are structured. You could get a flight anywhere out of the country almost at any time. Until we get a regional airport system that will address that, you know, coast to coast, people are still going to come to LAX. Let's face it. It's convenient.

But I sit, on those planes and watch those tips come real close. Traffic controllers want to see modernization to take care of that problem. If they address that, that will take care of the problem of the delays. There will be less fuel being burnt, the air will be cleaner, everything. I, for one, do not add to the problem of traffic at the airport. I like the off-site airport parking, take the shuttle in. That's the only way to do it.

One thing that everybody has to realize, all the unions are for the regional airport system, but LAX is a jewel. As the hub at the center point of the hub, it has to be the one that we use because people come in from anywhere in the world there. That's the economic engine of Southern California, believe it or not.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00020 Slawson, Richard**Los Angeles Building &
Construction Trades Council****10/30/2001****PHMP00020-1****Comment:**

Good evening. My name is Richard Slawson. I'm the executive secretary of Los Angeles and Orange Counties Building Construction Trades Council. Our group represents 130,000 craftsmen and women working throughout this region. Our address is 1626 Beverly Boulevard in Los Angeles.

3. Comments and Responses

We've followed the airport plans for a number of years now and attended quite a few hearings. And I've testified at quite a few hearings as well. And we've submitted written comments as well. I want everyone to know that the building trade's unions support the idea of regional airport expansion. And in fact, we worked hard to see that an international airport is constructed at the El Toro Airforce or Marine Base in Orange County and as well pushed for further modernization at Ontario Airport. We know also that there are many other airports in the area that could take up some of the slack. However, as was stated earlier, Los Angeles International is an important part of the overall air transportation system in Southern California. And it's vital that it be modernized.

Our elected officials need to move forward on modernization at LAX or it will put thousands of workers in jeopardy, thousands of families in jeopardy of losing their jobs. There are 400,000 jobs that are related to LAX, and the airport is a critical part of our economic infrastructure. While it is extremely appropriate and necessary to make sure LAX is the safest and securest airport in the country, we can't lose sight of the fact that it remains an integral part of our overall infrastructure. We need a safe and secure airport, but we have to recognize the safety of our economic future and the security of working families in this area is also at stake.

There are hundreds and thousands of working families in our areas whose livelihoods depend on keeping LAX competitive with other airports in our region, not just in Southern California, but in the region of the western states. Let's have a regional solution to this issue, but LAX must be a major part of that solution.

The workers that we represent are very excited about the safety and security proposals that Mayor Hahn has put forth. In fact, tonight, I'm also happy to hear that Mayor Gordon of El Segundo is supportive of the possible changes the city will be proposing. I have not heard that before. Many of the speakers from the area of the airport have been against any proposals. I am happy to see there is some breakthrough.

The September 11 attacks were devastating, however, I believe the opposite effect that the terrorists expected has happened. We are coming together in this area. Listening to the testimony here tonight I think we're close to a solution. We will come together on an LAX proposal, and I'm sure with the leadership of Mayor Hahn it will fulfill the safety, security and travel needs of our area.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00021 Rascon, Sergio

Laborers Local 300

10/30/2001

PHMP00021-1

Comment:

Thank you. My name is Sergio Rascon. I'm the business manager of Laborers Local 300 in Los Angeles. I represent over 6,000 members in the County of Los Angeles and, of course, this means a lot to us. As Dick just mentioned, it means a lot of jobs to Laborers Local 300.

Although we're not ignorant of the fact that there is a lot of concerns, and we stand with those concerns, we want to make sure that the people in the surroundings understand that we're not all about just jobs, but we are all about security and safety. And we will stand with them to make sure that their concerns are heard. But at the same time we must understand one thing. If we do not go ahead with the modernization of this airport, you can consider Los Angeles to be a ghost town. These jobs are much needed. Our people depend on it. As you can see, before the 9/11 incident, thousands and thousands of people were working there. Now thousands and thousands of people have been laid off.

If we don't do something about it, again, I must repeat to you, this will be a ghost town. Sure we can go to Palmdale. Sure we can go to Ontario. Sure we can go anywhere else, but how many people are willing to go as far as Palmdale, as far as Ontario, for a job that only pays \$6, \$7 an hour. We must understand that. We have to have good paying jobs at this airport and any other job that is needed to keep the community healthy and have their benefits.

So I encourage each and every one of the people present that we're with you, even if you have the concerns and you're opposing it. But we're with you and we'll stand with you to make sure that you will be heard and that we can come to the middle of it and work together, and let's get this airport going, and let's get the jobs back where they belong.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00022 Humber, Dan

Ironworkers Local 433

10/30/2001

PHMP00022-1

Comment:

My name is Dan Humber. I'm an ironworker out of Local 433. I live in the Montebello area, 222 West Via Corona, Montebello. I'm a native Californian here and I'm a construction worker. I've been working construction here all my life since I got out of high school. L.A. Airport has been around ever since I can remember. When I was a kid, we used to go to the beach down there and by the airport. It's important that we keep this airport and get this recommendation done and make it secure for me and my family because when I travel, I use a LAX because it's convenient for me. It's easy access, and I'm able to get to where I'm going. But we need these jobs here, and we need to maintain the airport there, especially if business does pick up in the air business.

I've been in airplanes sitting on that runway waiting to take off for a long period of time. There's been -- it's been very crowded. And I feel that we will need -- this airport needs to be renovated to make it safe and secure for everybody and -- you know, the airplanes nowadays are bigger. The stuff I heard here tonight makes me concerned we need to have an updated airport, a modern airport that's safe and secure for the family. Especially nowadays with new security, things I heard here about security, it's important that we have the security.

I know when I went to pick up one of my nephews at the airport a couple of weeks ago we went over there to parking lot C. It was very inconvenient to go to that parking lot and shuttle and go through all the hassle. Now I understand they opened it up. It needs to be -- you know, the security needs to be where we could be safe and the airlines can be safe, but we don't want to lose this airport. We need to do this work, the renovation work. I'm just here to state my case. There's a lot of our members that do a lot of this renovation work on this airport and has been doing it for many years.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00023 Jackson, Eric

None Provided

10/30/2001

PHMP00023-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Eric Jackson I'm a pipe fitter. I've been a pipe fitter for 28 years. For the last 28 years we've worked at that airport. The airport expansion is critical for economic growth, for jobs of people in the community. Safety now being the grave issue after 9/11.

But, again, I'm a pipe fitter. I work hand in hand with boilermakers, ironworkers, as Dick Slawson said, over 130,000 people in L.A. basin. We're constructors. We build things. If we don't have an opportunity to build things, we have to go somewhere else. It is vital for the people in the industry, the building craft industry, to have this airport modernization built and expanded in a professional manner, fast, efficiently safe. To bring jobs to the community will help my family, my grandchildren, your grandchildren and a lot of other people. It's convenient as all the other people got up here and spoke. LAX is one of the few airports in Southern California, you can get a flight almost anytime, anytime of the day.

So I urge you to concur with the people that are for the airport, and I thank you at this time.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00024 Visek, Rodger

None Provided

10/30/2001

PHMP00024-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Rodger Visek. I live at 1660 Kempton Avenue in the beautiful City of Monterey Park. I came to this city because I like the quality of life, the peace and the quiet that this city has afforded our family.

I attended a meeting of the FAA last year in which it was conducted in the City Hall of Monterey Park and it discussed the subject of the flights over the city and the quality of life. My credentials as far as knowing anything about aircraft, I served with an antiaircraft outfit in the United States Marine Corps in the Marianas in the '40s. So I know a little bit about tracking aircraft.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00024-2

Comment:

The aircraft have been coming over our home at a rate of about 22 to 24 an hour in a fog-bound LAX. They have been coming in at elevations somewhere between 1,500 feet up to about 2,500 feet above sea level. However, we know that the topography of Monterey Park is in the area of 500 to 700, 800 feet. So we've got the planes coming in real close. Some FAA person came along and said, "Well, the noise isn't too bad," but the noise bounces off the walls, the hills and we get the echo effect.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments AL00051-3 and AL00051-4. The reverberation of noise in variable topography is the subject of ongoing scientific study, but verifiable results have not been published and incorporated into the noise modeling software.

PHMP00024-3

Comment:

So with that thought in mind, I'm asking that we propose raising the elevation up to the 3,500- or 4,000-foot level when they are making their pass to connect into the glidepath which is running about 4,000 or 5,000 feet about ten miles south of Monterey Park. If this can't be done, I was even thinking in terms of asking our city counsel to propose that Monterey Park become a no-fly zone and any aircraft coming over the city would be fined \$10,000 for soundproofing homes in the city.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00051-4, regarding modifications to the flight patterns over Monterey Park.

The City of Monterey Park cannot regulate the airspace above the city boundaries due to federal preemption. If every surrounding community could control its own airspace and prohibit aircraft from operating overhead, and requiring operations to go to alternate areas there would be a "patchwork quilt" of allowable airspace thus creating gridlock on the national aviation system. That is why the FAA oversees national airspace and not local communities. Please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation.

PHMP00024-4

Comment:

I thank you very much for this opportunity to vent a little bit of frustration about the quality of life. I hope everybody will concur with it. As far as the Master Plan and job security and all that, I'm with that 100 percent.

Response:

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

PHMP00025 Collins, Michael Los Angeles Convention and 10/30/2001
Visitors Bureau

PHMP00025-1

Comment:

Hello. I'm Michael Collins. I'm executive vice president at the L.A. Convention Visitors' Bureau. I'll mention a couple of things that are probably obvious to many people in the room.

LAX is the distribution system for our visitor economy. That economy is a large 123 million visitors, 13.6 billion dollars in direct, unmultiplied, new revenue coming into this market, 240,000 workers. And a better way of framing it is for every one percent of growth in the visitor arrivals, we find ourselves getting 280 million dollars in new revenue into this economy.

Virtually half of domestic visitors arrive by air and every single one, for all practical purposes, of international visitors arrive by air. They account for those international visitors, about one-third of the entire 13.6 billion dollars in this economy. And it's that segment of our economy right now that is in expansion. And it's that international market and its current afflictions that are driving the loss of about 2 billion dollars that we anticipate between the end of September and the beginning of June, and perhaps more dramatically the loss of 41,000 jobs within Los Angeles.

We have to look to a future right now. We certainly aren't about to define the issues which we look forward to as being defined by the current status quo. The goal would be to maintain our Gateway status, protect share-of-market losses, especially in Asia, while taking advantage of every option to distribute the demand for L.A. throughout the LAWA system. To do that, we believe that security will indeed qualify this destination as open for business. Without it, any other considerations will not apply, especially if we're to address the international market that currently remains in paralysis largely because of the security concerns.

To be secure and user-friendly is the art form. That is the most difficult challenge that's facing this particular group. The timing for addressing that challenge could not be better. Now is that time to introduce the due dynamic of security into the planning alternative that is already building on the good work done to date. You could not pick a better time to introduce security into the current planning.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00026 Norris, Merry Gateway to L.A., Inc. 10/30/2001

PHMP00026-1

Comment:

Good evening. I'm Merry Norris, executive director of Gateway to L.A. which is a property-based business improvement district. Our offices are located at 6151 Century Boulevard in Los Angeles.

3. Comments and Responses

By way of explanation, the Gateway to L.A. is comprised of properties along Century Boulevard between the 405 Freeway and Sepulveda Boulevard at LAX as well as several properties on Airport and Aviation Boulevards between Century and 98 Street.

Gateway to L.A. is comprised of 13 hotels, 7,200 hotel rooms, over 15,000 parking spaces and several million square feet of office and commercial space. Gateway to L.A.'s goal is to revitalize the properties and businesses within our borders and to create a meaningful and recognizable Gateway to the City of Los Angeles. We have worked successfully with LAWA on improvements to the LAX Gateway area. I'm sure you're aware of the beautiful enhancements, recent enhancements, which include the lighted pylons and palm trees which have become really a new landmark for the city.

Since well before September 11th, the Gateway bid has been working with the architecture for DMJM to develop a vibrant new vision for our area. We are hoping next to partner with LAWA with these plans because it is now time to take a different approach at LAX. In considering a new approach, we all know that the assurance of safety and security is a paramount importance for all travelers. Any future changes are an opportunity for a win-win situation for businesses in and around Los Angeles as well as our neighbors. These opportunities would create new jobs, provide large scale entertainment, develop more parking and also to develop safer modes of ground transportation. In collaboration with DMJM, we have been developing really big ideas which we call "Aeratopolis," a Gateway, a destination point which exemplifies and proliferates the brightness, the grandness and bigness of the city in which we live. We look forward to sharing our ideas with you.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00027 Ragus, Nicholas None Provided 10/30/2001

PHMP00027-1

Comment:

My name is Nicholas Ragus. I live at 716 Rodman Circle in Monterey Park. I would like to welcome you here tonight. I want to demonstrate the two ways we carry on conversations in my neighborhood. This is the first way, (indicating). And this is the second way we do it (indicating).

Now, this started around 1995. Prior to then I was always traveling. I noticed when I got home that I was always looking up at aircraft. Anyway, LAX has already unilaterally expanded operations over Monterey Park. This was accomplished without an environmental impact study nor a mention of any Master Plan. So I'm all for Mayor Hahn's new plan because you've already expanded over our city anyway. When we citizens called to complain to the FAA and LAX, the two agencies give us the City Hall salute.

While we may not know who's really in charge of the aircraft flying over our homes, we are sure of a few facts.

Response:

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

PHMP00027-2

Comment:

One, outdoor conversations are nearly impossible now.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PHMP00027-3**Comment:**

Two, TV signals inside the house are interfered with, but that's okay because we can't hear the TV anyway.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels, Topical Response TR-LU-5 regarding thresholds used to identify significant noise levels and Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program. Also see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PHMP00027-4**Comment:**

And, three, our children at school live under the shadows of these aircraft and our schools are not insulated to prevent this sound from interfering with the classroom time. I've talked to several teachers there. They stop instruction for these aircraft to fly over. It takes a long time for a 747 with flaps and slats deployed and gears down to lumber on over our city.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding aviation easements, prior noise mitigation payments, and other provisions of the "Settlement Agreement" that resolve land use compatibility and aircraft noise mitigation issues between affected schools and aircraft operations. Since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, a Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was prepared that evaluated an additional Master Plan alternative (Alternative D), incorporated information on Year 2000 conditions, and provided new analysis of single event and cumulative aircraft noise levels that result in classroom disruption. Schools without aviation easements that are determined to be newly exposed to significant aircraft noise levels are eligible for mitigation. Mitigation measure MM-LU-1 provides mitigation for schools determined to be significantly impacted by aircraft noise, excluding schools with aviation easements. Mitigation may take the form of sound insulation or relocation. Further mitigation is provided under mitigation measures MM-LU-3 and MM-LU-4 in the form of study of aircraft noise levels that result in classroom disruption and sound insulation for schools determined by the study or interim noise measurements to be significantly impacted.

PHMP00027-5**Comment:**

And, also, on Sundays our ministers have to stop sermons in order to accommodate LAX traffic.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels and Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and how to file a noise complaint. Also see Response to Comment AL00006-2 regarding current measures underway to address existing high aircraft noise levels.

PHMP00027-6**Comment:**

So that's what life has been like here in Monterey Park since 1995. The sound levels are equivalent to those of the cities adjacent to LAX.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00105-2 regarding flights over Monterey Park.

3. Comments and Responses

PHMP00027-7

Comment:

Unfortunately, when we call the FAA and LAX, they say, "Well the Master Plan and Environmental Impact Study really doesn't accommodate a city so far away from LAX. They are only for cities that are directly adjacent to the airport." See, we're kind of stuck in a Catch 22 situation. While we're all for expansion of LAX, we all want jobs -- in fact, my career is in commercial aviation -- but if I wanted to hear airplanes 24 hours a day, I'd live at LAX. I chose Monterey Park because that's where I was born and raised and it was a quiet city at one time.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00027-8

Comment:

So I hope we can come up with a plan and move those aircraft north maybe over a small minority community like San Marino or south over the railroad yards in the City of Commerce, but keep them away from our homes here.

Response:

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

PHMP00028 Lovett, Wayne

Mercury Air Group

10/30/2001

PHMP00028-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Wayne Lovett. I'm with Mercury Air group which is an aviation service provider located here in Los Angeles. We have been at LAX since 1954 when we were founded by several members of the Flying Tigers Group out of China.

Our company is not just at LAX. We also are at Ontario. We are also at Burbank. We are also all over the country. So we don't have a particular grief about any particular place that should or should not be the Gateway to Los Angeles and Southern California. The fact of the matter is, LAX is the Gateway to Southern California. It is the regional airport that we have today. What we are looking for is a safe, secure and efficient airport.

We applaud the idea that this Master Plan should move forward. We applaud the idea that Mayor Hahn has to consider safety and security and going forward with the Master Plan. Surely anybody can see that that is necessary given the events of 9/11. Just as surely, if we needed a demonstration of what happens when you emasculate our system, you've seen it. You've seen the job losses. You've seen the economic loss. You've seen what happens when you don't pay attention to your economic infrastructure. What we are looking forward to here is a plan that does just that. It pays attention to the infrastructure and what is necessary to make this system work.

We believe that Mayor Hahn and LAWA have acted responsibly in moving forward with the LAX Master Plan at the same time focusing the process on safety and security. The Mayor's fresh ideas on how to shape the Master Plan are constructive and most welcome.

The bottom line, ladies and gentlemen, all of us here, is that while some things have changed, other things have not. LAX is still the Gateway to this area. At the end of the day something needs to be done. Studies need to end and decisions need to be made. What we pay you to do is to make the studies, but at the end of the day what we pay you to do is to make the decisions. I would ask you to move forward and do that.

Response:
Comment noted.

PHMP00029 Cabrales, Luis

**California League of
Conservation Voters Education
Fund**

10/30/2001

PHMP00029-1

Comment:
Thank you, sir. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Luis Cabrales. I'm an assistant director of outreach at the California League of Conservation Voters Education Fund.

Response:
Comment noted.

PHMP00029-2

Comment:
According to Coalition for Clean Air, the Los Angeles Airport is the second largest industrial small source in the Los Angeles area.

Response:
Please see Response to Comment PC01186-4.

PHMP00029-3

Comment:
For many years low-income communities and communities of color located under the airport's flight path have endured these sources of pollution. The proposed expansion will intensify the airport's environmental impact of those communities.

Response:
Please see Response to Comments AL00017-190 and PC02203-33.

PHMP00029-4

Comment:
I am also a resident of Pico Rivera. It's one of the communities located under the proposed LAX expansion pathway. But I have lived all my life in Southeast L.A. For many years I also had to endure the noise and air pollution created by the airplanes that flew just above my home, schools and parks where I lived, played and studied. I was actually living in Southgate when one of the tires from one of the airplanes fell not too far away from my house, by the way.

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

PHMP00029-5

Comment:
The proposed expansion, which according to the Environmental Impact Report has significant impacts for aircraft noise and pollution in low-income communities and communities of color making it one of the

3. Comments and Responses

most important issues this community faces. Thus, it is time for L.A. officials to pay attention to the environmental injustice implications that the LAX has had for so many years and how this expansion will exacerbate this pollution rate.

Response:

Noise and air toxic effects on minority and low-income communities were addressed in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The Environmental Justice Program outlined in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice, of the Final EIS/EIR recognizes the potential disproportionate effects that the Master Plan would have on minority and low-income populations and goes beyond basic mitigation proposals to address the unique needs of these communities. With input gathered through environmental justice workshops and an extensive public outreach effort, the Environmental Justice Program represents a full and good faith effort to identify all possible means for avoiding, reducing or off-setting the impacts of the Master Plan in a manner that addresses the needs and preferences of affected minority and/or low-income communities in accordance with NEPA and CEQA requirements. Regarding fairness, with the orientation of the runways at LAX, it is inevitable that increases in aircraft activity and associated noise will have a greater burden communities to the east of LAX than those to the north and south. It should be noted however, that LAWA Staff's new preferred alternative, Alternative D, has the least impacts of the Master Plan build alternatives and would limit operations at LAX to levels that would be similar to what would occur with existing facilities if the Master Plan were not approved. Please also see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts on low-income and minority communities, Topical Response TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits, and Topical Response TR-EJ-3 regarding environmental justice and regional context.

PHMP00029-6

Comment:

It is important to mention that many of the people who have been impacted by health problems from this pollution are brothers, sisters, siblings, children, parents of union members and even union members themselves. So far the jobs and money created by the LAX have not improved the health status of the Latino and African communities that surround the LAX. And the pollution increases that will come with the expansion will only exacerbate this problem.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00017-190 and PC02203-33.

PHMP00030 Hossan, Carole

None Provided

10/30/2001

PHMP00030-1

Comment:

Hi. My name is Carole Hossan. I live in Westchester. As a native of Westchester resident, I oppose LAWA's preferred Alternative C because it would remove homes in one-third of our central business district. I also oppose projects like the proposed Sepulveda widening, my community becoming a mere transportation corridor to LAX. In past expansions Westchester has lost thousands of homes and residents.

Response:

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

PHMP00030-2**Comment:**

Frankly, I'm very displeased with the current situation of having the previous Master Plan alternative still looming over us. Now, we also have the nebulous fifth alternative, which according to an article in the L.A. Times is a proposal for a new security conscious LAX which exists only in Mayor Hahn's mind and in the preliminary concepts of airport planners which means the public is being asked to offer suggestions without seeing a single picture, map, sketch or even basic description of the mayor's concept. I think we need more than that to work from. The devil is always in the details.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan alternative, and was circulated for public review and comment.

PHMP00030-3**Comment:**

Briefly, I believe the previous Master Plan should be officially declared dead in writing. I oppose the runway extension suggested in Alternative Five. I oppose incremental expansion and I favor lowering the noise levels.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PHMP00030-4**Comment:**

As for safety improvements at LAX, one, having the allotted number of air traffic controllers on staff would be good. Two, adopting the solution proposed by NASA's Research Center for preventing runway incursions, and, three, making sure all luggage on domestic flights is screened.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding aviation safety and Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security issues. In addition, please see Response to Comment AL00037-16 regarding the feasibility and potential environmental impacts of using an end-around taxiway to reduce the potential for runway incursions.

PHMP00031 Rose, Harry**None Provided****10/30/2001****PHMP00031-1****Comment:**

My name is Harry Rose. I live at 7725 Hindry Avenue in the Westchester District in the City of Los Angeles. Historically, the communities of Westchester, Playa Del Rey, Inglewood and El Segundo have

3. Comments and Responses

born the brunt of LAX expansion. We're the ones that must bear the increased air pollution, traffic and noise pollution of any proposed expansion of LAX. We are the ones who face the destruction of our business district and many of our homes by the proposed extension of the north runway.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; and relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 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-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHMP00031-2

Comment:

Last April Southern California Association of Governments endorsed a regional approach to increase the airport demand. We currently have only one international airport to serve a five-county region of what LAWA calls Ontario International Airport, it has no customs. From a logistical and safety standpoint, continued expansion of LAX is senseless. Continued expansion -- I'm sorry. This region needs another international airport, not just one in name only.

Response:

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

PHMP00032 Hightower, Holly Association of Flight Attendants 10/30/2001

PHMP00032-1

Comment:

Good evening, gentlemen. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. My name is Holly Hightower. I'm the vice president for the Association of Flight Attendants. More importantly, I am a working flight attendant. Each day since September 11th myself and my flying partners have dealt with the grief and the fear associated in the aftermath of losing our colleagues to the terrorist attacks, men and women who went to work feeling safe. On September 10th, I, too, felt safe. Now we know better. And as the saying goes, when you know better, you should do better.

There have been some improvements. We have the National Guard at the security checkpoints. We have the one-bag-maximum imposed on the passengers, and I have seen that at work. And many items of a dangerous nature have been banned from the aircraft cabins. The front door of the airport is deadbolted. But the back door is swinging open and banging in the wind.

There are three simple things that need to be done to make Los Angeles International the premier airport for safety and security in the United States. One, screening checkpoints that can be set up for all ground personnel, caterers, baggage handlers, et cetera. Currently these people have access to our

aircraft with only an ID badge too easily replicated. Two, all checked baggage must be screened. This is not done domestically and is a gaping hole in our security system. And, finally, three, passengers and their checked baggage must fly together. Positive bag match is essential to the integrity of the aircraft.

I'm certain Mayor Hahn and this body will want the best for the people who work at Los Angeles International and for those passengers who will be flying out of that airport. I believe that I will feel safe at my work place again. And I believe that the passengers will feel safe again and they will fly again. And I believe that you can help. Please set the standard.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC02236-2.

PHMP00033 Bustamonte, Darryl None Provided

10/30/2001

PHMP00033-1

Comment:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Darryl Bustamonte, concerned citizen at-large and a current user of one of the best aviation systems in the entire world.

I'm a firm supporter of LAX expansion. I'm a firm supporter of any airport expansion which increases not only just jobs, but the availability of one of the greatest commodities that we have. That's an airline seat. As demand for public transportation rises, that demand must be met. Regionalization, while may sound nice on the surface, airlines go where the demand is. If the demand isn't there, the airlines will not go. Shifting people and cargo to far out stations such as Palmdale may alleviate some flights, but they will increase the traffic on the roads.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00033-2

Comment:

As a citizen of Monterey Park as well, noise really is not an issue. Planes have been flying over Monterey Park for better of 40 years. I've been there for a good 35 of them. I can tell you today that CFM56 is a lot quieter than a JTAD ever was. The greatest threat, I believe, as a citizen of Monterey Park is not airline noise, but people noise. Your gardeners, your barking dogs, your thumping stereos are a heck of a lot louder than any airplane ever was.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00033-3

Comment:

I believe that LAX has been a good citizen. The citizens also need to be good to the airport because it represents the lifeblood of the economy, jobs, and we need to travel. Americans do travel and we should not be stifled in that.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHMP00034 Luddy, Bill

**Southwest Regional Council of
Carpenters**

10/30/2001

PHMP00034-1

Comment:

Thank you. My name is Bill Luddy. I'm representing the Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters for 533 South Fremont Avenue in Los Angeles. We represent approximately 50,000 working carpenters who live and work throughout this region. All of the cities that are represented, all of the cities that are impacted, we have members in there. We have members working there.

We've been in support of this plan for sometime now. We recognize the benefits of a regional approach and improvements in some of those airports and support that. But when all is said and done, there is nothing that is going to change the fact that LAX is, in fact, the central regional airport. With that said, I think the arguments that were presented by Mr. Collins, the economics out there, the job impacts, the economic engine that that represents is indisputable. It cannot be ignored. It cannot be let run down.

We've seen since September 11th the types of impacts on the economy that are happening and that people have when they are unsure and unwilling to spend money or willing to move forward or willing to travel because they are not clear on their safety. This plan needs to be readdressed and has been refocused by Mayor Hahn's statement and by your actions on the question of safety and security. The traffic controllers, the Pilots Association, the attendants have all laid out an excellent list of issues that need to be addressed. None of that can be addressed at the facility as it stands now. It requires a new plan. It requires work. We do not have the luxury of another ten years to think about this. The economics, the safety, the security and the confidence of the public regionally and the travelers requires that we look at this issue, formulate the plan and move forward on it now.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00035 Marquez, Luis

None Provided

10/30/2001

PHMP00035-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Luis Marquez. I'm a resident of the Los Angeles Florence-Graham area directly under the airport flight path. My family and neighbors, friends have been directly impacted by the airport's noise, traffic and, of course, the fear of an airline air traffic tragedy directly over our houses. We have been bearing more than our fair share of the burden for a very, very long time. It's time for a truly Regional Airport Plan. We need a regional system that spreads the burdens of traffic, air pollution, noise and other impacts throughout the communities in the region. Keep LAX constrained to its physical capacity that does not go beyond the 78 million annual passengers.

Response:

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

PHMP00035-2**Comment:**

Security and environmental justice in our airport systems have everything in common. A more decentralized airport system with LAX constrained is the best way to achieve both. Assuring maximum security dictates that we develop a more regional aviation system and not expand LAX. It makes no sense to expand LAX as it should make it a super target with no reasonable back-up options. It makes no sense to create an overcrowded LAX where the security challenges is made too complex, a security that is inevitably compromised to increased passengers throughout. It makes no sense. Common sense tells us that there is a regional planning dimension to our airport security. Common sense tells us a more decentralized airport system will be a safer, more secure airport system.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments AL00051-93, AL00051-93, AL00033-253, and PL01835-29.

PHMP00036 Schneider, Denny**LAX Community Noise
Roundtable****10/30/2001****PHMP00036-1****Comment:**

Hi. I'm Denny Schneider. I come from the Westchester area. I've spoken before this board several times. I am a member of the LAX Community Noise Roundtable. I'm the subcommittee chair for the north and east sectors. I applaud the people that came out to this meeting and appreciate all of their efforts.

We have spoken many times about the expansion and the previous four alternatives that call for wholesale expansion of LAX. I'm glad to hear the Mayor has decided that it is unacceptable. I applaud the decision to try to make LAX safer. We look forward to working with LAWA and look forward to hearing some of the details which in the past have been very difficult to get before they were in firm concrete.

Response:

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

PHMP00036-2**Comment:**

I also would like to commend the FAA for helping since 9/11. They are creating more jobs for the Hollywood industry because they are creating what we call the "Hollywood effect." That is, at night the

3. Comments and Responses

planes are going every which way and making the stars look like they are moving all over the sky. In other words, the FAA has done less, not more, to control the noise in our communities. And we wish to get more control, not less.

Response:

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

PHMP00036-3

Comment:

We urge you to look at a regional solution that spreads out the traffic, that allows people to go to an airport closer to their home so they don't have to spend two and a half hours on a freeway to get to LAX.

Response:

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

PHMP00037 Frye, Nora

None Provided

10/30/2001

PHMP00037-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Nora Frye. I live at 7844 Midfield Avenue, Westchester, California, home of the Los Angeles International Airport. I'm here all the way from Westchester. That's a long way in the evening to be driving, although I did get a ride, but I'm here in support of the people that live here locally in Monterey Park. I know what they are talking about noise. And any way that they can be helped, I'm for it.

I'm also here for safety and health situations at LAX International without any type of expansion. We've had enough. It's been expanded, expanded, expanded. And I personally know someone who has had to give up her home twice. As you get older, it's harder to do.

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-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition.

PHMP00037-2

Comment:

I am for the Regional Airport Plan. And from my understanding, Ontario has room for a third runway within safety constraints. I think the question is how to get the airlines there. Well, where are the salespeople? Where are the salespeople to get the people outside of California to fly into Ontario? I know my son has flown there on United two years ago and he had a better price than flying into LAX. Plus, he made it to our house in the same amount of time because it wasn't such a hindrance getting out of LAX.

Ontario is realistic for expansion. And I think every effort should be made to build the business so the airlines feel the need to go there.

Response:

Comment noted. Use of Ontario International Airport was thoroughly discussed in Chapter 1, Air Transportation in the Los Angeles Region, located in the Draft LAX Master Plan. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PHMP00038 Shriver, Daniel

None Provided

10/30/2001

PHMP00038-1

Comment:

Hello. My name is Daniel Shriver. And I'm here representing Atemi-Ryu JuJitsu, which is a close-range martial art that would be highly appropriate for flight attendants and flight crews. We've given information to Congressman Waxman. We've done a demonstration for his office, and he thinks it's highly effective and should be considered. It is a close-range combat skill. It is not a sport. It is something that is being trained right now in Fort Bragg. If we're going to have our flight attendants and flight crews to be on the front line of this new war, we should give them the tools to succeed.

If you have a sister or a mother or someone that you care about, you would want them to know this skill. It is a skill that uses leverage and knowledge over size and strength. It is very effective. It is not a sport. It can take care of the drunken executive who is trying to take a crap on the tray. It could take care of the crazy man who is trying to pull a copilot out of the seat or it can take care of the deadly terrorist. Please consider this. We have given information to the FAA. We have given information to the Flight Attendants Association, and we are serious.

September 11th I lost a dear friend to the World Trade Center. He was a guy that lived in Los Angeles and got a great opportunity to be a stockbroker with his brother in the World Trade Center. He was a fighter. He was able to make some phone calls and talk about, "It doesn't look good and give everybody my best and let them know that I love them." This is a personal mission for me to see if you guys will take the opportunity to learn the skill or at least get a demonstration. It is effective. It is the real deal, and it is something that my friend from the Flight Attendants Association said, "We need to start that measure."

If we introduce a gun into the system, it can be used against you. A Taser is a one-fire shot. Cords come out. What if you miss the wrong person? You're done. We've eliminated pocketknives, all this stuff. With a pen you can do the same damage that you could do with a box cutter. Every martial artist across the country when 9/11 happened said, "If the flight attendant that had the first box cutter to her neck only had simple martial arts, this would be a different world we're living in. I am genuine. I am sincere. This is effective. Please consider it, Atemi-Ryu LA.com --- Atemi-RyuLA@AOL.com is the way to get to me. My name is Daniel Shriver. My phone number is 310-871-9015.

Again, this is a personal mission. Once you see it, you'll see how effective and appropriate it is. A person could take multiple attackers. You don't have to worry if there are eight strong people in the cabin hoping they are brave and strong enough to pull somebody off. They are on the front lines. This is where the rubber meets the road. Let's give them the tools to succeed so we can all get back to flying and get back to the way we remember life.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHMP00039 Finney, Kevin

Coalition for Clean Air

10/30/2001

PHMP00039-1

Comment:

Kevin Finney representing the Coalition For Clean Air, 30 years of experience in Southern California working for practical solutions to our air pollution problems.

Coalition for Clean Air firmly believes Southern California's future aviation demand must be met by a regional solution that will share both the substantial burdens of mitigation needed to reduce the significant environmental impacts associated with modern-day airport operations.

Response:

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

PHMP00039-2

Comment:

Well before Los Angeles World Airports and the FAA proposed a massive expansion of LAX's facilities, Los Angeles International Airport was already identified as the second largest emissions source for smog-forming gases in the Los Angeles area. Currently only emissions from Chevron U.S.A. surpassed the levels of smog-forming emissions generated at LAX. The future of the airport is likely to surpass all emissions sources for smog-forming chemicals in the southcoast air basin, especially if the facility expands as proposed under the Draft Master Plan and Draft EIS/EIR as future regulatory actions where aircraft emission standards is restricted by international law.

Response:

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

PHMP00039-3

Comment:

Although the Coalition is not opposed to a limited expansion scenario for the LAX facilities to help meet future aviation demand, none of the build alternatives presented in the Draft Master Plan and Draft EIS/EIR should be considered limited nor do they adequately mitigate the substantial environmental impacts that will be brought upon the residential and business communities surrounding the airport and under its established flight paths.

Response:

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

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

PHMP00039-4**Comment:**

If any of the three build alternatives are pursued, as described under the Draft EIS/EIR, the result is likely to be a significant increase in air toxics, fine particles, smog-forming chemicals, noise and other human health hazards.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding increased air pollution. Also, please see Topical Response TR-HRA-3 regarding human health impacts of toxic air contaminants.

PHMP00039-5**Comment:**

And since these impacts will fall most heavily on the low-income and minority communities surrounding the airport, they would seem to constitute a clear case of environmental injustice.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00017-190 and PC02203-33.

PHMP00039-6**Comment:**

What is needed is, indeed, to focus on airport security and a regional solution with Los Angeles International Airport constrained in terms of its passenger capacity. The Coalition hopes that the airport authority and the FAA will consider the comments that we have submitted and will move forward on, both, adopting more significant mitigation measures and developing a new proposal that the public can comment on and a new Environmental Impact Report for that proposal.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PHMP00039-1 through PHMP00039-5 above. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan Role in the Regional Approach to meeting demand. Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, was added and was addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR in response to comments submitted on the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHMP00040 Heitman, Verne**None Provided****10/30/2001****PHMP00040-1****Comment:**

My name is Vern Heitman. I live in Monterey Park under the glide path. I oppose expansion of LAX. Future growth in this area is to the east and to the north in the region. Each area needs to take its share of the traffic and the economic opportunities with expansion in their areas. The current EIR needs to stop for Mayor Hahn's new proposals and to do a new EIR.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHMP00041 Lopez-Reid, Norma City of Montebello

10/30/2001

PHMP00041-1

Comment:

Thank you. Good evening, everyone. My name is Norma Lopez-Reid, and I'm councilwoman from the City of Montebello. I'm also a member of the Airport Noise Community Roundtable. I would like to talk about the residents of Montebello and how they have expressed ongoing legitimate concerns over this proposed expansion of LAX. In fact, the counsel and the staff receive noise and safety complaints regularly.

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.

PHMP00041-2

Comment:

Our primary concern is the low overflights over our community. And, basically, to let you know, every time I look up in the sky, it feels like the airplane is going to land on my roof. And, you know, I'm a person who travels a good bit. So if I had wanted to live near the airport for convenience, I think I would have bought a house there. At this point in time it's not only annoying, but it's also, we believe, a safety factor.

Response:

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

PHMP00041-3

Comment:

At the airport's current operation, Montebello's residents as well as surrounding communities are severely impacted by the noise of low overflights. Expansion of LAX would compound the existing noise, safety and reduce quality of life issues. Because of the concerns, in August of 2000 the Montebello City Council adopted a resolution supporting a Regional Airport Plan. As such, the City Council -- the City of Montebello remains steadfast in voicing our concerns and we are vehemently opposed to the expansion.

