5.5 RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS (SUBMISSION #1- #337)

Submission 1 Erin Hoops

1-1 The commenter's support for the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Submission 2 Johnny Menhennet

2-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro studied another station option in Lawndale in the 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis but removed the option from further study at the request of the City of Lawndale.

Submission 3 Kyle Freitas

3-1 The commenter's support for a below-grade alignment along the Metro ROW (called Alternative 1 during public scoping and the Trench Option within the Draft EIR) is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

3-2 As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, and Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, all Metro ROW alignments include multi-use recreational paths along a portion of the alignment in Lawndale, as well as soundwalls in areas where noise mitigation is proposed. As discussed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, the LPA also includes multi-use recreational paths and soundwalls.

Submission 4 Robert Kessmar

4-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

4-2 The comment that the Trench Option would provide a more constrained visual experience for passengers compared to aerial or at-grade alignments is noted. However, passenger experience is not an environmental impact under CEQA and therefore is not evaluated in the Draft EIR. Under CEQA, the analysis of aesthetic impacts focuses on changes to views from publicly accessible locations. Furthermore, as the project is located in an urbanized area, the analysis in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, evaluates whether the project would conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality. Based on the detailed analysis, set forth on pages 3.3-55 through 3.3-114 of the Draft EIR, including visual simulations, the Draft EIR concludes that none of the alignment options would conflict with applicable policies or regulations governing scenic quality. The cost estimates published in 2023 (estimated in 2022) with the Draft EIR are as follows: Elevated/At-Grade Alignment ($1.96B), Trench Option ($2.84B), Hawthorne Option ($2.96B), and LPA ($2.23B). See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

4-3 The commenter's support for an elevated alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. All alignment options studied have some portion of the light rail track that is elevated, as described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR. The LPA would be elevated between the Redondo Beach (Marine) Station to 162nd Street, where it begins to transition to at-grade. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 5 Leslie Andrew Ridings

5-1 The commenter's support for the Trench Option, which would be fully grade-separated, is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The LPA would also fully grade separate light rail from all roadways. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

5-2 The commenter's support for the Redondo Beach Transit Center Station is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission 6 Joseph Guay

6-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

6-2 The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission 7 Joanna G

7-1 Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant environmental impacts of the project. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character and MR-19: Project Benefits.

Submission 8 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 9 MJ Anderson

9-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

9-2 As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Metro ROW alignments include a multi-use recreational path between Grant Avenue and 182nd Street on the east side of the light rail tracks, which enhance access between the Redondo Beach Transit Center to the South Bay Galleria. Metro would continue to coordinate with the South Bay Galleria in future phases of design regarding pedestrian access.

During the Green Line Extension to Torrance 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis, Metro studied potential stations in the City of Lawndale between Inglewood Avenue and

Manhattan Beach Boulevard along the Metro ROW and along Hawthorne Boulevard at 166th Street. At the request of the City of Lawndale, the Metro Board of Directors (Metro Board) agreed to remove the proposed stations in Lawndale from further study.

Submission 10 Mary Ellen Martin

10-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The potential for noise impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

10-2 See response to Comment 10-1. The commenter's concerns regarding the decision-making process are noted. Metro values public input and has not made a final decision on the project. The Metro Board will consider the Final EIR, along with public comments and input received throughout the environmental review process, before deciding whether to certify the Final EIR and approve the project. That decision is anticipated in 2025.

10-3 The Draft EIR evaluated the Hawthorne Option, which travels along portions of Hawthorne Boulevard, as well as the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, Trench Option, and project alternatives, including the 170th/182nd Grade-Separated Light Rail Transit Alternative (selected by the Metro Board as the LPA in May 2024 and referred to as the "Hybrid Alternative"). Potential noise impacts associated with Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Options are evaluated in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. Potential noise impacts associated with the LPA are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, with additional clarifications provided in Section 4.20, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR. The Metro Board will consider the analyses and conclusions of the Draft EIR and Final EIR as part of its consideration of whether to certify the Final EIR and approve the project. Additionally, the recently completed Redondo Beach Transit Center is a bus transit center developed by the City of Redondo Beach; it is not a Metro project. However, the transit center project was funded, in part by local transit dollars from the Metro Call for Projects Funds, Measure R, and Measure M Local Return Transit Funds. See responses to Comments 10-1 and 10-2.

