



Response to comment S.30-10A.

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



COMMENT: S.30-11.Mark Poulvan.

Crenshaw/LAX
 Transit Corridor
 Project

Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement/
 Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report

S30-11

Comment Form

The Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor project team welcomes your comments on the evaluation of proposed maintenance facility sites for Metro's light rail system and an update on potential impacts to parklands and historic resources. Please fill out this form and use additional sheets, if necessary. Give this form to project staff or return to Metro (see directions on reverse).

Name (First & Last Name, Organization)

Mark Poulvan Southland Lumber

Address (Street, City, State, Zip)

8710 Aviation Ave Tor. 90301

Email (enter address to receive periodic project updates)

mpoulvan47@sbcglobal.net

Would you like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes No

THIS COMMENT RELATES TO:

Maintenance Facility Sites:

- Site #14 Arbor Vitae/Bellanca
- Site #15 Manchester/Aviation
- Site #17 Marine/Redondo Beach
- Division 22 North Expansion
- General Comments

Parklands and Historic Resources
 (Section 4(f) Resources)

Comment (please print):

~~The existing abandoned railroad right of way makes more sense as a route than displacing existing businesses along Aviation Ave.~~

It would make more sense to use the existing railroad right of way, which is now abandoned, than to uproot and relocate the existing businesses along Aviation Ave.

We need businesses and jobs now more than ever.

Response to comment S.30-11A.

Comment noted. The existing railroad right-of-way is being used for the project alignment. The project would not travel within the Aviation Boulevard right-of-way.



COMMENT: S.30-12. Denny Schneider.

S30-12

To Ken Alpern, Chair, CD11 Transportation Committee

3-12-2011

Re: Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor MTA Project Maintenance Yard Selection

I understand that the subject Maintenance Yard will be discussed by the Transportation Committee.

Bottom line Maintenance Site recommendation: Site 3 is best; Sites 2 and 4 are acceptable; and Site 1, although functional, is less desirable due to its limited ability to be expanded to meet greater repair activity needs if, (when) the system is expanded beyond the current project.

Our Westchester Neighbors Association (WNA) has held several meetings with MTA to highlight this project and to provide community input. WNA has expressed support for the MTA project as a whole and has asked for the "local" rail stop site to be located at Manchester/Aviation.

A

I have had the privilege to be involved in this process for almost two years and am selected for the Crenshaw/LAX Leadership Council which will help to review and guide the development of the environmental evaluation.

Four candidate sites remaining in contention for selection later this year:

1. Metro Division 22 Northern Expansion 3.5 Acre site just south of Rosecrans off the Harbor Subdivision rail at Isis adjacent to an existing rail maintenance yard in Hawthorne.
2. Arbor Vitae/Bellanca 17.6 Acre site just south of Arbor Vitae off the Harbor Subdivision rail line in LA near Aviation.
3. Manchester/Aviation 20.5 Acre site just west of the Harbor Subdivision rail line to Aviation in Inglewood from Arbor Vitae to the potential Manchester/Aviation proposed rail stop.
4. Marine/Redondo Beach 14.2 Acre site off Redondo Beach Ave north of Manhattan Beach Blvd.

B

Although none of these are outright reject able, Site 1 is an adjunct to an existing facility and is not expandable to meet future needs should they arise when the rail system is expanded. The other three meet are expandable and therefore more desirable.

From our perspective Site 3, Manchester/Aviation, is the largest and most desirable. It is farthest from residential areas and displaces the least amount of business activity because most of the land is consumed by rental car facilities which will eventually be moved into the LAX Consolidated Rental Car facility. Further, construction at this site will improve construction costs for the "optional" Manchester/Aviation rail stop due to simultaneous construction overlap opportunities.

C

There is strong support for a rail stop located at Manchester/Aviation within the Westchester Community. It is the only local stop within walking distances of residences and is easily accessible to connector bus lines. MTA has projected that this stop will be a very highly used when the South extension branch of the Crenshaw/LAX line is enacted.

D

Denny Schneider, community advocate
Denny@WeLiveFree.com

Response to comment S.30-12A.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the ideas of the commenter and public input is an important part of the planning process. The optional Manchester Station was removed from consideration during the final design process because of low initial ridership projections. The project has been designed so as not to preclude the inclusion of Manchester Station over the aerial crossing at a future time.

Response to comment S.30-12B.