At this time we ask you to readdress your plan, spend time, perhaps a day in our city, and to please listen to our concerns.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise in Section 4.1, Noise, and 4.2, Land Use, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 14a, and 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Reports S-1, S-2, S-9a, and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHMP00042 Rowe, Joy**None Provided****10/30/2001****PHMP00042-1****Comment:**

Good evening. I'm Joy Rowe. 30 years ago the FAA designated this area Monterey Park, Montebello as a corridor, alternate corridor. Since then the demographics have greatly changed because it used to be cow pastures and hills, vacant hills.

We live in Monterey Park on a hill overlooking a school. We have jets going -- jumbo jets coming over at 2,500 feet. It's not 2,500 feet, it's 1,600 feet where they are coming over. The kids are stopping and looking up and waiving at the passengers in the plane as these big jets are banking and turning to go -- because we're in the downwind right now. That means they are coming -- they are going to start their landing pattern. And they are coming in not every 30 seconds, which I understand is like a mile apart. They are coming in at 15 to 20 seconds over and over and over again. And I'm wondering why you have the EIR study for LAX and L.A. City, but you have not included EIR studies for out here where we are -- where we have been greatly impacted and the our kind of life has greatly changed with all the noise that we're having. Sometimes at 5:00 o'clock in the morning -- we understand they are not supposed to fly after 10:00 o'clock or before 6:00 o'clock in the morning, but they do all the time. When we complain, we get no results whatsoever.

Response:

The commentor is affected by the base leg (perpendicular) segment of the westerly approaches to the airport. This approach is used by all traffic arriving from west coast, Pacific and European origins. Under heavy traffic conditions, the base leg moves eastward over Monterey Park to better increase the separations between arriving aircraft and to safely sequence them into the arrival flows coming directly from the east. This eastward extension of the base leg approach results in the conditions described by the commentor. Air Traffic Control management has evaluated modifications of the approaches to the north and south runway complexes to increase aircraft altitude over Monterey Park, resulting in noise level decreases of several decibels. It is not likely that the procedures can be changed to remove the traffic entirely from over the area. Any modifications to the base leg approach to reduce the impacts of flights over communities under them beyond the 65 CNEL contour will be undertaken independent of the Draft EIS/EIR process. For further information on the effect of these approaches, see Subtopical Response TR-N-3.5 regarding the effects of elevation on noise, Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase, and Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

The commentor misunderstands the nighttime operating procedures. Over ocean procedures are in effect between midnight and 6:30 a.m., which result in the great majority of flights during those hours occurring over the ocean. However, before midnight, and when adverse weather conditions do not permit over ocean operations, aircraft operate as they do during daytime hours - by landing at the airport from the east.

PHMP00042-2**Comment:**

So I don't know. I know L.A. City is getting money, not just LAX, but they are getting revenue. So if you're going to continue this, I propose that Monterey Park gets at least two cents per passenger that comes over Monterey Park in the planes because I know the bottom line is money.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHMP00043 Hough, Marcus

None Provided

10/30/2001

PHMP00043-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Marcus Hough. I am a resident of Lennox, California, which is adjacent to the L.A. Airport. We went to a lot of these meetings that the airport has been putting on, and we're trying to build a relationship with them in good faith. So what we did in Lennox is we came up, as with per the Mayor's direction as soon as he was elected, he said that he would make the airport a good neighbor or a better neighbor to the surrounding communities.

So what we drafted in Lennox is what we call a Good Neighbor Policy. We would like to submit that for the Mayor's consideration. We read in the paper on Sunday that he will be taking into consideration our comments. So we will submit our policy that we would like him to look at and just to start working with the surrounding communities instead of having an adversarial relationship, to sit down and actually see what the Lennox community and what everybody else around the airport really wants and really could do for the airport as far as telling them how the airport is affecting us instead of just, you know, these things and meeting places that nothing really gets done, but you record and we say stuff and there's no back and forth.

Response:

LAWA and the FAA are encouraged by the input and creative problem solving. It is the intent of LAWA to be a good neighbor and work cooperatively with adjacent communities in the future.

PHMP00044 Walker, Daniel

Friends of the Green Line

10/30/2001

PHMP00044-1

Comment:

Good evening. I'm Daniel Walker. Tonight I'm speaking on behalf of the Friends of the Green Line. We're a new organization this year that recently came out, basically transit users and people that ride the metrolines and the buses in the Los Angeles Airport area. And we would like to see the Green Line extended into LAX. Not necessarily the plan that was proposed originally in the Master Plan going around behind the airport to a new western terminal which might not be built now, but rather using the original concept of having the Green Line go into the front of the airport, the existing airport, maybe not even the expanded airport.

The MTA owns a 26-mile long railroad track that runs in front of the airport right on Aviation Boulevard. It runs from L.A. Harbor to Alameda and Torrance. It runs right past the airport through Inglewood and eventually connects to the Union Station. We think that would be the ideal place to connect the Green Line from the current Aviation Station about a mile up Aviation Boulevard where they own the right-of-way to some kind of people mover or into parking lot C where you could easily connect the automated people mover system. I know there's been some articles in the L.A. Times that Mayor Hahn wants to look at improved security and improved access from the eastern side of the airport where they own some property now, where they are acquiring some property. So I think this makes sense.

I live about ten blocks north of the airport in Westchester. A lot of my neighbors would like to see reduced congestion, reduced air pollution. So the Green Line going into LAX is, I think, one thing that does that. It doesn't necessarily require an expansion. In fact, if the airport is smaller, it's still, I think, a good thing. Just last week the MTA voted to study for 60 days extending the Green Line out to Norwalk to connect to the Metrolink. In this part of town, Metrolink zooms by the freeway here. Metrolink connects to all of L.A. County and five counties in Southern California. So rather than having all these buses and cars congesting our streets in around the airport and throughout Southern California, if this Green Line is extended and improved, I think everyone benefits.

So we would like the airport to consider that seriously. We think it improves the safety in the area. It certainly can improve security. We could have security checkpoints where the Green Line enters the

airport. It reduces congestion, noise in the area. So we're eager to work with LAX and MTA and local city officials to make the Green Line to go where it's meant to go all along, where it was originally designed to go.

Response:

This comment is in favor of extending the Metro Green Line to LAX in the future. This idea is much more in line with Alternative D, which would include an Intermodal Transportation Center conveniently located on the airport's east side next to the Green Line station at Aviation, with direct people mover access to the terminals. This alternative is detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PHMP00045 Bustamonte, Hugo None Provided

10/30/2001

PHMP00045-1

Comment:

Thank you, sir. Hugo Bustamonte, 1451 Park Avenue, Monterey Park, California. What I hear today, there is something wrong. I can't understand it. This afternoon I was reading a book of Shakespeare or King Henry with a coffee and cigar. Every time a 747 went by my house I would look at it going by. To me these aircraft could be Beethoven, Bach. I enjoy the airplanes going by the houses.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHMP00045-2

Comment:

The Los Angeles Airport is fine where it is there, there's -- you don't have to make any additions. What you have to do is rearrange the buildings. The terminals should be pushed in. They are too far out. One of the AOPA fellows was talking about the runways are too short or too close together. They are not. I think an experienced pilot should know how to handle aircraft. Sometimes you get a good cross wind.

The problem is you have your freight lines. You have your little small -- we call them feeders, and your regular airlines. And you have the big one, the big troublesome one of all, the international. Regarding the lack of terminal space, the international should be pushed as far to the ocean as you can to the sand dunes. That's the best place. What I had seen, sometimes half-a-dozen small feeder lines from the skyways and American Eagle Airlines blocking 747s and their burning fuels standing there 10, 15 minutes.

So the problem is, L.A. Airport as the airport is all right as it is, the trouble is -- reshuffle some of the buildings. There's one more thing that should be done, the island of hotel and buildings in the center of the airport between 25 and 24, they should be removed. They are in the way. That's where your problem is, if you have an accident there. That's all have I to say. There's no reason for any regional airport. These people, they are not aviation people. I'm 72 years old. That doesn't bother me. I love the airplanes, just reshuffle some of the buildings. That's all.

Response:

Comment noted. All of the proposed build alternatives include various improvements and modifications to the existing airfield in order to substantially improve the operating efficiency of aircraft at LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

PHSP00001 McGindley, Meryt Councilmember Ruth Galanter's 11/1/2001
Office

PHSP00001-1

Comment:

Hi. My name is Meryt McGindley. I'm legislative deputy for policy and communications for Los Angeles Councilmember Ruth Galanter who chairs the Commerce Energy and National Resources Committee of the city council which oversees the Los Angeles World Airports Department. The address is City Hall, Room 475. I would like to read a statement by Councilmember Galanter on the record here tonight.

Thank you very much for being here tonight. In light of the events of September 11th the entire Master Plan is most likely obsolete. The assaults of the World Trade Center and the Pentagon have demonstrated that airports must operate differently or they may not be able to operate at all. Even before September 11th, trends within the airline industry were unclear. While the LAWA-proposed Master Plan includes in all its alternatives runways to accommodate planes carrying 600 passengers or more, airlines have, in fact, been flying and buying more 757s and 767s. Certainly since September 11, demand has fallen off the charts and the demand forecasts that the entire Master Plan is based on are no longer useful. In fact, the EIR is so flawed in its conception and current relevance, that the environmental assessment is inherently flawed as well.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, PC02131-5, and AL00033-253.

PHSP00001-2

Comment:

I'm concerned that we are now being asked to comment on a Fifth Alternative that is conceptual, at best, with no opportunities to inspect any analysis on its impacts on the surrounding communities, businesses or residents.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan alternative, and was circulated for public review and comment.

PHSP00001-3

Comment:

I'm concerned as long as this EIR process is on the table, the door is still open for incremental expansion later in this decade.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHSP00001-4

Comment:

I am also concerned that nowhere in the existing Master Plan document or in the proposed Fifth Alternative is there an overarching plan to address projected growth and demand in the Southern California region using LAWA's other airports, Ontario and Palmdale.

I urge you to reject this planning process and begin anew with a true regional plan assessed with a new environmental document that adequately addresses impacts on a regional basis.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR dealt only with the development of LAX. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. The recommendation that the FAA conduct a comprehensive analysis of various regional scenarios is beyond the scope of the subject EIS/EIR.

PHSP00002 Schneider, Denny

None Provided

11/1/2001

PHSP00002-1

Comment:

Good evening. I'm Denny Schneider. My address is 7929 Breen, B-r-e-e-n, Avenue in Los Angeles in Westchester. I'm here this evening with several hats on. Three and a half years ago I started out in favor of controlled expansion of LAX. The more I learned about it from heading up our neighborhood community organization, the more concerned I became because it was getting noisier and noisier. I discovered very rapidly that there is no way in which to control the amount of planes that are coming to LAX under the present circumstances. And so when someone tells you that the capacity of one level or another is our target for LAX, it's just an objective. It's not a thing that could be held accountable.

Response:

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

PHSP00002-2

Comment:

As we've seen, obviously, on the 11th the idea of expanding LAX has sort of gone away temporarily, at least. And what we really need is a regional solution whereby we build up our infrastructure all over the region and we spread the risks of a problem. Right now LAX is a single-point failure potential. If LAX has major damage, even from an earthquake, we in Southern California will have a major problem.

Response:

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

PHSP00002-3

Comment:

The environmental impacts on this area from the airport is of grave concern. For the people in this area you should be concerned of the way in which noise is defined. They use the number 65. My neighborhood happens to be 63. We are subjected to a number of airplane noise and we've had things fall off the walls, but we don't qualify for soundproofing. We have on the average of 40 to 50 events per hour at 50 DBs, and at least one every hour of the night and day at 70 DBs. That's a very loud vacuum cleaner.

What we've been told by the FAA in the roundtable discussions is that LAX will get as many flights as airplanes want to fly there. That means more flights over you folks as well, and you won't be counted as being impacted.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-N-2 regarding single event noise and CNEL differences, Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration, and Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase.

PHSP00003 Alpern, Kenneth Friends of the Green Line 11/1/2001

PHSP00003-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Kenneth Alpern. I'm part of a voluntary organization called Friends of the Green Line. I've been objected to expanding the Green Line in LAX. My address is 3222 Military Avenue, Los Angeles, California. I also wear more than one hat. I'm a physician who treats mostly Medi-Cal transit-dependent individuals. So the infrastructure that was alluded to by the previous speaker is very, very important to me, especially because we're so many decades behind in creating an appropriate infrastructure for the size and complexity of Southern California.

First off, as envisioned by Mayor Riordan, the LA Master Plan is pretty much going to be a thing of the past especially after 9/11. Secondly, we're entering a recession. That's no secret, especially here in Southern California. Thirdly, Mayor Hahn, now the MTA, are indeed committed to connecting the Green Line to LAX to both enhance LAX security and our local economy which relies a lot on LAX.

For getting to and from LAX is a nightmare, afternoon driving on the 405, South Bay or the west side or pretty much anywhere between Long Beach and the valley, and a large part because of LAX. And the last of my first initial point is that we have two competing extremes. We have many within the LAWA that want to extend without really considering the impact on the neighbors and also neighbors who are so against expansion that they are unwilling to improve or update LAX for the future. My main point is to have LAWA and Californians to work together. To go correct the inadequacies by more security and efficiency for LAX.

Certainly expedition of linking LAX to the Green Line, we need to be helped by federal representatives, representatives and senators giving us the moneys to do this. This requires millions of dollars, if not billions. Furthermore, let's consider giving LAWA a great partnership in operating just the parking lots, Norwalk, South Bay, so that they can comment and, therefore, put into the Green Line so they can be a positive cooperating partner to building a Green Line that will help Southern California and enhance LAX.

Response:

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

**PHSP00004 Park, Noel San Pedro and Peninsula
Homeowners' Coalition 11/1/2001**

PHSP00004-1

Comment:

My name is Noel Park. I live at 3233 South Walker Avenue in San Pedro. I'm the president of the San Pedro Peninsula Homeowners Coalition which represents 14 resident associations.

San Pedro -- some three years ago we got response from increasing noise issues in our community, especially Southern San Pedro and Palos Verdes, of aircraft noise. It's no coincidence that the highest noise levels in the 1999 Peninsula Noise Study was South Shores. We joined RSAC, which is the Alliance for Regional Solution to Airport Congestion, mainly consisting of people from Westchester to Playa Del Rey and surrounding areas. And I'm a member of the board of RSAC and, as such, Mayor Gordon of El Segundo and various other people. I just want to say, we stand here in total solidarity with

RSAC, with El Segundo and all other 65 governmental entities that are assigned on to their proposed regional plan of air travel expansion.

We submitted a written comment on this plan, as it's displayed in the lobby. I don't think I need to belabor any of that. We feel that the only alternative there acceptable is the no-project alternative.

Response:

Comment noted. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHSP00004-2

Comment:

I have a document here I want to share with you. I'll leave it with the court reporter. It's called "As Inland Empire Grows, Freeway Commute Slows" from the Tuesday, October 30 Los Angeles Times, which is about excruciating length of congestion on the 91, 60 and 10 Freeways as people try to head back to the evergrowing Inland Empire. I think that's just indicative. The same type of thing is going on in Santa Clarita, Valencia. Now, they are going to do a huge housing development on the Cajon Ranch. For all those people expected to drive to LAX to go on air travel, we don't think that's acceptable, the freeways, some of you on the 405, it just doesn't make any sense to us.

Response:

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

PHSP00004-3

Comment:

I want to say, I want to quote to you just from this Sunday, October 28th Los Angeles Times article entitled "Focus Shifts Hearings on LAX Expansion Plan." Does that mean that the public is being asked other suggestions at six public hearings beginning Tuesday, and doesn't have a single picture, map or sketch or basic description of the mayor's concept. We don't know what to say about this new concept. It's hard for us to understand how the whole thing could be reconfigured and taken forward under this whole Master Plan with the old Environmental Impact Report still in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, prepared in compliance with NEPA and CEQA, provided a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan alternative, and was circulated for public review and comment.

3. Comments and Responses

PHSP00004-4

Comment:

As far as the 78 map cap, if that could be somehow guaranteed, we could look at that. We've seen the airport grow from 40 of the existing Master Plan to 68 (timer beeping over his words.) We're afraid it's going to happen again.

Response:

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

PHSP00005 Shriver, Daniel

None Provided

11/1/2001

PHSP00005-1

Comment:

Hello. My name is Daniel Shriver. I live at 4741 Ben Avenue, Valley Village, California. I'm here representing Atemi-Ryu JuJitsu. It is a close-range combat style of martial arts. It could be highly effective and appropriate to train flight crews. This is the same martial art that is being taught to special forces in Fort Bragg and it uses pressure points and joint locks.

The reason I'm here telling you this is has nothing to do with airport expansion. Everyone has been affected by 9/11. I've lost a friend in the World Trade Center. He had enough time to make some phone calls and tell his family that he loves them and his last words was "It doesn't look good." His name is Joe. He used to live here . He's not with us anymore. He was a fighter, and we're fighters. We're going to pick up the fight where he left off for him and 6,000 other people. My mission, I'm spearheading a movement to raise awareness that this is a highly effective martial art. What we're going to do, we have people from our school that are going to be doing a small demonstration to show you people how effective it is.

We have flight attendants out there on the front lines. We need to give them the tools and training and be innovative how we approach the situations. My friend, the president of the Flight Attendants Association, testified when asked about introducing guns to the cabins, she had security experts across the country to come up with some ideas. There is a green laser light someone came up with. You could go blind, maybe. There are Tasers, two darts firing gun. They are attached, what happens if you miss? What happens if there are two pairs, two attackers? What if there's a crazy man with fear, breaks into the cabin and pulls off -- tries to pull off the co-pilot. Do you kill him? This is appropriate for the drunken executive who is trying to make a jerk of himself or the deadly terrorist. This is effective, a submission technique that you don't have to worry about, are there eight brave, strong people in the cabin? One flight attendant of any size could take care of multiple attackers. It does not take size or strength. It takes skill and knowledge.

You've heard the expression, knowledge is power. It has never been more clear with Atemi-Ryu JuJitsu, which means a strike to the body's weak spot or pressure points. Jujitsu means "gentle art." We're not trying to sell you on the idea of getting a kickboxer in there and having them do high kicks and do something they can't do. This is something within your ability and something you should consider and debate and discuss, this highly effective skill. Mr. Ritchie, is this a good time to do the demonstration?

All right this is Vince Cecere who is a Sensei. He is a third-degree black belt in Sanuces Ryu and second-degree in Jujitsu. The skills you are about to see are literally state of the art. There are very few people that could even teach this. There were 725 different styles of Jujitsu. This is a gentle, appropriate one.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHSP00006 Politeo, Tom**None Provided****11/1/2001****PHSP00006-1****Comment:**

Hi. My name is Tom Politeo. I live in San Pedro. My mailing address is P.O. Box 1256, San Pedro, 90733. I would like to start out by thanking Don Knabe for his leadership in supporting solutions for air travel in Southern California. In almost every corner in Southern California we are facing a transportation crunch. To ensure cities are attractive to live in and our region is prosperous, to ensure that we aren't wasting our lives stuck in traffic and in long lines at the airports, we need to explore a comprehensive transportation solution.

With new technology knocking on the door and especially after the tragedy of September 11, we need to look under every planning rock, security, convenience, diversity, competition, economics, technology, restructure management, redistricting, power-sharing livable communities and the environment so that we find good answers that work locally and regionally.

I think we should scrap our current plans for LAX and take a deep breath. So I'm supporting a no-plan option, but start planning anew. We need time after September 11th to develop perspective on important issues so we can act with enough understanding to avoid overreaction or missing points that might not yet be obvious.

We should look at diversity and good distribution, key planning points. For the sake of security, both against natural disasters and terrorist threats, it makes sense to distribute air travel use fairly, evenly throughout Southern California. If we do this, travelers may find airports conveniently close to home or work. On the other hand, the economies of scale for airlines may suggest greater service consolidation. Some airport neighborhoods may welcome expanded travel and others may reject it. We need to explore these issues to find optimal answers.

Response:

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

PHSP00006-2**Comment:**

As part of travel needs, we should explore a high-speed rail network that links San Diego, Los Angeles, Las Vegas, San Francisco and Sacramento. This could provide convenience and security. We cannot study our airports in a vacuum that does not consider this option.

Response:

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

PHSP00006-3**Comment:**

Our planning should also be comprehensive. We should consider all of our seaports as part of transportation network that could serve Southern California. Business passengers, vacationers, tourists and cargo should move easily between these facilities and major destinations.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHSP00006-4

Comment:

We should look at an automated electric-rail between moving cargo, between our air and seaports and key industrial locations. Such a system could speed up cargo transit, improve security, help government inspections, improve street traffic and help clean up our air. It could be a vital cog in a powerful Southern California economic engine.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHSP00006-5

Comment:

Exploring such an option will also have an impact on how we plan individual ports. We must modernize our plans. The city of Los Angeles is too small to be inclusive enough to be a good regional planning authority, and it is too large and geographically disjointed to serve the local needs properly. The City of Los Angeles is not a good authority to maintain such regionally-important facilities. Can I have a few seconds to go over, please? Thank you.

The City should transfer its land and seaports to the County. The County should run them as part of a regional network system in a framework with other Southern California counties. Each individual facility should be administered by a joint powers authority which the County is one partner and local neighborhoods near the facility are another.

The quality of our lives, our prosperity and the environment depend on what we do here. Let's take the time and develop the leadership and vision to move us wisely into a future that will serve us well. I think a lot of good work has been done planning proposals for the airport.

Response:

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

PHSP00007	Schneider, Denny	None Provided	11/1/2001
------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PHSP00007-1

Comment:

I'm Denny Schneider. Again, I would like to take a couple more seconds to add a few more comments. One of the suggestions and concerns that we have is low-frequency noise around the airport. When you're considering all of your security issues, one of the things that we definitely want to see, according to the experts on noise transmission, is a sound -- is a berm of land that's about eight feet thick and probably at least 10 to 15 feet high. You could use it as a security wall, and it will protect the local neighborhoods from the low frequency noise that goes right through buildings and travels for many, many miles and keeps many of us up at night.

In addition to that, this one is just specific about the EIR itself, and that is that there are a lot of mistakes in the EIR that needs to be addressed such as the one that defines how many people are impacted. The EIR states that about 40,000 people are impacted. When the airport and FAA came out and spoke to my community about a year and a half ago or two years ago now, they indicated in a view graph it was 87,000. We also took a census. We took the census charts and overlaid it with the charts that the airport puts out on a quarterly basis, and it also was in the 80- to 90,000-people range. So there's a lot of questionable pieces of data.

Response:

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. For additional discussion, please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation.

The differences between the modeled noise contours prepared for presentation in the Draft EIS/EIR and those prepared for delivery to the California Department of Transportation are discussed in Subtopical Response TR-N-1.2, regarding modeled vs. measured baseline year noise levels.

PHSP00007-2

Comment:

In terms of the FAA, I would just encourage you to look at the flight paths and to try to tighten them up a little bit and, specifically, to go back and ask for the ability to limit the number of flights coming to any one airport. This area on this side of the airport, our area, are all going to be inundated when the economy picks up again. And because of the way the noise is calculated, it just isn't going to help.

We're told, for instance, by the FAA folks that the flights coming in along the Santa Monica Freeway from the west to the east get in line and go around Monterey Park to get in line to land. Our eyesight is improving dramatically because we can now see those planes from Westchester going from the west to the east. At night the stars move in our sky in all directions. We call it the Hollywood effect. We're promoting it to promote tourism.

Response:

Comment noted. For information regarding future noise increases, please see Topical Response TR-N-6 regarding noise increase. In addition, please see Potential Noise Abatement Measures in Section 7.1 and Alternative-Specific Abatement Opportunities in Section 7.2 of Appendix D, Aircraft Noise Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR. Turbo-jet aircraft arriving from the Pacific Northwest and Asia are routed over the Santa Monica VOR. These aircraft cross a point 10 miles west of Santa Monica at altitude of 10,000 feet and then descend to cross Santa Monica at or above 7,000 before proceeding eastbound, before making turns in the Monterey Park area back toward the airport to land.

PHSP00008 Gaines, Jerry

None Provided

11/1/2001

PHSP00008-1

Comment:

My name is Jerry Gaines. I'm at 2101 West 37th Street, San Pedro in Los Angeles. Just a couple of brief comments. My many years of living in this area, I've been involved in a lot of landuse issues both as a taskforce chair for three council people -- I served on the charter commission -- and I'm also currently planning commissioner on the Harbor Planning Commission. So I have some city rep, but I also bring to you my wisdom, for whatever it's worth, in terms of the Harbor area as perceptions go.

You heard earlier about many of the homeowner groups being concerned about the impacts of any changes at LAX. I would also point out that we have a lot of experience with the other big industrial proprietorship organization called the Harbor at the World Port. Just recently through Mayor Hahn's efforts and others, we adopted a standing committee in the Harbor Commission to put together about 30 stakeholders from a variety of different entities in areas here in the region and try to address the various kind of environmental issues of an industrial operation of the LAX complex itself. It's a new process. It's one that we look optimistic to because of the fact that all lines of communication are critical as you go through the pressures of economic growth, the entities these organizations represent, and the like.

I also, obviously, address as a citizen what I'm sure the draft process of any new plans that are trying to, transportation and egress. Security issues are obviously on everybody's minds now. The regional focus is critical. I know SCAG worked on this for years. It's difficult when you have multiple government and jurisdictions and groups that try to mitigate and get everybody to come together. But I think Supervisor Knabe is doing his best. I commend him for that.

3. Comments and Responses

As one person living in the Harbor area, I go back to this very room we're in when we first came here 25, 30 years ago you were talking about an off-shore airport. That was a very strong meeting in this room that we're standing in -- about people's feelings about an off-shore airport. You could see that airport issue has been going for many, many years as how you could do it, where you would put it, how you make it bigger. I just urge you to think about some of these suggestions, particularly the process of getting all of people's stakeholders involved.

Response:

Comment noted. A major component of the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR work program is public participation and outreach. LAWA has had press releases, newsletters, neighborhood info packets, public workshops, and a web site in order to communicate with neighbors and interested parties. Please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public hearing process.

PHSP00009 Walker, Daniel

Friends of the Green Line

11/1/2001

PHSP00009-1

Comment:

Sure. My name is Daniel Walker, 7416 West 82nd Street.

Thanks for sticking around. I know I'm a little bit late. I represent a group called Friends of Green Line. We're mostly the West Los Angeles residents, and we would like to see the Green Line extend into LAX. That's the main reason why I came here to talk to people, people of San Pedro, and also the staff here. I brought a little handout which kind of describes our group. We're volunteers, local residents. We use mass transit. We wanted to talk about the Green Line and also possibly extending mass transit to other areas of Los Angeles like the San Pedro area. The MTA owns the Harbor subdivision railroad tracks that run from San Pedro right to LAX and it runs further north from Inglewood and to Union Station. A lot of us residents of that area don't really want to see an expansion of LAX, but would like to see less cars and less pollution. So I think there's been some steps taken recently toward that end.

Response:

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

PHSP00009-2

Comment:

Just last week the MTA approved a study to extend the Green Line out from Norwalk to the Norwalk transportation center of Santa Fe Springs. Here's the EIR that they did a few years ago. They are going to revisit this.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHSP00009-3

Comment:

We would like them, also, to take a look at extending the Green Line to LAX, not necessarily to the Master Plan location on the western terminal, that implies there's going to be a larger expansion, but up the Harbor subdivision train tracks, perhaps up to Century, people would move there and go into LAX, take a lot of traffic off the street and reduce pollution and noise.

So we're a volunteer group. None of us are paid. We're users of mass transit. In fact, this Sunday we're going to take a bike ride of the route at 11:00 o'clock for everybody that wants to come and join us. We think this should be studied, at least looked at.

In fact, today we went and looked at the railroad tracks as they go past the runway just to get a look to see if there would be any concerns there. We studied them. We are going to submit some comment

3. Comments and Responses

about that. There certainly are some issues that need to be looked at in terms of runway safety. This should be done in the most safest possible way. We think it's feasible. The railroad tracks run right next to the Aviation Boulevard, right next to the airport, so it should be a feasible project. And we want to work with the airport, work with other local residents that I recognize here, to make it happen, not for an expanded airport necessarily, but to alleviate traffic in the area. We think it could be done.

Response:

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

PHL00001 Crowder, Tessie None Provided 11/3/2001

PHL00001-1

Comment:

My name is Tessie Crowder. I live at 9622 7th Avenue, Inglewood, 90305. I would like them to hold the expansion just like it is as the airport was built for 40 million passengers a year. We're now up to 68. They want to expand to 79. This will mean extending runways, and that will put a whole lot of people out of their homes, plus the noise will be very bad. It's already bad. It would be worse. And the traffic will be bad. The pollution will increase more so than what it is now. And that's why I would like them to hold to the regular plan like it is.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation; and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, 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-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels, and Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHL00002 Hefner, Roy LAX Area Advisory Committee 11/3/2001

PHL00002-1

Comment:

Hi. I'm Roy Heffner at 6548 West 80th Place, Westchester, California 90045. I am a member of the LAX Area Advisory Committee. In fact, at the present I'm the chair of that committee. We have submitted a long list of written comments comprised of about 44 pages; however, I felt incumbent upon me to represent my committee to come at least to one of these activities. And seeing as how L.A. High School, the bravest high school in the city of Los Angeles, was my alma mater, I could not avoid coming back here.

I want to congratulate David and Jim for going to all these meetings and sitting here with great patience listening to many of the same stories over and over, and I will not disappoint. There are certain questions that we are still very concerned about.

In all of the alternatives that you have at the present time -- and I assume in Mayor Hahn's one, that you're going to have listed some type of maximum capacity both in tons of cargo and in flight operations and in number of passengers. However, as has happened back with the 40 million annual passengers, when the City Council agreed, 40 million annual passengers, when the Board of Airport Commissioners agreed to the number of annual passengers, when we reached that point, there was no cap. I want to know how you're going to cap these figures that you have in the Environmental Impact Report. I think there are 78.9. There is 89 something. There is 98 million. There is 4.2 million tons of cargo.

3. Comments and Responses

Mayor Hahn's last proposal, which is verbal and not in written form -- we're very happy with the fact they are not going to have a Ring Road; that they are not going to have a west terminal; that they are going to not add anymore gates. But throughout the years we would like to see that, as you have indicated, will come about in very a firm fashion, in written capacity.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels. Subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, newly elected Mayor James Hahn directed the Los Angeles Board of Airport Directors to develop a new LAX Master Plan alternative that, consistent with public comment calling for a regional approach alternative, would be designed to accommodate passenger and cargo activity levels at LAX that would approximate those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, have fewer environmental impacts than the No Action/No Project Alternative and, in light of the events of September 11, 2001, would be designed to enhance airport safety and security. Although the conclusion of the Draft EIS/EIR is that Alternative C would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region, that conclusion has been superseded by the conclusion of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D is now considered to be the Environmental Superior alternative and would have the least negative impacts to the communities and the region.

PHL00002-2

Comment:

Going back to this particular EIR/EIS, I want to trace the world of history for the record. In 1986 the 40 million annual passengers were surpassed. I believe it was around November of that year. In 1988 in February the Department of Airports submitted an EIR called 2000. That was supposed to take care of passengers up to the year 2000 and the expansion up to the year 2000. The City Council decided that they did not like that, and they wanted LAX to be part of the City. So it was submitted down to the City Planning Department around 1989. They held a couple of meetings, nothing to speak of any importance. And finally the airport said, "You're not doing anything. So we're going to take it back."

And back around 1994, 1995, the airport, once again, picked this up. They hired consultants and came up with four concepts. And at the time they were presented to the general public, there was comment made.

Since that time, though, two of those were reduced.

Response:

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

PHL00003	Gabbard, Dana	Southern California Transit Advocates	11/3/2001
-----------------	----------------------	--	------------------

PHL00003-1

Comment:

Good morning. My name is Dana Gabbard. I'm executive secretary of Southern California Transit Advocates. I currently reside at 2424 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles. I'm going to try to speak a little slowly since I can see our court reporters are working diligently; but it makes their lives a little easier to not speak so fast, which is my habit.

Well, you know, it's very hard to know what to comment on because we're being handed material that we're being told is obsolete. And it's rather discouraging to hear that there may be additional hearings after this mysterious Fifth Alternative is formulated. That's just a sort of bureaucratic hedging that really discourages the public. I mean, you better be more forthcoming in saying "we're going to have meetings about the Fifth Alternative" because we have no ability to comment on it because there's nothing in writing. How can we comment on something that the mayor is sort of pulling out of his hip pocket and just sort of blowing the breeze with? We're going to have to have meetings. You're going to have lawsuits over that, otherwise. I think you have to admit that.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan alternative, and was circulated for public review and comment. During the public review period for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, twelve public hearings were held.

PHL00003-2

Comment:

We're concerned about the ground transportation component. The original plan, in my opinion, stunk. It served bureaucracies. They were going to hold the Green Line extension hostage to the dubious extra terminal they wanted to the west. I think it's incumbent now to relook at what we're going to do about connection the Green Line. I think we need to understand what we'll need to do is get it close to the airport and have some sort of people mover arrangement because of various constraints on curvatures, et cetera. What we hope we can have is a regional transportation center that will be multi-mobile for the buses and trains that meet there and have the people mover serve that. That would be logical thing to do, and it would actually probably be an improvement and hopefully will facilitate getting more people out of their cars when they are going to the airport.

Response:

This comment is in favor of extending the Metro Green Line to LAX. This is the intent of Alternative D, which would include an Intermodal Transportation Center conveniently located on the airport's east side with direct people mover access to the terminals. This alternative was detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PHL00003-3

Comment:

I just hope maybe after the meeting I could ask Mr. Kessler a question or two just personally about one or two things I've heard about what's going on at the Department of Transportation with the meeting in Washington with Mr. Menetta and congressmen about a month and a half ago. No big deal, but I'm just curious about what's going on there. We're watching the process.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHL00003-4

Comment:

I'll just conclude. It amazes me how clueless bureaucrats are. For three years the people around the airport were organizing and the bureaucrats basically seemed totally full of themselves. We are the ones who make the decisions, and the public is there after the fact. It's already proven we have a voice in these issues, and bureaucracy has now been shown they have to answer to the public concerns.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHL00003-5

Comment:

My only concern is that the logical alternative, El Toro, is now being held hostage by certain people down there. Without that alternative, I don't know what the hell we're going to do.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PHL00004

Schneider, Denny

**LAX Community Noise
Roundtable**

11/3/2001

PHL00004-1

Comment:

My name is Denny Schneider. I've spoken before more than a few times. In my capacity as the subcommittee chair for the LAX Community Roundtable, Noise Community Roundtable and other capacities in the Westchester Playa del Rey neighborhood. We, obviously, have been concerned about expansion for years and years and the environmental noise and all the other traffic issues that are aligned with any of the expansion alternatives.

What I'm addressing, myself today, is to Alternative Five and, specifically, although we don't have anything in writing at this point, we are providing just simply suggestions of what we would like to see and hope to review at some point in the future at another hearing.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan alternative, and was circulated for public review and comment. During the public review period for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, twelve public hearings were held. Responses to the commentor's specific suggestions are provided below.

PHL00004-2

Comment:

Basically, I've mentioned that we could have some larger berms around with larger sound walls.

Response:

Please see Section 5.6, Noise, Appendix K, Supplemental Environmental Evaluation for LAX Expressway and State Route 1 Improvements, of the Draft EIS/EIR for a review of potential noise abatement measures. Please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for more information regarding noise-related mitigation. Please see Topical Response TR-N-4 regarding noise mitigation.

PHL00004-3

Comment:

I applaud the mayor in his decision to remove the Ring Road in any of the west terminals.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHL00004-4

Comment:

Also, we would like to -- as the gentleman before me said, it would be nice to have a multi-mobile transportation center someplace in the area locally. I brought some pictures of what they've done in Minneapolis for the record so you could take a look at what they've done. I think that would help considerably.

Response:

This comment is in favor of a highly visible multimodal transit center in the vicinity of LAX. This is the intent of Alternative D, which would include an Intermodal Transportation Center conveniently located on the airport's east side with direct people mover access to the terminals. This alternative was detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PHL00004-5**Comment:**

In addition to that, we would just like to thank you for your efforts in advanced because we are concerned about expansion and the regional solution. And we hope that what you write into your final comments supports the regional solution and ties it in very effectively. That's what we're looking forward to.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, has been designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient and efficient. Alternative D is consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP, which calls for no expansion of LAX and, instead, shifting the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

PHL00005**Russell, Judi****None Provided****11/3/2001****PHL00005-1****Comment:**

My name is Judi Russell. I live at 724 Milwood Avenue in Venice, 90291. This is a letter that we wrote to Mayor Riordan when he was still around. It still applies as our response to this Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PHL00005-2**Comment:**

"We are two artists who are lucky enough to own a house and a studio in Venice. We moved here in 1993 because it was quiet, had good air and was close to the ocean, a good environment to create in. The coast of Southern California is one of the best places in the world to live. We are privileged and don't take it for granted.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHL00005-3**Comment:**

About three years ago in August when we usually sleep with the windows open, all of a sudden during the whole night there was a constant roaring sound and vibration much like a continuous thunder. We found out after many calls that some Class-B airspace had been opened up over our area. We live about minutes north of LAX. And it often keeps us awake all night long.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01834-2.

3. Comments and Responses

PHL00005-4

Comment:

Closing the windows doesn't help enough and sound proofing with dual-glazing is effective only if you don't open your windows and never spend time outside in your yard. But this is Southern California. And we do that.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program and Topical Response TR-LU-4 regarding outdoor noise levels.

PHL00005-5

Comment:

Now they've added a couple of flight patterns over our area during the day and a dreadful holding pattern at night. It's definitely been getting worse, and this is without the expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC01834-2 for more information on flight patterns. Additionally, for information on nighttime awakenings please see Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, and the related appendices S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report, and S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHL00005-6

Comment:

We had always supported you as mayor until now. It is so hard to believe the compassionate conservative could not only allow but actually promote and support the expansion of LAX. It is going to have such an obviously negative impact on so many residents, not only the noise, but the traffic and pollution will be unbearable. Have you tried driving down Lincoln Boulevard lately? It's uncomfortably packed almost all the time, not to mention the effect on our property value.

Response:

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

PHL00005-7

Comment:

There must not be any flight patterns over your homes, Mayor Riordan, or you would never consider this project. We are miles away. Think of how it is for the residents that live closer.

We invite you to spend the days with us to get a real flavor of what it's like. We are unfortunately also under a flight pattern from Santa Monica Airport, but we are very aware of the differences between those flights and those of LAX. They are at least not asking to double their size.

Response:

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

Alternative. Noise impacts were addressed in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D and Technical Report 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures.

PHL00005-8

Comment:

The major airports around the world are all outside of town. It always takes at least a half hour to one and a half hours to get into the city. This doesn't seem to interfere with people traveling.

Response:

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

PHL00005-9

Comment:

Palmdale wants it. That's important. All we need is some quick transportation.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-3 regarding high-speed rail as a solution to airport capacity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PHL00005-10

Comment:

Our peaceful lifestyle is being threatened, and we are very concerned and upset about that. It's cancelled out all the good you've done. Hopefully you read this and maybe reply, which of course he didn't.

Response:

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

PHL00006	Clark, Anne	None Provided	11/3/2001
-----------------	--------------------	----------------------	------------------

PHL00006-1

Comment:

My name is Anne Clark. I'm a new resident of Westchester at 7717 Dunbarton Avenue. I'm not a president or chair of anything. I'm merely a citizen who's concerned. I'm not used to public speaking, so I wrote a few notes if you don't mind. I've been confused by about why common sense is called common sense because it does not appear to be very common. I am at a loss to understand how the expansion of LAX or the increase of traffic to LAX and the surrounds of traffic can benefit anybody. The following are just a few obvious reasons why this whole Master Plan and any considered incremental additions are in no way advantageous to the local public.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Reports 2 and 3, of the Draft EIS/EIR, and Technical Report S-2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

3. Comments and Responses

PHL00006-2

Comment:

First, most people who live close to the airport are low-income working-class people. The reasons for this are obvious; those who can afford to, live further away from the noise and the airport. If the residents of the LAX Airport and areas are displaced, where can they go? Where can they afford to buy or rent? I know of no place.

Response:

Residential relocation was addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ES-1, regarding property values, and Topical Response TR-RBR-1, regarding the residential relocation program.

PHL00006-3

Comment:

In a time when there is a resurgence of gang activity in the area probably due to poor education, dilapidated school buildings and a lack of cohesiveness in the city, how could we possibly justify subjecting our youngsters to additional pollution. Pollution takes many forms, poor air quality, additional noise, disregard for our fellow citizens, and the worst pollution of all, the haves versus the have-nots. Do you think we would be having this discussion if the airport abutted up Bel Air or Beverly Hills?

Response:

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

PHL00006-4

Comment:

I don't know if there is any scientific evidence, but I would guess living in an environment filled with all the mentioned pollutions and violations of human needs must surely result in psychological despair. Again, it appears to be an overpowering of the less advantaged.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00017-190.

PHL00006-5

Comment:

I would like each of the decision makers to take a moment and reflect, how would you feel if it were your children or your grandchildren were being forced to live in this environment? It is not in their best interest. What kind of message do you think we are sending to our youngsters and how do you think it will affect their self esteem if we go on and pulverize our city? Can we adopt a policy of sanity, one that's in the best interest of all our citizens?

Response:

Comment noted.

PHL00006-6

Comment:

Orange County and El Toro can and must handle their own residents' air needs and not expect Los Angeles to carry the whole load. It's not right. It's not fair, and it certainly makes no sense, common or otherwise.

Response:

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

PHL00007

Clarke, Darrell

None Provided

11/3/2001

PHL00007-1

Comment:

Thank you. Okay. I am Darrell Clarke at 339 10th Street, Santa Monica, 90402. I'm cochair of the Sierra Club Angeles Chapter Transportation Committee, vice chair of the City of Santa Monica Planning Commission and newly appointed to the Lincoln Corridor Task Force Citizens' Advisory Committee, although speaking here as an individual. I don't need to repeat the major impact LAX has on its neighbors, the pollution of jet fuel dumped over Inglewood, jet exhaust and, of course, oppose its further expansion. I would like to make a few specific points.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality, and human health and safety in Section 4.24, Human Health and Safety, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 4 and 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-4 and S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition.

PHL00007-2

Comment:

First, from where I am, LAX is my most convenient airport, but it certainly isn't that close to many other people in the L.A. basin, which is in and of itself a major argument for Palmdale, for Orange County, other locations where the airports are closer to people who live there.

Response:

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

PHL00007-3

Comment:

I'm glad the Ring Road is gone because it struck me as absurd to add capacity to roads going from LAX to the 405 Freeway when the 405 is gridlocked already. You just get to the gridlock a little faster. That was a pointless way of mitigating traffic issues to the airport itself and, in fact: this Monday of this week in the evening there was an excellent meeting in Westchester on the subject of widening Sepulveda

3. Comments and Responses

Boulevard from Westchester up to Howard Hughes Center. And the community got together behind a livable-streets approach as opposed to turning it into another Wilshire Boulevard.

Response:

Comment noted. The Ring Road is an important component of Alternatives A, B, and C. The impacts of the Ring Road were summarized in the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHL00007-4

Comment:

There absolutely needs to be a Green Line connection to LAX. There also needs to be a north-south connection, say, from LAX up the 405 Freeway to the San Fernando Valley as an alternative to driving to LAX. These are farther down the road, but they absolutely need to be done, and not as to support future growth of LAX, but to mitigate the impact that LAX already has on its immediate neighbors. LAX needs to step up and mitigate and help fund the rail alternatives to traffic gridlock that's there now.

As an example for the sort of support in L.A. -- this is a book of 3,000 signatures we submitted to the MTA in support of the exposition light-rail line from downtown L.A. to Santa Monica. This is the support of the expanded light-rail network in L.A. And, of course, we need a high capacity people mover moving through the airport. It's ridiculous. The terminal loop is jammed with cars, shuttles, big buses when we need a very high-capacity, reasonable people mover going through that terminal loop to connect these rail lines to connect with off-site use.

Response:

This comment appears to be in support of developing new rail connections to LAX Airport as an alternative to travelers driving. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan (see Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.2 regarding light/conventional rail connections and Subtopical Response TR-ST-5.4 regarding Metro Green Line extension to the west terminal complex) for more information. Alternative D would connect a people mover to an Intermodal Transportation Center near the Aviation station of the Green Line, with no extension of the Green Line necessary for terminal access. The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Sections 4.3.1, On-Airport Surface Transportation, and 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHL00007-5

Comment:

And, finally, I'm absolutely looking forward to the next round of public hearings when we have a more detailed proposal to review.

Response:

Comment noted. Please refer to Topical Response TR-PO-1 for a description of the public review process and schedule of public hearings on the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHL00008 Salk, Mike Councilmember Ruth Galanter's 11/3/2001
Office

PHL00008-1

Comment:

My name is Mike Salk. I'm a District Deputy to Councilmember Ruth Galanter who chairs the Committee on Commerce, Energy and Natural Resources which oversees the airport. Thank you all for being here today.

In light of the events of September 11th, the entire LAX Master Plan is most likely obsolete. The assault on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon have demonstrated the airports must operate differently or they may not be able to operate at all. Even before September 11th trends within the airline industry have been unclear. While the LAWA proposed Master Plan includes in all of its alternatives runways to accommodate planes carrying 600 passengers or more, airlines have, in fact, been flying and buying more 757s and 767s. Certainly demand has fallen off the charts and the demand forecasts that the entire Master Plan is based on are no longer useful. In fact, the EIR is so flawed in its conception and current relevance that environmental assessment is inherently flawed as well.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, PC02131-5, and AL00033-253.

PHL00008-2

Comment:

I am concerned we are now being asked to comment on a Fifth Alternative that is conceptual, at best, with no opportunities to inspect any analyses on its impacts on the surrounding communities, businesses and/or residents.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan alternative, and was circulated for public review and comment.

PHL00008-3

Comment:

I am concerned as long as this EIR process is on the table, the door is still open for incremental expansion later in this decade.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHL00008-4

Comment:

Finally, I'm concerned nowhere in this existing Master Plan document or in the proposed Fifth Alternative is there an overarching plan to address projected aviation demand in the Southern California region using LAWA's other airports like Ontario and/or Palmdale. I urge you to reject this planning process and begin anew with a true regional plan assessed with a new environmental document that adequately addresses impacts on a regional basis.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR dealt only with the development of LAX. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. The recommendation that the FAA conduct a comprehensive analysis of various regional scenarios is beyond the scope of the subject EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PHL00009 Rudick, Roger None Provided 11/3/2001

PHL00009-1

Comment:

Hi, Roger Rudick, 1943 Rodney Drive, Los Angeles. I'll be real brief. I moved here a little over a year ago from New York City and noticed right away that you have a bit of a traffic problem. I got a flyer from Darrell Clark shortly after moving here asking for people to support the building of the exposition line, which is a light-rail line which has been approved, from downtown almost all the way to Santa Monica. In the course of going through that and taking signatures for the expo line, I find overwhelming support for the Green Line going all the way to LAX to the terminals. This wasn't something I solicited. It came up over and over again. People would say, "What's with the Green Line?" I don't think this really has anything to do with whether or not you expand the airport. The bottom line is, you have a tremendous traffic problem for people getting to the airport. I know. I've done it several times, even before I moved here. It's almost painful to stand on Aviation Station platform and watch the planes land, and you have another half hour to get to the airport because of the shuttle bus is sitting in traffic with everybody else.

I think you guys should explore the simplest way to get the Green Line to the terminals, which may be just going along the road where the Harbor subdivision is, if you know the area I'm talking about. And I also don't think you should preclude the idea of the Green Line itself actually going and circling around the terminals. I heard someone say it can't be done, but I'm almost sure it can. There are plenty of places where light-rail lines make sharp 90-degree turns. I don't see why it couldn't make the loop itself. Of course, I agree, you should look into extending northward.

Response:

This comment is in favor of extending the Metro Green Line to LAX in the future. This idea is much more in line with Alternative D, which would include an Intermodal Transportation Center conveniently located on the airport's east side next to the Green Line station at Aviation, with direct people mover access to the terminals. This alternative was detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PHL00010 McNish, Richard City of Inglewood 11/3/2001

PHL00010-1

Comment:

I'm Richard McNish. I'm with the City of Inglewood. It appears from everything that I've looked at or read in recent weeks that the expansion plan has been stopped. That doesn't stop the increase in demand for airport-related services. And it creates -- September 11th, in my opinion, creates what we look at as a regional problem.

City of Inglewood's proximity to the airport ought to make it a player in the resolution to that problem. The restrictions that are placed on ingress and egress in the airport for passenger traffic, for pick-ups and drop-offs for off-site parking create problems from the standpoint that the service demand continues to increase and the service capabilities have been restricted. It would seem to me that the City and the airport need to be sitting at the table together to figure out how resources that we have and other abutting jurisdictions have to solve what the airport faces which now is a larger regional problem. As many people have suggested here, to seriously address mitigating the kinds of problems that are going to occur now that we're not going to be able to expand the airport under any circumstances.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC03002-1.

PHL00011 Carpio, Cecil None Provided 11/3/2001

PHL00011-1

Comment:

Yes. Good morning. I'm from the city of Inglewood. The reason I'm up here right now is I'm concerned about the Arbor Vitae interchange. It seems to me that Mayor Hahn's idea of holding back that Ring Road is disingenuous because if you look at the Ring Road, you'll see that it's about seven-eighths, nine-tenths two-thirds already built. We have Westchester Parkway, Pershing and Imperial Highway. We just need to hook up here and there. So when people are real happy that the Ring Road is dead, I say that it's alive and kicking.

Response:

Comment noted. The Ring Road is an important component of Alternatives A, B, and C. The impacts of the Ring Road were summarized in the Draft EIS/EIR, Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation. Also, please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or Ring Road, as detailed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHL00011-2

Comment:

And MTA, L.A. Dot and Caltrans are doing their best to try to get a project reinstated. That's the Arbor Vitae interchange. According to Alternative A -- and why anybody says Arbor Vitae has nothing to do with LAX expansion plans, here on figure three nine, "Landside access projects," it says on number eight is "build more Arbor Vitae 405 interchange." What a surprise.

Southern California Association of Governments understood that link and went through a long process with the community, with the public, with MTA, Caltrans and L.A. Dot, who would say different, and pull that project from their long range -- excuse me, from their Regional Transportation Plan for the year 2001. And now L.A. Dot, Caltrans and MTA are doing everything they can to get that little puppy back into the RTP.

So I am concerned that Mayor Hahn says, "No Ring Road," when, in fact, the Ring Road is just about finished being built. And there are just a few key projects that need to be implemented. And when the representatives from the Sixth District, from L.A. Transportation agencies say that that needs to be put back into the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan, concerns me.

Response:

Comment noted. This comment is similar in content to comment AL00008-8. Please see Response to Comment AL00008-8. Please note that Alternative D does not include the LAX Expressway or the Ring Road.

PHL00012 Weis, Brian None Provided 11/3/2001

PHL00012-1

Comment:

Yeah, my name is Brian Weiss. I live at 8836 Croydon Avenue. That's Westchester, California 90045.

I would like to comment to the mayor's statement about the new focus is on airport security being the number one priority. By definition, security means restricting access in some way, shape or form.

One of the fundamental problems that I see that LAX has in terms of security, especially in light of terrorist types of situations, is the fact that two of its runways run over top of a major road. I've traveled

3. Comments and Responses

dozens of airports within the United States and probably over a dozen international airports. I can't remember ever finding one of those same situations where the runways run over top of a major road. So it's not beyond imagination that some terrorists could have -- make a truck-type bomb similar to the one used in Oklahoma City driving a truck into the Sepulveda Tunnel at the appropriate time, blowing up the two -- you know, the two south runways. It could be done, you know, at a time when either jets are taking off or landing.

I don't think that if you talk to any airplane designer or commissioned airport designer and just gave them a blank sheet of paper and said "design me an airport," I don't think there would be any way somebody would consider trying to put two runways over top of a major road like that for that reason to restrict that access. And one -- a number of the plans call for doing the same mistake again to try to put a third runway over Sepulveda Boulevard. It's just blatantly ludicrous to think that those kinds of things could be allowed. The thing you need to concentrate on, focus on, is alleviating these kinds of situations that terrorists could take advantage of. You need to not have a roadway under a runway. It is just fundamentally not a good idea.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02206-14

PHL00012-2

Comment:

Another situation that's probably of major security problem is the fact that the fuel depot -- I don't how many hundreds of gallons, maybe millions of gallons of fuel are situated adjacent to Bradley Terminal and they are above ground. Some terrorist could get in there and take that fuel, too. It should be restricted somehow.

Response:

All areas of LAX including the fuel depot are under study by LAWA and the Transportation Security Administration for security protection.

PHL00013	Murphy, Ronald	None Provided	11/3/2001
-----------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

PHL00013-1

Comment:

Good morning. My name is Ronald Murphy. I live at 3310 West 74th Street. I'm not going to bore you with all these facts and figures, but I do have some concerns. My main concern is, you know, when you start talking expansion, you're talking about moving people away from homes that they've been in for years, although I read in the L.A. Times where 57 people are going to lose their homes because of expansion.

Response:

Comment noted. Acquisition was addressed in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition.

PHL00013-2

Comment:

I live on -- as I said, I live on 74th Street, four houses away from Crenshaw Boulevard. I'm right in the midst of air traffic. Not only that, I have to deal with bus traffic, being an ex-bus driver myself, retired. We get a lot of noise. Every five minutes my house is shaking due to noise. That is mainly my concern. Not only the air pollution, it's the noise pollution and the traffic. It goes along with it. With LAX expansion it's going to bring more headaches, more problems and problems that seem like no one is willing to solve.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed noise impacts in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use; air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality; and traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix D, Appendix G, and Technical Reports 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-C, Appendix S-E, and Technical Reports S-1, S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-8 regarding noise-based vibration. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHL00014 Hefner, Roy

LAX Area Advisory Committee

11/3/2001

PHL00014-1

Comment:

The continuing saga, part two. I was in the midst of tracing the history of the EIR process at LAX. I had gotten up to the point whereby there had been four concepts originally presented. Two of those concepts ended up in the final EIR. Two of them had been eliminated and two additional ones added. However, the two additional ones, there was no public input in the process of determining them. It ends up it started, in essence, in 1986. We're now in the year 2001. It appears that we're not going to get anything done until 2002. So we're talking 16 years for this particular process. In the meantime that airport has grown from 40 million to over 67 million. I think we can safely say that the airport is not going to increase this year and probably not next year.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00017-121 and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding the opportunities to alleviate impacts associated with past or present airport activities at LAX. Please also note that Alternative D, developed subsequent to the publication and public review of the Draft EIS/EIR, is responsive to public input calling for increased security and no expansion at LAX. Please see Chapter V of the Draft Master Plan regarding concept development.

PHL00014-2

Comment:

One of the things that they talk about is regional airports. And you want regional airports. We want regional airports. Everybody wants regional airports, except if the airport is in your region.

Back in 2000 the executive summary of the EIR Draft 2000, it states, as follows -- and I would like to read this.

"A Master Environmental Impact Report that contained an assessment of the impacts associated with Los Angeles International Airport accommodating approximately 40 million annual passengers was certified by the City of Los Angeles, the Board of Airport Commissioners in 1978. The approximate 40 AMP level of service was planned and analyzed on the basis of a number of regional perimeters."

Next paragraph, "LAX has been forced to go faster than originally anticipated and has to accommodate a portion of unmet regional demand that other regional carrier airports were unable to satisfy. These are the same arguments presented today that were presented in 1988. It's not a question that LAX goes out and tells fables to people. They usually tell the truth, but they don't tell the whole truth. We come back down here. They are in favor of regional development, but there is really no way they can't enforce regional development. The flight paths are not taken into account in these activities."

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels.

3. Comments and Responses

PHL00014-3

Comment:

Mentioning very briefly about the Green Line. We had the representative from MTA prior to the Green Line being built. We asked them if the cars were going to have spaces on the cars for luggage. They were shocked. You're going to come out and this is going to help alleviate the traffic, but you have no place to place the luggage. To this day no plans for luggage.

Response:

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

PHL00014-4

Comment:

My final statement what I started off with, how are you going to cap the number of passengers? How are you going to cap the amount of cargo, and how are you going to cap the number of operations?

Response:

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

PHL00015	Schneider, Denny	LAX Community Noise Roundtable	11/3/2001
-----------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------

PHL00015-1

Comment:

Denny Schneider, 7929 Breen, Los Angeles, Westchester, 90045. I just have one more suggestion that might be useful for Alternative Five.

There are several areas that are fairly blighted around the airport along Century. There are areas that those could be used for an off-site. We would not want to use necessarily Manchester Square, but it would make a nice park.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHL00015-2

Comment:

And Westchester and Playa del Rey has the lowest ratio of parks anywhere in the city which is less than most of the country.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00264-2 regarding expansion of parks and recreation areas.

PHL00016	Shriver, Daniel	None Provided	11/3/2001
-----------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PHL00016-1

Comment:

Hello. My name is Daniel Shriver. I'm with the Atemi-Ryu Jujitsu. I'm here to speak of the issue -- oh, you need to know my address; 4741 Ben Avenue, Valley Village, California 91607.

I lost a friend at the World Trade Center. He's not with us today. One of the things that could have changed that was self defense, a simple close-range combat style Atemi-Ryu JuJitsu. I've given a demonstration to -- we've given a demonstration to some of the people that were here last Thursday. This morning I understand we are going to be able to do that.

What we want to show is that security is a big thing. We're talking about, what's the cost of security? What's the cost of expansion? United Airlines lost a billion dollars last quarter. What if they lose another billion next quarter and next quarter and the other airlines? We're not going to be talking about airline expansion, but bus expansion. We're not going to be flying as much because of no confidence in the flights.

We have a simple, effective easy-to-use martial art that is not only appropriate for the sky marshals -- if you know about the sky marshals right now, your chance of being on a plane with a sky marshal is two percent. You see the National Guard in the airports. You see them with guns, but no bullets. They weren't issued with bullets. We're talking about making the airports safer, but we have the attendant's association saying the flight door, attendant back door, is open; people are getting in. We have to check bags. Will screeners be Federal employees or overseen by Federal employees? Would you feel safer if you knew the check was coming from the government or private individual or would you feel safer that the people that are in the front line of the new war we're on had enough training to keep from being captured or being kept from having an airplane taken over?

It's easy to do. It's easy to learn and appropriate. It uses joint lock and strikes to pressure points or weak spots on the body that allows a smaller, slighter person overtaking a larger more aggressive person and multiple attackers. You'll see this for yourself. The other day we had Susan, one of the staff here, take five minutes. She learned enough to possibly save her life. It doesn't take long. It's simple. It's effective, and it's easy to use. I have an information packet I want to submit into the record, including a letter from Congressman Waxman's office.

"I want to say thank you for coming to my district office to give my staff a demonstration of JuJitsu techniques. I know my staff was very impressed and felt these techniques would be very beneficial to the airline industry."

They forward it on to the FAA, Mr. Kessler. And I want thank you for forwarding it on to the security people involving sky marshals. We shouldn't stop with the sky marshals because they are not going to be on every flight. If we could train every flight attendant, that's one less seat that has to be taken up by a sky marshal, and it increases the odds against the terrorists. We're not looking for just one sky marshal. We're looking for everybody.

I want to introduce Sensei Vince Cecere, who I believe will be conducting the next demonstration.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHL00017	Cecere, Sensei Vince	None Provided	11/3/2001
-----------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PHL00017-1

Comment:

My name is Sensei Vince Cecere. I live at 4463 Laurel Canyon Boulevard, Studio City, 91607. I am a third-degree black belt in Sanuces Ryu JuJitsu, combat JuJitsu under Grand Master Moses Powell, and I'm a second-degree black belt, chief founder of Atemi-Ryu JuJitsu of Los Angeles. I am also amongst the men who were implemented to train people at Fort Bragg, and various police tactical units.

As of September 11th everyone knows that we live in a new world. Former Governor Tom Ridge, the chief of homeland security, was on television yesterday saying how the public needs to help the government with the security problems and issues that we're having with the airline industry. I assure

3. Comments and Responses

you that everything that we're talking about is not just for the airline industry, but any person who lives in a home or is underneath an airline that could possibly come down on their house is a possible victim.

Every good mechanic knows that you use the right tool for the right job. You don't ask a doctor to tune your car. You don't ask a fireman to represent you in court. If you have a combat and security problem, you go to a combat expert. You go to somebody that knows what they are talking about and could see through the loopholes of the individuals that think they are going to create terror on the airlines. The only way that you're going to absolutely control incidents aboard an aircraft is to train the crew with the knowledge to deal with the situation. Empower them. Don't let the flight crew, the American people, innocent children, people that are on the ground for plane crashes be lambs for the slaughter anymore. We want to get all Americans as well as all human beings to live in peace and security and not deal with these problems where we could enjoy our lives again.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHL00018 Cecere, Michael None Provided 11/3/2001

PHL00018-1

Comment:

My name is Michael Cecere. I live in Murrieta, California, which is a long way from here. And the closest that planes fly above my house are 30,000 feet. I'm here at this expansion meeting, once again, to support the Atemi-Ryu JuJitsu and proper security in the airline industry. What I'm here to say is that these meetings might be an exercise in futility if the airlines don't start getting passengers on board again and flying up to the standards that they were before this terrorist attack.

I've been in the security industry almost 20 years now. I'm familiar with all types of executive protection, asset protection, electronic security and as well as hand-to-hand combat and various types of martial arts. I'm familiar with Tia Kwondo and Aikido and everything else. Basically, the security and the techniques that you see here displayed by Sensei Vince Cecere are the only techniques that could work aboard an airplane. You can't do a high kick aboard an airplane.

Once again, it comes down to money. There will be no expansion on LAX, Ontario, Palmdale or anywhere else if the airlines don't start picking up passengers and getting back to where they were before. Everyone makes a commitment to security, but believe me, we've been working on both ends of this country with a lot of political officials, and we're getting a lot of lip service, but nothing more than that so far. I believe that the flying public is not going to go back to the way it was before unless they are assured that there is a program in place to certify all these qualified people. You will make your airline crews feel a lot safer. And, basically, I truly believe that a person cannot totally be free unless they can defend themselves.

You can be the most intellectual person in the world, the most spiritual person in the world, but if a thug comes up and lays his hands on you and you can't protect yourself physically, which does not require a lot of size and strength but strictly technique, then you will never truly be free. Before you talk about airplane and airport expansion, once again, you're going to have to talk about getting the flying public back up in the skies. Until we make our airports and planes safe, that will not happen.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHL00019 Clarke, Bryan None Provided 11/3/2001

PHL00019-1

Comment:

I want to know if I could use my time and James Karin's time in order to demonstrate what we're trying to do for the security of the FAA and what we're trying to demonstrate for the JuJitsu?

Response:

Comment noted.

PHL00020**Brown, Stacy****None Provided****11/3/2001****PHL00020-1****Comment:**

Good afternoon. My name is Stacy Brown; 2727 Butler Avenue, Los Angeles, 90064. I have submitted written comments in a prior comment period.

I have one comment or two for today. And that has to do with the current trends in aviation, that they tend to be toward the smaller jets, whether that be regional or private business jets. The use of private and business jets is increasing rapidly at a phenomenal rate. These jets are currently using small -- what I would call -- neighborhood airports. That's having a huge impact on surrounding communities. In my case that would be Santa Monica Airport, which is surrounded on three sides within 500 feet, I believe, of the runways with homes.

The LAX Master Plan appears to reduce services to general aviation. These smaller jets are covered under general aviation rules and regulations. What we would like to see, what my neighbors and I would like to see, would be for LAX to increase, not decrease, services to the private and business jets and take them from Santa Monica Airport and from whatever other airports are being impacted.

LAX theoretically has the ability to provide appropriate security. One of these jets here is certainly much smaller than commercial aircraft, but used strategically we know can be done. They can still cause great damage to local facilities, local buildings. And this is a huge concern of mine as well as just the nuisance value and the health values -- or the health impacts on myself and my community.

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.

PHL00021**Carpio, Cecil****None Provided****11/3/2001****PHL00021-1****Comment:**

Cecil Carpio, resident of Inglewood.

After September 11th we live in the exact same world we've always lived in. It's just that now maybe some people have awakened to reality. A strong push for a regional solution is the only answer in response to LAX expansion. LAX expansion plans are obviously obsolete, but not dead. I urge community outreach and community participation in formulating Plan Five.

Response:

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

PHL00021-2**Comment:**

What I would also like to know, perhaps you'll have this information at the next public hearing, is how do I review the transcripts of previous public hearings?

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The transcripts of the public hearings are provided in the Final EIS/EIR.

PHL00022

Weis, Brian

None Provided

11/3/2001

PHL00022-1

Comment:

The name is B-r-i-a-n. Last name Weiss, W-e-i-s-s, 8836 Croydon Avenue, Westchester, California 90045. I want to ask a few questions -- or to bring up a few comments about LAX just dealing with the public in general.

Two of the biggest complaints that the citizens surrounding LAX has had over the last decades is the fact that the jets continue to do early turns. And the second big complaint is sound mitigation. I think it's really pretty poor how LAX has dealt with the community on these -- both of these issues.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below. Please refer to Topical Response TR-N-3 regarding aircraft flight procedures and Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program.

PHL00022-2

Comment:

For instance, with regard to early turns, it's difficult to understand how -- how the airport can control or the airlines and the air traffic controllers can control with such accuracy the takeoff and landing and how close they are spacing each other and all the traffic on the ground. But yet, it seems that as soon as the plane is off the ground, they have no control over when the plane does early turns. The people in El Segundo have had to spend their own taxpayer's money from the City of El Segundo to install video cameras. The LAX's solution has been to have a round-the-clock toll free number you can call to try to report the time of day, and so on and so forth, so they can try to figure out what airline it was that was doing the early turn.

I mean, trucking fleets, if you call Fedex or UPS or a lot of these trucking fleets, they have GPS tracking systems on board their trucks so they know that the drivers aren't off goofing off at the beach or something all day. They know exactly where every single truck is. Why is it that you can do that on a \$20,000 truck, but you can't do it on a hundred-million-dollar aircraft to know exactly the flight projectory so that as soon as somebody veers on one the designated air spaces, that you send the airline \$100,000 bill for violating the traffic. I mean, these people need to be able to fly their planes and control air space to know where they are going.

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments PHF00031-2, PC02328-1, and PC03223-3.

PHL00022-3

Comment:

With respect to sound mitigation, the Federal Government had billions of dollars set aside to soundproof homes. Why is it it took years and years and years to have this money become available?

Response:

Please also refer to Topical Response TR-LU-3 regarding the Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program, and specifically Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.10 regarding progress of and impediments to implementing the ANMP. Available federal funding under the Federal Aviation Administration Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program (NCP) grant program is documented in the current 2001 ANMP. In order for participating jurisdictions to continue receiving federal funding they

have to demonstrate progress in implementing their respective sound insulation programs using all available federal funding that they have received. As was presented in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.8), Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1 would provide additional technical assistance from LAWA to local jurisdictions to support more rapid and efficient implementation of their land use mitigation programs, and accelerate existing commitments to current participants prior to proceeding with newly eligible properties.

PHL00022-4

Comment:

Why is it if I wanted sound mitigation, I have to sign away my future rights that says the airport could revise the runways so they land across the street from my house, and I have nothing to say about that. Why is it that the airport's response is so one-sided, overwhelming, unfair to the surrounding communities? The cities of Boston, Logan Airport, Chicago, Denver, a whole list of airports, other airports, don't have aggregation easement that takes away the rights of the citizens. I think it's a poor instance on any kind of business to propose that they want to do good for everybody, and then turn around and just give them the worst deal that they can possibly come up with.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR; however, please see Topical Response TR-LU-3.13 regarding aviation easements.

PHL00023

Weis, Brian

None Provided

11/3/2001

PHL00023-1

Comment:

Yeah. I would like to comment on -- Brian Weiss, W-e-i-s-s, 8836 Croydon Avenue, Westchester, California 90045. I would like to comment on part of the sound study environmental -- I guess it would be the EIR.

A portion of the study referred to the loudest impacted area of the sound contour being cited at sometimes at being 109 DBs, decibels. And that was along the Imperial Highway and El Segundo. I'm certain that all that data that was obtained for that study was done with the flights taking their normal straight line flight path. It probably didn't address what typically happens -- well, may not typically happens, but it doesn't frequently capture the fact that there are these early turns. The studies really need to include the worst-case situation, not just what the ideal is and whether or not there was any filtering of that data. In other words, the people conducting the sound study, they may have recorded data that was worse than that and thrown it out. Basically, when I review a report, it's nice to know where the raw data and the technical information came from. With just kind of a synopsis of what's given there without being able to see any of the actual data taken, there's no indication of what was really done.

Response:

The contour maps for the environmental baseline condition incorporates early turns to both the north and south, as monitored by the airports automated noise and operations monitoring system. This system evaluates the flight course of every aircraft departing or arriving at the airport and assigns it to the standard flight track most closely aligned to its course. Consequently, the early turn operations are captured in the noise contour evaluations. Because there are a limited number of early turns and most are conducted by light aircraft, the contours of average noise conditions are not substantially modified by their presence. The noise contours are reflections of the areas in which large volumes of noise energy are "piled up" over the course of an average annual day. For further information, 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-3.2 regarding early turns over areas north and south of LAX.

3. Comments and Responses

PHL00023-2

Comment:

Just as a general comment about all of the reports, I'm sure there is some -- the agencies or the companies that work on, I'm sure they have some kind of letter of certification in there. I would think as a matter of report -- I do a lot of technical work involved with the government. And, typically, we submit reports from my company. And when other test labs submit reports, there is some signature in there from some authority at that company, an officer of the company, that states that all information in there is true and correct to the best of their knowledge and all that.

Response:

Section 7.1, List of Preparers, of the Draft EIS/EIR presented the principal preparers of the document. Prior to any local action taken on the proposed Master Plan, the Los Angeles City Council will need to certify that the LAX Master Plan Final EIS/EIR meets the adequacy requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Similarly, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) will need to determine whether the Final EIS/EIR meets the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) prior to federal action occurring on the LAX Master Plan.

PHL00023-3

Comment:

And along with all that, there should be the calibration, traceability. I didn't see any of that in any of those reports.

Response:

Comment noted. Since the forecast does not rely on the noise monitoring system there is no requirement for calibration. LAWA's noise monitoring system electronically calibrates its microphones on a nightly basis and manually calibrates them on a bi-annual basis. Whereas, state law requires only annual calibration. Also, please see Topical Response TR-N-1 regarding the noise modeling approach.

PHL00023-4

Comment:

One of the things that was cited in the sound report, which I found kind of ironic, was that they referred to a 75 DB outside noise level as being equivalent to like a 65 DB interior sound level. They also trying to put that in perspective or justify that wasn't too loud. They cited a British sound study that was done that said for 100 -- a sample of 100 people, only two percent woke up for a noise between 70 and 80 decibels. An average alarm clock is far less than that. So are telephones. So the problem that I see with that data is that the average noise that wake people up are lower than what the study said. Only two percent of people woke up. There are blatant errors in this. It makes you wonder how accurate that information is that was provided by that whole agency.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC02206-2.

PHL00024

**Cecere, Sensei
Vince**

None Provided

11/3/2001

PHL00024-1

Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Sensei Vince Cecere. I'm a combat instructor. I'm third-degree black belt in Sanuces Ryu JuJitsu, head representative of JuJitsu under Grand Master Moses Powell as well as being the founder, chief instructor of second-degree belt in Atemi-Ryu combat JuJitsu systems. We

trained the very same people, a million of our associates, same men that are on the ground right now in Afghanistan. We trained at Fort Bragg. We trained many street tactical units. As of September 11th we all know we live in a new world, as former governor and chief of security Tom Ridge has asked, to get the public involved because the government can't handle all the problems. So that's the reason why we're here.

Every mechanic will tell you, you need the right tool for the right job. We have a security problem aboard an aircraft. You don't ask a cook to fix your car. You don't ask a fireman to represent you in court. The only ways to control incidents of aircraft is to train them to deal with the situation and empower them. Don't let the flight crew and innocent American people or anyone that lives in a place where an airline is going to fly over their house be victimized or be a lamb to the slaughter again. We're all in this together. This is not just an airline problem. This is an every American citizens' problem because we're all at risk. Together we should be able to solve this problem.

We have an illness of security, and this is a cure. We have to live together as residents of Los Angeles of the State of California of the great country of America. And we're all human beings, and we must live together in peace and enjoy it because without freedom and being in fear, which is what the terrorists are looking for, fear -- I assure you if they take a chance and take a look at what we have proposed, there shouldn't be fear aboard aircraft anymore. Don't fear anybody. You don't have to.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHL00025 Hefner, Roy LAX Area Advisory Committee 11/3/2001

PHL00025-1

Comment:

Roy Heffner, 6548 West 80th Place, Westchester, California 90045. I'm glad to be back again. This is series number three now of the saga. This will be a little fragmented because I never anticipated having an opportunity to speak three times at this meeting after attending the first one way back at the Airport Marina Hotel.

I would like to first deal with the concept of the Regional Airport Authority. When we talk about expansion of any airport, it seems today that the Southern California Regional Airport Authority under the leadership of Supervisor Don Knabe of Los Angeles County, this would be a place that regional activity would be emphasized. I realize they have no authority, but there's not too many outfits that have authority.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment AL00022-1 regarding the status of the Southern California Regional Airport Authority.

PHL00025-2

Comment:

I would like to emphasize that LAX does have not any authority over any plane that takes off.

I hear people talk about noise and aircraft flying over their homes. LAX cannot control that. That's under jurisdiction of the Federal Aviation Administration.

We know that at one time the Federal Aviation Administration was concerned with promoting air commerce. Since some time ago they have been eliminated of the responsibility to control or to promote air commerce. The only problem is the bureaucracy has been so set in that they still think that is their job. We would like to see the FAA in this expansion process set down some ridged rules as far flight paths are concerned, where they come in and where they go out. The global system is certainly something that should be involved with every particular plane.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

The FAA is currently looking at developing flight paths that would be more strictly defined. Larger jets such as the Boeing 737-500, 737-700, the 757 and Airbus series of aircraft are equipped with Flight Management System (FMS) technology. However, many aircraft, particularly propeller-driven aircraft are not yet so equipped. The FAA will continue to investigate the application of new technology such as FMS and GPS guidance to departure procedures. FAA's support or lack of support for air commerce is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR.

PHL00025-3

Comment:

We would also like to see -- seeing as how we have in 1984 the part 150 study there to create capability between the airport and the surrounding community pertaining to noise, those are supposed to only last for a few years. We are now in the year 2001, 17 years later. We're still operating under that same guideline as part 150. Many of those have not been adopted or incorporated in a proper fashion.

Response:

It is not clear from the commentor what guidelines of the 1984 Part 150 Study have not been adopted or incorporated in a proper fashion. As was presented in Section 4.2, Land Use (subsection 4.2.3), of the Draft EIS/EIR, land use compatibility of various land uses with airports is based on criteria presented in Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations Part 150, which defines incompatible residential uses as those exposed to the 65 CNEL or greater noise contour. As presented in Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, LAWA continues to operate under a variance from these standards. Under the terms of this variance, LAWA continues to reduce the noise impact area surrounding the airport through the ANMP and demonstrates progress through updates to the ANMP. Please also refer to Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the ANMP, specifically Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.10 regarding progress in implementing the ANMP and current impediments to a more rapid implementation of the ANMP.

PHL00025-4

Comment:

The Variance Hearing -- following comment made by another person, the Variance Hearing of 1990 we would encourage the Board of Airport Commissioners to eliminate the aggregation easement for sound insulation, which they did. The Board of Airport Commission did not require aggregation easements. In 1993 or 4, one of those years, they reinstituted aggregation easement. However, they know have a memorandum of understanding in Inglewood where Inglewood will not have to sign an aggregation easement, yet the citizens of the city of Los Angeles, which are owners of that particular airport, still have to sign that airport -- that's that.

Response:

This is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR; however, please see Subtopical Response TR-LU-3.13 regarding avigation easements.

PHL00025-5

Comment:

The Board of Airport Commissioners changes. They don't always know what has always happened before. Since I've been involved in the LAX Area Advisory Committee, I have experienced 35 different commissioners, and those commissioners truly try to do a good job, but they don't know what has happened before and, thus, they cannot continue. I don't plan to be back for a fourth.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHL00026

Brown, Stacy

None Provided

11/3/2001

PHL00026-1

Comment:

Good afternoon, Stacy Brown, West Los Angeles. My second round of comments is relating to the plan itself. The assumption underlying the existing Master Plan has changed dramatically. Part of that change is the remix that we're looking at into the future. And the Master Plan and EIR must address the likely difference in the fleet mix, which will certainly be included in many more smaller jets that will be used regionally as well as the private and business jets that I mentioned earlier.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR accounted for changes in fleet mix for each of the Master Plan alternatives. The Draft Master Plan provided details regarding the fleet mix assumptions.

PHL00026-2

Comment:

The truly Regional Plan proposed by the City of El Segundo and, also, I believe, by Mayor Hahn is the best means of achieving security for the region. And decentralizing air traffic and use of airports provides an alternative if one airport is somehow damaged. It also makes it much less likely that the airports are going to be the main target of terrorist attack only because we are not putting all our eggs in one basket. They will not be able to create the same type of havoc as would happened if the original LAX Master Plan would be put into effect.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PHL00026-3

Comment:

In addition to that, I think we've seen a part of the problem that we were looking at today. And we saw on September 11th that's due to the amount of control having been given to the airlines. And I believe that control over the airport and over air traffic, in general, needs to be taken from the airlines and also that local communities be given some amount of control in the way the airports in their communities are developed and are operated. The idea of having the Federal Government come in and fully control the operations at the airport, which severely impact the surrounding communities, is not acceptable. There are health effects. There are quality of life issues that all need to be addressed. This is why the communities need to be involved as well as the FAA, and the FAA does need to have far more control over how the airlines are used in the airports.

Response:

Comment noted. Human health impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.1, Human Health Risk Assessment, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Technical Report S-9 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

3. Comments and Responses

PHL00027

Weis, Brian

None Provided

11/3/2001

PHL00027-1

Comment:

Brian Weiss, 8836 Croydon, Westchester, California 90045. I would like to just continue a little bit with some thoughts as far as the legal issues regarding any actions that happen out of LAX.

One of the things I talked about in my previous statement was making sure that all the reports and every -- all the documents are actually signed by someone to validate that the work was done by, you know, an official company so that in the future when -- if and when there are any class action lawsuits, the airport won't be trying to figure out who it was that actually wrote some report and approved it, and why is it that this report is full of bad data. And if something expansion-wise occurs, we need to have people that are definitely known to be able to be held accountable for their actions in that respect.

The same thing is true with many of the people that provided any of the work in any of those reports. There had been what, 40 or 50 companies that contributed to the EIR and EIS materials.

Response:

Section 7.1, List of Preparers, of the Draft EIS/EIR presented the principal preparers of the document. Prior to any local action taken on the proposed Master Plan, the Los Angeles City Council will need to certify that the LAX Master Plan Final EIS/EIR meets the adequacy requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Similarly, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) will need to determine whether the Final EIS/EIR meets the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) prior to federal action occurring on the LAX Master Plan.

PHL00027-2

Comment:

My comments earlier about how one of the studies that was cited in there was just -- there were things that were just blatantly contradictory to what someone that's knowledgeable in that field would know to be incorrect with respect to what average kinds of sound levels are.

When somebody in technical is commenting on a sound report is telling me that a noise that's between 70 and 80 decibels only wakes up two people out of 100 people that are sleeping, and when I know that an alarm clock is 65 decibels, you know, average maybe 65 to 75. I tested all the ones in my home at the same distance that I would be from the device when I was sleeping or for the same thing with the telephone, and they were all the way below 75 decibels. I know that my phone and alarm clock wake me up all the time.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC02206-2.

PHL00027-3

Comment:

So for somebody to be in that capacity of writing a report, commenting with things that are just blatantly incorrect, it really scares me to think that the City would just blindly accept all this data, and then there's no signed signatures or authority that say the report was done by somebody. And down the road we end up in some big class action lawsuit. Who's going to pay the bill for that? Is that going to be the taxpayers?

Response:

Section 7.1, List of Preparers, of the Draft EIS/EIR presented the principal preparers of the document. Prior to any local action taken on the proposed Master Plan, the Los Angeles City Council will need to certify that the LAX Master Plan Final EIS/EIR meets the adequacy requirements of the California

3. Comments and Responses

Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Similarly, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) will need to determine whether the Final EIS/EIR meets the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) prior to federal action occurring on the LAX Master Plan.

PHL00027-4

Comment:

The same thing on funding. Is that going to be fully funded? Anything that happens is going to be fully funded so the taxpayers don't end up bearing the burden on this.

Response:

Comment noted. The proposed Master Plan improvements will be funded with a combination of monies from FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, and airline fees. No Los Angeles General Fund dollars will be used to pay for any of the proposed improvements.

PHL00027-5

Comment:

Can I be allowed to continue to speak or is there more people that want to talk? Do people want to me hear me ramble on? I've already submitted about 40 or 50 comments with all kinds of backup data support, but I'm working on more. Okay.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHL00028	Carpio, Cecil	None Provided	11/3/2001
-----------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------

PHL00028-1

Comment:

Cecil Corpio, resident of Inglewood. This is short. This is an interesting opportunity to have an official monologue with the FAA and LAWA. And I'll use it as such.

The presentation we just have seen reminds me of the first thing I thought of after the September 11th attacks. And, basically, how much safety and how much security are we really going to ask for? Tooth brushes, pencils, Popsicle sticks, they are all lethal weapons when someone knows how to use them. In the same light, eyeglasses, take off your eyeglasses, break out the glasses and you have a sharp object. How far do we go when it comes to what do we let on an airplane? So we really have to think about just how much security is enough. When is safety brought to the point where it's just ludicrous and it's more about bringing fear into the hearts of people rather than a sense of safety?

So I hope to see LAWA and the FAA working together along with the community to really, truly address the issues of what is -- how much safety is needed, how much security is needed and what price are we going to pay for the safety and security. Remember, what we're trying to do is get the people to feel confident in the system again, and so trying to alleviate worries that nothing is 100 percent safe. So let's realize that and just try to do what we can.

I'm just going to waste a little time and say, remember, this gentleman just showed a toothbrush, a hairbrush, not even a fingernail file is necessary. When somebody wants to do a little harm or a lot of harm, there are a lot of avenues that can be taken. So it is a matter of more education, perhaps for the public who is using the airways, as well as any other transportation mode.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHL00029

Weis, Brian

None Provided

11/3/2001

PHL00029-1

Comment:

Brian Weiss, 8836 Croydon, Westchester, California 90045. With respect to any kind of project that goes on at LAX, one of the concerns I have is that as a taxpayer, I don't want some project that starts and gets halfway completed and then some event happens like the recent terrorist attack that all of a sudden causes a huge drop in traffic. I don't know what the actual number is. I hear numbers out of the news and from out of LAX that says travel is down some 30 percent. I think it's almost the inverse of that. I hardly hear any planes over there. I flew out of there last week myself to Canada and, you know, there was hardly anybody there. It was like a ghost town.

So how does the City mitigate an expenditure like that when they get committed -- partway committed into a project? Is this going to be something that is fully funded and fully guaranteed to have the funds to be able to cover whatever kind of costs would occur prior to the start of the project? Because it's obvious that you can't rely on many passenger revenue and landing fees and concession fees in order to fund some type of project. Who's going to really underwrite all that? Is it just bonds or are you able to sell 12 billion dollars worth of bonds up front in order to fully guarantee and assure the people of the community that it will be able to be completed. That's one of my big concerns.

Response:

Project funding is not an environmental issue under NEPA or CEQA; therefore, it is not addressed in the EIS/EIR. The proposed Master Plan improvements will be funded with a combination of monies from FAA Airport Improvement Fund grants, passenger facility charges, general airport revenue bonds, and airline fees.

PHL00029-2

Comment:

And then, along with that, the mitigation of any problems down the road -- you know, there's been all these studies done. I've commented in my previous comments that when there's apparently no assigned responsibility or somebody that authenticates that the test -- all the tests were valid and certification from the testing, the agencies and authorities, calibration certificates that prove that all the instrumentation and everything used that was done in the course of their study was within calibration guidelines. Today many of the companies that do this type of work, they are ISO certified, which means they have processes in place within their company that assures that things are done in accordance with procedures. And the report, you know, it was basically a synopsis of what came out of the result of all of this. I guess the City boiled that down.

My question is, is the City then taking a responsibility for the correctness of all of that information that was provided therein because that's the legal issue that five years, ten years after a project is done and all the lawsuits are -- how is that going to be sorted out and who is going to have to pay the brunt of that? Is that taxpayers as a result of having incomplete information or is all that information available? Can I review that information? Is there / some place I can go to review it because it's not in the 21 volumes of the EIR, EIS that I've seen?

Response:

In accordance with the requirements of NEPA and CEQA, the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, including all appendices and technical reports, were made available for the public, regulatory agencies, local jurisdictions, and any other interested parties who wish to review the data, the assumptions, the approach and methodology, and analysis conclusions. During the review periods for each document, comments pertaining to the accuracy and validity of the subject information can be submitted to LAWA and the FAA, at which written responses to those comments are provided.

PHL00030 Weis, Christopher None Provided 11/3/2001

PHL00030-1

Comment:

My name is Christopher Weiss. And I don't want to move away from my friends. And they are going to take a lot of houses. And they are going to take a lot of houses. And they are also going to take a lot of money away from us. If they -- they are going to make us move. They are going to have to give us all the money to buy the next house.

Response:

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

PHL00031 Weis, Ellen None Provided 11/3/2001

PHL00031-1

Comment:

My name is Ellen Weiss. I live at 8836 Croydon.

Basically, first, the expansion was needed as it was advertised due to capacity, the large capacity of people and large planes. Now it's advertised as safety. It appears that LAX is manipulating the term to get the same results as they initially intended to do. LAX is already a target for terrorists. Now we will have a bigger target.

Response:

Comment noted. Safety impacts were addressed in Section 4.24.3, Safety, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Technical Report 14c of the Draft EIS/EIR and S-9b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-GEN-3 regarding actual versus projected activity levels and Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative.

PHL00031-2

Comment:

LAX shows little concern for the surrounding area.

The environmental mitigation is basically to take homes, schools and whatever else lies in the path of LAX to expand. To me this does not appear to be very -- have any concern for the environment or the surrounding area.

Response:

Both the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR presented a broad range of proposed mitigation measures to reduce or avoid environmental impacts associated with the Draft LAX Master Plan as described in the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. These mitigation measures provided the basis for the mitigation measures presented in this Final EIS/EIR. Also, it should be noted that Alternative D, the LAWA staff preferred alternative, proposes no residential acquisition.

3. Comments and Responses

PHL00031-3

Comment:

The 405 is already overcrowded. Removing the need by encouraging alternative airport use rather than adding vehicles and off-ramps will solve the problem. So, again, the point is getting people off the 405 alternative directions. Going in other ways is what's going to really solve the problem. Providing off-ramps is just a symptom, and getting more people at LAX is the problem.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand, Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, and Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PHL00031-4

Comment:

Again, expanding the LAX Airport shows the airport's lack of concern for the environment, the people who live in the surrounding area. It shows disregard for its neighbors that they continue to cave into businesses, especially when there are other areas requesting airport expansion in their area.

Response:

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

PHL00032

Weis, Brian

None Provided

11/3/2001

PHL00032-1

Comment:

Brian Weiss, 8836 Croydon, Westchester, California 90045. With respect to the traffic problems that currently exist on the 405 Freeway, there needs to be extremely detailed studies done that show what the affect would be of any increased traffic for expanding capacity at LAX. Currently it takes people that live in Orange County and work in the El Segundo area -- my wife works there and those people that currently do this, it takes them many times over two hours a day to get to or from work, you know, from Orange County. Any additional capacity that's placed on LAX is only going to further increase that.

The figures that are cited in the report, I believe, were about 18 million annual passengers a year from Orange County. I think that's the current figures. That equates to, if you use the numbers, also, I guess, provided by, I guess it was SCAG, that was like 1.4 -- or car trips per passenger, that equates to about 81,000 car trips a day from people in Orange County. There just -- there isn't a good way to mitigate that traffic on the 405 Freeway. There's just way too much traffic there now. And the entire report really doesn't address that. It talks about things like buses and train service and things like that, but the reality is that people in California just don't use that. And you ask yourself, why. Well, it's because the train system doesn't provide good enough coverage.

What Mr. Heffner said earlier, you can't take your luggage on the Green Line train. Then another person commented that it takes you a half an hour to get from the end of the train to the airport. So the reality of it is all those mass transit systems don't work. As a result, people continue to use their cars, and it's just worse and worse and worse. And the same thing with parking. As the price of parking goes up, what happens is people -- and depending on how long their trips are going to be -- will have the neighbor drive them or a friend or a spouse. All those things mean more and more traffic on the 405 Freeway.

Studies need to be done that will evaluate what the true impact is. When I talked to people in past meetings about the traffic impact, they tell me that they've looked at it and it -- when it gets over a peak number of cars per hour is when it just suddenly collapses into like no capacity at all or gridlock.

These are just some of the problems, people coming from the valley have the same problems. And it's ridiculous to think that you need to expand an airport when people can't currently get there now.

Response:

The demand numbers cited in this comment are overstated. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. In addition, this comment suggests that roadways around LAX are already congested, and that any increases in automobile and truck traffic will make the situation worse. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns, Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology, and Topical Response TR-ST-5 regarding the rail/transit plan.

PHL00033 Weis, Nicholas None Provided 11/3/2001

PHL00033-1

Comment:

I am Nicholas Weiss. I live at 8836 Croydon. And my dad made a big LAX sign. And it's 12 feet high and 24 feet long. And it says "LAX Expansion."

Response:

Comment noted.

PHL00034 Weis, Brian None Provided 11/3/2001

PHL00034-1

Comment:

Brian Weiss, 8836 Croydon, Westchester, California 90045. Continuing on with my last comment in regard to the traffic on the 405 Freeway, a lot of the assumption that is made in the EIS/EIR Report is that the traffic will be mitigated through the use of buses and commuter shuttle and things like. One of the benefits of living by the airport is you get to see what everybody's commute is like going to the airport because I leave the airport area in the morning, and I come home that night. So the typical traffic flow is just opposite that. So it serves as a really good point of reference for what the reality of traffic is like for people trying to get to LAX. There are many times when the Super Shuttle buses, you know, that have a capacity of like 12 people or some number like that, there's only one or two people in them. It's basically the same thing as getting in your car and driving to the airport. They get curbside service, but other than it's just not mitigating traffic. It's just another vehicle there because it doesn't consolidate and pick up quantities of people that are going to the airport. It just happens time and time again. I fail to see how the -- you know, how any study can be accurately made that assumes what the ridership and what the usage of these things will be. The ones that seem to have the best usage are the Santa Barbara and the San Fernando Valley bus. Those have a lot better ridership. But a lot of these other buses, there just isn't the people on them.

Response:

Comment noted. The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding airport area traffic concerns. With respect to traffic measures to minimize neighborhood impacts, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts. Please see Topical Response TR-ST-7 regarding Westchester Southside traffic for a brief history of LAX

3. Comments and Responses

Northside/Westchester Southside, its role in the Master Plan, and the impact/benefits of the proposed airport alternatives. Note that the project alternatives would replace most of the shuttle buses with a new people mover, which would eliminate many of the shuttle trips that currently exist.

PHL00034-2

Comment:

The problem I have with these kinds of a studies, as I've commented before, is it's just kind of a synopsis what's given in the 21 volumes. Actually, a lot of the material is repeated over and over again. There isn't enough meat in there to really be able to get into and refute. That's a concern because from my standpoint it says that the problems and the alternatives weren't really fully studied and evaluated. That leads back to my other comment about the risk for the City undertaking any kind of a project that isn't -- the thing hasn't fully been adequately studied and competently because California, Los Angeles especially, is a land of litigation. And there's a lot of lawyers that live in Westchester, Playa del Rey area. Some of them are kind of asleep, but if there is a north runway that changes the flight pattern and flights start flying over homes as a result of any changes, those people will be woken up and there will be lawsuits. That's why it's extremely important for these studies to be fully done properly and certified and well done so that the City doesn't put themselves at risk for giant class action lawsuits.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PHL00029-2 regarding the requirements of NEPA and CEQA related to the review of information within the LAX Master Plan EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-PO-1 regarding the public outreach efforts associated with the EIS/EIR.

PHL00035 Weis, Christopher None Provided 11/3/2001

PHL00035-1

Comment:

This is Christopher Weiss. I live at 8836 Croydon Street and I am not -- if they move all our houses, then and I'll move away my friends.

Response:

This comment does not pertain to the contents of the Draft EIS/EIR. The residential properties proposed for acquisition are detailed in Appendix P to Chapter V of the Master Plan, Preliminary Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan. Two residential properties on Croydon Avenue are included in Acquisition Area A; 8836 Croydon Avenue is not included within the Acquisition Area. Also, please refer to Topical Response TR-RBR-1 regarding residential acquisition and relocation.

PHPD00001 Burr, Kathleen Los Angeles County Farm Bureau 11/5/2001

PHPD00001-1

Comment:

Kathleen Burr, executive manager of the Los Angeles County Farm Bureau, 1006 West Lancaster Boulevard in Lancaster. I prepared a written statement.

As you know, Palmdale Regional Airport sits on approximately 17,000-plus acres of land, which according to the airport agriculture people 8,000 to 10,000 acres could be potential agricultural leases. Even though our area is growing by leaps and bounds, we are still a rural community with a huge emphasis on agriculture. Agriculture jobs in Los Angeles County comprise jobs of production, transportation, processing, marketing, and the farmer and rancher. The state of California produces half of all the nation's fruits and vegetables, nuts, not to forget the best alfalfa in the United States is produced right here in the Antelope Valley.

78 percent of wildlife species occupy private lands with over 90 percent of listed species relying partially on private lands for survival. And a vast majority of these private lands are owned by the farmers and ranchers. No one is more interested in maintaining the integrity of the land and the health of our water resources than those who directly rely on these resources for their livelihoods. The farmers and ranchers, who in some cases are second and third generations, preserve the integrity for their children.

Maintaining an adequate water source is utmost on everyone's minds, but there are options that have been on the planning table for several years. It is a shame to let the potential income for not only the airport, but the farmers and ranchers who provide a multitude of jobs, go to waste because those who make the decision may not fully comprehend the issues facing agriculture and/or the potential they hold in their hands. They do not realize the regulations that each grower must adhere to. They do not realize that just because it is cheaper to import a crop from another country -- that country does not impose the same safe growing regulations that are imposed on us. They do not adhere to the same health standards we do.

And I feel these are issues that need to be looked into and understood fully before -- a finger is always pointed at our agriculture stating, "You are the problem." The loudest proponent is the one that does not fully understand the issues. I can only see the potential for agriculture leases. I would be happy to host the LAWA members to spend the day with me talking to the farmers and ranchers in the area. If there are problems or unknown financial factors, compromises can be reached, issues can be worked out and problems solved. I think you would be surprised at the number of farmers, ranchers, agriculture-related businesses in Los Angeles County. It is a shame not to promote agriculture and promote it here. Thank you for the time to speak, and I look forward to hosting the Airport Board in the future.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHPD00003-1.

PHPD00002 Holloway, Harvey Antelope Valley Chamber of Commerce 11/5/2001

PHPD00002-1

Comment:

I'm Harvey Holloway with the Greater Antelope Valley -- excuse me, just the Antelope Valley Chamber of Commerce, 4202 10th Street West, Suite Number E, Lancaster 93534.

The Antelope Valley Chamber of Commerce supports a regional approach to resolving the issue of increasing air capacity in Southern California. A regional airport approach that would include the utilization of this facility here in Palmdale could better serve the flying public than any type of expansion at LAX.

Response:

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

PHPD00002-2

Comment:

There is a legitimate concern that adding additional air traffic, arriving and departing from LAX, could infringe on the safety of those flights. No matter what changes are made on the ground, there is still a fixed amount of airspace available. And by adding more traffic into this fixed area, the odds of a major catastrophe will increase.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHPD00002-3

Comment:

Palmdale is capable of managing an increase in air traffic without decreasing safety, and utilization of our airport could provide the airspace around L.A. -- around Los Angeles -- actually, the whole basin with some much needed relief.

Palmdale Regional Airport features this terminal and capability of handling up to 300,000 passengers annually. This facility could be used to establish a pattern of airline service into Palmdale. And as passenger traffic increases, Los Angeles World Airports already owns the adjacent property just under 18,000 acres that is available for development.

Response:

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

PHPD00002-4

Comment:

Palmdale Airport would serve a far greater geographic area than just the Antelope Valley. According to a study by the Los Angeles International Airport Expansion Task Force, using Palmdale Airport could save an average of 35 minutes for passengers that live an equal distance from Palmdale and LAX. Flight delays and airport closures due to fog would be virtually eliminated. Palmdale would quickly become the airport of choice for the millions of people that reside within a proximity that would allow them to take advantage of our airport.

Response:

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

PHPD00002-5

Comment:

A regional approach that includes Palmdale Airport is vital to improving passenger and cargo movement in Southern California. If the Los Angeles World Airports continues to defer the utilization of Palmdale Airport, we would urge their consideration of a "friendly takeover" of this facility by the Southern California Regional Airport Authority. This action could allow Palmdale Airport to become part of the solution rather than an untapped asset.

Response:

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

PHPD00002-6

Comment:

On behalf of Antelope Valley Chamber of Commerce and the millions of people that could utilize Palmdale Airport, I urge you to focus on a regional approach in resolving the need for increased air capacity in Southern California.

Response:

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

intended to accommodate future regional aviation demand at airports other than LAX. A description of Alternative D was provided in Chapter 3, Alternatives, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. For additional information, please see Topical Response TR-MP-2 regarding the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PHPD00003 Ziemer, Roger

None Provided

11/5/2001

PHPD00003-1

Comment:

My name is Roger Ziemer. It's spelled Z-i-e-m-e-r. I live at 32748 Dorama Avenue, Acton, 93510. I have a prepared statement and have a copy for your use.

First of all, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak for the group. As a homeowner and a citizen of the area for quite some time, I'm very interested in the betterment of this valley.

The terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001 had a profound impact on the airline industry and the flying public. I understand the LAX expansion priorities have shifted from expansion to safety and security elements as identified by Mr. -- by the Mayor Hahn. However, caution needs to be exercised when considering any changes to the existing LAX-EIR proposal that is going to have fundamental changes without a good public and professional input.

As a private citizen I find it difficult to rally around proposed changes for LAX and its expansion without first having an opportunity to review the details of the proposed changes. Without seeing details of the proposed changes to the LAX plan, there really is nothing to discuss.

Response:

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

PHPD00003-2

Comment:

On the other hand, the option that includes the proposed Palmdale Regional Airport is a logical alternative and requires a serious consideration.

Response:

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

PHPD00003-3

Comment:

The traffic getting to and from LAX using the 405 San Diego Freeway is awful, say nothing for the -- or about the difficulties of getting in and out of LAX itself. Just as an example, last month I had an opportunity to host a group of people in downtown Los Angeles at the Biltmore Hotel., And one of my guests coming in from Brentwood had to travel -- it took him, rather, an hour and a half just to get from the Brentwood area. Another guest traveled from Encino using the 405 and had a similar story. Traffic congestion on the 405 at any time day or night requires that I consider other airport locations for my personal and business and travel.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHPD00003-4

Comment:

I believe the ever-expanding borders of the San Fernando Valley, Santa Clarita and Antelope Valleys would support a more conveniently located Regional Airport located in Palmdale. Long-term major airline lease agreements and a commitment towards future growth would be essential to the success of a regional airport in Palmdale.

Response:

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

PHPD00003-5

Comment:

In addition, the FAA or an appropriate airport authority needs to make commitments to conduct and operate a safe and modern airport facility here in Palmdale. I would recommend an aggressive advertising campaign promoting the benefits of traveling from the Palmdale Regional Airport versus having to navigate the certain freeways leading to Los Angeles Airport.

The Antelope Valley with its available land and receptive communities would welcome support of a regional airport. With few exceptions, Los Angeles County has run out of available open space that qualifies for open airport construction. In conclusion, I would like you to take into account the Lockheed-Martin JSF Contract Agreement, the existing enterprise-zone benefits, the availability of an aerospace labor force, the expanded and improved I-14 Antelope Valley Freeway, a receptive community and local governments, and the existence of Plant 42 airport facilities that are proposed -- rather, that are proposed for the airport location.

Response:

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

PHPD00004 Cope, Garry

None Provided

11/5/2001

PHPD00004-1

Comment:

My name is Garry Cope. I'm an applicant for the Palmdale City Council. I live at 38008 12th Street, East Palmdale, California 93550-5354.

In Palmdale here the regional airport has been a buzzword issue for many, many years. We need to do something or stop talking about it and just let it drop and die.

Response:

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

PHPD00004-2

Comment:

I'm for a regional airport if the environmental concerns are met. The air quality in this valley, the way it's constructed, I've read may inhibit -- that we need to ensure the environment, the air quality -- if the airport continues to be made here that needs to be observed. Also, they've mentioned Plant 42. Plant 42 also provides us opportunity for space, but it also in its past has left us a record of environmental incidents and accidents that may endanger the safety of people. And those issues will have to be addressed by this community.

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.

Comment: To make sure the development works, we need to throw in enough developmental funds from both the City of Los Angeles, the City of Palmdale and any other governmental entity that make this work so real industry and real business can establish around the airport and make all mobile transportation connections here at the airport rather than scattering them throughout the Antelope Valley, as has been suggested so far in the City of Palmdale.

PHPD00004-4

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.

PHPD00005-1

Plant 42 and NASA, those provide jobs in the Antelope Valley. I was raised in the Air Force. I was an Air Force brat. Wherever the air quality went down and wherever airports came in, military jobs left.

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.

PHPD00005-2

Comment:

All right. The TEA 21 impact on human life, they are building homes right here at the end of the runway off Avenue N. Now, you have a thing about how the homes that are going to be around those places are supposed to have things put in for the noise, right, the way they are built where you would do something for noise abatement? None of that has been addressed. And those homes are going in and they are right near that runway. When you go out, those homes are there on Avenue N, brand-new homes going in, people buying them not knowing what's going to go on here that are just now coming up. They are not up-to-speed with what's going on in this community.

Response:

Comment noted. The comment, submitted at the Public Hearing on the LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR held in Palmdale, pertains to new development in proximity to Palmdale Airport. The comment does not pertain to the content of the LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR.

PHPD00005-3

Comment:

Impact on wildlife, we have a lot of wildlife here, and we know it will impact because every time we pollute the environment, whether you pollute the air, which later comes down as acid rain, it will impact the wildlife. It will impact the farms and the ranches. Someone already spoke to that. I'll just go on.

Response:

Comment noted. The comment, submitted at the Public Hearing on the LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR held in Palmdale, pertains to conditions near Palmdale Airport. The comment does not pertain to the content of the LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR.

PHPD00005-4

Comment:

Many moved here leaving the L.A. lifestyle behind. People living in flight zones do not support this project. It's cost-prohibitive. Side election and what people told me about this side election, when I went out and I was knocking on doors because this is an election year and I'm handing out pamphlets for one of the candidates, people told me, "Well, we don't want it here." The reason they don't want it there is because how it will impact where they live. So I was surprised. I thought everybody was for the airport. It's also inconvenient for a lot of people because if they were to use this area for commuting, or whatever they do about cars, and to rent cars is expensive. So many people would still have a problem unless they are connecting for a flight at LAX to go somewhere else.

Response:

Comment noted. The comment, submitted at the Public Hearing on the LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR held in Palmdale, pertains to conditions near Palmdale Airport. The comment does not pertain to the content of the LAX Master Plan Draft EIS/EIR.

PHPD00005-5

Comment:

After September 11th many became concerned over making us a target with this project. We now have to look at development of airports and transportation centers. And how long will this last? This facility

has failed three times. Oldtown Homeowners Group is against this project. We will be sending a full comprehensive packet addressing all pertinent information to you.

Response:

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

PHPD00006 Norris, Rick

City of Palmdale

11/5/2001

PHPD00006-1

Comment:

Good evening. My name is Rick Norris. I'm a city councilmember with the City of Palmdale. Whether I disagree with Marta, there are tens of thousands of people here that are relying upon the aerospace industry and airline industry and the thousands of jobs it will bring to the city and the tens of millions of dollars it will bring to our local economy. So we do have some areas of disagreement.

Response:

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

PHPD00006-2

Comment:

And contrary to popular belief, the air doesn't stand still very long in this region.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHPD00006-3

Comment:

We are not against the expansion of LAX, but our real interest is in Palmdale Airport and how the airport will help relieve some of the traffic that's generated from LAX. It will take thousands and thousands of people that are commuting from here to LAX and to fly out of Los Angeles. Our real interest is in the development of the airport and the economic benefits that it brings to us. Yes, we feel that they can address the environmental concerns and the environmental issues that may crop up.

Response:

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

PHPD00006-4

Comment:

But more importantly, we're working on ground transportation. We're working on a high-speed rail alignment from Northern California through the Antelope Valley down to LAX or the L.A. area. We're working with the San Joaquin Valley Rail Community, which is a State Rail Committee, in developing passengers and cargo rail service through the Antelope Valley. All of that will benefit and serve the Palmdale Airport. We need LAWA to issue the RFP that has been held up for the Palmdale Master Plan. We need that out there so that the decision on the high-speed rail alignment is going to be made in January of this year. We need to determine the route prior to that time, if possible. So we need that RFP out. It will assist us a great deal in getting the ground transportation and developing our community.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

LAWA issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to develop a master plan for Palmdale Regional Airport (PMD) on February 12, 2002. On November 13, 2002, LAWA awarded a consulting services contract to the URS Corporation to prepare a master plan and supporting environmental impact report for PMD. The master plan is scheduled to be completed by the end of 2004.

PHPD00006-5

Comment:

Ladies and gentlemen, we want the regional airport. We are very interested in all of the benefits that it brings. We need to take those commuters off of the freeway that are going down to LAX and hurting the environment with all the transportation issues that they generate.

Response:

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

PHPD00006-6

Comment:

But we also understand that as long as the LAX expansion occurs and you make it easier for the airlines to stay there, there is no incentives for them to go out to regional airports. So we need that addressed. We need the expansion addressed, but we need the transportation, the airlines to not make it so comfortable that they don't want to leave. We need you to be able to help them decide that they need to come out and service these outer -- outlying areas.

So the critical issues is that we need your commitment to us to help us develop a relief for LAX and an alternative to LAX congestion.

Response:

Since passage of the federal Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, the airlines make the decision about which airports they will serve. As a general rule, airlines will choose to serve the airports near the highest concentrations of conveniently located customers. Within this general framework, however, airlines must make strategic decisions about air service to maximize their investments and gain competitive advantages. For instance, in regions with multiple airports, airlines tend to concentrate their air service at a single, well-located primary airport for reasons of economic efficiency. Concentrating service at a dominant airport also facilitates connecting service, which can significantly increase an airline's market and allow even greater frequencies to more destinations. International service in particular relies on the availability of domestic connecting flights to a wide range of destinations. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-2 regarding the role of deregulation in aviation planning and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. 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.

PHPD00007 Maurer, John

None Provided

11/5/2001

PHPD00007-1

Comment:

My name is John Maurer. I live at 12318 East Avenue X-8, Pearblossom, California 93553. I was just curious that the previous speaker was speaking in the "Royal we." If you weren't and were speaking only -- if you were speaking for a large group, I think those people should show up and speak for themselves.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHPD00007-2

Comment:

I would like to state that anybody who would like to see what the area will look like if this airport comes into existence, they should go down to Cucamonga on a hot summer day and see the air quality in Cucamonga, Redlands, Riverside, that's coming out from the Ontario Airport. It's unbreathable.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHPD00007-3

Comment:

As you can tell from my opening statement, I'm totally against this idea. Ruth Galanter has done everything to shove that mess up here, but I'm going to attack it from the point of view of the type of writing that you have in your brochures. Since we're supposed to comment on this plan, I will give you some quotes.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

PHPD00007-4

Comment:

Under "Purpose and Need for Master Plan," quote, "Regional air service is expected to increase by 54 percent by 2015. Master Plan moves center airport activities away from communities." This is the part I find very interesting. "New large aircraft are quieter, cleaner." When you use the comparative form, it means they are already clean and they are already quiet, which they are not. When I go down to LAX -- I know you have addressed that 95 percent of the airplanes take off over the water. You fail to include that as many come into the airport from the east and they make a lot of noise.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR accounted for changes in fleet mix (i.e., greater use of newer larger aircraft) and the environmental characteristics, such as noise levels and engine exhaust emissions, of those aircraft in the approach mode, taxi/idle mode while on the ground, and takeoff mode.

PHPD00007-5

Comment:

My other issue is with some of your language on page 16. "Overall air quality in our five-county region has improved due to the many air quality measures implemented over the last three decades; however, the region has not attained air quality standards for three pollutants, ozone, PM, particulate matter less than ten microns in size, and carbon monoxides. In other words, the reason is called a non-attainment status for carbon. A non-attainment status is a nice euphemism. It's a nice word, but it doesn't quite make me feel very confident.

Response:

A nonattainment designation activates many additional air quality regulatory requirements, such as the need for emission offsets and application of the lowest achievable emission rate (LAER) for new major stationary sources, the application of reasonably achievable control technology (RACT) for existing major stationary sources, the need to demonstrate conformity (both transportation and general) for projects requiring the approval or funding by the federal government, and the need to demonstrate a specified "rate of progress" in the nonattainment area. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed compliance with applicable air quality requirements in Appendix S-E Section 2.3.

3. Comments and Responses

PHPD00007-6

Comment:

Later on page 35, "Improved technology is on the way just as newer aircraft produce less noise. The newer airplanes that will come into service in coming years will also produce less air pollution." How do we know that? That's just your claim. How can we be assured of that?

Response:

Based on the Aviation and the Global Atmosphere report published for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in 1999, fuel efficiency has been improving steadily since the 1960s and is expected to continue to improve into the future. Increased fuel efficiency lowers aircraft emissions.

PHPD00007-7

Comment:

I really feel that in this instance that, you know, this valley is almost pristine. And you can still breathe the air. I would like it to stay that way.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed air quality impacts in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G, Air Quality Impact Analysis, and Technical Report 4, Air Quality Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR. Additional air quality impact information is included in Appendix S-E, Supplemental Air Quality Impact Analysis, and Technical Report S-4, Supplemental Air Quality Technical Report, in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-1 regarding air pollutant deposition, Topical Response TR-AQ-2 regarding toxic air pollutants and Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PHPD00008 Zink, Jason

None Provided

11/5/2001

PHPD00008-1

Comment:

Jason Zink, Z-i-n-k, PO Box 295, Littlerock, California 93543.