Submission 11 Margie Alexander

11-1 The potential for vibration impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See response to Comment 1970-17. The predicted vibration levels at Breakwater Village are shown in Figure 3.6-B13A of Appendix 3.6-C Vibration Detail Maps. Operational vibration annoyance impacts would be mitigated to less than significant with mitigation for all Metro ROW alignments and the Hawthorne Option.

Regarding construction vibration impacts, the Draft EIR identifies temporary vibration impacts that could occur from certain activities, including pile driving, heavy equipment operation, and other high-impact construction methods. To address these impacts, Mitigation Measures MM-VIB-1: Vibration Control Plan, MM-VIB-2: Construction Equipment Location, and MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction surveys, would be required. With implementation of these mitigation measures, potential vibration-related structural damage impacts of the Trench Option, the Hawthorne Option, and the LPA would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation.

However, the vibration-related annoyance impacts associated with construction of each of those alignments would remain significant and unavoidable, even with mitigation. These annoyance impacts would be temporary and limited to periods when the most vibration-intensive equipment (e.g., pile drivers and vibratory compactors), is in use, which would typically be for a short duration near any given property.

In contrast to the Trench Option, the Hawthorne Option, and the LPA, construction of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in significant and unavoidable vibration impacts related to both structural damage and vibration annoyance, due to the need for pile driving to reconstruct the Grant Avenue freight bridge. Although the identified mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to the maximum extent feasible, they would not eliminate them.

See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

11-2 Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities, including senior residents at Breakwater Village, very seriously. Every aspect of the project has been and would continue to be designed to address potential risks and ensure that construction and operation are conducted safely. To clarify, the proposed light rail would be at-grade adjacent to Breakwater Village. There is no trench in this segment of the ROW for all alignments studied in the Draft EIR.

The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11, Utilities and Service System, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13 of Chapter 4, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, the clarifications do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that impacts related to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety, MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety, and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

11-3 Metro has fully evaluated the project's environmental impacts and proposed stringent mitigation measures to reduce impacts to the maximum extent feasible. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Potential air quality impacts are addressed in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. Compliance with Project Features PF-AQ-1: Tier 4 Engine Standards and PF-AQ-2: Dust Control Best Practices would ensure that construction activities comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District and Metro standards controlling emissions and dust. Operationally, the light rail vehicles would be powered by electricity and would not produce localized emissions. Regional air quality would improve with implementation of the project due to a shift from passenger vehicles to light rail in the corridor. Regarding any dangers associated with moving utilities, see MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety. Regarding property values, see MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

11-4 Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. The LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 12 Janet Lindquist

12-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Pedestrian safety is addressed in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. The Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists.

Submission 13 Tom Wooge

13-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

13-2 The commenter's observation on the Metro Rail system and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 14 N/A

14-1 The commenter's support for the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 15 Steven Miyamoto

15-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology. The LPA, Trench Option and Hawthorne Option would all grade separate light rail to avoid any conflicts with vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists traveling on roadways.

Submission 16 Milan Matsumoto

16-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option, and secondary support for an elevated configuration along the Metro ROW is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and LPA would both have an elevated segment in the north between the Redondo Beach (Marine) Station to south of 162nd Street, where it transitions down to travel at-grade. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 17 Russell Czwleger

17-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 18 Dina Gallo

18-1 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 19 David M

19-1 The commenter's support for the Right-of-Way Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 20 Grace Peng

20-1 Relative to the Trench Option, the LPA would reduce the area that would be trenched and address many of the construction-related concerns identified by the commenter. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

20-2 The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, these clarifications do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that impacts related

to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety for utility and pipeline relocation details in the Metro ROW. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for how construction and operation in the corridor would be handled in the context of soil conditions. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, regarding the installation of soundwalls and establishment of quiet zones.

20-3 The commenter's suggestions for ROW elevated/street-grade light rail are noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Also, a High-Frequency Bus Alternative along parts of Hawthorne Boulevard is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

20-4 The commenter's support for the High-Frequency Bus Alternative is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Street improvements on local city streets are generally not within the purview of Metro.

20-5 See response to Comment 20-4.

20-6 See response to Comment 20-1. Additionally, the project would be subject to Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls and MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment for the Metro ROW Alignments. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures for more information. Soundwalls are considered for all alignments studied (both along Metro ROW and Hawthorne Blvd).

Submission 21 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Public Agencies

Submission 22 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Public Agencies

Submission 23 Adriana Heidman

23-1 As discussed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, and Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives of the Draft EIR, the project includes Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls to reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level with mitigation. While soundproofing measures, such as retrofitting homes with noise insulation, have been used in some contexts, such as near airports, this approach is not considered feasible or appropriate for the following reasons

> Construction noise is temporary and mobile: Construction would occur in phases along the project alignment over a multi-year period, and no single home would experience intense noise for the full construction duration. Rather, heavy construction activity would be localized to a given block or segment for limited durations, with quieter finishing work occurring thereafter. Retrofitting homes for such temporary, localized impacts is not a proportionate or effective mitigation strategy.

> Retrofitting is not an effective approach for exterior noise: Construction noise is measured and assessed using exterior noise criteria, and the most effective mitigation is achieved by reducing noise at the source (e.g., through equipment selection, barriers, and site management). Soundproofing interior spaces, such as

replacing windows or adding wall insulation, does not address outdoor noise levels and may not be effective unless doors, ventilation, and other openings are also sealed.

- Interior ventilation could be impaired: For acoustic retrofitting to meaningfully reduce noise levels, windows would need to remain closed, which may conflict with ventilation and air quality needs protected under building codes and preferred by some residents. If windows remained open, the intended goal of reducing noise impacts to sensitive receptors would not be achieved as desired, reducing the effectiveness of mitigation measures.
- Retrofitting would require extensive coordination and participation: Implementing an acoustic retrofitting program would require sending formal offers to hundreds of property owners and tenants, negotiating liability and access terms, and coordinating multiple in-unit site visits for testing, construction, and post-construction verification. Many tenants would likely be unresponsive or unwilling to permit construction inside their homes, particularly given the disruptions and potential impacts to the buildings, such as interference with existing waterproofing.
- Retrofit measures are logistically and financially infeasible on a broad scale: Installing replacement windows or conducting individualized building modifications would require property-by-property assessments of building construction type, existing window conditions, occupancy status, and owner consent. To be effective, each unit would need to be analyzed based on building age, construction type, orientation, and existing conditions. It would also require coordination with contractors, temporary relocation in some cases, and follow-up inspections. These efforts would be highly disruptive to residents and disproportionately burdensome relative to the temporary nature of the impact. Further, given the scale, complexity, and potential for low participation, such a program would be unlikely to be completed within a reasonable timeframe.
- Retrofit measures may introduce secondary impacts: Construction work to install new windows or insulation, particularly if done on an expedited basis in an occupied home, can itself create disruptions, such as noise, dust, and temporary loss of access. These impacts could exceed or compound the temporary construction noise the retrofit is intended to mitigate.

For these reasons, retrofitting homes is not proposed as a feasible mitigation measure for construction noise impacts. Such a measure would be of uncertain effectiveness for the reasons described above and therefore would not constitute appropriate mitigation under CEQA. Metro could not force tenants and homeowners to participate in such a program, further limiting the measure's ability to meaningfully reduce the impact it is intended to address. Instead, the project would implement proactive measures that reduce noise at the source, are enforceable through the Noise Control Plan, and are applicable across the entire project corridor. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings) daily. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

See MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 24 Beryl Bryant

24-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option are noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

24-2 Under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. However, to address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

Submission 25 Duane Green

25-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 26 Luis

26-1 The commenter's support of the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Potential effects to the transportation network are addressed in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, and potential visual effects are addressed in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. It should be noted that in addition to the Trench Option, the LPA and Hawthorne Option would grade separate light rail to avoid conflicts with vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists traveling along roadways.

Submission 27 Vincent Perez

27-1 The Hawthorne Option would locate the light rail transit tracks and station in an elevated guideway above the median of Hawthorne Boulevard. Pedestrian crossings would be maintained at existing intersections or would be added at new, signalized intersections.

Submission 28 Lena Pullen

28-1 See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

28-2 As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would have two at-grade light rail crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets, while the Trench Option would be fully grade-separated. With respect to noise, under Project Features PF-NV-2: Crossing Signal Bell Shrouds and PF-NV-3: Gate-Down-Bell-Stop Variance, Metro would shroud the crossing signal bells at 170th and 182nd Streets and apply for a gate-down-bell-stop variance to reduce the duration of bell ringing. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

It should be noted that the LPA would significantly reduce noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade light rail crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets by locating the light rail in short trenches. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. Regarding system operations, the anticipated hours of operation are 4:00 a.m. one day to 1:00 a.m. the following day. System headways would be reduced during early morning (4:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m.) and late-night hours (7:00 p.m. to 1:00 a.m.) to approximately 15 minutes. Peak-hour system headways would be 5 minutes during peak travel hours. Weekend system headways would be reduced compared to weekdays due to reduced commuter demand. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-12: Emergency Access.

28-3 The commenter's preference for the No Project Alternative is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. However, to address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

Submission 29 Robert Sanchez

29-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option, Trench Option, and Metro ROW alignment, and the order of their preferences, is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

29-2 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Submission 30 Tom Wooge

30-1 The analysis in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, follows federal guidance, specifically the Federal Transit Administration Transit (FTA) Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018) to assess transit noise impacts. This same guidance was used to address potential impacts associated with the LPA. This methodology evaluates whether projected noise levels would exceed FTA's impact thresholds for sensitive receptors. The analysis ensures a consistent, objective approach to determine potential noise impacts and identify when mitigation measures are required. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds.

30-2 The analysis in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, evaluates the potential noise impacts of both the Metro ROW alignments and the Hawthorne Option within the context of both existing noise environments. This approach considers how project-related noise would interact with and contrast against existing background levels in residential and commercial areas, including background traffic noise on Hawthorne Boulevard. The noise analysis accounts for the location of noise-sensitive land uses along both Hawthorne Boulevard and the Metro ROW. This accounts for Hawthorne Boulevard having less

residential density than along the Metro ROW. The commenter does not cite – and Metro has not identified – any scientific or medical evidence demonstrating a causal relationship between the operation of light rail transit and the onset or exacerbation of ligyrophobia (the intense fear of loud noises). In the absence of any such evidence, any attempt to evaluate this alleged psychological impact would be speculative. Moreover, ligyrophobia is typically associated with sudden or unpredictable wounds like fireworks, balloons popping or alarms, whereas light rail systems are generally quieter and predictable compared to many other urban noise sources. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Regarding the existing noise environment along the Metro ROW, existing noise sources include freight operations and local vehicular traffic. The freight horn is an existing intense source of noise which produces noise levels up to 110 dBA (a-weighted decibel). The proposed mitigation measures in the Draft EIR would mitigate potential noise impacts along the Metro ROW. In addition, the project would enable the local jurisdictions along the Metro ROW to obtain a "quiet zone" designation, which would reduce existing freight noise overall along the corridor, by eliminating routine freight horn soundings, which as noted previously, produce noise levels of up to 110 dBA. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

30-3 CEQA does not assess beneficial impacts but evaluates specific environmental impact thresholds, as described in Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Impact Analyses, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

30-4 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 31 Tom Wooge

31-1 As described in Section 3.2, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR in Section 3.2-4.2, the project would comply with all applicable regulations and local ordinances governing construction activities to the extent feasible. Table 3.2-5, starting on page 3.2-26 of the Draft EIR, provides a detailed analysis of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment's consistency with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations pertinent to the project. The discussions in Table 3.2-5 of the Draft EIR would apply similarly to the Trench Option and Hawthorne Option. The Draft EIR concludes that the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Options would result in a less than significant impact. This same analysis applies to the LPA, as discussed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

As discussed in Section 3.2-4.1 of the Draft EIR, the project would not physically divide a community because residents would still be able to cross the Metro ROW at all existing designated rail crossings—i.e., the crossings at Inglewood Avenue, Manhattan Beach Boulevard, 159th, 160th, 161st, 162nd, 170th, and 182nd Streets. Land uses would not be altered so as to isolate any one part of the community from the other. The alignments evaluated along the Metro ROW, including the LPA, would result in less than significant impacts related to physical division of communities. It should also be noted that the LPA would fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways.

31-2 The comment is noted for the record. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

31-3 As discussed in Section 3.2, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, the project would replace or repair existing security fencing and add soundwalls in some locations, which would limit unauthorized access into the Metro ROW to ensure safety near operating rail. However, this does not constitute physical division of a community because residents would still be able to cross the Metro ROW at all existing designated crossings. See also response to Comment 31-1.

31-4 See response to Comments 31-1 and 31-3. As described in Section 3.2, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, the project would include safety barriers that would restrict the current level of unauthorized pedestrian access into the Metro ROW near active freight. Pedestrian access would still be available at the existing crossings, and the light rail would be grade-separated in all instances except in the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment crossing of 170th Street and 182nd Street, while freight crossings would be enhanced with safety improvements.

The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. As a point of clarification, there are no pedestrian bridges planned along the Metro ROW as part of any alignment or design option. Similar to the Hawthorne Option, under the LPA and Trench Option the light rail would be fully grade-separated from all roadways. Pedestrians would cross streets at-grade and avoid any conflicts with light rail trains. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

The following commenter made their comment in Spanish. Its response is given first in Spanish. An English translation follows.

Propuesta 32 Natalia Cliborn

32-1 Conforme a la Ley de Calidad Ambiental de California (CEQA), los impactos económicos tales como los cambios en los valores de las propiedades no se consideran impactos ambientales. El Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental se centra en los impactos ambientales físicos y las medidas para mitigarlos tal como lo requiere dicha ley. Para abordar cuestiones e inquietudes sobre el valor de las propiedades, Metro ha preparado más información. Consultar MR-14: "Valores de las propiedades e impactos a los comercios."

Submission 32 Natalia Cliborn

32-1 Under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

Submission 33 Donna Perkins

33-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

33-2 The commenter's opposition to the High-Frequency Bus Alternative as a substitution for rail service is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 34 Matthew Hinsley

34-1 See responses to Comments 34-2 and 34-3.

34-2 As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. Under the LPA, the light rail would be fully grade-separated from all roadways and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions.

34-3 Metro would implement mitigation measures directly under its control, including Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls and MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs. Additionally, Metro would install quiet zone equipment as part of Project Feature PF-NV-1: Quiet Zone Equipment Installation, which would qualify the crossings for an Automatic Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) Approval for a quiet zone. However, under federal regulations, cities must submit the quiet zone application to FRA. The Draft EIR acknowledges that implementation of quiet zones ultimately requires action by local jurisdictions. To address this, Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment commits Metro to working with the cities to support the FRA application. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

The Draft EIR fully discloses noise impacts with and without the implementation of quiet zones in Appendix 3.6-B of the Draft EIR, in Table 15 (page 93) and Table 16 (page 101). This is further explained in pages 3.6-100 through 3.6-104 of the Draft EIR.

Submission 35 N/A

35-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 36 Eric Homier

36-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic

Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. Under the LPA, the light rail would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists. See MR-8 Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

36-2 The project would provide an alternative mode to single-occupant vehicle travel throughout the region in an area currently unserved by the regional rail network. While a station is proposed near 182nd Street at the Redondo Beach Transit Center, this location would provide pedestrian access to nearby neighborhoods and businesses with the opportunity to arrive by local and regional buses as well. As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, Metro would not create additional vehicle parking at the city's recently constructed Redondo Beach Transit Center.

Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, and Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, analyze impacts related to noise and vibration impacts. The LPA, Trench Option and Hawthorne Option, would have less than significant noise impacts with mitigation during operations.

The LPA, Hawthorne Option, and Trench Option would all be fully grade-separated from all roadways. The Hawthorne Option would involve modifications to Hawthorne Boulevard to accommodate the support columns for the elevated guideway. This includes reducing the number of northbound left-hand turn lanes at 177th Street from two to one. For additional information, see MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service. As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions.

Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 37 Johnny Menhennet

37-1 Submission 2 includes the same comment from the same commenter. See response to Comment 2-1.

Submission 38 Marvin E. Badawi

38-1 The commenter's preference for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

Submission 39 Matt and Lori Smalling

39-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

39-2 Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. The LPA, Trench Option and Hawthorne Option, would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security, MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

The project would add Metro light rail vehicles to the Metro ROW, not high-speed trains. High speed rail passenger trains operate at speeds over 125 miles per hour with potential to carry hundreds of passengers, while the Metro light rail vehicles would operate at speeds up to 45 miles per hour throughout the residential areas.

39-3 The width of the Metro ROW varies throughout the corridor and thus the distance between rail tracks and property lines varies along the corridor. All light rail and freight tracks are designed according to Metro's design criteria with appropriate clearances, which include space for maintenance. See Appendix 2-A, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings, of the Draft EIR and Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative, for more details on the placement of relocated freight and light rail tracks, including specific design clearances.

39-4 Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. Every aspect of the project has been and would continue to be designed to address potential risks and ensure that construction and operation are conducted safely. To clarify, the proposed light rail would be at-grade adjacent to Ruxton Ridge. There is no trench in this area for all alignments studied.

The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11 Utilities and Service System, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, these clarifications do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that impacts related to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

39-5 Impacts associated with soil stability are addressed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information. The project would incorporate Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, which ensures that the project complies with Metro's Geotechnical Design Standards as outlined in the Metro Rail Design Criteria. These standards require thorough geotechnical investigations to assess and address risks such as settlement, slope, instability, and lateral deformations, as well as detailed stability analyses of retaining walls and embankments and incorporation of reinforce or other design features as necessary to ensure long-term stability and safety. Retaining walls would be designed with drainage features to manage groundwater and prevent water accumulation behind the walls, thereby maintaining stability during various weather events, including heavy rains.

The Draft EIR includes a detailed evaluation of potential visual changes. While it does not specially isolate retaining walls as a visual element, the analysis applies the Federal Highway Administration's methodology for evaluating visual quality, based on three criteria: vividness (the memorability of the landscape), intactness (the extent to which the landscape is free from visual intrusions), and unity (the coherence and harmony of the landscape). As described in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, the project area is already highly urbanized, with a mix of residential, industrial, and commercial land uses, as well as existing freight rail infrastructure. There are no designated scenic vistas or notable natural landscapes within the project's vicinity. Because the existing visual quality is already rated low under all three criteria, permanent visual changes introduced by the project, including structural elements such as retaining walls, not degrade the visual environment and are considered neutral in effect. With respect to potential for new shading, the creation of shade on a private property, such as reduced sunlight in a private yard, is generally not considered a significant environment unless it affects public spaces or public resources such as parks, open space, or solar access. In addition, because the position of the sun changes throughout the day and year, any shading from project features would be temporary and vary in duration, rather than causing continuous loss of light. In some cases, shade may even be beneficial, particularly during hot weather. For these reasons, shading of individual properties is not considered a significant impact.

Impacts related to alterations of drainage patterns are addressed in Section 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR. Each alignment option would increase impervious surfaces but would include a low-impact development (LID) drainage system designed to retain most stormwater runoff within the project footprint. This system would meet the stormwater quality design volume requirements under the MS4 Permit established by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB), minimizing flooding on-site and off-site, including in sumps, per Project Feature PF-HWQ-6: Low Impact Development (LID) BMPs per Regional Requirements. Additional runoff from the project would continue to be collected by storm drain facilities. Elevated portions of the alignment would include down drains. Discharge locations of underdrains installed along the alignment would be the same as existing discharge locations. The retainment of the majority of stormwater runoff within the project footprint and preservation of existing discharge locations reduces the potential for erosion and sedimentation to occur on or off site. Thus, the impact of the addition of impervious

surfaces in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation would be less than significant. Regarding stormwater management for the Trench Option, Project Feature PF-HWQ-7: Trench Operation Runoff Collection and Treatment would ensure proper collection, treatment, and rerouting of excess runoff, which would prevent flooding, reduce strain on sump pumps and help maintain natural water absorption.

As detailed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, the LPA would have similar hydrology impacts to the Trench Option, with less than significant effects due to compliance with regional LID standards. For more information on LARWQCB requirements, see Section 3.10-1.2 of the Draft EIR.

39-6 Residences located along Ruxton Lane to the west of the Metro ROW are represented by Clusters E2 and E3 in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives of the Draft EIR. The multi-story building height was accounted for in the analysis and noise levels were predicted based on the third story of the building. The proposed source height (light rail tracks), receiver height (residences), and soundwall height and locations were all accounted for in the soundwall noise attenuation prediction per the Federal Transit Administration Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018). As shown on Page 3.6-52 of the Draft EIR, soundwalls are proposed along both the west and east side of the Metro ROW to mitigate light rail noise. As shown in Appendix 3.6-B of the Draft EIR, Table 4, pages 27-28, operational noise impacts to the residential buildings cited by the commenter would be less than significant with mitigation. