



**APPENDIX K-(S)
REPOSE TO COMMENTS RECEIVED
ON THE SDEIS/RDEIR**

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK



K.0 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE SDEIS/RDEIR

K.7 Overview

The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (SDEIS/RDEIR) for the Crenshaw/LAX Corridor Transit Project) was circulated to the public for comment over a 30-day review period that concluded on April 11, 2011. Section 15088(b) of the *California Environmental Quality Act* (CEQA) Guidelines describes the evaluation that is required in the response to comments:

The written response shall describe the disposition of significant environmental issues raised (e.g., revisions to the proposed project to mitigate anticipated impacts or objections). In particular, the major environmental issues raised when the lead agency's position is at variance with recommendations and objections raised in the comments must be addressed in detail giving reasons why specific comments and suggestions were not accepted. There must be a good faith, reasoned analysis in response. Conclusory statements unsupported by factual information will not suffice.

In order to comply with Section 15088(b) of CEQA, reasoned, factual responses have been provided to all comments received, with a particular emphasis on significant environmental issues. Generally, the responses to comments provide explanation, clarification, or amplification of information contained in the SDEIS/RDEIR. All comments and responses will be considered by the Metro Board prior to certification and in any approval of the project.

K.8 Organization of Comments and Response

There were 198 written comments from 42 commenters and oral comments made by 53 speakers received during the circulation period for the SDEIS/RDEIR. Comments were received from federal, state, and local agencies, elected officials, community organizations, transit advocates, and from members of the general public. Comments were received via mail, e-mail, phone, and the public hearings. Comments were recorded in a database with the source, date, method of receipt, and issue area identified.

Although alternatives to project components are not required under NEPA or CEQA, the DEIS/DEIR and SDEIS/RDEIR considered alternatives to the proposed maintenance facility for the proposed project. Many comments received on the SDEIS/RDEIR were not related to the Site #14 – Arbor Vitae/Bellanca Alternative, the preferred maintenance site alternative selected by the Metro Board on April 28, 2011. A Master Response was developed for questions and comments issue areas pertaining specifically to the other three sites.

Supplemental Master Response 1. Regarding Comments Received regarding the potential selection of the Site #17 – Marine/Redondo Beach, Site #15 – Aviation/Manchester, and Division 22 Northern Expansion Alternatives.

Comment Noted. Metro appreciates the ideas of the commenter and public input is an important part of the planning process. Based on the evaluation of impacts of the four maintenance site alternatives and public comment received on the evaluation, on April 28, 2011 the Metro Board of Directors selected the Site #14 – Arbor Vitae/Bellanca Alternative as the preferred site for the maintenance facility for the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project. Based on the Metro Board action, the Site #15 – Arbor Vitae/Bellanca, Site #17 – Marine/Redondo Beach, and the Division 22 Northern Expansion Alternatives are no longer under consideration and will not undergo further environmental review for the purpose and need of this project. No CEQA findings will be made for the Site #15 – Arbor Vitae/Bellanca, Site #17 – Marine/Redondo Beach, and the Division 22 Northern Expansion Alternatives and they will not be included in the FTA Record of Decision. Further future consideration of these sites would require a new environmental review process with additional opportunity for public comment. No additional response regarding the potential selection of the remaining three maintenance alternative sites is required, since they are no longer under consideration as potential sites for the maintenance facility.

K.9 List of Commenters on the SDEIS/RDEIR

This section lists the agencies, organizations, and individuals that commented on the DEIS/DEIR. For ease of use, an index tables is provided for the reader to find their comment correspondence and responses. Page numbers are provided in these index tables.

Table K-1. List of Commenters on the SDEIS/RDEIR

| Comment # | Name | Agency/Organization | Page # |
|------------------------|-------------------------|---|--------|
| Public Agencies | | | |
| S10-1 | Patricia Sanderson Port | U.S. Department of Interior | K-4 |
| S10-2 | Connell Dunning | U.S. Department Environmental Protection Agency | K-6 |
| S10-3 | Dianna Watson | Department of Transportation | K-10 |
| S10-4 | Gregg MacClain | City of Hawthorne | K-13 |
| S10-5 | James T. Butts, Jr. | City of Inglewood (City Council) | K-19 |
| S10-6 | Linda F. Tatum | City of Inglewood (Planning Department) | K-21 |
| S10-7 | Perry A Banner | City of Lawndale (Community Development Department) | K-27 |
| S10-8 | Mike Gin | City of Redondo Beach (City Council) | K-30 |
| S10-9 | Gail Farber | County of Los Angeles (Public Works) | K-36 |
| S10-10 | Richard J. Bruckner | County of Los Angeles (Regional Planning) | K-39 |
| S10-11 | Michael M. Stevens | City of Inglewood (City Council) | K-41 |
| S10-12 | Ian MacMillan | South Coast Air Quality Management District | K-45 |
| S-10-13 | Scott Morgan | Governor’s Office of Planning and Research | K-49 |
| Public Agencies | | | |
| S20-1 | Rob Antrobious | AMB Property Corporation/ property owner 4000 Redondo Beach | K-54 |
| S20-2 | Gary Kehler | Aviation Center Owners Association (President) | K-56 |
| S20-3 | Peter Jorgensen | DHL Global Forwarding | K-59 |
| S20-4 | Amy R. Forbes | Gibson Dunn LLP / Client: Avis Budget Car Rental | K-62 |
| S20-5 | Hannah Bentley | On Behalf of the Fusion Homeowners Association Board of Directors | K-68 |



| Comment # | Name | Agency/Organization | Page # |
|--|------------------------------------|---|---------------|
| S20-6 | Kevin H Brogan | Hill, Farrer and Burrill LLP/ Client: AMB Spinnaker | K-116 |
| S20-7 | Cyndi Hench | Neighborhood Council of Weschester Playa (President) | K-120 |
| S20-8 | Joe Ahn | Northrop Grumman/ Manager of Governnt and Public Affairs | K-122 |
| S20-9 | Michael H. Leifer | Palmieri, Tyler, Wiener, Wilhelm, and Waldron/ Client: US Storage | K-127 |
| S20-10 | Ismael Rodriguez | SkyOne Federal Credit Union Facility (Manager) | K-130 |
| S20-11 | Ben Wong | Southern California Edison (Local Public Affairs Region Director) | K-133 |
| S20-12 | John S. Harmer | Southland Lumber and Supply Company Inc. (Manager) | K-137 |
| S20-13 | Alexis Lantz | Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition (Planning and Policy Director) | K-139 |
| S20-14 | Michael H. Leifer | Palmieri, Tyler, Wiener, Wilhelm, and Waldron/ Client: US Storage(Hawthorne Mini Venture) | K-145 |
| S20-15 | DJ Moore | Latham and Watkins | K-151 |
| Individual Comments | | | |
| S30-1 | Steve Cady | | K-169 |
| S30-2 | Beckie Chan | | K-171 |
| S30-3 | Silio Chianese | Wiseburn Watch | K-174 |
| S30-4 | Abby Frank | | K-177 |
| S30-5 | Jason Gromski | | K-180 |
| S30-6 | Patricia P. Gulto | | K-183 |
| S30-7 | Raphaele and Jim Machado | | K-186 |
| S30-8 | Jonathan Meister | | K-189 |
| S30-9 | Erin Monroe | | K-192 |
| S30-10 | Ann Murakami | | K-195 |
| S30-11 | Mark Poulan | Southland Lumber | K-198 |
| S30-12 | Denny Schneider | | K-201 |
| S30-13 | Celinda M. Vazquez & George Avalos | | K-203 |
| S30-14 | Debbie Bliss | | K-206 |
| Oral Comments From Flight Path Learning Center | | | K-209 |
| Oral Comments From Inglewood City Hall | | | K-264 |

COMMENT: S.10-1. Patricia Sanderson Port, United States Department of the Interior.

S10 - 1



United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
Pacific Southwest Region
1111 Jackson Street, Suite 520
Oakland, California 94607

IN REPLY REFER TO:
ER# 11/0173

Electronically Filed

11 April 2011

Mr. Roderick Diaz, Project Manager, Metro
One Gateway Plaza, MS 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952
Email: diazroderick@metro.net

Subject: Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS)/ Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR), Crenshaw Transit Corridor Project, Updated Information on a New Evaluation of Maintenance Sites, Proposals to Improve Transit Services, Funding, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA), Los Angeles County, CA

Dear Mr. Roderick:

The Department of the Interior has received and reviewed the subject document and has no comments to offer.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project.

Sincerely,



Patricia Sanderson Port
Regional Environmental Officer

A



Response to comment S.10-1A.

Comment noted.



COMMENT: S.10-2. Connell Dunning, United States Environmental Protection Agency.

S10 - 2



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

April 7, 2011

Mr. Ray Tellis
Federal Transit Administration
Los Angeles Metropolitan Office
888 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 1850
Los Angeles, California 90017

Subject: Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Crenshaw/LAX
Transit Corridor Project, Los Angeles, California (CEQ #20110054)

Dear Mr. Tellis:

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the above-referenced document pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. We previously reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the project and provided comments in an October 26, 2009 letter. We rated the DEIS as EC-2, *Environmental Concerns, Insufficient Information* due to concerns about the air quality analysis for the project. We look forward to a discussion of those issues in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). We are rating the SDEIS as LO, *Lack of Objections*. Please see the attached *Rating Factors* for a description of our rating system.

A

While we have a lack of objections to the project elements (maintenance facilities) discussed in the SDEIS, we have a few recommendations regarding selection of the facility site and future construction:

- EPA encourages the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) to avoid and minimize impacts to schools and other sensitive land uses and receptors in site selection and mitigation activities.
- Due to unavoidable construction impacts to air quality and potential cumulative impacts if other construction projects take place during the same time and in the vicinity of this project, EPA encourages FTA and LACMTA to maximize use of mitigation measures to minimize these impacts, especially in the vicinity of sensitive receptors.

B

C



- As stated in our comments on the DEIS, considering the existing impairment of local water bodies, EPA encourages aggressive efforts to manage stormwater runoff to minimize additional introduction of pollutants, including use of “green infrastructure” in onsite stormwater management. We commend FTA and LACMTA for committing to treatment control best management practices (BMPs), monitoring of those BMPs to ensure effectiveness, and employing green infrastructure strategies.

D

We appreciate the opportunity to review this SDEIS. When the FEIS is released for public review, please send one hard copy and one electronic copy to the address above (mail code: CED-2). If you have any questions, please contact Carolyn Mulvihill, the lead reviewer for this project, at 415-947-3554 or mulvihill.carolyn@epa.gov.

E

Sincerely,

Connell Dunning, Transportation Team Supervisor
Environmental Review Office

Enclosures:
Summary of EPA Rating Definitions

cc: Roderick Diaz, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Ray Sukys, Federal Transit Administration
Steve Smith, South Coast Air Quality Management District



SUMMARY OF EPA RATING DEFINITIONS*

This rating system was developed as a means to summarize the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) level of concern with a proposed action. The ratings are a combination of alphabetical categories for evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposal and numerical categories for evaluation of the adequacy of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF THE ACTION

"LO" (Lack of Objections)

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

"EC" (Environmental Concerns)

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

"EO" (Environmental Objections)

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

"EU" (Environmentally Unsatisfactory)

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

ADEQUACY OF THE IMPACT STATEMENT

"Category 1" (Adequate)

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

"Category 2" (Insufficient Information)

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analysed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

"Category 3" (Inadequate)

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analysed in the draft EIS, which should be analysed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

*From EPA Manual 1640, Policy and Procedures for the Review of Federal Actions Impacting the Environment.

**Response to comment S.10-2A.**

Comment noted. A response to comments received from the USEPA on the DEIS/DEIR has been prepared as part of the FEIS/FEIR. This response can be located in Appendix K of the FEIS/FEIR.

Response to comment S.10-2B.

Comment noted. Metro and the FTA during the development of alternatives, identified sites that would have minimal impacts on residences and other sensitive land uses.

Response to comment S.10-2C.

Comment noted. Where impacts were unavoidable, mitigation measures were provided to minimize the adverse effects the extent feasible, particularly in the vicinity of sensitive receptors.

Response to comment S.10-2D.

Comment noted. Mitigation measure WQ in the SDEIS/RDEIR employs green infrastructure strategies as a way of managing stormwater runoff.

Response to comment S.10-2E.

Comment noted. A hardcopy and electronic copy of the FEIS/FEIR will be provided to the address listed.



COMMENT: S.10-3. Dianna Watson, Department of Transportation District 7, Regional Planning.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AGENCY

EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 7, REGIONAL PLANNING
IGR/CEQA BRANCH
100 MAIN STREET, MS # 16
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-3606
PHONE: (213) 897-9140
FAX: (213) 897-1337



*Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!*

S10 - 3

March 14, 2011

IGR/CEQA No. 110305AL-RDIR
Ref. IGR/CEQA No. 090916AL, DEIR
Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project
Vic. LA-10, LA-405, LA-105
SCH # 2007091148

Mr. Roderick Diaz
Los Angeles County Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza, MS 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Diaz:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Department) in the environmental review process for the above referenced project. This Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report presents additional information pertaining to the Crenshaw/Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) Transit Corridor Project, previously known as the Crenshaw Transit Corridor Project. The document provides additional environmental analysis of four new alternative maintenance facility sites for the proposed Project.

A

The proposed project site is estimated to generate a total of 21 trips during the morning peak hours (9 inbound/12 outbound) and 23 trips during the evening peak hours (13 inbound/10 outbound). Based on this information, there is no significant traffic impact to the State facilities.

Storm water run-off is a sensitive issue for Los Angeles and Ventura counties. Please be mindful that projects need to be designed to discharge clean run-off water. Additionally storm water run-off is not permitted to discharge onto State highway facilities.

B

Transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials, which requires the use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways, will require a transportation permit from the Department. It is recommended that large size truck trips be limited to off-peak commute periods.

C

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"



Mr. Roderick Diaz
March 14, 2011
Page 2 of 2

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (213) 897-9140 or Alan Lin the project coordinator at (213) 897-8391 and refer to IGR/CEQA No. 110305AL.

Sincerely,

DIANNA WATSON
IGR/CEQA Branch Chief

cc: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

Response to comment S.10-3A.

Comment noted.

Response to comment S.10-3B.

The maintenance facility will be designed to discharge clean run-off water. Storm water run-off will not be discharged on State highway facilities. The nearest highway to the preferred maintenance site facility would be the I-405 which is located approximately 0.5 miles from the site.

Response to comment S.10-3C.

Metro acknowledges that the use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways will require a transportation permit from the Department of Transportation and one will be obtained shall it be necessary. Consistent with the provisions of the permit, Metro specifications shall require the contractor to limit these truck trips to off-peak commute periods.



COMMENT: S.10-4. Gregg McClain, City of Hawthorne.

S10 - 4

CITY OF HAWTHORNE

PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT



4455 West 126th Street • Hawthorne, California 90250-4482

(310) 349-2970
Fax (310) 644-6685

April 5, 2011

Roderick Diaz
Project Manager
Metro
One Gateway Plaza, MS 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

RE: Crenshaw/LAX Corridor Metro Project
Potential Site Expansion of existing ND22 in the City of Hawthorne

Dear Mr. Diaz:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Supplemental EIR/EIS ("EIR"), which evaluates four alternatives for a maintenance yard that will service the proposed Crenshaw/LAX Corridor. The maintenance yard identified as ND22 and located within the City of Hawthorne is one of the sites being taken into consideration for facility expansion. The City of Hawthorne has the following concerns regarding the EIR and potential impacts to uses adjacent to ND22.

A

The EIR clearly indicates improvements will be required at the existing site (pp. 2-1, 2-13, 2-15), but the document is significantly deficient in evaluating potential impacts of these proposed improvements to the adjacent uses. The document is also unclear as to the exact nature of these improvements, as opposed to the improvements in the expansion area to the north. Therefore, in order to properly evaluate the impacts, it is necessary for the document to clearly explain how use of the existing site (ND22) is proposed to be altered from its present condition.

In further evaluating the impacts of the Hawthorne expansion site (ND22N), the EIR is often unclear if it is referring to impacts upon the neighborhood called "Holly Glen," the housing complex known as "Fusion" (also known as "Willow Glen"), or other adjacent uses. Holly Glen is north of Rosecrans Avenue approximately 750 feet from the northernmost point of ND22N and Fusion is adjacent and south of ND22, at one point less than 250 feet from ND22N. This apparent confusion in the discussion of impacts makes it difficult to follow the narrative related to impacts and thereby nearly impossible to properly understand these impacts.

B



The EIR states many technical conclusions and provides graphs and charts without citing to where in the technical appendices the supporting material can be found. This makes it difficult to properly evaluate the conclusions presented and supported by the graphics.

C

Many of the mitigation measures referred to in the EIR are illusory because they are required only "when feasible", or "where possible" (see e.g., pp.3-110, 3-111, 3-115), and some mitigation measures are improperly deferred because they rely on plans to be developed without any reference to standards that will apply to those plans. Additionally, the EIR relies on the use of BMPs as mitigation. However, there is not sufficient information to conclude that significant impacts will not remain after BMPs are put in place.

D

The EIR concludes odors and contamination will be limited to on-site impacts, but no explanation is provided to substantiate this conclusion.

E

As the Hawthorne site is the only alternative adjacent to residential uses, and noting that the combined ND22 and ND22N site is not adequate to meet Metro's needs (p. 2-7), we strongly encourage Metro to remove this site from further consideration. Should ND22N remain in consideration after this review period, we request a complete analysis of potential impacts be conducted to fully understand the significance to the adjacent and nearby residential uses.

F

Respectfully submitted,

Gregg McClain
Acting Director of Planning and Community Development
Hawthorne

CC: James H. Mitsch, City Manager
Russell Miyahira, City Attorney

Encl.: City Council Resolution 7357



RESOLUTION NO. 7357

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL, OF THE CITY OF HAWTHORNE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, OPPOSING THE CONSIDERATION OR SELECTION OF 14724 AVIATION AS A SITE FOR AN EXPANSION OF THE METRO RAIL MAINTENANCE FACILITY IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE CRENSHAW/LAX AND GREEN LINE EXTENSION PROJECTS

WHEREAS, the Measure R Expenditure Plan as approved by the voters of Los Angeles County in November 2008 will provide the funding for the proposed Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor, a Light Rail Transit Line in the Crenshaw District which runs along Crenshaw Boulevard from Exposition Boulevard to the Metro Green Line, extending approximately 10 miles from Wilshire Boulevard on the North to El Segundo Boulevard on the South; and

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) has completed the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS/DEIR), in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act for the proposed Crenshaw Transit Corridor; and

WHEREAS, four sites for the facility have been identified through a screening process and Metro is currently finalizing an Environmental Assessment/Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (EA/DEIR) for the selection of one of these sites as a rail maintenance facility that would service and support the proposed Crenshaw Transit Corridor, and has only recently released its findings and presented them at a public hearing; and

WHEREAS, one of the sites identified as a candidate site for a rail maintenance facility in connection with the proposed Crenshaw Transit Corridor is located within the City of Hawthorne near the Fusion Center at South Bay and is described as “Metro Division 22 Northern Expansion”; and

WHEREAS, the residents at the Fusion Center have expressed strong opposition to the proposed maintenance facility expanding next to them and sought the assistance of the City Council in their opposition.

G



NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Hawthorne, California, does hereby declare, find, determine and order as follows:

Section 1. The City Council does hereby resolve that it is officially opposed to the consideration of the expansion of the MTA maintenance facility described as “Metro Division 22 Northern Expansion” at Aviation and Marine near the Fusion at South Bay.

Section 2. The City Manager and/or his designees are hereby authorized to:

- Participate in any and all hearings, meetings and discussions regarding the locating of a MTA maintenance facility in the City of Hawthorne.
- Send and respond to official correspondence regarding locating a MTA maintenance facility in the City of Hawthorne including, but not limited to, comments on all environmental review documents.
- Take all other actions necessary to advocate for the City’s official position.

Section 3. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution and shall cause this Resolution and his certification to be entered in the Book of Resolutions of the Council of the City.

Section 4. This resolution shall be in full force and effect immediately upon its passage and adoption thereof.

Section 5. The City Attorney is authorized to make minor typographical changes to this Resolution that does not change the substance of this Resolution.

G



PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 22nd day of February, 2011.

**LARRY M. GUIDI, Mayor
City of Hawthorne, California**

ATTEST:

**NORBERT A. HUBER, City Clerk
City of Hawthorne, California**

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

**RUSSELL MIYAHIRA, City Attorney
City of Hawthorne, California**

Response to comment S.10-4A.

Comment noted. Please refer to Supplemental Master Response regarding the selection of Site #14 (Arbor Vitae/Bellanca) as the site for the maintenance facility.

Response to comment S.10-4B.

Comment noted. Please refer to Supplemental Master Response regarding the selection of Site #14 (Arbor Vitae/Bellanca) as the site for the maintenance facility.

Response to comment S.10-4C.

Comment noted. In order to make the document more reader friendly, much of the technical analysis has been moved to the Appendices. References to which appendix are provided in the appropriate sections.

Response to comment S.10-4D.

Comment noted. Environmental legislation requires lead agencies to consider feasible mitigation measures to avoid or substantially reduce a project's significant environmental impacts. Mitigation measures have been provided to reduce potential adverse effects that would result from implementation of the project. The BMPs provided for water quality and geological resources in the SDEIS/RDEIR would result in no adverse effects. A mitigation monitoring program has been developed with the FEIS/FEIR to ensure that the mitigation measures provided in the SDEIS/RDEIR and FEIS/FEIR are adhered to with implementation of the project.

Response to comment S.10-4E.

Comment noted. Odors emitted from a maintenance facility site are typical of industrial uses and would not warrant a detailed discussion of potential impacts. The impact discussion acknowledges that the type of land use would not generate adverse odors. Therefore the conclusion is substantiated.

Response to comment S.10-4F.

Comment noted. Please refer to Supplemental Master Response regarding the selection of Site #14 (Arbor Vitae/Bellanca) as the site for the maintenance facility.

Response to comment S.10-4G.

Comment noted. Metro acknowledges receipt of the resolution. Please refer to Supplemental Master Response regarding the selection of Site #14 (Arbor Vitae/Bellanca) as the site for the maintenance facility.



COMMENT: S.10-5. James T. Butts, Jr., City of Inglewood, Office of the Mayor.



CITY OF INGLEWOOD
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR



James T. Butts, Jr.
Mayor

April 5, 2011

S10 - 5

Roderick Diaz, Project Manager
Metro
One Gateway Plaza, MS 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (SDEIS/RDEIR)

Dear Mr. Diaz,

I would like to take the opportunity to submit my comments for the SDEIS/RDEIR dated February, 2011. As the Mayor of the City of Inglewood, I feel that it is important to offer the following comments:

The Manchester/Aviation Alternative, also referred to as Site No. 15, is located on the City's western border. As mentioned in the SDEIS/RDEIR, this site contains industrial uses, including National/Alamo Car Rental, Crimson Technical College, as well as an industrial park. Currently, the City is collecting sales tax and other revenue from these entities; the acquisition of these parcels by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation (Metro) would remove these parcels from the tax rolls, in perpetuity. Impacting land currently used by National/Alamo, which is one of the City's largest tax generators, may cause this entity relocate outside of the City; simply put, this is revenue the City cannot afford to lose.

A

Although the City has supported the selection of the Inglewood Maintenance Facility in the past, as a newly-elected member of the City Council, I believe that an economic analysis is needed before the City fully supports the selection of Site No. 15 by the Metro Board. The creation of this maintenance facility will preempt other potential development uses for the proposed site. Therefore, in order to protect the interest of our citizenry, the City must conduct an analysis to determine whether or not the development of the maintenance facility will have an adverse fiscal impact to the City's General Fund (GF). If the economic impact analysis reveals a significant loss in GF revenue, the City Council will challenge the selection of Site No. 15 by Metro.

B

I look forward to working with you and your staff and coming to a resolution that benefits the City of Inglewood. If you have any questions or concerns, do not hesitate to contact me by phone at (310) 412-5300.

Sincerely,

James T. Butts, Jr.
Mayor

Response to comment S.10-5A.

Comment noted. Please refer to Supplemental Master Response regarding the selection of Site #14 (Arbor Vitae/Bellanca) as the site for the maintenance facility..

Response to comment S.10-5B.

Comment noted. Please refer to Supplemental Master Response regarding the selection of Site #14 (Arbor Vitae/Bellanca) as the site for the maintenance facility..