For people that don't want the airport in Palmdale, they can move to Montana, as far as I'm concerned. What happened on September 11th has changed all our lives. We realize the terrorists can and will affect America. And what's even worse here is that it was planned for a bombing at LAX on New Year's Eve of 2000 the Millennium. They would have had enough explosives in that vehicle to blow up a great deal of the terminal at LAX and would economically devastate L.A. County. I think our leaders shouldn't put all our eggs in one basket. We need to diversify. We have ten million people in this county. Why would we build something so big and put all our eggs in one basket. We must diversify this county. Ten million people count on it as far as investments.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, and PC02131-5. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand.

PHPD00008-2

Comment:

As far as investments, people have been waiting for this airport for 30 years. I'm in real estate. Nine out of ten times people call and talk to me. They are asking me, "Jason, what's going on with the airport?"

When is it going to happen?" I have clients all the way from Australia to Germany to Hong Kong that talk to me on a daily basis asking me about the airport and what's going on in Palmdale. You will create such an economic investment in this county, in the Antelope Valley, that we haven't seen in a long time.

Quality of life, this is really about the quality of life issue, if nothing else. Forget about air transportation or anything like that. Forget about the other passengers from across the board. This is about quality of life for the people of L.A., the people in the City of LA. There is no reason why people should live in apartments, two to three families in apartments down in L.A. when we have the American Dream sitting right here for the last 20 years. This is the place. This is where people are going to prosper. Young, growing entrepreneurs, they'll never be able to afford a house in L.A. for \$300,000 or more. It's leadership's responsibility for economic stimulus to create jobs, create housing. It's the leadership's responsibility to do this. You are oppressing the people of L.A. by not building this airport here.

Response:

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

PHPD00008-3

Comment:

Secondly -- I lost my train of thought. We must do everything we can -- oh, the ten million -- I believe that it's probably going to take a ten-million-dollar subsidy to subsidize the airlines up here. We have to ensure that. We have to guarantee that -- would it be the cheapest investment we've ever made.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHPD00008-4

Comment:

What's ten million dollars? You can't even buy a decent house in Bel Air for ten million dollars anymore. What's ten million dollars when you consider a 12 billion-dollar expansion plan or a billion-dollar county budget?

What's ten million dollars of that? I will tell you, if the board members, they can say that -- because they voted for an airport in Palmdale, they've made a difference in this life and changed the quality of life for millions of its citizen in L.A.

Response:

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

PHPD00009 Tennant, Niki

**Councilmember Ruth Galanter's 11/5/2001
Office**

PHPD00009-1

Comment:

My name is Niki, N-i-k-i, Tennant, T-e-n-a-n-t, with Los Angeles City Councilmember Ruth Galanter.

3. Comments and Responses

First of all, I want to thank everyone here for being here tonight. I'm especially pleased to be here in the Palmdale Regional Airport Terminal. I wish to convey Councilmember Galanter's appreciation for the opportunity for this additional public hearing in order to get public input from this region.

Two points that I wish to convey to you tonight. After the events of September 11th, the aviation industry has been unequivocally changed and all alternatives displayed here tonight are obsolete.

The second point is, this is our golden opportunity to actually plan for the region's aviation demands for the near and not so near future. The Master Plan process for our Los Angeles International Airport was begun in the early '90s and is based on flawed and outdated data. In fact, the EIR is so flawed in its conception and current relevance after the events of September 11th that the environmental assessment is inherently flawed as well. This Master Plan does not include relevant planning for Ontario International Airport or Palmdale Regional Airport, and it completely leaves out data for the 2000 census that show this region is one of the fastest growing regions in the state.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan role in the regional approach to meeting demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale. The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR dealt only with the development of LAX. The City of Los Angeles and LAWA can only control the development of LAX, Ontario, Palmdale, and Van Nuys airports. The recommendation that the FAA conduct a comprehensive analysis of various regional scenarios is beyond the scope of the subject EIS/EIR.

PHPD00009-2

Comment:

With regard to planning for the state's future, many people here are familiar with Councilmember's Galanter's speech that makes the argument, Palmdale Regional Airport is well-situated to serve the aviation needs of a growing San Fernando Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, Antelope Valley and the Central Valley of the state of California.

Right now leisure and business travelers from this region use Burbank and LAX for their air travel needs. The result is miles and miles of congestion along the 14 and the 5 as people have to drive long distances to get to a usable airport, as well as jobs in the L.A. basin.

With careful planning and cooperation between the cities of Los Angeles, Palmdale, Lancaster and the County of Los Angeles, we can produce a viable airport to serve this region that may well be the first well-designed airport in this nation that could provide jobs, take cars off the freeway and continue the fine aviation tradition of this area.

Response:

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

PHPD00010 Yore, Joseph

None Provided

11/5/2001

PHPD00010-1

Comment:

My name is Joseph Yore, Y-o-r-e, like the days of yore. Mr. Ritchie and the general people, I've come here tonight -- I'm not running for office. You'll have some people come up here tonight and speak. They are running for office. I'm here to save the lives -- I've done my own survey. I live just down the street here, 38753 26th Street East. It's Avenue 26th and Q. I live closest to the airport than anybody here in this room.

Why are you sitting here tonight? Because it's an empty airport. It's failed three times. Nobody wants to come here and fly out of here. I'm a member of Plant 42 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base

Environmental Group. I called Ruth Galanter's office several times and invited her to come to our rap group on environmental issues. Plant 42 is contaminated. Every military base is contaminated.

I'm for the expansion of LAX and El Toro Air Force Base. I believe LAX could be one of the greatest airports in the whole world if it's expanded and planned right by the city planners. Many of the city officials here never go to an environmental group, while you had one lady come up here and speak about the farmers coming, wanting the land for the farms. We are running out of water in the Antelope Valley.

Response:

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

PHPD00010-2

Comment:

I did my own scientific survey many years ago. I laid glass in my backyard. When they were flying out of here, when Plant 42 was burning jet fuel in the air, my whole backyard was covered with glass and the jet fuel did not go up in the air and disappear like some people think it does. It fell to the ground right by my property.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHPD00010-3

Comment:

I'm for the military Air Force base. There is nothing more beautiful than seeing a B-2 fly by my house. I run out of my house every time I see a B-2 or a military plane fly and cheer those boys on. This is a military base. They shouldn't have parties out here like SR. SR has failed the people. There is going to be nobody working within a month at SR.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHPD00010-4

Comment:

Antelope Valley is like a bowl. It was built many years ago. Antelope Valley is shaped like this (indicating). When you land in like this, you come into a bowl. Nothing moves out of it. It settles down into the valley. Nothing moves out of it. This is no place for an airplane, airport. This place is for Air Force and Air Force only, not a place to have many planes coming and going for cargo.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHPD00010-5

Comment:

These people that have realtors out here, like Greg Anderson didn't show up, they are here to sell property. They are here to make the buck.

3. Comments and Responses

LAX is the place for expansion. If it's done properly, it could be the best place in the world.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHPD00011 Hossan, Carole

None Provided

11/5/2001

PHPD00011-1

Comment:

I'm Carole Hossan, 7725 Hindry Avenue, Los Angeles. I'm a Westchester resident.

First I have to state my objection to having to attempt to comment on a Fifth Alternative to the LAX Master Plan, thus far it is only a nebulous concept in Mayor Hahn's and his airport planners' minds. I keep hearing that the LAX expansion plans are dead, but they are here in this room still being commented upon. Since the fifth safety and security alternative is not in any written form, I am not sure if the extension of the northern runway is a part of that plan. Rumor has it that it is.

For we Westchester residents, the extension of the north runway is an expansion. It would remove one third or about 235 of our central businesses in our central business district as well as some homes. In past expansions Westchester has lost thousands of homes and residents. We and other LAX-adjacent communities have warned and are bearing more than our fair share.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan alternative, and was circulated for public review and comment. Please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. Alternative D would not acquire any property within the Westchester business district, and does not propose any residential acquisition.

PHPD00011-2

Comment:

The City of Los Angeles runs Ontario and Palmdale Airports. The Southern California Association of Governments, known as SCAG, this year espoused a regional approach to increased air traffic. And, yes, now air traffic is down, but it won't be that way forever.

I believe that the City of Los Angeles and LAWA must do what is necessary to help Ontario and Palmdale Airports become airports that complement the needs of citizens of Ontario and Palmdale instead of concentrating all cargo and passengers at LAX. LAX needs to share the wealth.

Response:

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

PHPD00011-3

Comment:

On the safety and security note for LAX, I would say that LAX should have the proper allotment of air traffic controllers. All baggage should be screened and runway incursions can be mitigated by means other than runway extensions.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 and Response to Comment PC00543-1 for further discussion regarding aviation safety. LAWA met the congressionally mandated deadline that all checked baggage on passenger flights be screened for explosives after December 31, 2002.

PHPD00012 Numer, Agnes**None Provided****11/5/2001****PHPD00012-1****Comment:**

I am Agnes Numer. I lived in Antelope Valley for 47 years. I've seen it grow to what it is right now. We also have a very important ministry of Antelope Valley. They've helped people very -- I should say in very dire circumstances and needy people, and we were able to help many thousands of them. And I feel we are going to expand very quickly in many areas, that we would like cargo planes. We are going to Long Beach or somewhere else to send out air cargo, but it would be have nice to have it in Antelope Valley. We would appreciate it very much. I appreciate the airport. I've been honored to be on that airport for 47 years. Now I'm relocating. So we can have the airport there.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale and Response to Comment PC00281-19 regarding relocating cargo operations.

PHPD00013 Shriver, Daniel**None Provided****11/5/2001****PHPD00013-1****Comment:**

Hi. My name is Daniel Shriver. I'm at 4741 Ben Avenue in Valley Village, 91607. My last name is spelled S-h-r-i-v-e-r. I'm here to talk about airport security and the illusion that is being perpetrated of airport security.

September 11th I lost a friend at the World Trade Center. And I'm a martial artist. I'm here to represent the Atemi-Ryu JuJitsu, which is a close-range combat style of martial art that many people think will highly effective and appropriate for close-range situations like an airport. My friend was in the World 25 Trade Center. If he had been on a plane, he would have jumped to his feet and fought to the end. He didn't get a chance. So I'm here to pick up the fight for him and the 6,000 other people.

The FAA has looked at our information packet that I have here. We've done two demonstrations at two other public hearings. The responses we get from everybody that sees it is "It's very impressive and should be considered." At this time we would like to offer an invitation to any airline. We will train a flight crew at no cost to them so that they can see -- judge for yourself; is this effective, is it not effective? We also -- the idea -- there's a revolutionary war, I believe, an Arab Poem that said "for the won of the nail, the shoe was lost, for the won of the shoe, the horse was lost, for the won of the horse, the rider was lost, for the won of the rider, the battle was lost. For the won of the battle, the war was lost.

We have simple effective ways we can keep the airlines safe. They are looking at technology. They are looking at 20 years, 10 years in the future when the technology exists where you could remotely control a plane from the ground, while the terrorists will probably learn how to override that and hijack planes from the ground. And that's ten years away. Laser light to blind the passengers, gas flooding the cabins, ice hammers and fire extinguishers, they are all things they said, "Maybe we could solve the problem with this."

The FAA is dedicated to making the travel safe for the public. In their own documents they talk about how simple is good, about how we learn from our mistakes and how we need to ensure the flying public is safe, and it's our obligation to do that. We have a gift of knowledge, and knowledge is power. We are here to raise awareness and introduce this concept into the general discussion. If you feel that you would be safer knowing that the flight crews have been trained in very effective martial arts that are the same martial arts that are being used by special op forces in Afghanistan right this minute, being taught

3. Comments and Responses

to women of all ages in rape-prevention classes across the country, being taught to little girls to keep them from being abducted.

This is the real deal. We're genuine. Please take us up on our offer to show you just how effective, how cost-effective it is. With airlines losing billions of dollars, we won't be talking about airplane expansion for very much longer.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHPD00014 Angel, Drew

None Provided

11/5/2001

PHPD00014-1

Comment:

Good evening. I'm Drew Angel. I'm running for mayor of the City of Palmdale. My address is 38611 Jacklin Avenue in Palmdale, 93550.

I'm sure it's very difficult for you to assimilate all these many points of view. I would just like to take a couple of minutes to explain, first of all, it seems this plan is a 15-year program of expansion. And I understand that the total life cycle of the plan would be many decades. Well, let's just divide what kinds of time we're dealing with. The short-term I would call 1 to 12 years, and then this not-so-future maybe 10 to 25, and then long-term we're looking at 10 to 50 years. That's about how long the airport has been really operating since the DC6's has been running. What about 50 years from now?

Response:

The proposed Master Plan uses 2015 as a reasonable long-term planning horizon within which a comprehensive plan for improvements to accommodate future growth at LAX can be defined and implemented. This approach is consistent with that of other large-scale long-term planning program, such as the general plans for local jurisdictions, urban water management plans for water suppliers/districts, integrated waste management plans for counties, and other such programs.

PHPD00014-2

Comment:

First of all, airline traffic is going to be greatly diminished because ground transit is going to take over.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHPD00014-3

Comment:

The next big generation of these big jets, they are going to be still running them. It's probably the last new big -- I mean, they'll be advanced many times, but air travel pollutes tremendously.

LAX contributes 30 percent of all the air pollution in California. California -- I mean, in Los Angeles. California contributes 10 percent of the world's air pollution. That's significant. And we're just one of many airports. Okay. I'm going to have to go real quick through this.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC01186-4.

PHPD00014-4**Comment:**

The high-speed ground transit, which was already mentioned, will be coming up here. If we have any plan here, it has to be integrated with the idea mach speed ground transit. I think for the future of airlines corporate-wise and the facilities, we have to integrate those kinds of systems with the airport. It's got to be part of your plan.

Response:

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

PHPD00014-5**Comment:**

Let's say for Palmdale, the local authorities have said that -- Mr. Ledford, has suggested we could have as many as 400 flights up here. As I understand, that would be one quarter of the present traffic of LAX. That's impossible. We couldn't really tolerate it up here. 50 flights a day, I think, would be the maximum for a cargo facility at a peak, unless it becomes a space port, in which case perhaps an entirely new site for a new airport might be considered somewhere up here in the high desert. If we have really high speed ground transit like 600 miles an hour from LAX up to here or up to, say, California City, that might be the future in 20, 30 years. But right now 50 planes a day to summon traffic off your runways down below and maybe expanding this facility a little bit so that the locals could get out on a limited number of actual passenger flights, that might work.

Response:

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

PHPD00015	Adkins, Domingo	None Provided	11/5/2001
------------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PHPD00015-1**Comment:**

Domingo, D-o-m-i-n-g-o, Adkins, A-d-k-i-n-s. Our address 541 East Ivesbrook Street, Lancaster, California 93535. I came down here today because I used to live here in Palmdale and I'm a resident now in Lancaster. I grew up right by the LAX Airport for years since I was a little kid. I see no problems with the airplanes flying overhead and with the noise. I'm here just to let the people know that, you know, it's no problem to have the airport here. I am for the airport to be here in Palmdale. I'm a witness to let the people know it's a good thing to have it here in Palmdale because L.A. is growing. And being a native to Los Angeles, I have seen L.A. grow from big to bigger to enormous.

And I lived all over Los Angeles, the Valley to Pomona, by Orange County, everywhere. We have an overflow of people everywhere here in Southern California. Lancaster is the place with Palmdale to just make this whole valley grow. I'm not ashamed to say I'm a Californian, but I have seen traffic and traffic and more traffic. It's not the problem about the airplanes. It's the problem about the people. Where are we going to fit all these people, cars? We have many, many cars, but we know the future is going to get better. We see electric cars coming, and even planes are going to be coming. And they will get better, but we need to give the people of Los Angeles opportunities to spread out so then they can have a safer place to actually live. I'm not a scientist, but I do know when you put rats in a cage and they all clump together, they will attack each other.

So I'm here to say, hey, give it a chance out here. Let Palmdale have this airport, and I believe it's not the airport that the people are complaining about, it's just the expansion of the people that will come out here. We need to grow. That's what Southern California and United States is all about, to let the people understand that we are a nation that will grow and it will be done.

3. Comments and Responses

I've been waiting for this airport. I lived here since 19 -- well, not since. I lived here in 1994 because I was expecting this airport to come. And I have seen great people move here and then leave this city because they were expecting this airport to come. I believe this will be a great place and for a lot of great people. Let this airport come.

Response:

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

PHPD00016 Hull, James

**Palmdale Regional Airport
Advisory Council**

11/5/2001

PHPD00016-1

Comment:

My name is James Hull. I'm a travel agent with Sierra Travel in Lancaster and, also, at the present time chairman of the Palmdale Regional Airport Advisory Council. I moved here in 1965 from Seattle, went to work at Edwards Air Force base. And in 1992 after retiring and working with some other people, I went into the travel business.

At the present time Sierra Travel is one of the few travel agencies left in the valley because of the things going on with the airlines, and so forth. We book people, of course, out of LAX, Burbank, Ontario, sometimes Long Beach and once in a while out of Bakersfield. I try to avoid that. We are very anxious to have something come out of Palmdale.

When I moved here in '65, the airport, of course, had already the property of 17,700 acres that had existed. And so we've been looking forward to this for a long time. As you well know, we had two airlines up here at one time. There was not enough traffic. It just went over the hill. That's all it did.

People were speaking about down below how bad it's got. I used to live in the Redlands at one time. I moved out of there in '57. I was at Norton Air Force base working there. The smog used to move in there in mid '50s bad enough in the summertime that it would blacken -- darken the mountains, but then again the Inland Empire had a barrier, just like Pasadena has a barrier, like other places have barriers. So there's not much air circulating through that entire area. But out here the air does circulate. I've seen it circulate plenty. Once in a while it's stagnant, but we need some help out here.

We have an airport, as you see, building. We need some help here. I would plead with the L.A. World Airways to consider Palmdale as a very viable terminal even if we have limited amount of aircraft out here, airlines to go to San Francisco, Oakland, Reno, Denver, Dallas, Fort Worth, maybe Phoenix, wherever. We need help. We don't want it to go from here over the hill again. We want it to go out there and maybe go to Vegas, who know. But we do need some help. I appreciate the time that you've given me here.

Response:

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

PHPD00017 Friss, Vianna**None Provided****11/5/2001****PHPD00017-1****Comment:**

Yes, Vianna, V-i-a-n-n-a, and Friss is F-r-i-s-s. I have Post Office Box 900696 in Palmdale, California 93590. And I've been here since 1947. My folks came here when it was just a small town for a weekend retreat. And then we'd move back to Santa Monica, and then we'd move back and forth. I've seen the influence of Lockheed and Plant 42 on the environment, and I never saw anything that was really harmful to our environment.

My late husband and I worked at FAA over here for five years. So I've seen that influence. I think they are very protective of the environment so far. And there are already 300,000 people in this valley which could be prospective customers to you people. And we have Antelope Valley College. We have the University of California at Bakersfield. We have a Performing Arts Center. We have Edwards Air Force base, and we have that aerospace industry right here. And the airlines are already here using the Plant 42 to train their pilots for take off and landing. I've seen them for years here taking off and landing. So what's the problem with having your airline industry here? They've already adjusted to the winds and everything.

Response:

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

PHPD00017-2**Comment:**

And this is not a bowl. This is not a dust bowl. There's wide-open, flat desert. We have constant winds here that blow the exhaust from the aircraft out into the desert. So it's not a dust bowl. And it goes all the way to Death Valley, so we would not have the element of smog here.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHPD00017-3**Comment:**

These were just some of my ideas I didn't think but to speak here, but I've seen this valley. I am a proponent of the airport if we can have heavy environmental assurances. And I think that LAX in Inglewood needs an expansion to Palmdale. I've been here for 40 years. I've heard about the airport, but when are you going to do something about it? How long does it take to go to the airport now? Are you going to keep letting the bombs in there? You've got to spread it out. You put everything in one place -- even the military know this, not to put everyone in one place. You have to spread out the population.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHO00001 Leon, Paul City of Ontario 11/7/2001

PHO00001-1

Comment:

First off, I would like to say thank you for coming to our city to hold these hearings. It's a pleasure to have you here, an honor. I want to greet you on behalf of the Ontario City Council and Mayor Gary Orritt.

Once again I want to say, good evening. I'm Paul Leon, an Ontario City Councilmember and the airport liaison for the Ontario City Council. I'm here this even to speak in support of Los Angeles Mayor James Hahn's recently articulated plan to upgrade security at LAX and to express appreciation for his statements and actions in support of a regional approach to the air passenger and cargo needs of Southern California. We are especially appreciative of his efforts to expand service at Ontario International Airport and his recent marketing trip to Mexico which resulted in daily Aeromexico flights between our Ontario and Hermosillo beginning in January 2002.

The City of Ontario values owner partnership with the City of Los Angeles and Los Angeles World Airports, and stands ready to work with the entire region to accommodate our share of Southern California air traffic at Ontario International Airport.

Response:

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

PHO00002 Ruh, Bill City of Montclair 11/7/2001

PHO00002-1

Comment:

Thank you. I am Bill Ruh, Councilmember from the City of Montclair. I am also a member of the Board of Directors for the Friends of the Ontario Airport.

I'm here tonight to express to you that there is regional support for this airport.

Response:

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

PHO00002-2

Comment:

I know as a councilmember that there is a 5.5 billion dollar-impact to our local economy. We know that whatever happens here to this airport will drive our local economy. I believe that every city that borders Ontario Airport and every city in the sphere of the Ontario Airport is aware of the strength of our economy that relies on the day-to-day traffic, both passenger and cargo, at Ontario Airport.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHO00002-3**Comment:**

We must look at expansion and be very, very clear that with the expansion we must make sure there are dollars in place for the regional infrastructure, the freeways and the regional surface arteries that lead in and out of the airport must be adequate to handle the growth in that expansion in a very timely and well-planned manner. Because if that isn't done, what happens is a tremendous amount of congestion that then translates to frustration for residents who will find other means and other airports to use.

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR analyzed the traffic impacts associated with the development of the alternatives. Mitigation measures were included which alleviate the associated impacts by the additional traffic generated by the development of the concepts. These mitigation measures would be funded as part of the Master Plan development. In addition Alternative D is a new alternative which was analyzed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR which constrains the operation to 78.9 MAP at LAX and requires other airports in the region to accommodate a higher percentage of the air travel demand. For a complete explanation of the additional traffic generated as a result of the alternatives please see Topical Response TR-ST-2 regarding surface transportation analysis methodology.

PHO00002-4**Comment:**

We view regionally that this airport is the key to the future success of the entire Inland Empire. We realize that without the airport, there is a domino effect to our economy, that we must work regionally to keep this strong. And I'm proud to say that most of the cities here do work very closely with Ontario on this issue, and we certainly appreciate what our colleagues are doing. And we stand ready to lend a hand to help continue to keep this vital economic factor moving forward.

Response:

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

PHO00003 Metzler, Keith**Southern California Logistics
Airport Authority****11/7/2001****PHO00003-1****Comment:**

Good evening. And thank you. Again, my name is Keith Metzler. I'm from the City of Victorville. I'm here to indicate that Southern California Logistics Airport is prepared to play a role, again, accommodating the aviation -- the aviation demand.

Currently Southern California Logistics Airport operates as a fully dedicated logistics facility. Southern California Logistics Airport previously operated as a former George Air Force Base. Currently we are accommodating all facets of logistics integrating cargo with rail and truck transport. We have the infrastructure and we're prepared to expand on our infrastructure to accommodate regional growth.

We currently have two runways. We have inherited two 10,000 lineal foot runways. We just recently expanded one of those runways to 13,000 lineal feet and we're in the process of expanding that same runway into 15,000 fully accommodated, fully dedicated air cargo, transport and getting fully loaded 747s up and across the nation.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

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

PHO00003-2

Comment:

The City of Victorville wishes that decentralized airport plan provide for greater coordination pushing air cargo to outerlying airports, thus, relieving the transportation congestion in Southern California and mitigating some of the impacts of our highway system. Therefore, we are in support of Mayor Hahn's approach to a decentralized airport aviation.

Response:

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

PHO00004 Tennant, Niki

**Councilmember Ruth Galanter's 11/7/2001
Office**

PHO00004-1

Comment:

Yes, my name is Niki Tennant. I'm with Los Angeles City Councilmember Ruth Galanter.

And first of all, I would like to thank everyone for attending tonight, such as the attendance is, and to LAWA for holding the extra public hearings accessible for people of this region.

First and foremost, I would also like to remind you all that this is a public hearing on the Master Plan to expand LAX in the preferred alternative to the 98 million annual passengers. This is not a hearing on the Fifth Alternative proposed by Mayor Hahn. We hope to see such a public hearing soon, and we'll look forward to reviewing that as well.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHO00004-2

Comment:

In light of the events of September 11th, this Master Plan is obsolete. And, in fact, it now contains assessments that may be fatally flawed. Now more than ever it is imperative that our air capacity should be planned for and implemented so that it allows people to utilize airports that are closer to where they live and work and can reduce the environmental impacts on those folks as well as easing the burden on an area that is already suffering the dramatic impacts of more than 67 million annual passengers per year, many of whom drive across the country to Los Angeles International Airport.

We also have this opportunity to reduce the security threat of only having one major international airport. Although the aviation industry has been dramatically changed since the events of September 11th, demand will creep back up as travelers begin to feel more comfortable with the security measures that are being implemented in airports around the world. So it is very important that we seize this opportunity to truly plan for a regional system of airports that best serve the interest of the traveling public and business and industry.

Response:

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

PHO00005 Shriver, Daniel None Provided 11/7/2001

PHO00005-1

Comment:

Hello. Thank you for having this public hearing and allowing us to do a demonstration. My name is Daniel Shriver, 4741 Ben Avenue, Valley Village, California 91607. I'm here representing the Atemi-Ryu JuJitsu.

I'm here talking about -- I'm here to talk about airline security. Basically -- do you want to give me three minutes or should I start with that?

Thank you. Recent events have occurred on United Airlines this last weekend where a gentleman went past screeners and brought in, I believe it was a can of mace, a stun gun and several knives. There was a red team for the FAA that not too long ago did some test on how effective the screening was. And one of the security screening companies won a lawsuit because the red team put through weapons that weren't considered classic identifiable weapons, but they were perfectly acceptable weapons that would be used against them.

We have to rethink how we're approaching the security thing. If people can get through with weapons, we have to train the flight crew in a close-range self defense. Atemi-Ryu JuJitsu has been demonstrated here on two occasions. Vince Cecere and James Karin are here with me tonight. We want to do one more demonstration for those who that haven't seen how effective it is. It's a martial art that uses pressure points, weak spots in the body and joint locks. We have people we pulled from the audience that have been given three minutes' worth of introduction and find their skills are very effective and appropriate. We ask that you guys consider doing a test where we take a flight crew, any flight crew, and we train them in the skills that you can see how effective it is.

There are kickboxing -- cardiovascular kickboxing schools that are training flight attendants. There are people that 'are trying to teach you how to use an ice hammer and a fire extinguisher, a tray, whatever, but these aren't effective. And they are not really going to solve the problem. Once you see our effective close-range self defense that's being taught to Girl Scouts, being taught to elderly, being taught to all kinds of people, it's effective and needs to be considered and considered thoroughly.

The fact is that airline screeners, our federal employees, won't really affect how safe the flight is. Right now the FAA is saying something like 80 percent accuracy rates -- I don't know if it's FAA, but 80 percent accuracy rates of the screening machines. It was on public radio the other day talking about the success rate is 20 percent and the failure rate is 80 percent. There's an illusion of security that's out there. And we need to address it before something else terrible happens. Thank you. Shall we do the demonstration now?

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PC02236-2.

3. Comments and Responses

PHO00006 Cecere, Sensei None Provided 11/7/2001
Vince

PHO00006-1

Comment:

My name is Sensei Vince Cecere, third degree chief instructor of combat systems, second degree black belt chief instructor and founder of the Atemi-Ryu combat systems of Los Angeles.

We are hearing a lot of people talking about security, talking about expansion. We're talking about money. We're talking about whose communities are going to be sheared up by this income of money. I assure you that we're putting the cart before the horse. Until we get the flying public's confidence back that they can actually get on the plane without having anxiety and not being afraid of some lunatic who didn't take his medication or some guy with bad intentions or some group decides that they want to hinder our way of life, I assure you, those of you who have seen our combat techniques in the other demonstrations as well as those who will see it now, you'll see that we are offering a solution to a major problem.

We have the infrastructure to get the people trained. I have a plan through Ballys which has over 300 clubs, which I have already talked to them, which they will assist us in training as many airline personnel as we need. So we have the people. We have the clubs. We have the places to train them, and we definitely have a need.

People will say, "Why are you doing this? Why are you doing this? Why don't you just keep training the military? Why don't you just keep training the police? Why don't you just keep training the different places?" I didn't get a chance to serve my country in any other facet, really, and I see something that I know that most people don't. Shame on me if I sit on my hands and do nothing while a lot of innocent people, a lot of innocent lives were taken.

Secondly, I'm a New Yorker. I take it personally. And if it would be okay, we would like to demonstrate.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHO00007 Gordon, Mike City of El Segundo 11/7/2001

PHO00007-1

Comment:

Good evening. Thank you for the opportunity to be here this evening. My name is Mike Gordon. I'm the Mayor of the City of El Segundo. I just want begin by letting you know that the City of El Segundo is very pleased that Mayor Hahn has agreed to set aside Mayor Riordan's Master plan for the expansion of LAX and is now committed to developing a new plan for LAX that limits growth at LAX to 78 million annual passengers.

For the first time since LAWA embarked on this Master Plan odyssey, the mayor of Los Angeles has now committed to being a full partner with the region in developing a truly regional airport plan that serves the aviation needs of all of Southern California.

Response:

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

PHO00007-2**Comment:**

The Inland Empire airports needs to be the first priority of development of a regional system. The Ontario International Airport is itself the most important component of the regional airport plan.

We are pleased that Mayor Hahn recognized and embraces the role Ontario must play in the regional airport system. We applaud Mayor Hahn's successful negotiation with Aeromexico to bring more flights to Ontario. Ontario is ready today to play an enhanced role in our regional aviation system, and it has significant unused capacity that could be put into play tomorrow.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHO00007-3**Comment:**

Developing a truly regional airport system reduces vulnerability of LAX and reduces the vulnerability of our regional economy. It will reduce vulnerability of our airport system by adding regional airports in Southern California that could handle significant passengers and cargo and create flexibility and redundancy in the region's aviation system.

Response:

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

PHO00007-4**Comment:**

But a truly regional plan will help to ensure that security will not take a back seat to passenger throughput. It will help to ensure that LAX receives only as much air traffic as it can safely handle.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment PHO00007-3.

PHO00007-5**Comment:**

We are grateful to Mayor Hahn for setting aside the previous Master Plan alternatives for LAX expansion. We are pleased to offer this preliminary public input for the mayor's new plan.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHO00007-6

Comment:

Now, discussing the well funded, comprehensive campaign designed specifically to market Ontario Airport locally as well as nationally and internationally as a convenient alternative to LAX, but Ontario isn't the only regional airport opportunity in Inland Empire.

Former military bases at March, Norton and George are now available for commercial aviation. Now called San Bernardino International, Southern California logistics and March Inland Port, these airports are planning their entry to the Southern California marketplace. Southern California logistics is already operating commercially. All these airports have strong community support for further development. As specialty cargo airports, these airports can relieve much of the cargo burden at LAX.

Response:

Please see Topical Response TR-MP-1 regarding air cargo activity and demand and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations, including cargo, to Palmdale.

PHO00007-7

Comment:

Perhaps more importantly, the Inland Empire airports and others in the region are poised to play an increasingly critical role in post September 11th security efforts.

You will recall the Secretary of Transportation temporarily banned the carriage of mail and cargo on passenger planes following the events of September 11th. And for that we believe the airport system is what is truly necessary here in Southern California.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHO00007-8

Comment:

We are grateful to Mayor Hahn for joining us and calling for a regional solution. We look forward to working with the communities in the Inland Empire in bringing that about. We are happy to respond to questions.

Response:

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

PHO00008

Hossan, Carole

None Provided

11/7/2001

PHO00008-1

Comment:

You said it right, too. You're probably tired of seeing me. But I keep hearing that the LAX Master Plan expansion is dead, but it's here in the other room being commented upon.

During past expansions of LAX, Westchester has lost over 3,000 homes and thousands of residents. I would like to see LAX constrained to its current footprint and not have the northern runway extension occur that would take out one-third of our central business district and also some homes.

Response:

Comment noted. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed residential and business relocation impacts in Section 4.4.2, Relocation of Residences or Businesses. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-LU-2 regarding impacts to the community of Westchester. As indicated in TR-LU-2, Alternative D does not include any residential acquisition or acquisition within the Westchester business district.

PHO00008-2

Comment:

I also object to the potential LAX Expressway which would either degrade the historic centinella adobe or take out homes in Inglewood.

Response:

Appendix K of the Draft EIS/EIR does acknowledge that the Centinela Adobe house would be potentially affected under Alternative 2, the split viaduct. Subsequent to the publication of the 2001 Draft EIS/EIR, Alternative D, the subject of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was developed and does not include the proposed LAX Expressway or ring road. Alternative D is the LAWA staff preferred alternative. Finally, please see Topical Response TR-HA-1 regarding impacts to the Centinela Adobe.

PHO00008-3

Comment:

Rather than pour everything into LAX, I would like to see the City of Los Angeles and Los Angeles World Airports put muscle and not just lip service into the regional approach to increase air traffic espoused by them, Southern California Association of Governments, also known as SCAG.

Los Angeles and LAWA should help Ontario and Palmdale in concrete ways, not just with encouraging words. LAX adjacent communities will be watching what the City and LAWA does, not just what they say they will do, to help Palmdale and Ontario become the airport their citizens want them to be.

Response:

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

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport, and Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

3. Comments and Responses

PHO00009 Carpio, Cecil None Provided 11/7/2001

PHO00009-1

Comment:

My name is Cecil Carpio. I'm from the City of Inglewood, and a couple of books I would like to cite. One is the "Executive Summary for the EIR/EIS LAX Proposed Master Plan Improvement."

On page ES-7 under development of alternatives it reads, "Alternatives to increasing capacity at LAX. Two broad categories of options were analyzed in the search for alternatives to increase capacity at LAX. First, alternative airports and alternative modes of transportation were evaluated. Second, various aviation activity management or demand management scenario for study, in all cases the analyses revealed that the alternatives in these two categories could not reasonably be expected to meet the purpose and needs of the Master Plan and would not eliminate the need for improvements at LAX. This range of alternatives was rejected from further consideration."

And so my comment is, the Regional Airport Plan needs to be further considered.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. This new option - Alternative D, Enhanced Safety and Security Plan - is designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative (consistent with the policy framework of the SCAG 2001 RTP), and shifts the accommodation of future aviation demand to other airports in the region.

PHO00009-2

Comment:

And second is the economic study. It's called the "Industrial Economic and Administrative Studies Pathway to Becoming World Class and Cutting Edge." It's done by KH Consulting Group, and it was the final report, November 1999. And on page XIII-69 under "Marketing," it says "Given the current controversy surrounding LAX Master Plan, it may be many years before new facilities can be added. So the role of Ontario as a reliever will be doubly important."

Response:

Comment noted.

PHO00009-3

Comment:

Ontario should establish a marketing program to work with the airlines to investigate the feasibility of increasing operations. This program should be coordinated with LAX to ensure that the message to the airlines is unified and clear. Ontario should gather detailed historical information about airline load factors by route, route profitability and passenger travel patterns to construct an effective marketing plan. This marketing plan should be incorporated in the overall Master Planning efforts for Ontario."

And my comment to this is, this marketing plan should be incorporated into comments, or I should say, a new Master Plan when we're discussing a regional solution.

Response:

An update of the master plan for Ontario is currently underway. The ONT master plan will recommend the needed improvements to meet the projected demand of 17.6 MAP in 2015. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, which discusses the Ontario Master Plan. Please also see Topical Response TR-RC-1 regarding the LAX Master Plan Role in the regional approach to meeting demand, which discusses demand and capacity at the region's airports.

Describing the details of the Ontario marketing plan is beyond the scope of the EIS/EIR for the LAX Master Plan.

PHO00010 Perrone, John None Provided 11/7/2001

PHO00010-1

Comment:

Thank you. Good evening. I've been flying with American Airlines for almost ten years. I'm a flight attendant. I live in Riverside. I'm very pro the development of Ontario as a viable alternative to Los Angeles. Before September 11th, I was one of a few of us who would be flying in and out of Ontario, when I was done with the services, the beverages and the meals. I'm willing to sit down and talk to passengers and thank them for choosing Ontario. Oftentimes I ask them where they live. A lot of times I'll get the Inland Empire cities. Sometimes I'll get the Pasadenas and some people in the valley and Orange County, south of Orange County. But most are obviously from this area. When I do speak with people that are closer to Los Angeles or South Orange County, I ask them, "Why do you think more people choose Ontario?" And most of them think it's just an image thing, because traffic normally on the 15 northbound and southbound is a lot easier, and sometimes they'll be going opposite the heavy traffic anyway, and they think it's an image thing.

Response:

Comment noted. Ontario will continue to play an important role in meeting the regions air transportation needs.

PHO00010-2

Comment:

I know when I was younger -- I should say, I think when I was younger the fares out of Ontario when American was the premier carrier of Ontario they offered cheaper fares than LAX. Now, again, I speak as an employee. So I don't call reservations too often. I think for the most part American encourages and other airlines encourage their passengers to choose Los Angeles by offering lower fares. I don't think Ontario is promoted that way with lower fares at all.

Response:

Actually, the average fare for domestic flights from LAX is higher than for Burbank, Long Beach, Ontario, and Orange County. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

PHO00010-3

Comment:

Now we have only six flights a day which allows American to not utilize their union labor at Ontario or Long Beach. You need to have seven flights a day for running six months or however longer to require the union. The only unions right now representing at Ontario are the pilots and flight attendants. Until '94 where they cut off the flights to Chicago, right now only American serves Dallas, Fort Worth.

So I guess I'm just here to ask Los Angeles World Airports to do your best to promote this Inland Region to Los Angeles and Orange County residents in the best manner you see fit.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHO00011 Hossan, Carole None Provided 11/7/2001

PHO00011-1

Comment:

Okay. This is off-the-cuff, but just some things. I didn't go to the last Board of Airport Commissioner Meetings, but I know at previous meetings I believe the advertising budget for Ontario was put on hold, I believe, because of budget concerns after the September 11th tragedy.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHO00011-2

Comment:

And a suggestion that I don't know if it was made at a public forum, but maybe the name Ontario to people that aren't familiar with the area, they might not even realize that it's near Los Angeles. Maybe it should be LAX -- or Los Angeles Ontario, or something so people realize where it is, you know, that it's a travelable distance from Los Angeles.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHO00011-3

Comment:

And I know, you know, we went out to Palmdale the other night. There's an airport with no airplanes. I don't know the history of Palmdale. I don't know if they need advertising. I don't think I would know about it if it weren't for being involved in this situation. I know they want flights that go to destinations, not just flights that go to Los Angeles to go to somewhere else. I'm sure that will -- you know, ticket prices and landing fees, et cetera.

Response:

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

PHO00011-4

Comment:

Again, I'm not sure about the latest situation on this, but Ontario's landing fees, you know, fairly recently were raised 59 percent. I don't know if they've been lowered or not, but there are specific things that can be done to enhance and promote these airports. Especially the time that Los Angeles has had these airports, I think more progress should certainly have been made in this direction.

So I really hope that, you know, people get together and pull together for the economic health of the whole region.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHA00001 Johnson, Veronica Councilmember Ruth Galanter's 11/8/2001
Office

PHA00001-1

Comment:

I'm here for Councilmember Ruth Galanter who represents the District of the City of L.A. She's sorry she couldn't be here tonight. Thank you all for being here tonight.

In light of the events of September 11th, the entire Master Plan is most likely obsolete. The assaults on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon have demonstrated that airports must operate differently if they are to be able to operate at all. Even before September 11th trends within the airline industry have been unclear. While the LAWA proposed Master Plan before us tonight includes in all of its alternatives runways to accommodate planes carrying 600 passengers or more, airlines have, in fact, been flying and buying more of the smaller planes. While the overall loss of life on September 11th was beyond horror, it is a sign of some drastic changes in demand that already occurred, that the four already hijacked planes carried fewer than 400 total passengers and crew. Since then demand has plummeted and demand forecasts on which the entire Master Plan is based are no longer relevant or useful. In fact, the base line data for the EIR are so flawed in their conception and current relevance that the Environmental assessment is inherently flawed as well.

Response:

Please see Response to Comments AL00051-93, PC01881-31, PC02131-5, and AL00033-253.

PHA00001-2

Comment:

I'm concerned we are not being asked to comment on the possibility of a Fifth Alternative that is conceptual, at best, with no opportunity to inspect any analysis on its impacts on the surrounding communities, businesses and residents.

Response:

Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided a comprehensive description and analysis of Alternative D, the fifth Master Plan Alternative, and was circulated for public review and comment.

PHA00001-3

Comment:

I am concerned as long as the current Master Plan process is on the table, the door is still open for incremental expansion later in this decade.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHA00001-4

Comment:

I'm concerned that nowhere in the existing Master Plan document or in the proposed Fifth Alternative is there an overarching plan to address projected aviation demand in the overall Southern California region using LAWA's other airports, Ontario and Palmdale. I urge you to reject this Master Plan in the

3. Comments and Responses

current planning process, to abandon it and begin anew with a true regional plan assessed with a new environmental set of data that adequately addresses impact on a regional basis.

Response:

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

PHA00002 Rodine, Robert Valley Industry and Commerce Association 11/8/2001

PHA00002-1

Comment:

Thank you. I'm Robert Rodine. I'm a resident of Sherman Oaks. I'm speaking before you tonight as the Chairman of the Aviation Committee of the Valley, the Industry and Commerce Association.

I'd like to continue on the theme that I began in Monterey Park at which time I addressed the folly of the Regional Plan. Attached to my comments at that time was a schedule that showed the loss to this community. When I speak of this community, I mean the entire region of some 42 million annual passengers as a result of the Regional Plan absent some very, very dynamic and effective leadership on the part of our politicians to demand certain airports open up their curfews, their limits and constraints.

Speaking primarily of airports, Burbank, Long Beach, Ontario and John Wayne, all of those airports are capped. John Wayne is capped by an environmental issue. The others are capped by political will. By virtue of those caps and by virtue of the fact that the people of Orange County don't prepare to be moved want to have El Toro built. The assumption that the Regional Plan will work is absolutely ludicrous. If those airports other than LAX can't assume the passenger load by virtue of limitations, then. I think that in the interest of protecting the air commerce infrastructure of the region, LAX has to go forward with a Master Plan of at least 92 million annual passengers. 78 million annual passengers will cost this region too much, and we cannot afford the loss of the direct economy from the employment associated with it or the economy of those passengers which are diverted to other regions such as Phoenix, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, Las Vegas and wherever else they might go because LAX will not be able to accommodate them.

Response:

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

PHA00003 Sambrano, Diane None Provided 11/8/2001

PHA00003-1

Comment:

Good evening. Thank you for being here tonight to hear our comments. As one of the persons who is greatly affected by LAX on a regular basis, 15 minutes all night long every night, 2:47, 3:01, 3:15 and 3:46 last night is the last time I called in. For someone to say LAX needs more of the burden, I would say, come move in with me for a week and see if you agree. Ladies and gentlemen, it is time for the rest of this region to accept some of the burden if they want any of the benefits. I'm tired of the burden for someone else's benefits. We are subjected to noise, pollution, not being able to sleep all night, not to

mention congestion and the assorted other dreadful, horrible, rotten assortment of activities I can think of that go with somebody else make some bucks.

As you see here tonight, there is not a great response. And probably part of that is because many of the people in this region don't understand what the burden is. It's nice for someone else to make money, but somebody else's profit shouldn't be to my detriment. We stand to lose schools, air quality, not to mention quality of life.

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. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations and Topical Response TR-LU-1 regarding impacts on quality of life.

PHA00003-2

Comment:

Among the comments in this very nice and pretty glossy document it says that perhaps we'll lose \$50,000 -- or 50,000 jobs if the airport does not expand. How could you lose something you don't already have? Projected is not reality. It is someone's whim. Somebody's dream. Someone's goal.

Response:

As was discussed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics, and Technical Report 5, Economic Impacts Technical Report, of the Draft EIS/EIR, the net decline in total jobs associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative would result from productivity increases (i.e., producing more economic output per worker) that would overwhelm the net additional jobs associated with limited growth in annual passengers and cargo tons. In contrast, Master Plan build Alternatives A, B, and C would each generate a sufficient number of new jobs to compensate for any employment decline associated with increased productivity and yield net job growth. Additionally, as was discussed in Section 4.4.1, Employment/Socio-Economics (subsection 4.4.1.2), and as detailed in the accompanying technical report, the employment projections and economic impacts analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR are based on computerized econometric models that account for the complexities of the economic interactions between LAX and the regional economy over time. Analysis using the models was supplemented with a wide range of data assembled from historical records, surveys, and interviews in order to establish statistical economic relationships.

PHA00003-3

Comment:

To those of us who live near the airport, it's not a dream. It's a nightmare. It's as if LAX acts as though it is a child who wakes up every 15 minutes and screams it's bloody head off. I think anyone who has had a child is very glad that child grew up and probably doesn't wake up every 15 minutes all night long.

For those who are so insistent that saying money is everything, well, all you have to do is go back in history. Was Howard Hughes happy? How about King Solomon? All the wealthy investors of the world that became known for their cash flow didn't live near an airport, did they? You know why? They didn't have to get up at a certain hour and go to work at some of these minimum wage jobs. To have a job should not be the goal of life. To enjoy life should be one of the benefits that one has in living in a supposed first-rate country.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relevant to nighttime awakening in homes in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PHA00003-4

Comment:

Our children cannot study because of the noise.

Response:

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

PHA00003-5

Comment:

And we cannot sleep because of the noise.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed the effects of single event aircraft noise relative to nighttime awakenings in homes associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and all four build alternatives in Section 4.1, Noise, and Section 4.2, Land Use, with supporting technical data and analyses provided in Appendix S-C1 and Technical Report S-1. Please see Topical Response TR-N-5 regarding nighttime aircraft operations.

PHA00004	Ackerman, Bruce	Economic Alliance of the San Fernando Valley	11/8/2001
-----------------	------------------------	---	------------------

PHA00004-1

Comment:

Good evening. Again, thank you for having this hearing. My name is Bruce Ackerman. I'm the President Chief Executive Officer of the Economic Alliance of the San Fernando Valley. I'm also a resident of the valley living in West Hills and also President of the Friends of Burbank Airport.

The Economic Alliance has had a long-standing commitment to and support of the LAX Master Plan. That support has always been a limited build out and limited build up at LAX.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHA00004-2

Comment:

No small part of that support has been the Van Nuys flyaway. We are very concerned about the discussion for curtailment of that build out or change in that build out for what had been proposed. We are very supportive of an immediate expansion of the flyaway as a satellite terminal. If we could accomplish that in a short time, we would see three major benefits happen in the San Fernando Valley as well as LAX. Number one, economic impact of the increased jobs would be immediate. Number two, the reduction in traffic at LAX would be felt immediately. And number three, the security factor of having a remote satellite terminal would be felt immediately.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00050-6 regarding Flyaway service.

PHA00005**Flink, Carol****None Provided****11/8/2001****PHA00005-1****Comment:**

Good evening. Hi. I don't have a prepared speech. I'm here with -- I'm here because three weeks ago I started taking lessons in JuJitsu from the attending Master over here, Sensei Cecere. I work in medicine. I run a radiology department. After September 11th I felt insecure. I felt unhappy about what happened to us. I wanted to do something that gave me some self-esteem and encouragement to build up my ego to feel safe within myself. I don't fly a lot, but after taking only three lessons and I have about three or four five months to go, I learned self-defense that I feel I could apply if someone approached me from the front, from behind, from the side. And I could put a person down. I put my husband down on the ground. I feel this is a method that could possibly apply to our air marshals, our stewards, anyone in everyday society that needs to protect themselves.

I didn't even know about this meeting until about three hours ago. I kind of ran over from my office. I don't think I'm even talking in term about what you're talking about airport expansion at the moment. I believe there is going to be a demonstration later. I've got months of training, but in three weeks I could protect myself. I could do it in closed quarters. I feel better. I don't feel like a defenseless person against the terrorism that unfortunately, you know, we're all involved in now. It's very emotional for me. I know friends in New York that were affected by this. I want to say, if I could learn how to do this, I think anyone can. I think later on he's going to do a demonstration. You are going to be amazed by what you're going to see. I was after only one hour. That's all I have to say.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHA00006**Brink, Charles****None Provided****11/8/2001****PHA00006-1****Comment:**

I'm Charles Brink in Van Nuys. I'm, of course, totally opposed to any more expansion of LAX to be a regional facility except for bringing public transportation into there, the expansion of the flyaways, secure baggage check-in facility and the expansion of more facilities like flyaway in remote locations would help the problem. Because with the event of larger aircraft, we could get more people into the aircraft, but we don't have the facilities to park them or handle them there. Plus, we're used to traffic on the 405.

Response:

Comment noted. It should be noted that Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Alternative D includes a new Ground Transportation Center and Intermodal Transportation Center which would be the primary access points for all passenger drop-off and pick-up and vehicle parking. Passengers would then access the CTA via an automated people mover system. In addition, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding the rail/transit plan and Topical Response TR-SEC-1 regarding security concerns. The Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed traffic impacts in Section 4.3, Surface Transportation, and air quality in Section 4.6, Air Quality. Supporting technical data and analyses are provided in Appendix G and Technical Reports 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft EIS/EIR and Appendix S-E and Technical Reports S-2a, S-2b, and S-4 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PHA00006-2

Comment:

The decision of not continuing the Rapid Transit Line to the airport is one of the dumbest things the City has ever done, but there are a number of dumb things. That happens to be one of them. I asked the reason, someone said, "Well, we're afraid an airplane may crash into a Rapid Transit vehicle causing damage." What about all the people?

Response:

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

PHA00006-3

Comment:

So I'm suggesting you restrict expansion to be expanding the methods of getting the public physically to the airport and lessening the impact of the mitigation in the area.

Response:

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

PHA00006-4

Comment:

Of course, for noise mitigation, quieter aircraft stage four type aircraft should become available that would work.

Response:

All aircraft operating at LAX and weighing more than 75,000 pounds meet the most restrictive noise level regulations now established by the federal government. At this time, there are no Stage 4 standards. Transitioning to more restrictive noise standards for the operating fleet at this time would be a difficult process that would require the concurrence and acceptance of the United States Congress and the international community. Nevertheless, a large number of the aircraft now operating at LAX already meet the proposed Chapter 4 noise guidelines that have been developed by the International Civil Aviation Organization Committee on Aviation Environmental Protection (CAEP).

PHA00006-5

Comment:

But most of all, you need to expand the other airports.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

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

PHA00006-6

Comment:

Palmdale Airport needs to be expanded. There's a gorgeous opportunity to take trains from Metrorail and bring it directly to the airport to provide transportation and park and ride facilities, various ideas that would improve public transportation in the area.

Response:

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

PHA00006-7

Comment:

But the idea of simply expanding LAX more and more and more would have come to an end without September 11th. It came to an end at the 11th. But use your time. Use your money, and don't waste any more 110 million dollars in symbols, big LAX signs. Put your money on the road and make it worthwhile.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PHA00006-1 above.

PHA00007	Shriver, Daniel	None Provided	11/8/2001
-----------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------

PHA00007-1

Comment:

Hello. My name is Daniel Shriver, S-h-r-i-v-e-r; 4741 Ben Avenue, Valley Village, California 91607. I'm here to speak about Atemi-Ryu Jujitsu.

Back at the Luminarias I first spoke to this Board to talk about Atemi-Ryu JuJitsu and about how close-range martial arts would be very effective for the airline industry. We've done demonstrations. Sensei Vince Cecere, Brian -- I'm forgetting his name right now, Brian Clark and James Karin have come to our aid to show you just how effective and appropriate this is. I appreciate their efforts. We're here because it's the right thing to do. We're here because it's appropriate and everyone that sees it knows it's effective. Martial arts came about because of bullies, because of people like terrorists who -- we all know it. We all went to high school. We all went to elementary school. We all know there are people that want to take things from you and have you live in fear.

Martial arts has always been an answer to this. I lost a friend on September 11th. And I couldn't help but think that if the flight attendant that had the first box cutter to her throat had simple self-defense, we would be living in a different world. We wouldn't be having these meetings. We would be expanding LAX. The United Airlines wouldn't be losing 15 million a day as was reported in the news today. American West would not be losing a million dollars a day.

This is not an aviation problem. This is an industry problem. Ben Affleck and Matt Damon were doing a TV show called "The Runner." It's gone away. I have friends that were going to open a restaurant. It's gone away. No investments. This is something that affects everyone, everyone. Please, this is an easy-to-do, simply applied, effective and appropriate answer to what we're all facing. And I hope and pray that people that read this report, people that hear this talk about it and let's bring it to the discussion of everyone because everyone will benefit. They say, why are we doing this? Why am I here? Because it's the right thing to do. It couldn't be simpler.

Response:

Comment noted.

3. Comments and Responses

PHA00008 **Cecere, Sensei Vince** **None Provided** **11/8/2001**

PHA00008-1

Comment:

Hello. Good evening. Real good. For those of you who don't know me, Sensei Vince Cecere. For those who haven't been in other meetings, I'm a third-degree back belt in combat JuJitsu and head representative of Grand Moses Powell as well as the chief founder and chief instructor of the Atemi-Ryu JuJitsu of Los Angeles.

I know that we're at an expansion meeting that we're talking about money, this, that and the other thing. Nobody in today's world is going to doubt we have a security problem on multiple levels. If you watch the news every day, you see the countries tearing themselves apart. You see these maniacs putting powders in envelopes. You see New York's bravest fighting . Somebody has got to put the brakes on. Somebody's got to say, "Hey, people, take a breath. Look what's going on. You're letting the people run us into the ground." Everyone is running scared. You don't have to be scared. A lot of problems we can't do anything about. Some of the security problems we can. One of them which we can is to make sure another airliner doesn't have to be a weapon of mass destruction.

Every fighter will tell you that if you take three hooks to the head, you'll start covering up. We haven't even begun to raise our hands. What are we going to say when the next building gets hit? If you don't believe that everything that the media is showing about our security on the news, if you don't believe that these lunatics walking around screaming Islamic aren't looking at another airplane to grab, you should look yourself in the mirror, look yourself in the eye and see if you can sit here and say you are truly safe. You can ask any person in this room or any person across the country that knows anything about security and they are going to tell you, these guys are waiting to hit you and grab something else. It doesn't have to be. I'm not saying this is an easy thing to do. I'm saying, it's a tremendous undertaking. To take any great journey, you have to do it one.

Step at a time. Somebody has to be brave enough to step up and take that journey. That's why we're here. Hopefully tonight we'll get another chance to do another demonstration. For the people that haven't been mesmerized yet, maybe we'll get the other half.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHA00009 **Karin, James** **None Provided** **11/8/2001**

PHA00009-1

Comment:

Hello. I'm James Karin. My address is 12433 Moorpark, Studio City. I've been around the traveling business all my life. My mother is a travel agent. Because of that, I was very fortunate to be able to travel around the world. One thing I've always enjoyed doing is talking with people about trips they've taken or planning on taking. But since September 11th all that has changed. People are scared to fly. My mother says all the time people are canceling trips they have planned for months because they are scared to fly. We can't have this. There is a time when people need to stand up and protect themselves. That is now.

I've been in martial arts most of my life, studied many, many different styles. When I saw Atemi-Ryu JuJitsu for the first time, I was blown away. I couldn't believe it. The amount of control you can have with minimum movement no matter what your size or shape is is astonishing. I think everybody needs it, not just flight attendants or flight crews or people in security positions. Anybody in any situation. The only person you can count on is yourself. So I think everyone should have the tools and knowledge to help protect them.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHA00010

Carpio, Cecil

None Provided

11/8/2001

PHA00010-1

Comment:

My name is Cecil Carpio from the city of Inglewood. Basically, what I would like to do right now is just read a document or two into the record.

"For immediate media release October 8, 2001 contact Julie Wong 213-978-0741. Mayor Jim Hahn calls for LAX Master Plan alternative based on safety and security." And page two of this letter Mayor Hahn asked that the new alternative plan to accommodate no more than 78 million annual passengers. In addition, Mayor Hahn requested that the proposed alternative simply reduce or eliminate airport incursions, which are a significant safety issue given the present LAX airfield configuration. The alternative could make a better design to handle the next generation quieter and more environmentally friendly jets, and redesigning ticket and baggage handling areas.

Response:

Comment noted. Subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, an additional option was formulated for the LAX Master Plan. Alternative D has been added to provide a build alternative designed to serve a level of future (2015) airport activity comparable to that of the No Action/No Project Alternative, and will make the airport safer and more secure, convenient, and efficient.

PHA00010-2

Comment:

Also I would like to read from Immediate Release August 27, 2000; contact Hilda Delgado 213-978-0741. Mayor Jim Hahn urges airport commissioners to make Ontario International Airport more business friendly, outlines proposal to support regional air traffic growth. Mayor Hahn's recommendations for Ontario International Airport are, lower landing fees, lower parking rates, create a flyaway bus shuttle service from the San Fernando and San Gabriel Valley to Ontario International Airport. Nationally market Ontario International Airport. Immediately proceed with the Master Plan initiative for Ontario International Airport, provide ticket pricing parity.

Response:

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

PHA00010-3

Comment:

Then there is a copy of a letter attached that addresses the commissioners. The reason I read those two documents is because I want to emphasize the fact that now more than ever we really need to focus when we go to a new plan on the regional solution.

Response:

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

3. Comments and Responses

PHA00011 Blanks, Bobby

**Congressmember Maxine
Waters' Office**

11/8/2001

PHA00011-1

Comment:

My name is Bobby Blanks. I'm Field Representative to Congressmember Maxine Waters. The address 10124 South Main Street, Los Angeles, California 90003. I would like to read a statement on behalf of Congressmember Maxine Waters.

"Thank you for the opportunity to speak and to submit a statement regarding the proposed Los Angeles Airport Master Plan and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement Environmental Impact Report. As a Congressmember of the 35th Congressional District, I represent over 600,000 constituents including residents, business owners and schools, and many more located in cities such as South Los Angeles, Inglewood, Gardena, Hawthorne, Lennox and portions of Westchester. With the numerous phone calls and letters and people whom I have spoken with directly, we are in agreement that there should not be any expansion of the Los Angeles International Airport.

While there has been over 60 million wasted in preparing the Draft EIS/EIR, the document is deeply flawed and contains numerous omissions and ambiguous or misleading information and a number of faulty assumptions.

Specifically, our objections to the plan proposed expansion hinges on the following:

Response:

Comment noted.

PHA00011-2

Comment:

One, the Draft EIS/EIR states that the environmental, noise and health burdens of the airport's operations and expansion are and will be borne by low-income and minority populations, yet it offers low commitments to recognize and address this imbalance.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC02203-2.

PHA00011-3

Comment:

Two, the air quality is already horrible. The current operations at LAX already constitute the largest single source of air pollution in the nation's worst air quality region. Any proposed expansion will decrease the air quality in surrounding communities and L.A. basin.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment PC00070-1 regarding existing air quality. Also, please see Response to Comment AL00043-6 regarding LAX as a source of air pollution. Further, please see Topical Response TR-AQ-3 regarding air pollution increase.

PHA00011-4

Comment:

In regard to traffic, LAX constitutes one of the largest single destinations for vehicular traffic in the Los Angeles region. The Draft EIS/EIR construction activities from any of the proposed alternatives will

result in increased traffic congestion, potentially affecting the communities during the next 15 years and beyond. It further states that these traffic impacts to citizens living and working in the communities surrounding the airport will be "significant and unavoidable." Calculations show the increase of cargo volume alone will require over six semi trucks per hour or one every ten minutes to support increase. This is not acceptable.

Response:

The surface transportation impacts of the Master Plan alternatives were presented in Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment AL00043-3 regarding proposed traffic improvements for off-airport roadways. Regarding traffic concerns pertaining to the cargo truck traffic plan and neighborhood impacts from trucks, please see Topical Response TR-ST-1 regarding Cargo Truck Traffic. Regarding existing traffic concerns surrounding LAX, percent contribution of airport traffic in the adjacent communities, and how traffic conditions around the airport would change with implementation of the Master Plan Alternatives, please see Topical Response TR-ST-4 regarding Airport Area Traffic Concerns. Regarding traffic measures to minimize neighborhood impacts, please see Topical Response TR-ST-6 regarding Neighborhood Traffic Impacts.

PHA00011-5

Comment:

Given the events that took place on September 11th, there should be more focus on safety and security rather than expansion. However, we will not be fooled into expansion under the guise of safety and security.

Response:

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

PHA00011-6

Comment:

I strongly support a regional approach to air travel so other airports such as Ontario and Palmdale begin to accept their fair share of air traffic. Thank you.

Response:

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

Please see Topical Response TR-RC-4 regarding Orange County air transportation demand, for information on El Toro, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario International Airport. Also, please see Topical Response TR-RC-5 regarding transferring LAX operations to Palmdale.

3. Comments and Responses

PHA00012

Silver, Gerald

Homeowners of Encino

11/8/2001

PHA00012-1

Comment:

Good evening. I'm Gerald Silver, president of Homeowners of Encino. I'm speaking on behalf of 49 homeowners associations. I won't take the time to mention them now. The Sierra Club National Chapter we are very much interested in noise issues, principally at Van Nuys Airport.

I want to address, basically, the situation out at LAX. Number one -- and by the way, I may run over a moment or two. If you have more speakers lined up, I'll be glad relinquish.

Let me then withdraw the comments on the subject and talk about your -- three minutes and you have plenty of time is inadequate for a thoughtful discussion of these issues. You're not really seeking input, then. What you're really saying is you'll give people three minutes so you can stand around and have coffee. That's inappropriate. I'm hoping you'll reconsider. As I said, I represent a number of homeowner associations.

Response:

Comment noted. The 3 minute time limit rule was adopted in response to the extensive amount of people hoping to become speakers at each of the 21 public hearings held on the environmental documents and the project and alternatives and the desire to afford the opportunity to speak to as many residents and interested parties as possible.

PHA00012-2

Comment:

Let me begin, clearly the Riordan plan was an unacceptable approach. It was build, build and more build. It was designed to support, principally, the moneyed interest along Century Boulevard. It was done because the airlines wanted to take the least line of resistance. And clearly we need not only a regional approach on paper, but in practice as well. You heard this over and over and you'll hear it again.

Response:

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

PHA00012-3

Comment:

Clearly Palmdale for 20 -- I guess 30 years now we've been asking Palmdale Airport be a major mode of transportation. Now, how is that going to be done? How do you propose to do that as well as Ontario? Well, it's going to obviously require a terrorist approach with respect to LAX when new projects are proposed. What needs to be said, yes, we're glad to do that. We're bound to provide this facility, but we have a thoughtful and analytical process when improvements are made at LAX.

Response:

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

PHA00012-4

Comment:

I have 47 seconds and another three minutes of comments. I hope you won't cut me off. So what you'll tell the airlines is you can make your improvements at LAX, but this is going to be a two-year program that we have to look at analytically with a number of advisory committees.

Response:

Comment noted.

PHA00012-5

Comment:

But on the other hand, if you want to make your improvements at Palmdale, we have a fast-track approach. That fast track will allow you to go in and get expedited treatment over people waiting to go to LAX. We also have a few carrots we're going to offer, the kind of marking provisions some of the build procedures that would allow them to build their terminal facilities with relative ease and with some of the money being footed by LAX. Now, may I go on?

I appreciate that courtesy. So with that kind of carrot-and-stick, what it does encourage not by force, but by the economics by the time frame for them to take that kind of action. We do this all the time anyway, you know, City agencies do that.

Response:

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

PHA00012-6

Comment:

Now, let me also comment about the physical layout and design.

The idea of putting additional runways in to increase capacity is really an impractical solution to this problem. And I very much like -- we very much like the proposal that Mr. Hahn has put forward. Many of the other airports around the country do this. Rather than try to funnel everybody through this horseshoe, what is needed is satellite intake terminals and the kind of brilliant intelligent terminals needed, not the haphazard operation and ill-planned such as we have, for instance, on Lot 2. I won't take the time to go into the experience I had in the last few weeks going into Lot 2. The way that was handled as a satellite terminal I will not fly out of LAX until that matter is straightened out. You can see air transit is going down the drain until that matter is cleared up.

The satellite terminal notion of having monorail or some other kind of mechanisms of people movers to bring people from these remote lots, the remote lots have to be properly structured. They have to have signage, adequate notices put out to the public so they can properly use those. It has to be a responsible flow of public going in and out of these various lots. You don't have that. You have covered area so in hot and rainy weather people are encouraged to fly through load factor is another thing that needs to be addressed. Obviously, more people can go on flights. You don't have -- I realize the airlines to some extent have a lot of control in load factors, but, you know, they are the bully puppet element here. That's really what's needed on the part of the LAX Administration.

Response:

Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, developed at the direction of Mayor Hahn, has been added to the range of build alternatives currently being considered for the LAX Master Plan. The specifics of that plan are described in the Draft Master Plan Addendum and the environmental impacts associated with Alternative D were addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

PHA00012-7

Comment:

Now, let me also talk about the FAA because there are very important --

May I ask, respectfully, I have another point or two. If I could close? I don't want to take their time. I don't want to have dead air and waste your time and the City resources here.

FAA, that was my last point before you interrupted. The FAA has their hands full right now. They are dealing with security matters. This is all new to the FAA. So they are not about to take on a lot of these smaller issues. I think the DOAC in looking at these programs need to take some very strident positions. Yes, it may be necessary to change or to challenge what the FAA rules and regulations are. But you have friends that are out there. You have residents who are willing to go to their congressmen. Remember, congress has overwriting authority on the FAA on this. We will help. We'll go to the various congressmen and support the measures that need to be taken. So I don't see that these FAA rules that say you can't do this or can't do this are ironbound. That's a very important thing.

Response:

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

PHA00012-8

Comment:

Bottom line, no more physical expansion at LAX. We must use every tool and technique to go out to Palmdale, to Ontario. I thank you very much for allowing me to go on. I realize you have a lengthy line of speakers that want to speak after me.

Response:

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

SAF00001 Amaglio, Sandro Federal Emergency Management Agency

SAF00001-1

Comment:

Thank you for providing a copy of the subject document to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for review and comment. We have reviewed the document and determined that FEMA's concerns are limited to the effects of the proposed alternatives on flood hazards.

As you may be aware, the City of Los Angeles participates in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Under this program, the Federal government makes affordable flood insurance available within participating communities. In exchange, the communities adopt certain floodplain management regulations to reduce the risk of flood damage. In support of the NFIP, FEMA has identified Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs) in floodprone communities. An SFHA is an area that is subject to inundation during a flood having a 1 percent chance of occurrence in a given year (also known as the base flood or 100-year flood). Flood insurance is required for structures within SFHAs in order to protect Federal financial investments and to reduce the cost of disaster assistance. Further, the floodplain management regulations adopted by participating communities affect the construction and improvement

of structures located in SFHAs. Accordingly, FEMA is concerned with the location of potential construction activities relative to any identified SFHAs.

FEMA has prepared Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) to show SFHAs in communities throughout the United States. The area of Los Angeles International Airport is shown on the FIRM for the City of Los Angeles. Almost all of the airport lies in an area that has been designated Zone C on the FIRM. Zone C is defined as an area that has little or no rise of flooding. The floodplain management requirements of the NFIP do not apply in Zone C. The only SFHA on the airport site is a thirteen-acre area in an undeveloped part of the site just north of Imperial Highway. This area, which is shown on panel 89 of the FIRM, has been designated Zone A, an SFHA that has been studied by approximate methods. However, in a September 6, 2002, letter to City of Los Angeles, FEMA stated that the area in question has been filled and is no longer subject to significant flood hazards. This letter, which is included in Appendix S-A of the subject document, constitutes a revision to the FIRM, and the area in question is now considered Zone C. Consequently, the requirements of the NFIP no longer apply to this area.

Response:

Comment noted.

SAF00001-2

Comment:

We also evaluated the document to determine if the proposed alternatives would have an effect on off-site flood hazards. Section 4.7 of the document indicates that increases in impervious area could potentially increase stormwater runoff and cause flooding in the Dominguez Channel, which lies southeast of the airport. To mitigate possible flooding effects, the document indicates that Los Angeles World Airports would prepare detailed drainage plan and identify measures to reduce runoff and increase drainage capacity. The NFIP does not have specific regulations regarding basin changes that result in increased flood discharges. However, we urge the City of Los Angeles to monitor the effects of the project and, following the completion of the drainage plan, to evaluate whether the resulting basin conditions would require a restudy of flood hazards. Such a restudy would be necessary to revise the FIRMs for Los Angeles and neighboring jurisdictions to ensure that flood hazards are accurately depicted on the maps.

Response:

Comment noted. As indicated in Mitigation Measure MM-HWQ-1 on page 4-420 in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and/or the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering are responsible for implementation of any upgrades to regional drainage facilities that may be required in order to accommodate current and projected future flows. LAWA will relay to these agencies the above comments regarding the monitoring of basin conditions and the potential necessity of a flood hazards restudy.

SAF00002 Eldridge Jr, John Federal Emergency Management Agency

SAF00002-1

Comment:

This is in response to your Supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Master Plan development of the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX).

Please review the current effective Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) for the site of construction. Please note that the Federal Government and the City of Los Angeles, California are participants in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The NFIP floodplain management building requirements are described in the Code of Federal Regulations 44, Sections 59 through 65.

3. Comments and Responses

The basic NFIP floodplain management building requirements are as follows:

- All buildings constructed within a riverine floodplain, (i.e., any of the "A" Flood Zones designations as delineated on the FIRM), must be elevated so that the lowest floor is at or above the Base Flood Elevation level.

- If the area of construction is located within a Regulatory Floodway as delineated on the FIRM, all "development", (the term "development" in this context includes not only the construction of buildings, but all types of developments), must not increase base flood elevation levels. A hydrologic and hydraulic analysis must be performed prior to the start of the development. This analysis must demonstrate that the development would not cause any rise in base flood levels.

- All buildings constructed within a coastal high hazard area, (any of the "V" Flood Zones designations as delineated on the FIRM), must be elevated on pilings and columns, so that the lowest horizontal structural member, (excluding the pilings and columns), is elevated to or above the base flood elevation level. In addition, the posts and pilings foundation and the structure attached thereto, is anchored to resist flotation, collapse and lateral movement due to the effects of wind and water loads acting simultaneously on all building components.

- Upon completion of any development that changes existing Special Flood Hazard Areas, the NFIP directs all participating communities to submit the appropriate hydrologic and hydraulic data to FEMA for a FIRM revision. In accordance with CFR44, Section 65.3, as soon as practicable, but not later than six months after such data becomes available, a community shall notify FEMA of the changes by submitting technical for a flood map revision. To obtain copies of FEMA's Flood Map Revision Application Packages, please refer to the FEMA website at http://www.fema.gov/mit/tsd/dl_mt-2.htm

Please Note:

Many NFIP participating communities have adopted floodplain management building requirements, which are more restrictive than the minimum federal standards described in CFR44. Please contact the local community's floodplain manager for more information on local building requirements.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AL00033-182 regarding the Letter of Map Revision issued by FEMA that removed the 100-year floodplain designation for the 13-acre area to reflect the current actual conditions.

SAF00004	Port, Patricia	United States Department of the Interior	8/20/2003
-----------------	-----------------------	---	------------------

SAF00004-1

Comment:

Thank you for granting a comment period extension to the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) for the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) Proposed Master Plan Improvements (Plan).

We understand this extension to October 31, 2003, was discussed and agreed upon in a telephone conversation between you and Ken Corey in the Service's Carlsbad office, on August 13, 2003. We also understand this extension coincides with an extension to November 7, 2003, granted to the City of Los Angeles.

Our need for this extension is because our Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Service office, responsible for this review, is currently working on a high priority Biological Opinion (BO) for the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan. This exceptionally large and complex BO will address the potential effects of economic and urban development on 146 species and their habitats within a 1.26 million-acre planning area.

As you are probably aware, this project is the focus of intense public and political attention. Service efforts to produce this Biological Opinion began in July, and we committed to Riverside County officials to issue a draft in September 2003. This has impacted the Service's ability in the short-term to devote attention to other issues, including the LAX Plan.

We recognize this commitment as a very ambitious goal, and we recognize the short-term consequences for other project reviews, but we believe there will be long-term fish and wildlife benefits as the result.

The LAX Plan is designated a priority project under Presidential Executive Order 13274, Environmental Stewardship and Transportation Infrastructure Project Reviews. The Service has expressed interest in reviewing this SDEIS because we submitted substantial comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement in 2001 and the project will require consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

The Service has also indicated they are committed to doing their part to ensure appropriate environmental stewardship while streamlining the LAX environmental review process. With this in mind, we believe that allowing this extension contributes to the Executive Order's streamlining and stewardship goals by reducing potential for last minute conflict that could occur during ESA consultation. Finally, we wish to acknowledge the positive coordination demonstrated by the Federal Aviation Administration in this effort.

Response:

Comment noted. The US Department of the Interior submitted a subsequent letter to FAA with substantive comments on the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR on November 6, 2003. This letter is numbered SAF00006. Please see responses to comment letter SAF00006.

SAF00005 Manzanilla, Enrique United States Environmental 11/5/2003
Protection Agency

SAF00005-1

Comment:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (SDEIS/R) for the above- referenced project. This is a priority project for accelerated environmental review pursuant to Executive Order 13274 (Environmental Stewardship and Transportation Infrastructure Project Reviews; February 27, 2003). Our comments are provided under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality's NEPA Implementing Regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. EPA provided comments on the Notice of Intent to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (July 31, 1997); the DEIS (September 24, 2001); and a preliminary draft of the SDEIS/R (May 1, 2003). EPA is pleased that many of the comments we made previously have been addressed.

The SDEIS/R presents a new Safety and Security Alternative (Alternative D), which seeks to accommodate projected growth in air traffic, without providing additional capacity. We note that Alternative D is the preferred alternative of the City of Los Angeles, and that the preferred alternative of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) will be identified in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Based on our review of the SDEIS/R, EPA is rating Alternative D as Environmental Concerns - Insufficient Information (EC-2). We continue to rate Alternatives A, B, C, and No Action as Environmental Objections - Insufficient Information (EO-2) due to the projected violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Please refer to the attached "Summary of EPA Rating Definitions."

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments SAF00005-2 through SAF00005-12 below.

3. Comments and Responses

SAF00005-2

Comment:

EPA appreciates the efforts of FAA and the City of Los Angeles to more effectively control and reduce emissions from the project (especially construction emissions) which can contribute to reducing air pollution levels in the South Coast Air Basin, an "extreme" ozone nonattainment area. Alternative D results in less emissions than Alternatives A, B, and C, and No Action.

Response:

Comment noted.

SAF00005-3

Comment:

EPA remains concerned about auxiliary power unit (APU) emissions at LAX, and believes that further reductions of APU emissions can be achieved. We recommend that the FEIS quantify APU emissions at LAX for each pollutant; the degree to which APU emissions can be controlled or reduced by FAA or the City of Los Angeles; and, for each pollutant, the degree of emissions reductions that could be achieved by a comprehensive APU-reductions strategy. The importance of applying all feasible controls to reduce emissions is highlighted by attainment assessments in the new South Coast Air Quality Management Plan, and by a sharp rise in the number of violations of the Federal ozone standard in the air basin during the summer of 2003.

Response:

In both the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, auxiliary power units (APU) emissions were presented combined with ground support equipment (GSE) emissions. In the Final EIS/EIR, Tables x, y, and z present APU emissions separately from those of other source types. For the criteria pollutants, APU emissions are generally less than five percent by mass of GSE emissions. Thus, APU emissions represent a relatively small contribution to total on-airport emissions.

As noted in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Appendix S-E Section 2.3.1, it is LAWA's goal to have all of its aircraft gates at LAX equipped with 400-Hz power and preconditioned air in the near future. This feature will allow aircraft pilots to minimize the use of their aircrafts' APUs while parked at the gate. FAA, EPA, and LAWA will engage interested parties in an evaluation of all feasible measures for reducing APU emissions at the gates; such measures may include incentive programs and aircraft guidelines restricting APU use at gates when turnaround time exceeds certain limits. This effort is not part of the air quality mitigation measures recommended for the LAX Master Plan but is rather a measure which LAWA voluntarily enters into, for the reason noted below.

The Clean Air Act Section 233 (42 USC 7573) declares that all states and their political subdivisions are preempted from adopting or attempting to enforce "any standard respecting emissions of any pollutant from any aircraft or engine thereof" that is different from an applicable EPA standard. Therefore, it is beyond the jurisdiction of either LAWA or FAA to utilize a "command-and-control" approach to limit APU emissions.

SAF00005-4

Comment:

The SDEIS/R does not address whether any fully evaluated alternative would have a disproportionately high, adverse effect on low-income or minority populations due to the project's air quality impacts. EPA is also concerned with the accuracy of the projected level of acrolein emissions, a hazardous air pollutant. We acknowledge the SDEIS/R's improved discussion of the uncertainties involved in accurately predicting air toxic emissions. However, the projected hazard indices from exposure to acrolein are a source of concern.

Response:

Please refer to the Response to Comment SAF00005-10.

SAF00005-5

Comment:

U.S. EPA - Detailed Comments - Supplement to Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (SDEIS/R) - Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) Master Plan Improvements - November 5, 2003

Air Quality

The South Coast Air Basin is classified as "extreme" nonattainment for the Federal National Ambient Air Quality Standard for ozone. LAX is the largest single source of emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and oxides of nitrogen (NOx)--ozone precursors--in the air basin (see 2003 AQMP [Air Quality Management Plan], Attachment D to Appendix III, Top 300 SCAB VOC and NOx Producers in 1997, South Coast Air Quality Management District).

Response:

Comment noted. Please note, as shown in Attachment A to Appendix III of the 2003 Air Quality Management Plan, all aircraft sources in the South Coast Air Basin account for 1 percent of the VOC and NOx emissions. Also mitigated VOC and NOx emissions from on-airport operational sources for Alternative D, the LAWA-staff preferred alternative, are predicted to be below baseline emissions as shown in Table S4.6-19 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SAF00005-6

Comment:

Auxiliary Power Units (APUs)

Emission estimates in the SDEIS/R from APUs, combined with ground service equipment (GSE), are higher than corresponding estimates in the 2001 DEIS/R for carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds (VOC), nitrogen oxides (NOx), and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM-10). Although EPA understands that these increases are the result of an updated version of the Emissions Dispersion Modeling System (EDMS) model, we note that the increases constitute a large proportion of on-airport emissions (SDEIS/R at p. 4-367).

The SDEIS/R does not present the assumptions used to estimate APU emissions, nor disaggregate LAX's APU emissions as a line-item separate from GSE emissions. APU/GSE are the largest on-airport source of VOC at LAX. APU emissions are projected to increase in future years (even though many passenger gates for commercial aircraft at LAX are already equipped with fixed electrical and preconditioned air systems). It would be helpful, especially in refining the air quality impact assessment and LAX's air mitigation program, to quantify: (i) APU emissions during "taxi-in" and "taxi-out" operations; (ii) APU emissions when commercial aircraft are at the gates; and (iii) the extent to which commercial jets use the existing preconditioned air and power available at the gates.

APU emission reductions could be achieved through reduced APU operating time, centralized power, or pre-conditioned air systems at terminal gates. EPA recognizes that mitigating emissions during "taxi-in" and "taxi-out" operations is constrained by safety and operational requirements. We are also aware that FAA is drafting national guidance to reduce emissions from APU operations associated with gate turnaround of commercial aircraft. However, the SDEIS/R does not provide a clear commitment by FAA or the City of Los Angeles to mitigate at-gate APU emissions at LAX as a component of the proposed action (see S-E, Supplemental Air Quality Impact Analysis, p. 36).

The SDEIS/R presents a commitment to mitigate emissions from GSE through incentives, tenant lease requirements, and by providing sufficient fueling infrastructure (S-E, Supplemental Air Quality Impact Analysis, p. 40). A similar approach for reducing APU emissions at LAX should be considered.

3. Comments and Responses

Reductions in APU emissions at LAX from a strengthened mitigation commitment may also be applicable to FAA's Clean Air Act General Conformity analysis.

Recommendation: EPA recommends that the FEIS include measures to reduce APU emissions at LAX, based upon appropriate operational and aircraft safety considerations, and address the extent to which such mitigation could be implemented by FAA or the City of Los Angeles, including under tenant lease arrangements. We also recommend that APU emissions be quantified to reflect specific activities and uses during aircraft operations for each alternative.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SAF00005-3 regarding APU emissions.

SAF00005-7

Comment:

Emissions Data

EPA continues to be concerned with the quantification of air quality impacts and the accuracy of the data reported in the SDEIS/R. The SDEIS/R provides emissions estimates by source category at LAX in 1996 and 2000, and for the impact analysis years under Alternative D (section 4.6 in Volume 1; Appendix S-E; Technical Report S-4). The SDEIS/R adjusts the emissions estimates for No Action and Alternatives A, B, and C presented in the 2001 DEIS/R, based on the latest version of the EDMS model (version 4.11). However, the SDEIS/R does not provide an inventory of these revised emissions estimates for each analysis year and source category.

A comparison of on-airport motor vehicle emissions estimates in Tables S4.6-6 and S4.6-7 shows an unexplained increase in emissions of NO_x and SO_x from 1996 to 2000, i.e., 431 tons per day of NO_x in 1996 to 1,841 tons per day in 2000 (an increase of more than 400 percent); and 2 tons per day of SO_x in 1996 to 13 tons per day in 2000 (a 650 percent increase).

EPA's review finds unexplained values in Table S.4.6-9 for NO_x emissions under Alternative C in 2005, and SO_x emissions under No Action in 2015. Our review indicates that the NO_x emissions under Alternative C in 2005 should be approximately 6,100 tons per year (tpy), not 5,800 tpy; while the SO_x emissions under No Action in 2015 should be approximately 530 tpy, not 770 tpy.

Recommendation: The FEIS should provide emissions estimates for all individual source categories (unmitigated and mitigated cases) under all alternatives in all impact years. Changes in airport-related emissions estimates, relative to the 2001 DEIS/R, should be explained in the FEIS.

Response:

On-airport emission estimates, separated by source groups has been provided in Attachment N of Technical Report S-4, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Interim year emission estimates are provided in Attachment O of Technical Report S-4, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. A detailed discussion of the methodologies used to estimate and update emission calculations is provided in Section 4.6.2.2, Emission Estimates, and in Section 2.1, Emission Estimates of Appendix S-E of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

As stated in Section 4.6.2.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, on-airport traffic emissions were estimated using the most recent version of EMFAC available (EMFAC2002). The 1996 on-airport traffic analysis was done using the most recent available EMFAC model at the time of analysis (EMFAC7G). Please note, updating the 1996 Baseline on-airport traffic emissions would result in a higher Baseline emission estimate that would be compared against future emission estimates, lowering the difference between the Baseline and Future scenarios. Therefore, the original analysis provides a conservative estimate.

SAF00005-8

Comment:

Mitigation of Construction Emissions

We are pleased that the SDEIS/R incorporates EPA's recommendations to reduce emissions from construction equipment (Table S4.6-18), which serves to reduce emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM), an air toxic.

Recommendation: EPA requests that the proposed air quality mitigation in the SDEIS/R be referenced in the FEIS and Record of Decision as part of a comprehensive "Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan." We recommend that a combination of fuels and controls (such as diesel particulate filters) be required on all construction equipment for this project, unless technically infeasible.

Response:

All construction-related mitigation measures will be incorporated as part of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan adopted as part of the project. The proposed combination of cleaner burning diesel fuels, newer engine specifications and add-on controls including diesel particulate filters will be used to the extent technologically feasible.

SAF00005-9

Comment:

Air Quality and Source Apportionment Study

EPA commends Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) for its efforts in developing an "Air Quality and Source Apportionment Study of the Area Surrounding Los Angeles International Airport," although we recognize that this study is not part of the SDEIS/R. The Air Quality and Source Apportionment Study is intended to supplement gaps in current information on the effects of LAX on air pollution, thus allowing FAA and the City of Los Angeles to better understand the airport's contribution to local and regional air pollutant loading. Data and analysis developed by LAWA's study could facilitate a more effective disclosure of impacts, identify appropriate mitigation, and improve the decision-making process for this project. The study's findings and recommendations could complement the Human Health Risk Assessment (HRRRA). Because the SDEIS/R does not specifically determine if any fully evaluated alternative would have a disproportionately high, adverse effect on low-income or minority populations based on air quality impacts, the Air Quality and Source Apportionment Study remains of keen interest to EPA.

Recommendation: We encourage LAWA to proceed with the Air Quality and Source Apportionment Study in a timely manner since it would provide important data on LAX's air quality impacts, thus enabling FAA and the City of Los Angeles to make the most informed decision for the proposed Master Plan Improvements, including appropriate air quality mitigation. FAA and the City of Los Angeles should integrate the information from the Air Quality and Source Apportionment Study in the decision-making for this project as such information becomes available.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-AQ-2 regarding the Source Apportionment Study.

SAF00005-10

Comment:

Environmental Justice Impacts

The SDEIS/R suggests that Alternative D, even without Federal air quality violations, would have adverse air quality effects on adjacent communities, many of which are predominately low-income or minority (pp. 4-329 and 4-330). Furthermore, according to the SDEIS/R, Alternative D "could contribute to higher ozone levels due to increased NOx emissions associated with airport traffic," and low-income or minority communities "may be more severely affected because they may be more susceptible to asthma and other chronic respiratory illnesses" (p. 4-330, Volume 1). Emissions of hazardous air pollutants from this project (e.g., acrolein and 1,3-butadiene) present a potential health or environmental risk to low-income or minority populations (although FAA may have over-estimated the potential health effects of acrolein).

3. Comments and Responses

The SDEIS/R remains inconclusive about whether any fully evaluated alternative would have a disproportionately high, adverse effect on low-income or minority populations based on air quality impacts, including emissions of hazardous air pollutants. Our May 1, 2003 comment letter on the preliminary draft asked that the SDEIS/R specifically address this issue or whether the information needed to make such a determination is "incomplete or unavailable" (40 CFR 1502.22). DOT's Final Order on Environmental Justice identifies steps to be taken when a disproportionately high, adverse human health or environmental effect on low-income or minority populations is identified. According to DOT's Final Order, a proposed activity having such an effect should be undertaken only if further mitigation or alternatives avoiding or reducing such effects are not practicable (Federal Register, April 15, 1997, pp. 18377-18381). There are several tools, presented below, that could prove useful in enabling FAA to make this determination in the FEIS.

Cumulative risk, defined by EPA as "the combined risks from aggregate exposures to multiple agents or stressors," is an emerging discipline that EPA is addressing, in part, through a Framework for Cumulative Risk Assessment, EPA, 2003 (see <http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/cfm/recordisplay.cfm?deid=54944>). This framework identifies the elements of a cumulative risk assessment process and offers a structure to conduct a cumulative risk assessment (May 27, 2003 Federal Register at p. 28825). Maps showing potential cumulative risks in the air basin are at <http://www.aqmd.gov/rules/CIWGmeet.htm#maps>.

Draft guidance issued by EPA regarding Title VI of the Civil Rights Act may be a useful reference, including the development of a methodology to make a determination on disproportionately high, adverse effects on low-income or minority populations (see Federal Register, June 27, 2000, pp. 39650-39701, "Draft Title VI Guidance for EPA Assistance Recipients Administering Environmental Permitting Programs and Draft Revised Guidance for Investigating Title VI Administrative Complaints Challenging Permits"). EPA is available to assist FAA in developing the analysis necessary to complete this determination for Alternative D, the City's preferred alternative.

Recommendation: Because of high hazard indices for acrolein, it is appropriate to validate the estimated (modeled) concentrations of hazardous air pollutants with current monitoring data, especially for two pollutants, acrolein and 1,3-butadiene. Estimated concentrations of hazardous air pollutants, especially acrolein and 1,3-butadiene, could potentially be validated by monitoring over a representative number of days over several months in different seasons. We recommend that FAA consult the air district to more comprehensively identify emissions of hazardous air pollutants at LAX, and to provide potentially-affected populations with the best available data on exposure and health risks.

Although EPA recognizes that uncertainties regarding potential air quality and health effects remain, the FEIS should clearly address if this project, especially the City's preferred alternative (Alternative D), would have a disproportionately high, adverse effect on low-income or minority populations based on air quality impacts. The tools referenced above (EPA's cumulative risk assessment document; the air district's cumulative risk maps; and EPA's draft Title VI guidance) are potential components allowing FAA to make this determination in the FEIS, based upon the best available data, information and references.

If additional mitigation for reducing impacts from air pollutants is feasible, it should be implemented by FAA and the City of Los Angeles to the fullest extent. The SDEIS/R presents an excellent program to reduce construction emissions, and opportunities to substantially reduce certain operational emissions (e.g., GSE emissions). Reducing APU emissions to the fullest extent practicable, consistent with safety and operational requirements, would be a significant accomplishment in approving this project at the Federal level. The FEIS should also explore practicable mitigation opportunities within the impacted areas that could provide additional air quality benefits. We are available to FAA and the City of Los Angeles in this regard.

Response:

Cumulative impact, as defined by CEQA, is a change in the environment that results from adding the effect of the project to those effects of closely related past, present, and probable future projects. As defined by USEPA (2003), cumulative risk assessment means "an analysis, characterization, and possible quantification of the combined risks to health or the environment from multiple agents or stressors." USEPA (2003) notes "One key aspect of this definition is that a cumulative risk assessment need not necessarily be quantitative, so long as it meets the other requirements." The scope of the cumulative human health risk assessment might be defined as human health risks potentially resulting

from exposure to pollutants released as a result of implementation of the build alternatives combined with pollutants released from closely related past, present, and probable future projects.

USEPA (2003) indicates that complexities such as multiple exposure durations, pathways, sources, or routes, multiple effects or impacts, nonconventional stressors or risk factors (e.g., lifestyle and access to health care), and quantification of risks may or may not be addressed. USEPA (2003) also indicates that nonconventional stressors such as lifestyle and access to health care in general require continued research.

USEPA (2003) describes various ways in which populations may be vulnerable, such as susceptibility/sensitivity, differential exposure, differential preparedness, and differential ability to recover. Preparedness and ability to recover include such factors as lack of access to health care, income differences, unemployment, and lack of health insurance. USEPA (2003) states that "cumulative risk assessments may be uniquely suited to addressing the issues related to vulnerability....However, many of these factors have not yet been extensively developed beyond correlations between mortality rates and several socioeconomic factors such as income." Susceptibility has been more developed than the other factors and USEPA currently employs implementation of a 10-fold factor to address heterogeneity in sensitivity.

Some subpopulations can be highly exposed to stressors because of geographic proximity to the sources of these stressors. For example, people living near and downwind of LAX may have higher exposure. USEPA (2003) indicates that some heavily exposed populations may also be particularly vulnerable to the effects associated with stressors of concern, such as people with chronic respiratory problems and those who are economically disadvantaged and do not have good access to medical care. They indicate that "a cumulative risk assessment may need to take into account potential combinations of high exposure and high vulnerability, but few, if any methods are currently available and accepted to address the combined effects of exposure and vulnerability. This is an important area for further research and methods development."

USEPA (2003) also indicates that qualitative approaches can be valuable for cumulative risk assessment and that, in the near term, qualitative approaches may be the only way to overcome the complexity and data deficiencies that hinder quantitative approaches. The guidance indicates that displaying matrices on a map can help in visualizing areas with multiple stressors. Geographically based hazards are identified as potentially useful cumulative measures; although they are not quantitative estimates of risk, the location of hazards can be used as an indicator of aggregate exposures and thus cumulative risks from the potential chemicals associated with the site. USEPA (2003) states that environmental justice literature has used this approach. It also indicates that the methodology is not currently available to evaluate how a number of factors, e.g., crime, drugs, health care access, infectious disease, diet, etc, influence cumulative health risk. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR includes maps showing risk ranges by census tracts. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR also incorporated South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) maps showing potential cumulative risks in the air basin, as discussed in the comment.

For the No Action/No Project Alternative and for each build alternative, cancer risks and non-cancer health hazards were estimated for each chemical of concern. If the risk or hazard for a specific chemical was less than the baseline estimate for that chemical, it was viewed as a beneficial impact, i.e., the risk or hazard has been reduced below baseline conditions. This was expressed as a negative estimate of risk or hazard for that chemical. The risk and hazard for each chemical were summed to get a total estimate of cancer risk or non-cancer health hazard for the alternative. A negative estimate of total risk or hazard indicates that overall (i.e., considering both beneficial and non-beneficial impacts) the combined risks or hazards for an alternative were less than those estimated for baseline. This comparison was applied consistently between each alternative and baseline; as such, it is a reasonable method to compare the total risks and hazards.

The Draft EIS/EIR presented an analysis of cumulative health risks for cancer using results of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study (MATES-II Study). This study provided estimates of cancer risks due to toxic air pollutants in ambient air for the entire South Coast Air Basin. Thirty toxic air pollutants were monitored and evaluated in the MATES-II Study for their contribution to excess lifetime cancer risk within the general population living in the South Coast Air Basin. Risks calculated in the study were based on data collected from April 1998 through March 1999. This study integrated impacts from freeway systems along with all other sources of toxic air pollutants in the region. The study concludes that the current excess population cancer risk resulting

3. Comments and Responses

from exposure to toxic air pollutants is about 1,400 in one million (1.4×10^{-3}) in the South Coast Air Basin. Particulate matter from diesel-fueled engine exhaust (PM₁₀) was found to be the dominant pollutant, contributing approximately 70 percent of the total risk. The dominant source for diesel-related PM₁₀ within the Basin is mobile sources such as trucks, buses, automobiles and locomotives. The results of the MATES-II study were used as estimates of background cancer risk in the Draft EIS/EIR. Estimated risks associated with LAX operations were compared to risks associated with other sources to determine the impact of LAX operations on cumulative risks (risks associated with LAX operations plus background risks) for people living in the South Coast Air Basin in Section 6.7, Cumulative Risks Associated with LAX Operations, of 14a Human Health Technical Report. The cumulative analysis suggested that LAX operations would cause an increase in cumulative cancer risk at some locations near the airport under Alternatives B and C, but that implementation of Alternatives A and D would reduce cumulative risks at all locations. Nonetheless, because many sources of TAPs in the South Coast Basin are not related to LAX, potential cancer risks for all populations within the Basin remain high.

An analysis of cumulative health hazards for impacts other than cancer was not provided in the Draft EIS/EIR, but was included in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Cumulative impacts were evaluated for chronic and acute non-cancer health hazards using data from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). These data can be used in a general way to illustrate the possible range of relative impacts among the build alternatives, but lack resolution to make predictions of impacts for specific locations around the airport. USEPA provides estimates of non-cancer hazards for toxic air pollutants based on information from the Toxics Release Inventory and other sources, and air dispersion modeling. USEPA predictions were used as estimates of current total impacts from all sources in the vicinity of LAX and thus provided the baseline for assessment of cumulative impacts. With regard to non-cancer hazards, Alternatives A, B, and C could add to total average acrolein concentrations in the Basin and therefore to possible chronic non-cancer hazards and acute human health hazards associated with exposure to acrolein. Alternative D would reduce cumulative impacts with regard to non-cancer chronic and acute health hazards and would result in a beneficial effect. However, because many sources of TAPs in the South Coast Basin are not related to LAX, potential non-cancer hazards would remain high. Additional detail is provided in Technical Report S-9a of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The cumulative analyses presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are in line with the USEPA (2003) guidance on cumulative risk assessment.

Given the recognized difficulties with evaluation of cumulative risk, both within groups of chemicals that have common mechanisms of toxicity and within populations with differential health status and health care availability, the approach provided in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is appropriate. "LAWA will work in cooperation with the affected communities and appropriate regulatory agencies to support and participate in long-term studies that would contribute to an understanding of these types of environmental impacts." In addition, toxicity criteria used in the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR incorporate conservative assumptions designed to protect the most sensitive individuals. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR includes maps showing risk ranges by community boundaries or locations.

The analyses contained in Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice and Appendix F of the Draft EIS/EIR and Section 4.4.3, Environmental Justice and Appendix D of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR provided extensive information (over 125 pages of narrative, maps and tabular data) pursuant to NEPA and CEQA and consistent with Executive Order 12898 and DOT Order 1610.2 that is sufficient to support informed decision making. The environmental justice analysis presented in subsection 4.4.3.5 of the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR focused on those issues with potential for disproportionate effects on minority or low-income communities and also drew on extensive quantitative analyses contained in the other technical sections of these documents.

For the purpose of the environmental justice analysis, the assessment of disproportionate impacts was based on a comparison between affected and non-affected or less-affected areas and looked at whether impacts fall predominantly or more severely on minority and low-income communities. Where impacts fall more or less equally on everyone within a geographically-defined community (for example, noise and air pollution), a comparison of this kind was deemed to be more relevant than the kind of statistical analysis typically used in Title VI investigations. If impacts fall predominantly or more severely on minority or low-income communities, the impact may be disproportionate. This approach is in keeping with the guidance provided by USEPA (2003) on evaluation of cumulative risk. Also please see Topical Response TR-EJ-1 regarding potential air quality and health risk impacts to low-income and minority communities and TR-EJ-2 regarding environmental justice-related mitigation and benefits.

Collection of additional air data as recommended in the comment would provide an indication of ambient concentrations of hazardous air pollutants. However, it would be difficult to identify the portion of the total concentration attributable to LAX emissions given the presence of other sources, including the nearby sources of Interstate 405 and Interstate 110. For example, the major environmental source of 1,3-butadiene is the incomplete combustion of fuels in mobile sources (e.g. automobile exhaust). Although atmospheric 1,3-butadiene undergoes rapid destruction, 1,3-butadiene is almost always present in urban and suburban air at low concentrations due to constant releases from vehicle exhaust. Similarly, the major source of emissions of acrolein to the atmosphere is combustion of fuels. Acrolein is detected in exhaust gases from gasoline and diesel, as well as jet engines.

USEPA. 2003. Framework for Cumulative Risk Assessment. May.

SAF00005-11

Comment:

Jet Aircraft Noise Impacts and Mitigation

While the SDEIS/R assesses jet aircraft noise impacts for Alternative D, it also provides additional single event noise disclosure information (thresholds of significance) for previously- evaluated Alternatives A, B and C as well as Alternative D. This supplemental information was added for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) purposes and in response to a State appeals court ruling ("Berkeley Jets"). This analysis of single event noise addresses awakenings and classroom disruption.

In general, noise exposures due to jet aircraft under Alternative D are expected to be less than exposures under Alternatives A, B, C, and No Action. When compared to No Action in 2015, Alternative D in 2015 is projected to result in less residents exposed to noise levels that are equal to, or greater, than 65 decibels Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). Due to a shift in the noise contours of Alternative D in 2015, approximately 2,000 new residents will be exposed to noise equal to or greater than 65 CNEL, and approximately 250 new residents to a 1.5 CNEL increase. The SDEIS/R states that the thresholds of significance for single event aircraft noise effects are only used to consider noise impacts under CEQA, and are not meant to apply to Federal analyses under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Recommendation: The FEIS should clarify that the CEQA awakenings threshold is based on a 1997 Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise sleep disturbance curve, and determine whether the projected impacts from aircraft noise require mitigation by FAA.

Response:

The resident totals that the commentor provides are from Table S55, Alternative D 2015 Residential and Noise Sensitive Uses Newly Exposed (Compared to No Action/No Project) and Table S62, Alternative D 2015 1.5 CNEL Increase Compared to No Action/No Project Alternative of S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The commentor is also correct in paraphrasing that the thresholds of significance for single event aircraft noise effects are established solely for use in consideration of noise impacts under CEQA and are not meant for application to federal NEPA evaluations. This information is provided in Section 4.1.4.1.1 CEQA Thresholds of Significance of Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook discusses the relevance of single event noise to land use planning evaluations in the environs of airports in California. However, it concludes that no definitive, widely recognized, single-event noise level guidelines currently exist relative to land use compatibility planning. Please see Section 6.1.1 Threshold of Significance of Section S-C1, Supplemental Aircraft Noise Technical Report of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR where it does acknowledge that the 10 Percent Awakening Level is based on Figure 2 of FICAN's awakening document. There is no federal threshold of significance. Therefore, there is no metric that can be reliably applied to measure the effectiveness of mitigation with regard to single event noises and the different responses from different people to those noise events. Please see Section 4.1.4.1.2 Federal Standards of Section 4.1, Noise, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

3. Comments and Responses

SAF00005-12

Comment:

In Alternative D, residents that are newly exposed to noise equal to or greater than 65 CNEL, or exposed to a 1.5 CNEL increase, would be mitigated by Mitigation Measure MM-LU- 1. While we support studying the relationship between aircraft noise levels and the ability of children to learn (and implementing possible future mitigation in response to this study), it is important to ensure that all schools exposed to levels equal to or greater than 65 CNEL are mitigated before 2015.

Recommendation: If Alternative D is selected as FAA's final preferred alternative, the FEIS and Record of Decision should provide a commitment to provide appropriate mitigation for newly-exposed residents and sensitive sites (e.g., schools and health care facilities) before 2015.

Response:

Mitigation Measure MM-LU-1, Implement Revised Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), acknowledges that the expanded ANMP shall mitigate land uses (i.e., residences, schools, hospitals and churches) that would be rendered incompatible by noise impacts associated with implementation of the LAX Master Plan. Additionally, LAWA shall accelerate the ANMP's timetable for achieving full compatibility of all land uses within the existing noise impact area pursuant to the requirements of the California Airport Noise Standards (California Code of Regulations, Title 21, Subchapter 6) and current Noise Variance. Section 2.3.1, 2001 Noise Variance, of S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, lists terms and conditions that LAWA is required to implement as part of its 2001 Noise Variance. Schools without avigation easements that are determined to be subject to significant aircraft noise impacts 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 MM-LU-3 and MM-LU-4 in the form of study of single event noise levels that result in classroom disruption.

SAF00006	Sanderson Port, Patricia	United States Department of the Interior	11/6/2003
-----------------	-------------------------------------	---	------------------

SAF00006-1

Comment:

The Department of Interior (Department) has reviewed the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement / Environmental Impact Report (SDEIS), for the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) Proposed Master Plan Improvements, Los Angeles County, California. Our comments are based on biological resources information presented in the SDEIS as well as the original DEIS, supporting technical appendices, and our knowledge of biological resources in western Los Angeles. Our comments on the DEIS are still relevant and are hereby incorporated by reference.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The proposed project will impact non-native grasslands, disturbed areas, valley needlegrass grasslands, southern foredune, southern dune scrub and ephemeral wetlands. Federally threatened and endangered species that will be impacted, or have potential to be impacted, include the endangered El Segundo blue butterfly and Riverside fairy shrimp. The project will additionally impact several non-listed sensitive species with limited distribution in the Los Angeles Basin including, but not limited to, the loggerhead shrike, burrowing owl, western spadefoot toad, and San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit. The SDEIS analyzes an additional action alternative, Alternative D, as compared to the DEIS.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SAF00006-2

Comment:

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Volume II. Section 4.10 Biotic Communities. Pages 4-449 - 4-479

Habitat Modeling: We remain concerned that the habitat model does not accurately describe or quantify habitat values for sensitive species' habitats affected by this project. As a result, we are concerned that existing habitat values are underestimated and restored habitat values are overestimated. The original DEIS used a habitat model referred to as a "modified Habitat Evaluation Procedure" to evaluate the effect of each alternative on biotic communities and sensitive flora and fauna within the study area.

The study area encompasses developed land that LAX currently occupies, undeveloped areas around the airport, and sensitive dune habitat west of the airport. Nine ephemeral wetted areas occur in the study area that contain Riverside fairy shrimp cysts.

The habitat model has been renamed in the SDEIS, and is now called the "Mitigation Land Evaluation Procedure (MLEP)." Changing the name of the analysis does clarify confusion about use of the habitat model in the SDEIS, as compared to how a traditional Habitat Evaluation Procedure would be used. The bulk of our concerns, however, are not addressed in the SDEIS.

We expressed concerns with this methodology in our previous comment letter, and remain concerned that, in addition to inaccurately described and quantified habitat values, previous scientific documentation of this model was not included, causing us to question some conclusions it generated. Specifically, we have the following concerns with the MLEP:

a. The MLEP is based on idealized vernal pool/native grassland habitat characteristics. All habitat types within the study area are then assigned habitat values based on this idealized habitat. As one would expect, southern foredune and southern dune scrub score lower habitat values than valley needlegrass grassland when compared to an idealized grassland habitat. These diverse habitat types should be scored against similar habitat types rather than a single habitat type. This method also does not score habitat based on the value the habitat provides to individual species. Thus, we do not believe MLEP habitat values can be used to accurately reflect impacts of this proposed project to each habitat type.

b. Once habitat units are calculated using the habitat values, the total number of habitat units impacted are calculated in an aggregate manner for each project alternative. As such, MLEP "habitat units" do not translate into the actual amount of impact to each habitat type. Thus, tracking losses of individual habitat types would not be possible. It is important to calculate losses for each habitat type individually so that they can be mitigated with the same type of habitat where feasible. The basis for an accurate appraisal of impacts of this project is given in table S4.10-4 (p. 4-459), before the MLEP is applied.

c. The MLEP methodology results in an overvaluing of habitat to be restored for mitigation. As explained in the SDEIS, habitats are evaluated against an idealized native grassland/vernal pool habitat. Habitats can score from zero to one; zero represents a habitat that does not share any characteristics with the ideal habitat and a score of one represents a habitat that is identical to the ideal habitat. In the case of analysis of the SDEIS, valley needlegrass grassland scored a habitat value of 0.65 habitat units, per unit area, indicating that it shared 65 percent of the characteristics with the ideal habitat. The evaluation then used habitat value of 0.8 for restored habitat; a habitat value higher than any of the naturally occurring habitats' values. This represents a projected overvaluation of habitat to be restored as part of the project's mitigation measures.

For example, assume that the project impacts 10 acres of valley needlegrass grassland, valued at 0.65 habitat units per unit area. The loss in terms of habitat units is 10 acres multiplied by 0.65 habitat units per acre or 6.5 habitat units. According to the plan these units are then mitigated at a 1:1 ratio, so 6.5 habitat units would need to be replaced. Restored habitat has a habitat value of 0.8, so to mitigate for 6.5 habitat units of impact, 6.5 units or 8.1 acres (8.1 acres x 0.8 habitat units per acre = 6.5 habitat units) of restored habitat would be created. This illustrates that the loss of 10 acres of valley

3. Comments and Responses

needlegrass grassland would be mitigated at less than a 1:1 ratio, in terms of actual acres, by restoring 8 acres rather than 10 acres.

Our original comments pertaining to the model were intended to encourage an accurate accounting for each type of habitat lost and an accurate discussion of plans for mitigating losses of valuable and diverse habitat. The MLEP does not achieve this goal.

We recommend revising use of the MLEP and integrating it with an analysis of acres impacted for each habitat type. This will facilitate accurate accounting for the loss of each type of habitat, and corresponding mitigation.

Response:

In response to the U.S. Department of Interior's concerns about the Mitigation Land Evaluation Procedure (MLEP), the following information is arranged to correspond with the Department's comments:

a. The MLEP compares the overall habitat quality of Non-native Grassland/Ruderal, Disturbed/bare ground and Landscaped biotic communities at LAX to the ideal habitat conditions represented by two reference sites, the Santa Rosa Plateau in Riverside County and the Carrizo Plain Natural Area in San Luis Obispo County. The Santa Rosa Plateau and Carrizo Plain Natural Area represent the target biotic community, Valley Needlegrass Grassland/Vernal Pool complex. The selected reference sites were intended to represent the Valley Needlegrass Grassland/Vernal Pool complex historically present at LAX, and were not intended to be analogous to the southern dune scrub or southern foredune plant communities present within the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes. As stated in the Draft EIS/EIR, the two reference sites were selected because they represent optimal habitats for a multitude of floral and faunal species similar to historical biotic communities present at LAX during the early 1900's. An analysis of historical aerial photographs of the area now LAX and surrounding vicinity revealed a site showing indication of hydrologic and topographic features of vernal pools. This indication is substantiated by historical USGS 7.5 minutes series topographic maps of the Venice quadrangle dated 1934 and 1944 showing topographic depressions characteristic of vernal pools. Pierce and Pool (1934) report the deflation plain immediately to the west of the currently designated Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes as supporting native grasses and annual forbs. This information indicates that the deflation plain to the east of the backdune at LAX historically supported a grassland habitat dotted with vernal pools. Under current conditions, the same area at LAX is characterized primarily by non-native grassland vegetation, and disturbed bare ground unsuitable to support vegetation. Ponding is observed during substantial rainy seasons as a result of manmade depressions and inappropriate contouring of roadways to allow for proper drainage.

With regard to the latter part of this paragraph, the MLEP is a model comparing the overall habitat quality of current biotic communities to ideal habitat conditions. The MLEP is an assessment of overall ecosystem function and value, rather than a specific species-habitat analysis.

b. There are only 3 habitat types within the LAX Master Plan boundary for which impacts were converted to habitat units: non-native grassland/ruderal, disturbed/bare ground, and landscaped. Non-native grassland/ruderal and disturbed/bare ground areas will be converted to development, and a small portion converted to landscaped. To mitigate for the loss of non-native grassland/ruderal and disturbed/bare ground HU's, on-site restoration of existing habitats within the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes has been proposed. Non-native grassland/ruderal and disturbed/bare ground areas and existing roadways would be restored to Valley Needlegrass Grassland and Southern Foredune biotic communities. LAWA has not proposed to restore the exact biotic community that will be impacted (because it is highly degraded and disturbed), but rather, proposed to restore the biotic communities that historically dominated the area located outside the Airfield Operations Area. Impacts to habitat within the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes resulting from the installation of navigational aids and associated service roads would be mitigated through the restoration of Valley Needlegrass Grassland and Southern Foredune within the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes.

c. The habitat value of 0.8 for restored habitat should be higher than that of existing habitat. It is anticipated that existing plant communities can be restored to meet (or exceed) a habitat value of 0.8. Mitigation credit for the restoration activities would be based on performance criteria developed for each biotic community or habitat type. Once restoration is complete, the mitigation area would have a habitat value of at least 0.8.

SAF00006-3

Comment:

Volume II. Section 4.11. Pages 4-481 - 4-494

Riverside Fairy Shrimp: The SDEIS indicates all alternatives, including the No Action alternative, would result in adverse impacts to the Riverside fairy shrimp. The Riverside fairy shrimp occurs in only a few geographic areas in Southern California. The Riverside fairy shrimp cysts found on LAX are a likely remnant of a once much larger vernal pool complex. These cysts are now isolated from other vernal pools supporting the Riverside fairy shrimp, but as is acknowledged on page 4-489, the "destruction of the individual cysts could contribute to the cumulative impacts to the continued existence of the species if other populations are extirpated."

In addition, the existence of the last remaining population of Riverside fairy shrimp on the Los Angeles coast could be genetically significant, and provide important information about the evolution of the Riverside fairy shrimp. For these reasons it is paramount to preserve these cysts in situ at LAX, or to relocate the cysts to suitable habitat at a nearby location that will be managed and monitored for the long-term conservation of the Riverside fairy shrimp.

While no decision has yet been made regarding on-site or off-site conservation, an evaluation of alternate sites to relocate and restore, or recreate vernal pool habitat for the Riverside fairy shrimp has been conducted by LAX. We will be continuing our coordination with LAX to resolve this question.

Our previous comment letter discussed replacement estimates for vernal pools and their associated watersheds. It is important that the vernal pools have sufficient watersheds to create the conditions that will allow for the long-term survival of the Riverside fairy shrimp.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Topical Response TR-ET-2, the definition and evaluation of wetlands/vernal pools, for further discussion of Riverside fairy shrimp mitigation. All aspects of mitigation for impacts to the Riverside fairy shrimp have been subject to Section 7 consultation between the FAA, LAWA, and the USFWS. As a result of consultation, it has been determined that preserving the cysts in situ at LAX would not be desirable because the habitat would have to be maintained in a manner not conducive to the shrimp completing their life cycle. The Biological Assessment Technical Report, completed pursuant to Section 7 consultation, has determined that mitigation for impacts to Riverside fairy shrimp at LAX would be feasible through relocation of the cysts to an alternate location. As a result of Section 7 consultation among LAWA, FAA, and USFWS, the soils containing cysts of the Riverside fairy shrimp will be relocated to property owned by the FAA and designated a habitat preserve at the former Marine Corps Air Station at El Toro, or a comparable site approved by the USFWS in conformance with the Draft Biological Opinion issued by the USFWS. In addition, the FAA and LAWA have incorporated 12 conservation measures specified in the Draft Biological Opinion. Specifically, conservation measures 3, 5, and 6 address direct and indirect impacts to wetlands, including watershed adequacy as a requirement for the vernal pool mitigation site. Conservation measure 6 identifies success criteria to be met by created vernal pools, including holding water for a minimum of 60 days, having less than 10 percent absolute cover of exotic plant species in the pool(s), having less than 20 percent absolute cover of exotic plant species in the surrounding watershed, and providing suitable water quality for Riverside fairy shrimp. The Draft Biological Opinion issued by the USFWS is included as Appendix F-E of this Final EIS/EIR.

SAF00006-4

Comment:

El Segundo Blue Butterfly: Alternative D would potentially impact 10,597 square feet (0.24 acres) of occupied El Segundo blue butterfly habitat due to installation of navigational aids and associated service roads. The SDEIS does not discuss the potential impacts, if any, from future maintenance and operation of navigational aids and associated service roads. We recommend the Final EIS (FEIS) clarify whether vegetation adjacent to navigational aids and service roads will be sprayed with herbicide as

3. Comments and Responses

part of routine maintenance. Moreover, the indirect effect of fragmenting occupied El Segundo blue butterfly habitat is not analyzed in the SDEIS, or considered in offsetting measures for this species.

We recommend the FEIS include more information about the configuration of installation, operation and maintenance of these roads, and resulting impacts to the butterfly. Our concern is that there may be indirect effects to this species, which have not been considered in this SDEIS.

Response:

No further impacts are anticipated as a result of future maintenance and operation of navigational aids and associated service. Maintenance activities related to navigational aids are expected to be minimal following installation. Regular maintenance of navigational aids will be performed quarterly in addition to maintenance performed on an as needed basis. Overall, maintenance of navigational aids at the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes is projected to take place an average of one time per month.

Vegetation adjacent to navigational aids and service roads will not be sprayed with herbicide at any time. The new service roads will be similar to existing service roads in the dunes: they will consist of gravel, serve only to allow access to the navigational aids, and be only as wide as necessary for a vehicle to pass safely (approximately 15 feet wide). Their configuration has been designed to minimize the amount of new road to be installed by connecting to existing service roads wherever possible. Additionally, the majority of proposed service roads and navigational aids are not in habitat occupied by the El Segundo blue butterfly.

The new service roads are not anticipated to cause any indirect effects to the El Segundo blue butterfly because they will be only 15 feet wide and be subject to minimal use and/or maintenance. Furthermore, the majority of present El Segundo blue butterfly habitat at the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes is currently divided by former city streets (approximately 20 feet wide) and the presence of these roads does not appear to have caused any harm to the species.

SAF00006-5

Comment:

CONCLUSION

Issues raised in our comments on the DEIS remain unresolved. We recommend the FEIS include a more thorough discussion of habitat impacts and how impacts will be mitigated. We also recommend the FEIS contain detailed information on how restoration, management, and monitoring will be conducted to ensure long-term conservation of both the El Segundo blue butterfly and the Riverside fairy shrimp.

Response:

This Final EIS/EIR provides responses to all comments to the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. In response to the comments received to the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, clarification has been provided for many aspects of these documents, including habitat impacts and mitigation for those impacts. Long-term conservation of the El Segundo blue butterfly is addressed in and subject to the Long-Term Habitat Management Plan for Los Angeles Airport/El Segundo Dunes. With regard to long-term conservation of the Riverside fairy shrimp, please see Topical Response TR-ET-2.

SAS00001

Henry, Teresa

State of California

11/4/2003

SAS00001-1

Comment:

Thank you for the chance to comment on your updated EIS/EIR. We would like to draw your attention to our letter of September 24, 2001, in which we discussed our concerns with impacts in the Coastal Zone.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment SAS00001-2 below and responses to comment letter AS00006.

SAS00001-2

Comment:

The Airport Dunes are entirely within the Coastal Zone; most of the proposed development is not in the Coastal Zone. There is extensive documentation identifying most of the Airport Dunes as an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA). The section of the Coastal Act most applicable to projects in and adjacent to Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas is Section 30240, which states:

Section 30240 Environmentally sensitive habitat areas; adjacent developments

(a) Environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses dependent on those resources shall be allowed within those areas.

(b) Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas and parks and recreation areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade those areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of those habitat and recreation areas.

Recently, the Commission and the courts have interpreted this section very narrowly - the replacement of existing sensitive habitat with a different kind of habitat, or with plants from a different habitat type with different ecological requirements could be interpreted as a significant disruption of habitat values. An example of a questionable activity would be an attempt to install vernal pool habitat on the dunes.

As we discussed in our prior letter, any development in the Coastal Zone requires a coastal development permit, unless the development is owned by a federal agency, or involved in other significant ways described in the Coastal Zone Management Act, in which case a consistency determination under the Coastal Zone Management Act will be required. Even development that is a mitigation measure required for impacts elsewhere will require a coastal development permit if the mitigation measure is located in the Coastal Zone. Please note that grading or the installation or removal of vegetation on the Airport Dunes will require a coastal development permit and will be evaluated for its consistency with the Coastal Act. The standard of review will be Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act and whether or not the activity or development will prejudice the ability of the City of Los Angeles to adopt an LCP that is consistent with the Coastal Act.

Response:

Vernal pool creation within the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes will not be attempted. In June 2000, the FAA sent a letter to LAWA indicating that creation or restoration of vernal pools immediately west of the north runway complex, within the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes, to accommodate soils containing cysts of the Riverside fairy shrimp from the LAX airfield would be unacceptable due to aviation safety considerations.¹ The FAA's statutory mission is to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace, therefore the creation of vernal pools in the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes would be inconsistent with the provisions of 14 CFR Part 139, Section 139.337(f), Wildlife Hazard Management. Pursuant to the Federal Code of Regulations, Title 14, Part 139, Section 139.337: Wildlife Hazard Management, routine operations and maintenance activities, including the elimination of standing water, shall be undertaken 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).

With regard to the latter part of the comment, LAWA acknowledges the California Coastal Commission's direct permitting responsibility and regulatory authority as set forth in the California Coastal Act. Alternative D includes the addition of ALSF-2 navigaids in the Los Angeles/El Segundo Dunes for the approach ends to Runway 6L and 6R. These navigaids are owned by the FAA. A small portion of the Habitat Restoration Area will be affected by the installation of these new navigaids as well. FAA and LAWA will perform mitigation at least three years prior to the disturbance to ensure that coast buckwheat has established and matured sufficiently to accommodate the El Segundo blue butterfly. As appropriate and applicable, LAWA will apply to the California Coastal Commission for a Coastal Development Permit for any development or change in intensity of use within the coastal zone.

3. Comments and Responses

1. U. S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, 30 June 2000 (Letter to Los Angeles World Airports (James Ritchie) from the Federal Aviation Administration (Mr. David Kessler). Subject: Los Angeles International Airport Potential Mitigation Measures for Riverside Fairy Shrimp Cysts.

SAS00001-3

The attachment included as part of this comment letter is identical to comment letter AS000006; please refer to the responses to comment letter AS000006.

SAS00002 Cohen, David State of California 11/7/2003

SAS00002-1

Comment:

For your consideration, we offer the following comments relative to aviation system planning, environmental planning for the proposed projects through the Master Plan, and airport land use compatibility. The following comments include our perspectives on both the proposed Airport Master Plan and its Draft Supplemental EIS / EIR.

1. The project is the integration of Alternative D, the Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, into the existing environmental review process for the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) Master Plan. The EIS / EIR also serves to present certain supplemental information and environmental analyses that apply to all of the five alternatives to the project. The alternatives evaluated in the original EIS / EIR and this supplemental EIS / EIR are the results of eight years of master planning process, ongoing scientific study, several hundred information community meetings, and an extensive formal public comment period for the identification of project issues for environmental analysis. In addition to the No Action / No Project Alternative, the original EIS / EIR and this supplemental environmental document analyze four build alternatives. However, this supplemental EIS / EIR is focused on the new Alternative D, which is also the CEQA Preferred Alternative.

2. The California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics' stated mission is to foster and promote the development of a safe, efficient, dependable, and environmentally compatible air transportation system." The Division is a permitting agency for public-use airports, and therefore a Responsible Agency under CEQA.

3. We have attended various project development meetings, technical advisory consultations facilitated by the California Office of Planning and Research, a simulation for air traffic control and airfield operations at the National Aeronautical and Space Administration's Ames Research Center. We appreciate the intergovernmental coordination and public participation efforts undertaken by the City of Los Angeles and the Federal Aviation Administration.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments below.

SAS00002-2

Comment:

4. In the technical advisory consultations and the simulation at the Ames Research Center, we have observed that the proposed physical changes to the airport taxiways, runways, and the construction planned for aircraft parking and terminal facilities have undergone extensive scrutiny and systematic testing in the operational and environmental analyses for Alternative D. The operational testing was observed and participants were interviewed by the Department in conjunction with our analyses of the various project components. In our opinion, the new large aircraft requirements, for the Airbus Industries A-380 and Boeing 777 type aircraft, necessitate most of the proposed changes, as well as the physical constraints of the existing facilities. The high-speed taxiway exits from the outer Runways 25L on the

south complex, and 24R on the north complex of the airport have generated most of the surface incidents and runway incursions at the airport. The operational changes for the air traffic control procedures, user awareness programs, and pilot training have apparently reduced the number of incidents and their frequency since their implementation. Therefore, we think that alternatives to eliminate the high-speed exits by physical removal, such as their conversion to slower-speed exits are not extensively evaluated or presented in the environmental document. The center taxiways between both north and south parallel runways are a key feature to alleviate the problems due to the operations of the high-speed exits. However, we would like to review your operational research to establish the nexus between the operation of the center taxiways and runway incursions. The Master Plan and its environmental document do not conclusively explain this relationship or refer to a technical study regarding this issue. The Department does not object to the center taxiway conceptual design as long as it is operationally and financially justified. Airport delay related to the new flow patterns were also not evaluated in the analyses.

Response:

Please see Response to Comment SPHF00038-3 regarding the purpose of constructing a center taxiway to enhance safe aircraft operations and reduce the potential for runway incursions. Also see Topical Response TR-SAF-1 regarding runway incursion at LAX.

Further, please refer to Figure S3-8 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and note that all existing high-speed exit taxiways associated with the existing north and south airfields would remain and would be improved in Alternative D. In each case these taxiways will be widened and the exit angles reduced to improve their efficiency. The transition of these high-speed exits onto the center parallel taxiway will also be carefully developed during design to ensure a safe and efficient transitions. The operational research on this topic was completed by the NASA Ames Research Center, Future Flight Central program mentioned by the commentor and to which the commentor states he was a participant. LAWA sponsored and participated in this operational analysis and human-in-the-loop testing that included FAA Air Traffic Controllers from LAX Tower. In this program, controllers found the center parallel taxiway to be an operationally efficient solution to the primary cause of the most severe types of runway incursions experienced at LAX. The text of the study and its findings can be further reviewed by accessing the report at http://ffc.arc.nasa.gov/newsroom/newsletter/index.html#lax_study.

Please see Appendix E of the LAX Draft Master Plan Addendum, July 2003 for a detailed description of the Alternative D Airside Analysis. This Appendix provides the complete results of the comparative simulation analysis that was performed to compare the flow patterns and airport delay that would result from the implementation of Alternative D to the other build alternatives and to the No Action/No Project Alternative.

SAS00002-3

Comment:

5. Where feasible, the Department encourages airports to meet or exceed minimum design safety standards outlined in the FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13 Change 7, the Airport Design Guide (ADG), when making design changes. In many instances, runway and taxiway dimensional criteria are difficult or impossible to achieve within the given space available for LAX today. Nevertheless, any substandard runway and taxiway separation specifications in airport design will require approved design exceptions from the FAA. The Department has incorporated excerpts the ADG as State airport design standards for runways and taxiways in accordance with the California Code of Regulations Title 21, Section 3526(c). We recommend an FAA-approved Airport Layout Plan depicting the proposed changes become effective in conjunction with the adoption of the Master Plan.

Response:

Comment noted. FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13 Change 7 provides multiple ways for an airport to meet modern FAA Airport Design Standards. LAWA intends to use the flexibility inherent in FAA Standards and have an airfield that simultaneously meets FAA standards and meets needs of airport users. LAWA intends to have an FAA-approved airport layout plan as a product of its master planning effort. LAWA intends to coordinate with CALTRANS as appropriate during the approval process for the airport layout plan.

3. Comments and Responses

As described on page 3-42, in Section 3.3.2, Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, FAA Design Group VI taxiway separation standards call for 600 feet between a runway centerline and taxiway centerline intended to serve aircraft with Design Group VI tail heights, length and wing span. Significant analysis was provided in the Draft LAX Master Plan, Chapter IV, Section 3.2.6.3, Justification for the Modified Group VI Standards to Accommodate the NLA at LAX, documenting the feasibility of using 520 feet separation at LAX and meeting the same safety standards set by FAA for airfield safety.

SAS00002-4

Comment:

6. Higher weight bearing runways and taxiways are strongly recommended in advance of any consideration to accommodate the new large aircraft. This design should meet or exceed FAA's current design specifications. To this end, Caltrans District 7 has also proposed structural improvements for the tunnel on State Route 1 (Sepulveda Boulevard), which goes under LAX. These structural improvements will include the placement of a new deck on the top of the original structure, capable of supporting the proposed aircraft design load. These structures are owned and maintained by the Los Angeles Department of Public Works. However, the Department's oversight involvement with Mr. Jim Ritchie this project is necessary given that the proposed improvements are within the Caltrans right-of-way. Through the Project Study Report / Project Report process, the Department will also propose a Traffic Management Plan in case of an emergency situation which could require the full closure of the Sepulveda Subway. The construction of Sepulveda Subway project is expected to start by June 2004 and be completed by June 2005. Runway closures and potentially significant airport capacity impacts should be anticipated during construction.

Response:

Comment noted. LAWA will coordinate with CALTRANS District 7 as appropriate during the design and construction phases of the project to assure that the concerns of CALTRANS are addressed. The Sepulveda Tunnel was reconstructed in place over the original tunnel/bridge structure in the early 1990s. The existing structure has been recently tested and found to be sufficient to support the projected operational weights of the Airbus A380 (or NLA). LAWA will continue to work with CALTRANS to develop the appropriate emergency operations plans for the Sepulveda Tunnel.

SAS00002-5

Comment:

7. Terminal gate facilities designed for older aircraft prohibit new large aircraft and large aircraft such as the Boeing 747 from typical self-ingress and egress from terminal rows in many locations. Frequently, aircraft must shut down and stop in a taxi lane or taxiway traffic area(s), and be towed into tightly engineered gate spaces. Departing fully-loaded aircraft are typically towed out from these constrained locations and block the active movement areas until started and ready for taxi. Therefore, terminal and existing gate facilities must be expanded to accommodate the typical fleet of aircraft using the airport today and those new large aircraft planned to arrive in the coming years.

Response:

Comment noted. Alternative D would provide a wide range of contact gates capable of serving the existing and future aircraft fleet based on the forecast including New Large Aircraft. The new West Satellite, North Linear Concourse, and re-configured TBIT would be designed to efficiently accommodate the existing and future aircraft fleet. This new space combined with the centralized terminal facilities will allow for more efficient programming of smaller aircraft in the fleet to the older pier concourses on the south side of the terminal area. These areas were originally designed to accommodate early narrow-bodied jets and these areas still work well for the narrow-bodied jets in the existing fleet.

SAS00002-6

Comment:

8. The Alternatives A, B, and C all propose the relocation and the reconfiguration of the LAX Fuel Storage Facility. As technical studies, the Chevron Fuel Farm Relocation Feasibility Study and the Scattergood Fuel Farm Relocation Feasibility Study were included in the original environmental study, whose scope did not include Alternative D. On the other hand, Alternative D calls for a reconfiguration of the fuel farm during the last phase (Phase III) of the proposed activities, but does not propose relocation. From a physical security standpoint, we recommend that the EIS / EIR clearly assess and disclose the risks and opportunity costs of the decision to have the fuel farm remain in its place. We recommend your interagency coordination with the Transportation Security Agency, the California Highway Patrol, and local law enforcement agencies to technically assess the physical security problems associated with the LAX Fuel Storage Facility.

Response:

While Alternatives A and B provide options for the relocation of the existing fuel farm at LAX, Alternative C maintained the fuel farm in its existing location and reconfigured the layout of several associated fuel tanks.

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addressed risk of upset impact associated with the fuel farm under Alternative D in Section, 4.24.3, Safety (CEQA) (subsection 4.24.3.6.3). By showing alternatives that relocate the fuel farm and an alternative that does not, it is clear that the choice to leave the fuel farm in its current location in Alternative D represents both a technical and a public policy choice to accept any associated opportunity costs. In addition, LAWA Police Division (LAWAPD) and the TSA are the only agencies with general security oversight of the airport perimeter including, this facility. These agencies have a perimeter security program that has been in place at LAX for many years.

SAS00002-7

Comment:

9. From an airport land use compatibility planning standpoint and in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21096, the Department's California Airport Land Use Compatibility Handbook (Handbook) must be utilized as a resource for projects at the airport and for projects within the boundaries of an airport land use compatibility plan, or if such a plan has not been adopted, within two nautical miles of the airport. For your reference, the Handbook is published on-line at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/planning/aeronaut/htmlfile/landuse.html>. In specific, the Public Utilities Code Sections 21676(c), 21664.5, and 21661.5 require that proposed airport master plans, expansion of an existing airport, and plans for construction of a new airport must be submitted to the Airport Land Use Commission for review. We also recommend that the growth-inducing impacts of the decision to restrict the growth of LAX be considered from a region-wide perspective. The Department's California Aviation System Plan and its policies can also be used as a resource in these analyses. In this context, we recommend that a preferred plan for the regional distribution of commercial air service and its associated benefits and adverse impacts be included in the environmental analyses. These analyses should be supported by impacted communities and stakeholders, namely regional airports, commercial airlines, and general aviation. Lacking sufficient support, we are concerned that the desired regional aviation system left to evolve on its own will not materialize as described in the LAX Master Plan, Alternative D.

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. Please see Topical Response TR-RC-1 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.

3. Comments and Responses

SAS00002-8

Comment:

10. On page 11 of "S-1. Supplemental Land Use Technical Report," line 4 states that " This suspension of aviation easement requirements has been granted by Caltrans." This is not the case. The Department of Transportation has not suspended any of the requirements of the Noise Standards found in the California Code of Regulations, Title 21, Section 5000 et seq.

This bullet further implies that notifying homeowners "regarding the existence and significance of such noise impacts" is sufficient to meet the requirements of the Noise Standards. Such notification is not sufficient. For a residence within LAX's 65dB CNEL aircraft noise contour to be excluded from calculations to determine the size of the airport's noise impact area, the residence must meet one of the descriptions in Section 5014(a) of the Noise Standards.

Response:

The statement on page 11 of Technical Report S-1, Supplemental Land Use Technical Report, referenced by the commentor is incorrect. In response the referenced sentence has been revised. Please see Appendix F-C, Errata to the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, of this Final EIS/EIR.

The notification process, as detailed in the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Los Angeles and City of Inglewood, is sufficient since it would include the following components: (a) a written acknowledgment by the homeowner, accompanying the homeowner's authorization to proceed with the insulation, that he/she is aware of the existence and extent of LAX noise impact levels and of the noise attenuation that the proposed insulation is intended to provide, (b) a written acknowledgment by the homeowner, following installation, that the improvements have been installed and have attenuated the noise, and (c) enactment by the Inglewood City Council of an ordinance provision requiring that sellers of Inglewood residences give notice to buyers regarding the LAX noise impact levels and the attenuating effect of the insulation. By this process interior noise levels would be reduced to 45 CNEL and the noise impact area would be fully evaluated as required under the ANMP and consistent with Title 21, Section 5014(a). See also Topical Response TR-LU-3 for a description of the ANMP.

SAS00002-9

Comment:

11. This Supplemental EIS / EIR is for an Airport Master Plan. Future project-specific environmental studies can be tiered from this environmental study during the subsequent phases of the proposed development, and the Department encourages tiering as an environmental streamlining technique. However, tiering should be subject to the time and scope limitations mentioned in the CEQA Guidelines Sections 15152 and 15153, and the instructions in the Airport Environmental Handbook (FAA Order 5050.4A), Chapter 10.

Response:

Comment noted.

SAS00002-10

Comment:

12. The projects proposed through this Master Plan will require multiple amendments to the State Airport Permit for LAX. Please coordinate with our Aviation Safety Officer Mr. Kurt Haukohl for the processing of these requests at (916) 654-5284.

Response:

Comment noted.

SAS00002-11**Comment:**

These comments reflect the areas of concern to the Department's Division of Aeronautics. We advise you to contact Caltrans District 07 office regarding surface transportation issues.

The need for environmentally compatible airport operations is a local, regional, statewide, and federal issue. We strongly feel the both the protection of aviation facilities from the encroachment of incompatible land uses and the calculation of all environmental costs and benefits in the development of airport projects will contribute significantly to the safety of airport operations, to the well-being of the communities surrounding aviation facilities, and to California's economic future.

Response:

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments above.

SAS00003 Buswell, Stephen State of California 11/7/2003

SAS00003-1**Comment:**

This letter supplements our letter of July 20, 2001 and pertains to the new alternative, "Alternative D".

In summary, the Supplement to the Draft EIR/EIS for the proposed LAX 2015 Master plan will need to provide sufficient project detail for transportation improvements within the State right-of-way

Response:

The Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are "program level" documents intended to analyze the impacts of the Master Plan. It is acknowledged that further documentation may be required to address certain environmental issues in a more specific manner as necessary and appropriate. For example, elements of the Caltrans Project Development Process, such as Project Study Reports, Project Reports, etc., will be prepared where appropriate for projects within the State right-of-way.

SAS00003-2**Comment:**

and adequately identify the funding sources or short fall of resources associated with implementing these projects.

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.

SAS00003-3**Comment:**

Additional environmental determinations will be needed for individual transportation projects that are proposed within the State right-of-way.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment SAS00003-1. Please see Response to Comment SAS00003-1.

3. Comments and Responses

SAS00003-4

Comment:

Any work within State highway right-of-way, typically needs a Project Study Report (PSR) and/or an encroachment permit from Caltrans. The PSRs and permit applications will need to include all pertinent analysis, reports, and plans to allow for a comprehensive review of the work proposed and its impact to the State highway right-of-way.

Response:

These reports and permit applications will be prepared at the appropriate time.

SAS00003-5

Comment:

Following are our comments on the Supplemental to the EIS/EIR document prepared for LAX 2015 Master Plan:

Response:

Please see Responses to Comments below.

SAS00003-6

Comment:

I. General Draft EIR/EIS Comments

The Draft EIR/EIS has not provided sufficient geometric detail for the proposed ground transportation improvements. Therefore, it should be noted that the document does not constitute geometric approval or environmental approval for any specific work to be done on the State Highway System.

Response:

This comment is similar to comment SAS00003-1. Please see Response to Comment SAS00003-1.

SAS00003-7

Comment:

Please provide a discussion of the proposed series of airfield improvements, which in general terms consist of the construction of a new parallel taxiway between runways and the centerline realignment of a runway. What affect will the improvements have on the Sepulveda Boulevard tunnel? Will loads be increased over the tunnel?

Response:

Airfield improvements and modification proposed as part of Alternative D are described in Section 2.1, Airside Facilities - Alternative D, of the Draft Master Plan Addendum.

The Sepulveda Tunnel was reconstructed in place over the original tunnel/bridge structure in the early 1990s. The existing structure has been recently tested and found to be sufficient to support the projected operational weights of the Airbus A380 (or NLA).

LAWA will coordinate with CALTRANS District 7 as appropriate during the design and construction phases of the project to assure that the concerns of CALTRANS are addressed.

SAS00003-8**Comment:**

II. Draft EIR/EIS Section Comments

Section 4.3.2

The significant ground transportation projects need to be included in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and State Implementation Plan (SIP) so as to ensure FHWA air quality standards are met.

Response:

Comment noted. The significant ground transportation projects will be included in the RTP, RTIP, and SIP at the appropriate time.

SAS00003-9**Comment:**

Section 4.3.2.8

Mitigation measures provided in this section need to be applicable irrespective of the extent to which airport revenue is permissible under federal law and policies to fund these measures. To the extent that airport revenue is not permissible, other sources of revenue need to be identified.

Response:

If the Federal Aviation Administration does not permit the use of airport revenue for a particular mitigation measure, either funding from sources other than airport revenue would need to be used or an alternative mitigation, acceptable to LAWA and LADOT, would be identified. Alternative mitigations may require additional environmental study.

SAS00003-10**Comment:**

Additionally, we recommend reviewing and evaluating for mitigation measures, some of the proposed improvements identified in the I-405 Arterial Improvement Planning Studies, Final Report (June, 2003), prepared by KAKU Associates.

Response:

LAWA will review the proposed improvements in the I-405 Arterial Improvements Planning Study to identify potential alternative mitigation measures to those offered in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SAS00003-11**Comment:**

Section 4.3 2.8

Right-of-way lines should be considered for display in final document.

Response:

It is unclear what the commentor meant by this comment. Section 4.3.2.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR discusses mitigation measures; there are no maps or drawings in this section of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR to which right-of-way lines could be added.

3. Comments and Responses

SAS00003-12

Comment:

SCAG's 2001 RTP, Regional Aviation Element specifies a 78 Million Annual Passengers (MAP) in 2025. Please state why LAWA proposes to achieve the 78 MAP by 2015.

Response:

The passenger capacity of LAX under Alternative D is 78.9 MAP. Based upon current forecasts, LAX will reach its capacity close to the 2015 time frame. SCAG's 2001 RTP and Draft 2004 RTP reflect the assumption that LAX will be operating at its capacity prior to 2025 and 2030, respectively.

SAS00003-13

Comment:

Section 4.3.2.8 and Technical Report 2b
Intuitively, we have concerns when the MAP would increase to 78 million by 2015 and traffic projections indicate that traffic would remain about the same as 2001. SCAG conducted a survey analysis for the 2001 RTP using the Regional Airport Demand Allocation Model (RADAM) for travel forecasting. RADAM was developed for SCAG and it breaks the SCAG region into 100 large zones. Then SCAG distributed the trips into their Travel Analysis Zones. SCAG used the same methodology for the 2004 RTP. Please provide a discussion on the parity of the future passenger travel numbers used for this document comparing SCAG's methodology and travel numbers with LAWA's methodology and travel numbers.

Response:

Per CEQA/NEPA, LAWA is not required to analyze or validate plans, forecasts, and/or conclusions of another agency's models. LAWA can only vouch for the analysis completed for the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SAS00003-14

Comment:

Section 4.3.2.9
It appears that impacts associated with the Lennox Boulevard new interchange off of I-405 will include required relocation of as many as 12 residential homeowners, 7 businesses, and 1 community center. However, the DEIR/DEIS states that compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act (mitigation) would ensure a less than significant impact. Furthermore, after the implementation of mitigation, the DEIR/DEIS anticipates less than significant visual, noise, and historical impacts. All these very preliminary conclusions need to be reassessed for this project and the proposed fly-over access off of I-105/Imperial Highway and substantiated in a Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report and environmental documents, as well as full and comprehensive discussions about biological, archaeological, and other resources. All technical studies need to be prepared by qualified personnel.

Response:

Comment noted. The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR addresses the environmental effects associated with Alternative D. Alternative D, as proposed, does not include any improvements to highway facilities that are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and/or the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). As such, no highway-related approvals or funding from FHWA or Caltrans are being requested for Alternative D at this time. The environmental analysis completed for Alternative D recommends, as mitigation, certain improvements related to Interstate 105 (I-105) on the south side of LAX and to Interstate 405 (I-405) on the west side of LAX. The recommended improvements include the construction of access ramps between the proposed Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) and I-105, and the construction of a new interchange at Lennox Boulevard and I-405. Nearby roadway and highway systems near LAX could continue to operate, albeit at substantially degraded levels of service, if Alternative D were implemented as proposed, the construction of the recommended ramps/interchange improvements would substantially reduce impacts

to those systems. Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the supporting Supplemental Technical Report S-2.b. provide the analysis of impacts to the off-airport surface transportation system and described the improvements recommended to mitigate the impacts of Alternative D. If Alternative D is selected and approved as the alternative to be implemented for the LAX Master Plan, along with the recommended mitigation measures, LAWA would initiate the formal requests for approvals of the recommended ramps/interchange improvements. It is understood and acknowledged by LAWA and the FAA that no approvals of, or environmental clearances for, the ramps/interchange improvements recommended for Alternative D are being sought as part of the Master Plan approval or as part of certification/approval of the Final EIS/EIR for the Master Plan. Should Alternative D be approved, and LAWA initiates a request for federal funding and/or approvals of the subject improvements, a complete NEPA review, likely in the form of an EIS, and CEQA review, likely in the form of an EIR, must be conducted prior to approval and implementation of the improvements.

SAS00003-15

Comment:

Section 4 3.2.9.2

The development of several new Fly-Away remote terminals is proposed to reduce the amount of vehicle traffic associated with travel to and from LAX. For the FEIR, please report on the progress of adding Fly-Away terminals at Los Angeles Union Station, Long Beach, Inglewood, Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Transportation Center and San Fernando Valley II. A traffic analysis may be needed for these new Fly- Away locations.

Response:

The appropriate environmental clearance will be sought for each location where LAWA has determined to pursue construction of a FlyAway. A traffic impact analysis would be conducted when required.

Please see Response to Comment SAL00004-27 for further discussion regarding FlyAways.

SAS00003-16

Comment:

Section 4.3.1.3

The State relinquishment of Sepulveda Boulevard between Lincoln Boulevard and Imperial Highway appears on the City of Los Angeles State Highway Projects List, 9/23/02, but does not have a number of priority order assigned to it. Please seek to have a priority number assigned and report on the priority status in the FEIR.

Response:

As a result of receiving this comment, LAWA informed LADOT staff regarding Caltrans' request to prioritize the Sepulveda Boulevard relinquishment. Staff from the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation and the Bureau of Public Works determine the priority list for the state highways that they would like to have relinquished to the City of Los Angeles. They use four criteria for the establishment of this list, which are: 1) significance to the state highway system, 2) benefit to local traffic flow, 3) benefit to new development, and 4) benefit to the local community. The only state highways currently prioritized are Santa Monica Boulevard, Highland Avenue, and Glendale Boulevard.

SAS00003-17

Comment:

Section 4.3.8.4

Please be mindful that CMP mitigation analysis is a 10-year old methodology for analyzing traffic impacts. Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), responsible and commenting

3. Comments and Responses

agencies need to ensure that LOS for roadway facilities is not made worse by new land-use proposals. If proposals worsen Level of Service conditions, responsible and commenting agencies need to ensure that the agency proposing the land-use put the roadway back the way it was. The CMP in acknowledging the Department's role, stipulates that Caltrans needs to be consulted to identify specific locations to be analyzed on the State Highway System.

Response:

LAWA has been in discussions regarding the LAX Master Plan and proposed mitigation measures affecting State highways for many months. The locations studied in the CMP analysis in Section 6 of Technical Report S-2b of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR are the same locations that were analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR in Section 6 of Technical Report 3b. This CMP analysis was reviewed by Caltrans. In addition, LAWA has undertaken detailed feasibility analyses of the proposed mitigation measures on the I-105 and I-405 freeways. These feasibility studies have been thoroughly reviewed by Caltrans, and all locations requested by Caltrans have been fully analyzed.

SAS00003-18

Comment:

Section 4.6

On page 4-355 paragraph 3, we recommend that the first sentence of this paragraph include the amount of emissions released by ALL sources at or near LAX. (The sources should be inclusive as is indicated; they can be either positive or negative.)

Response:

All sources associated with the LAX Master Plan have been included in this analysis, including all on-airport operational and construction sources, as well as off-airport traffic associated with LAX, and can be found in Sections 4.6.6 and 4.6.8 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Please also see Section 4.6.7, Cumulative Impacts, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for additional information on cumulative impacts.

SAS00003-19

Comment:

It is important to clarify for each alternative, the specific year that the interim year is applicable to, e.g. 2005, 2015 or 2013 as indicated in Section 4.6 2.1 - Interim Year Analysis

Response:

In the Draft EIS/EIR, as presented in Section 4.6.2, air quality analyses were performed for two horizon years, 2005 and 2015, for the No Action/No Project Alternative and the build alternatives (A, B, and C). In the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, as presented in Section 4.6.2.1, air quality analyses of Alternative D were performed for an interim year, 2013, and the horizon year, 2015. In all presentations of data for all alternatives in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, the interim year is annotated; as an example, see Footnote 3 in Table S4.6-9 in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

SAS00003-20

Comment:

Does the use of AERMOD limit the number of receptors that can be used? If so, can the model override its defaults to allow for the inclusion of additional receptors?

Response:

The number of receptors allowed in AERMOD is only limited by the memory of the computer it is being run on. There are no "default" receptors. All receptors are chosen based on the modeling scenario, such that the modeling domain is sufficiently covered, and are reviewed by the appropriate agencies via a modeling protocol.

SAS00003-21**Comment:**

Is any "real" weather data used? Has the a.m. weather gathering concerns been resolved with AERMOD?

Response:

Actual hourly surface meteorological observations from LAX were used in the dispersion modeling analyses. There have never been any "concerns" regarding obtaining morning meteorological data for AERMOD.

SAS00003-22**Comment:**

Bullet 1 should indicate the date of the CO attainment demonstration, i.e. the revision/update is incorporated within the 2003 revision to the CO Plan.

Response:

The CO attainment demonstration prepared by SCAQMD for the 2003 AQMP is discussed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR Section 4.6.3.1.

SAS00003-23**Comment:**

Section should indicate SCAQMD has issued the Final 2003 AQMP. Data should be updated to indicate the 2003 Final Air Quality Management Plan, August 2003.

Response:

The Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR was released in July 2003 prior to the issuance of the Final 2003 AQMP. The Final EIS/EIR will incorporate any references to the 2003 AQMP as the Plan issued by SCAQMD in August 2003, or a later revision or amendment as appropriate at the time of publication of the Final EIS/EIR.

SAS00003-24**Comment:**

Identify "WTA" in the list of acronyms on page 4-392.

Response:

The acronyms listed on page 4-392 are specific to terms used in Table S4.6-18 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. WTA is not used in Table S4.6-18. Please note that WTA (West Terminal Area) was included in Section 7.6, Abbreviations/Acronyms, of Chapter 7 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and is also included in Section 7.6, Abbreviations/Acronyms, of Chapter 7 of this Final EIS/EIR.

SAS00003-25**Comment:**

Conformity Applicability: Since the LAX Master Plan is being proposed in a federally designated non-attainment area for various pollutants, the Plan must consider consistency with the latest RTP and AQMP/applicable State Implementation Plan (SIP). Projects associated with the proposed plan are subject to conformity.

3. Comments and Responses

Response:

Please see Response to Comment AF00001-4 regarding the general conformity determination.

SAS00003-26

Comment:

Please update smog alert episode to reflect that in the early summer 2003, the basin experienced a Stage 1 smog alert episode. Information that there has been no State 1 smog alerts since 1999 is erroneous.

Response:

The commentor is correct that the South Coast Air Basin experienced its first smog alert since 1998 during the summer of 2003. This fact does not change the conclusions presented in Section 4.6, Air Quality, of the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.