Comment noted. The commenter correctly asserts that the Division 22 Northern Expansion Alternative does not have the future expansion potential that the other three alternatives have.

Response to comment S.30-12C.

Comment noted. The commenter correctly asserts that the Site #15 Manchester/Aviation Alternative is the largest site, and along with the Site #17 – Martine/Redondo Beach Alternative, are the furthest from residences. The amount of business activity that the commenter refers could be seen as a subjective qualification. This site has the most businesses located on site. The presumption that the rental car facility could be moved to the consolidated rental car facility is speculative and cannot be reasonably weighed in the characterization of business activity.

Response to comment S.30-12D.

Comment noted. Please see response to comment S.30-12A. Metro acknowledges the support from the Westchester community for a Manchester Station and the increased ridership potential if the South Bay Extension of the Metro Green Line is implemented.



COMMENT: S.30-13. Celinda Vazquez & George Avalos.

S30-13

From: Celinda Vazquez [celindavazquez@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2011 4:19 PM
To: Diaz, Roderick
Cc: George Avalos; ariel@scottmgmt.com; Ball, Rob
Subject: Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor/Site #17 Marine/Redondo Beach: Opposition Letter
Attachments: Metro Opposition Letter Vazquez-Avalos.doc

Hello Mr. Diaz,

Attached please find a letter of opposition to the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor/Site #17 Marine/Redondo Beach proposed project.

Should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me. My contact information is below.

Thank you, Celinda

--

Celinda M. Vazquez
5405 W. 149th Place, Unit 5
Hawthorne, CA 90250
310.844.8076
celindavazquez@gmail.com



April 11, 2011-04-11

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

RE: Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor – Maintenance Facility Site #17 Marine/Redondo Beach Proposed Project

Dear Mr. Diaz:

My husband and I are homeowners at Fusion Condo (Building 5405 Unit 5). I am writing this letter in strong opposition to the proposed Metro Maintenance Facility Site #17 project. There are several reasons for this opposition. They are as follows:

- We are gravely concerned with the air pollution this construction will cause as we have a two year old and our building is 50 feet away from this site. Our son plays daily in our community's Tot Lo. This construction site is absolutely in a residential area not an industrial one as Metro has described. This site is bounded by young children. It is not acceptable to expose young children to this kind of environmental hazard. My son is not the only child resident at Fusion. There are many, many young children in the community. A

- Noise coming from this current site is a nuance, but we knew that when we purchased our home and have to deal with it. However, expanding this site will further the noise level. B

- At this difficult time in our economy and housing market, it is simply unthinkable to do more harm to homeowners/tax payers by contributing to lowering property values. Construction dust, noise and traffic issues will absolutely negatively impact our property value. C

- Lastly, we didn't learn about this project until our Homeowners Association and Property Management Company informed us of it and from what we understand they were not notified in a pro-active timely manner by Metro. D

We urge you to reconsider this project and avoid putting innocent children in harms way.

Sincerely,

Celinda Vazquez & George Avalos



Response to comment S.30-13A.

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.30-13B.

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.30-13C.

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.30-13D.

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



COMMENT: S.30-14. Debbie Bliss.

S30-14

Dear Mr. Diaz and whomever else it may concern:

Please consider this email written to express my strong opposition to the MTA Expansion in Hawthorne, California.

A

I am a resident of the Fusion at South Bay Community. I was one of the first buyers and have been living here since December 2006.

As a relatively long-term resident, I am extremely concerned about the proposed expansion efforts for the following reasons:

- - I work at home several days a week and will be significantly disrupted by the construction noise.
- - I also rent my 2nd bedroom, and both the noise and proximity of the construction work to my home will be unappealing to prospective renters and may even turn desirable tenants away.
- - Since I live in this community, which is less than 50 feet away from the proposed construction site, the work would absolutely be “adjacent to” a residential area and should not be inaccurately classified otherwise in order to make it okay.
- - In addition to dust and other construction related air pollution, truck noise and increased traffic on Aviation, the singular point of access to the community, will negatively impact quality of life in Fusion at South Bay.
- - Currently, I believe that the Fusion community is adequately insulated from the main street to the west, the MTA site to the north and the Federal Building to the south. Some units, including mine, are also separated from the electrical field on the eastern border. However, if MTA expands as proposed, construction, publicity, public opinion and the final MTA facilities will significantly impair the value of my home.

B

C

In addition, I am unacceptably uninformed by MTA of plans to build a car servicing and paint facility in this space adjacent to my home, but strongly oppose it for the same reasons as listed above.

D

I most certainly would not have purchased a home in the Fusion community if I had known previously of the possible MTA expansion, and may reconsider continuing to live here if the plan is approved.

In the given economy, it will probably be more realistic to rent than sell my home. And if the MTA expansion project proceeds, I may be forced to rent at a below market price. I fear that some neighbors may feel the same way. Ultimately, this could result in a complex that does not have the same culture of owner-occupied pride, visual aesthetics and safe surroundings.

E



Please consider these points of strong opposition to the proposed expansion and find another place for the new facility/facilities. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Debbie Bliss

Response to comment S.30-14A.

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.30-14B.

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.30-14C.

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.30-14D.

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.30-14E.

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



Oral Comments from Flight Path Learning Center 3/1/11

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
METROPOLITAN TRANSIT AUTHORITY
CRENSHAW/LAX TRANSIT CORRIDOR LIGHT RAIL
PROJECT
OPEN HOUSE/PUBLIC MEETING

FLIGHT PATH LEARNING CENTER
6661 WEST IMPERIAL HIGHWAY
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
MARCH 1, 2011



were received.

Please come to the mic when your name is called.

Each speaker will be given two minutes to speak. There will be a timer on the screen for you to keep track of your time left.

If you have any additional comments when your time is up, once again, you'll be able to submit comments today or at a later date prior to April 11th by 5:00.

Please remember to state your name, speak clearly and into the microphone so that the court reporter will be able to record all your comments.

Oh, we have one more representative. We have Alex Varga with the Office of Mayor Pro Tem -- I'm sorry. We have Alex Varga, Mayor Pro Tem, in attendance as well, with the City of Hawthorne. I apologize.

Okay. Robert Leabow, take it away.

- PUBLIC COMMENT FORUM -

ROBERT LEABOW: Robert Leabow, Rolling Hills Estates.

Looking at the four proposals, the one on -- for the Yard 22 North seems too small but that seems like the most logical location since you do have some facilities there.

And of the other three yards, I would suggest the one in Redondo Beach because I think the ones closer to the airport, the land could be put to better use than a railroad yard.

And the one in Redondo Beach, if it is built, will they -- the question I know you can't answer is: Will they have two yards, no matter which one is chosen, other than 22, operational almost side by side, or will they combine the two?

S44-1



Thank you.

MR. GUTIERREZ: Thank you.

If I could please have Chris Richert up at the mic.

CHRIS RICHERT: Chris Richert. I am a resident of Hawthorne. I'm also a board member for the Fusion at South Bay Community Association.

S44-2A

We have some serious concerns about the expansion of Division 22.

First, we are in such close proximity, it's going to be a real noise nuisance as well as directly affect our property values.

S44-2B

We have homes that are within 20 feet of the tracks existing. If we are, you know, potentially doubling the track, like there's no way that's not going to be a direct impact on quality of life.

Another concern we have is it seems like we've been categorically excluded from the selection process as well as the information gathering.

I have a copy of the distribution lists for the community groups, both from the September EIR as well as the one that was just released in February.

S44-2C

We have homeowners associations from all over the city that are included on the distribution list. We are categorically excluded from both. Not once has the MTA reached out to us as homeowners or as an organization to solicit our feedback.

I know part of the requirement for an expansion of a facility like this is to, you know, notify people within a certain radius of the impacted area of public hearings, of environmental impact reports.

There was a public hearing similar to this in December. I didn't receive a single notice and I found out after the fact and it was brought to my attention by a neighbor.



