



COMMENT: S.44-25. Jeff Tiddens

Response to comment S.44-25A.

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.44-25B.

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.44-25C.

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



PUBLIC COMMENT: S.45 Inglewood City Hall 3/31/11

given two minutes to speak. There will be a timer.

Given the number of speaker cards I've already received and the temperature in this room, I think we'll want to move through this pretty quickly.

And please remember to state your name, speak clearly into the microphone so that our court reporter is able to accurately capture your comments.

Are there any additional speaker cards that anyone would like to . . .

Okay. So our first five speakers I will call, and please go to the microphone, is Mary Jo Farrell. Second is Honorable Councilman Daniel Juarez, Raphaelle Machado, Erin Monroe and Chris Richert.

Ms. Farrell.

- PUBLIC COMMENT FORUM -

S45-1A

MARY JO FARRELL: Good evening. My name is Mary Jo Farrell and I'm a resident of the community Fusion at South Bay which is immediately south of the Division 22 North maintenance facility.

First of all, I have to tell you that I am a fan of public transportation and I use Metro whenever I can, so don't misunderstand my opposition to mainly D22 North as an expanded facility. Had that been one of



the original choices, it's our position that it would never have made it past the initial screening.

S45-1B

On the 12 criteria that were used to measure likely projects, that one fails all but three of them. I don't see how it can be considered.

Second, it's not in MTA's best interest to use that facility, either, as a long-term solution. There isn't enough room, as you can see, to last beyond the next two or three years, and I don't know about all of you, but I really don't want to do this again in two or three years.

S45-1C

Finally, I believe that the environmental impact report was based on flawed data. The report references, repeatedly, 13 households adjacent to that facility. That data is tremendously outdated. There are 319 residences between two complexes.

We're very familiar with it. The existing bay door is about a hundred feet from my front door, so the remodeled one would be about 30 feet from my front door.

I think you could agree that at the end of a two-year construction project with eight trucks an hour coming in and out of that driveway, 200 construction workers plus the regular load of employees all trying to enter and exit the only access point, which is



Aviation Boulevard, which is 15 feet from our driveway,
I think it makes no sense to consider that as a
possibility.

Thank you.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you.

Councilman Daniel Juarez.

S45-2A

COUNCILMAN JUAREZ: Good evening. My name is
Daniel Juarez, Councilman from the City of Hawthorne,
and I represent 90,000 people but today I'm here
representing my constituency over at the Fusion
project. I'm not going to repeat what was said already
but just go over some other items that were not
covered.

The biggest concern that I have is the noise
concerns. You know, we talked about -- or we were told
about a project over in Pasadena where there was a
buffer zone. Well, over here there's no room for a
buffer zone so it would do us no good.

S45-2B

The other item is the electromagnetic fields.
Right now over at the Fusion they've got a rating
higher than the standard and that is unacceptable for
our residents.

S45-2C

We talk about property value. Right now with
this construction going over there and we're already in
a down economy, this is going to bring down the values



that much more, especially when you bring in an expanded facility there.

S45-2D

We already talked about the capacity and I guess what irritates me is if we're going to have to do this again, let's do it right the first time. There's limited money. So let's not go that route.

Limited access. There's very little access.

Aviation. I work for Northrop Grumman. I've been there for four years and I have to fight that traffic every day on Aviation. This is just going to create more congestion all the time.

The required notice that was given, the other potential sites were given a lot more time. Our folks at Fusion were not given enough or ample time to do this.

S45-2E

We talked about the sample size and I just want to end by saying that this issue's about quality of life and I hope that those that are making the decision think about would I want to put this facility next to my house and if you don't, then don't vote for it and put it in another spot.

Thank you.

MR. JACKSON: Raphaelle Machado.

S45-3A

RAPHAELE MACHADO: Raphaelle Machado and I'm a resident of the Fusion at South Bay and my unit is



S45-3B

actually on the north end, which is right next to the Metro maintenance yard, and with this connection that we're talking about, it would definitely create a problem for us as far as the noise and the congestion and the air quality, which is my concern.

I go out and clean my deck every day and there's this heavy, black soot on my deck and I can just imagine having more cars and more construction and all that would just exacerbate the situation already.

Plus the air quality is a big concern of mine and I think it would definitely have an impact on our air quality and, not to mention, you know, the value of our properties. We're already in a bad real estate market and I think with this construction going on for a year or two, it would definitely destroy whatever value that we might have left now.

S45-3C

So I am definitely against having the expansion of this property, and I think some of the other locations definitely would work better in that they're larger and would be able to accommodate the traffic that you're talking about and so, anyway, that's it.

Thank you.

MR. JACKSON: Our next speakers are Chris Richert but prior to her, I'll ask that Joel Reeves,



Samantha Millman, David Slavin, Kevin Brogan and the Honorable Alex Vargas please come to the microphone.

Chris.

ERIN MONROE: Actually, I'm Erin Monroe. I also live in the Fusion complex and I came to the previous meeting that was held at the beginning of March.

S45-4A

I'm a little bit confused today because I think that all of the residents were pretty clear at that meeting about what this actually does mean to us, and on the video that I just saw, it said that all the residents that are living right next to that facility have no problem opening up their windows because the noise level is so low; so a little bit of a disconnect and I think that's also on video, so I'm just stating that that's not true.

S45-4B

And, if we need to, I'm happy to go door to door for those people that couldn't make it at six o'clock tonite and ask them and get a petition because I think there's a whole lot more people than could actually come tonight that would also agree with me on top of what everybody else has said.

I also don't understand why it's even considered. When I look at all those criteria, it's half the size. It is half the money, so maybe that's



S45-4C

why. I don't know. Half the capacity. There's residents next to it.

I haven't seen any reason why it's even on the list, why it made it, why it was added at the end, why it's the fourth one. So I guess maybe that just needs to be clarified.

And, also, their claim that there was zero displaced residents, well, I think there's 300 households that are going to be displaced and very unhappy when this happens. And if it does happen, I have a feeling a lot of people will be moving out. Whether or not we can sell, I don't know.

Also, the EMFs. We talked about the EMFs, that they're out of control as it is and to do this would just, I think, make it toxic for us all to live there, especially with babies, all the babies that are there. There's just so many things but it's all on the previous video, so that's all I have to say today.

Thank you.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you.

Chris.

S45-5A

CHRIS RICHERT: Chris Richert. I'm also a resident of Fusion at South Bay.

The previous speakers as well as probably most of the speakers behind me will probably talk about the



quality of life issues, so I'm going to skip that tonight. I'm going to talk about this from a concerned taxpayer's standpoint.

S45-5B

Yes, I understand the initial cost for the expansion of D22 is 117 million, approximately, but everyone has stated so far that barely meets, you know, our opening day and medium-term goals. It gives us no room for expansion.

One of these other sites is going to have to be considered a few years down the road anyway. We brought this up, actually, with multiple people with the MTA staff and, you know, one of the responses I got was, you know, when I said we're going to have to go through this whole process again a few years from now, the response was: Well, you know, the EIR process is only a couple million bucks.

S45-5C

Well, that's a couple of million bucks from all of us. We voted for Measure R. We paid increased sales taxes to fund these projects. When I hear it's only a couple million bucks or when I hear, well, we're going to do a \$117 million Band-Aid and then probably have to spend 300 million later, for a combined total of 400 and change, when we could have done it for 300 and done it right the first time, I am real hesitant to ever support an MTA project again when I hear that's



how my money's being used.

Thank you.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you.

Joel.

JOEL REEVES: Hi. Good evening. My name is Joel Reeves. I'm also a Fusion resident and this is probably the third or fourth meeting that I've been to where we kind of look at the same map that's been redrawn a little bit and look at it and here's the same information.

This was pulled off the website. I believe that every other meeting that I've attended, someone in the group has asked the question, "What's the criteria?" And they've touched on it briefly, but no one has ever answered that before.

Here's the criteria from the website. Here's the matrix that people have alluded to. There's 11 or 12 criteria on here.

If you see those red dots on there, those are other sites. Originally, there were 16 sites and the D22 was not one of those originally. It was added after that. Every red dot you see on there was a failed site because of a specific reason.

I think one of the other residents, Mary Jo, had mentioned that there's only 3 out of 11 or 12 of

S45-6A



these that the D22 complies with. So the very first thing -- and this is off the website too -- as the maintenance facility evaluation criteria is the impact to residents. So you'll hear over and over again the impact to residents is fiscal, it's quality of life, it's the concern of raising our kids.

We already have power lines behind us and so it's pollution, it's noise, it's not being able to open your windows in the middle of the night to enjoy the fresh air instead of breathing exhaust. These things we shouldn't have to deal with.

S45-6B

So I agree with another one of the residents, Chris, in saying let's not just ax D22 now. Can we please ax it for future expansion as well. Can we just eliminate it because it would never even have passed the initial screen, so why are we even considering it.

Thank you.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you.

Samantha.

S45-7A

SAMANTHA MILLMAN: Hi. My name is Samantha Millman and I'm here from Millman Redondo Properties. We own the property adjacent to directly north of the subject property in Redondo Beach. We're at 4020, 4030 Redondo Beach Avenue. We've owned this property since 1978, and Northrop Grumman has been our tenant since



1987 when at that time they were TRW.

For starters, MTA's failed to provide any notice to us. No notice that it was under consideration, no notice of the public hearing on the 1st, no notice of this hearing, and that is even after contacting MTA on February 14th and asking to be put on the list.

Redondo Beach is not the right place for this facility. DHL has spent millions of dollars upgrading the facility nextdoor to ours. It is perfectly located for what DHL does and it would be very hard for them to find a new facility.

S45-7B

Many businesses including our tenant, Northrop Grumman, would be very disturbed by this facility. Northrop Grumman, in particular, has invested millions of dollars in highly technical and noise-sensitive equipment which is not copacetic with a rail maintenance yard.

The City of Redondo Beach is opposed to the facility and, in addition, there's a large Chevron pipeline that goes underneath the subject property in Redondo Beach and the vibration caused by the continual ingress and egress of heavy rail cars could have a severe negative impact on that pipeline which also runs under our property.



S45- 7C

In short, this is really not the right place. It's also not the cheapest option despite what's been presented. It's not cheaper than Arbor Vitae and Manchester. The costs of relocation are incredibly high for DHL and the other tenants.

The time frame to get the Redondo Beach approved will be much longer due to litigation and eminent domain proceedings, and the price calculations need to be redone to take this into account.

The City of Inglewood appears to want the Manchester site and cheaper relocation costs for Arbor Vitae and Manchester in that area seem to welcome the cost.

Thank you.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you.

David.

S45-8A

DAVID SLAVIN: Hello. My name is David Slavin. I'm also a resident at Fusion. I live in a unit that's about as far away from the train yard in the proposed expansion at D22 as you can still live in the complex, and even I can hear that loud, piercing, blood-curdling sound that happens every time the trains brake to come into the facility.

If you were here earlier, you heard that feedback from the mic when it was being adjusted and



S45-8B you multiply that by about a factor of 10 and you have it go on for about 30 seconds or maybe even a minute, that's the kind of sound that comes from that yard.

Now, it comes from that yard a few times a day and that is something that's currently acceptable. I can hear that sound through a double-paned glass, half of a building and then a whole row of buildings between me. I can still hear that sound. But if that happens, you know, regularly throughout the day and night, that is going to become a complete nuisance.

S45-8C The only building in that entire stretch of Aviation, probably within about a half-mile radius of that property that generates that amount of noise and sound and light pollution is that facility. Currently it's annoying. It would be completely unacceptable.

And so in terms of long-term planning, it seems to me that choosing a larger facility that's in a more truly industrial zone makes a lot of sense.

S45-8D Leaving that facility the way it is and potentially thinking about selling it and turning it into another place where residents will be close to the line, which would be potential users of the rail, would be much better in the long-term.

If the plan is to turn a luxury set of condos into Section 8 housing, then choose D22A.



MR. JACKSON: Kevin.

KEVIN BROGAN: Thank you. My name's Kevin Brogan, B-r-o-g-a-n. I represent AMB Spinnaker, the owner of Site 17.

S45-9A

Site 17 is a 336,000 square-foot building which, to give you an idea, is about 7 acres under roof, which employs over 400 people involving two tenants; DHL's key facility and DK28.

We are opposed to the acquisition of Site 17 for this maintenance yard and we'll submit a letter to Mr. Diaz that will formally detail at length all of our issues. But for the purpose of tonight's hearing, I'd like to address a couple of matters.

S45-9B

First of all, the MTA acknowledges in its Draft EIS that it will be difficult to relocate tenants to the same proximate area with respect to LAX. That's a very important factor with respect to these 400 employees and, of course, DHL.

S45-9C

Secondly, Site 17 only works if the MTA expands its facilities at Division 22 at Hawthorne; in other words, Site 17 is coupled to the expansion of Division 22.

According to the EIR, if it chooses Site 17, the MTA must create a paint and body shop in Division 22, build more tracks, add more building



space, create ancillary facilities including additional utility lines and parking all on Division 22.

S45-9D

The EIR glosses over the combined effect of the impact of both Site 17 and the Division 22 acquisitions and certainly creates a greater impact in two areas as opposed to one in some of the other sites.

S45-9E

I'd like to point out that the City of Redondo Beach has passed a resolution opposing -- opposing the acquisition of Site 17 for the maintenance yard as a use inconsistent with the city's proposed zoning and general plan.

And, finally, I'd like to point out there's a underground pipeline that pushes jet fuel under the subject property, under Site 17, that has not been addressed at all in the EIR.

We will address the rest of our issues in a letter to Mr. Diaz.

Thank you.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you.

Our next speakers are Alex, however, I would like to call up Martin Coyne, Aaron Jones, Tom Gutto, Kim Bordet and Marc Gephart.

Honorable Alex Vargas.

ALEX VARGAS: Thank you. My name is Alex Vargas. I'm mayor pro tem for the City of Hawthorne



S45-10A

and I'm here in solidarity with the residents of the Fusion project and the residents of Hawthorne as a whole.

I had the privilege of being invited by the Fusion residents to go to the site, to go to their resident complex, and I have been witness to all the concerns that they are feeling that might happen with the expansion of the site.

One of the things that the city council of Hawthorne rarely does is issue resolutions against these types of projects. We're usually on board but in this case we can't. Overwhelmingly, we support a resolution opposing this.

And I was present at the Fusion complex and I am concerned as well and I understand their concerns with regards to the EMFs. That's nothing negligible. I'm a physicist. I'm an engineer. I understand what the impacts of that could be health-wise. They're not negligible as some people may say.

S45-10B

Noise pollution definitely a concern with the increased activity that might happen there at that site and the issues with property values and the whole litany of additional items that the residents of Fusion are going to be presenting to you today.

One item of concern that was not really



S45-10C

mentioned was the fact that the residents of the Fusion project were not included in the early phases of consideration for the maintenance sites. There was a list of about 20 neighborhood associations but the one resident homeowners association that's closest to or directly affected by this type of expansion was not included in that list, so that's of concern to me.

But other than that, I'm here as a resident of Hawthorne. I'm here as mayor pro tem for the City of Hawthorne respectfully asking the board to please consider an alternative site.

MR. JACKSON: Martin.

S45-11A

MARTIN COYNE: Good evening. My name is Martin Coyne. That's C-o-y-n-e. I'm senior vice president and regional manager for AMB Property Corporation. We own the property at 4000 Redondo Beach Avenue referred to in your documents as Marine/Redondo Beach Alternative or Site 17.

I want to restate AMB's unambiguous opposition to the selection of our property for a Metro satellite maintenance facility in conjunction with the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project. I want to be clear that under no circumstances are we a willing seller.

AMB is the world's leading third-party owner and operator of air-freight distribution real estate at



S45-11B

and near major cargo and logistic airports such as LAX. We are especially prominent in the southern California region.

This particular property is distinctive because of its size, proximity to the airport, support from the city in which it is located and because of its unique combination of office and warehouse space.

It is because of the fact that this property is literally irreplaceable that I am here to support the interests of our two principal tenants, DHL and JR286. These are two world-class tenants.

S45-11C

DHL Global Forwarding is a leader in air and ocean freight markets, and JR286 is an entrepreneurial leader in manufacturing, distribution of branded licensed sports accessories. JR286 has recently become the exclusive distributor for Nike.

To recommend or select this site as a prospective location for a satellite maintenance facility would jeopardize both these companies and over 400 employees they have on this site. That is 400 employees.

In light of these facts, I respectfully urge you to remove from consideration the Site 17.

Thank you.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you.



Next speaker is Aaron Jones.

S45-12A

AARON JONES: Good evening. I'm Aaron Jones, the planning director for the City of Redondo Beach. Pleasure to be here this evening. I wanted to reinforce some of the statements made earlier this evening.

The city has unanimously adopted a resolution opposing the location of the Marine/Redondo site, and I would like to go a little bit further and discuss some of the rationale for that decision.

S45-12B

In particular, the environmental document spends very little time addressing the issues of physical division in the community, inconsistency with our general plan, our land use goals for this critical area of our community, and does not discuss in any detail the zoning consistency; in fact, it completely erroneously states a conclusion about consistency with zoning.

S45-12C

We have submitted written comments on March 24th addressing these issues as well as the prior resolution.

I do think it's important to note that this is a critical aerospace campus section of our community and that all of our land use goals for the area are for aerospace campus, industrial and other large-scale



S45-12C

campus park use of this property.

Our major businesses and employers demand that this location be free from heavier industrial uses, especially those generating impact such as vibration. And we, in particular, in a long-range perspective certainly support transit-oriented development in and around the site that would not be at all consistent with a rail maintenance facility in close proximity to those types of uses.

So thank you for your consideration and your time this evening.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you.

Next speaker is Tom.

S45-13A

TOM GUTTO: Tom Gutto. I'm a resident of Fusion complex as well and my constituents have so eloquently spoken about the quality of life issues.

My wife and I, shortly after our one-year wedding anniversary, bought a home for the first time in the Fusion complex. We had a number of reasons for wanting to live there; the occupants there, the value of our homes, the location.

We were a little concerned with the MTA site as was but we thought we could really build a life there. We thought we could make Fusion a part of our life for the long-term.



When we found out about this proposed D22 expansion, we were shocked, you know. We can't believe that of all the sites chosen that this was even under consideration for all the points made prior regarding the increase in traffic on Aviation, the EMFs, the noise, the construction.

There are a lot of young families that live in Fusion and we would like to be one of those young families very soon. We're having second thoughts about raising children in a place where you've got a doubled increase in trains running in and out, noise all night long and decreased property values.

I just urge the board here to think about selecting another site.

Thanks.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you.

Next speaker is Kim Bordet.

KIM BORDET: Hello. Good evening, everyone.

S45-14A

My name is Kim Bordet and I work for DHL Global Forwarding and I'd like to talk a little bit of a personal nature.

To me, that is my residency. Unfortunately, I work there 10 to 12 hours. My boss is here so I thought I'd put that on the line.

When we first moved to this facility, we had