S44-2D	<p>For this hearing I received nothing from the MTA and, again, only through our proactivity did we know about this.</p> <p>You know, property values for us -- you know, we're one of the only facilities that you're considering that's directly bordering, adjacent to a residential neighborhood. All the other sites are industrial, commercial.</p> <p>You know, these are kids. These are homes. These are -- wow. We really have a buzzer?</p>
	<p>MR. GUTIERREZ: Thank you.</p> <p>Can I please have Mary Jo Farrell.</p>
S44-3A	<p>MARY JO FARRELL: Hi. I'm Mary Jo Farrell. I reside in Hawthorne. I also live in the Fusion at South Bay Community.</p> <p>Just to put it in perspective for you, if the D22 North expansion takes place, those guys will be working less than a hundred feet from my front door.</p> <p>I can already tell you, based on the noise from that facility, which one of those guys working nights is having trouble with his wife and whether they're getting along any better now, because all that noise comes into my home.</p>
S44-3B	<p>And, yes, we bought after that thing was established but, you know what, we bought because it was a relatively contained, quiet facility.</p> <p>We did not sign on for a two-year construction process that will have eight trucks an hour trundling down our driveway right next to ours, with the noise, with the dust, with the stock-piled materials, with all that stuff blowing around.</p>
S44-3C	<p>Now, another perspective for you is I find it disingenuous that the maps all show a tiny little triangle on the north border 650 feet from our homes. In reality, that's a staging area.</p> <p>The actual maintenance and preventive maintenance and paint and body</p>



S44-3D | work is done 50 feet from a child's playground, 70 feet from the only park that our residents have access to.

There's one way in and out of Fusion. There's one way in and out of D22 North. This is not the place to put a two-year construction project.

S44-3E | Second thing that I find disingenuous is the financial impact is stated as only a loss of \$2894 after the U.S. Storage facility goes away.

You have to realize that the 280 residences at Fusion South Bay contribute two million dollars to this county's economy by way of property taxes. You're going to chop those by whatever proportion property values drop.

S44-3F | And I'm guessing, as a real estate professional, that we won't be able to give those homes away after a two-year construction period with twice the number of trains coming in and out of there.

Thank you.

MR. GUTIERREZ: Thank you.

Up next we have Jim Segner.

S44-4A | JIM SEGNER: My name's Jim Segner. I'm a board member of the Fusion community that's being affected by this as well.

What's interesting is I just received a map and I'd like to also verify that I did not receive, as two of my neighbors did not receive, any correspondence on any of the hearings from the MTA.

S44-4B | One thing I'd like to point out is what the gentleman before pointed out as to where the construction and the property was going to be brought in. They were pointing that out as the side yards, the storage yards for the trains.

So what they did not point out is that when they do the expansion, that if you look at the map of what they're going to expand -- I'm going to go on with what



- S44-4C | Mary Jo said here -- is that the facilities to be expanded are right next door to the homes.
- S44-4C | All the construction, all the 70 trains a day that are going to be maintained instead of the 17 they currently now have will be done within 50 feet of our homes. That is not acceptable.
- S44-4D | The other thing I'd like to point out is that we were one of the facilities that was added on as an afterthought. So when they talked about at the beginning of the presentation when they sought out public comments as part of the EIR, well, since we are not part of the original selection process, none of us, even if we would have been notified, which we have not been notified, had no comment, no process, no way to input to the selection process and the criteria.
- S44-4E | And, second of all, the gentleman who said that there's no criteria for evaluating a major project like this, I work for a major aerospace company, and on a project this size there's always evaluation criteria on how it will be evaluated to make the final site selection based on technical, cost and public comments. So, sir, you misled us again.
- S44-5A | Thank you.
- S44-5A | MR. GUTIERREZ: Thank you.
- S44-5A | Up next we have Matthew Hetz.
- S44-5A | MATTHEW HETZ: Thank you.
- S44-5A | Matthew Hetz, Westchester resident, transit rider since 1992, so I greatly support the line.
- S44-5A | And as a Los Angeles resident, I think I'll have to go to bat and support the Arbor Vitae/Bellanca site. As it being in a commercial area, there's no homes taken. I don't believe there's any homes close to it, so that makes sense.



S44-5B

And perhaps with the construction of the yard, perhaps the City of Los Angeles could be approached to help redevelop the whole business area there because it's rather old, falling down, decrepit and so forth.

So it could be a win for transit, it could be a win for the maintenance yard and for the city of Los Angeles to get a redeveloped business area in that center.

S44-5C

I also support the station at Manchester and Aviation as an option.

So I look forward to the line. I'll ride it. I can't wait for it to start.

Thank you.

MR. GUTIERREZ: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Tom Gutto.

S44-6A

TOM GUTTO: Hi. Good evening. My name is Tom Gutto and I'm also a resident at the Fusion townhome complex there on 149th Place, and I just basically wanted to go on the record to voice my opposition to the D22 expansion.

My wife and I bought our home there in July, so we were kind of late to this whole process, and we just don't want to see our property values decline anymore than they already are.

S44-6B

Along with the points that my colleagues have made regarding traffic, the distance to our complex, the children playing there in the playgrounds, I just think that of the four sites you have, this is probably the worst site, and we definitely vehemently oppose that expansion.

Thanks.

MR. GUTIERREZ: Thank you.

Next speaker is David Slavin.

DAVID SLAVIN: My name is David Slavin. I'm also a resident at Fusion.



S44-7A

I was looking at the relative merits and costs of the different sites, and it seems like an expansion of Redondo is only relatively small in terms of price compared to the D22 choice.

S44-7B

And there's a possibility that if you actually expanded one of the other three areas you could build more than you intended and also -- so that you could replace the work at D22 so that all -- you could actually take that away. You could sell that property.

If you're going to buy property now for 14 or 17 or the other one, you're going to be buying at a lower price.

If after two or three years, when you've built up that new facility, you could then sell the property at 22A for a higher value, it can offset the overall cost of the project.

You would, then, not only get the advantages of that money that you'll get for selling the land if you sell it to something like condos or townhomes, you'll get an increased revenue strain from future property taxes.

S44-7C

And I noticed that D22A is currently marked as industrial. That particular plot may be industrial but there is nothing around there that is industrial. The closest thing that's industrial is across the street which is a semiconductor fab area for Northrop. But that building is made so that whatever goes on inside is quiet and there's no noise or light coming out of there.

The noise and light that currently comes out of the D22A facility is very annoying and disruptive to our property values and our way of life.

So if you could consider that as a possibility, I think that's a win-win for the city, the county, MTA and the residents in that area.

Thanks.



MR. GUTIERREZ: Thank you.

Up next we have Bonnie Shrewsbury.

S44-8A

BONNIE SHREWSBURY: Hi. I'm Bonnie Shrewsbury. I also live in Fusion. I wanted to reiterate what my neighbors have been saying.

This is the one site, the one choice that is adjacent to residential. The expansion that you're talking about up on the north property, the actual expansion will be happening 50 feet from people's homes. There are children that live there.

You have other options and I would like to ask that you please choose a site that does not impact residences, does not impact L.A. County property taxes.

MR. GUTIERREZ: Thank you.

Next speaker is Jennifer Newman.

S44-9A

JENNIFER NEWMAN: Hi. My name is Jennifer Newman. I also live in Fusion.

I just wanted to go on the record to say that it definitely needs to be taken into consideration that it is not just an industrial site. Everything in that presentation suggested that it was industrial, leading everyone to believe that it is, but if I could go on the record to make that wall that we have right now higher, I would, but that's not even an option.

S44-9B

We are already inconvenienced by the sounds and the noise and dust and everything going on right now. To expand it would -- it would be unbearable. We'd have to leave and our property values would go down, so we'd be at a bigger loss than when we started, so thanks.

MR. GUTIERREZ: Thank you.

I will be announcing two at a time so we can make sure everyone has time to make their comments tonight.



S44-10A	<p>So first up is John Bacon followed by Hannah Bentley.</p> <p>JOHN BACON: I'm a local electrical engineer.</p> <p>MR. GUTIERREZ: Can you please state your name into the record.</p> <p>JOHN BACON: John Bacon is my name and, having grew up in Chicago, I'm familiar with this particular technology under consideration; rail technology.</p> <p>It seems to me that one thing you could do instead of building these -- having these special storage lots in one small area, we could just have lines -- have a storage track parallel to the line -- well, the present Green Line along the 105. There should be enough room for at least one track all along there and it would cut down on deadheading in the evening and in the morning because of the heaviest traffic that sources from the east end.</p> <p>Also, it would be more convenient to drop off failed trains and activate fresh ones so you could maintain reliability.</p>
S44-10B	<p>Certainly, you would have to have some way of cutting the cost of moving to and from the maintenance facilities, which there's enough room right now where they're doing it now, but you could do it automatically using electronics.</p> <p>I mean, there's an electronics revolution and some rail -- some commuter lines actually run without requiring personnel onboard at all, even in passenger service. And certainly for deadheading and so on you could do that; have an automatic operation, rather.</p>
S44-10C	<p>The original Green Line was designed so you could have automatic operation because none of it's along the street.</p> <p>So, anyway, I would suggest that you use electronics for control to avoid having to have any of these four sites expanded for storage and it would be more</p>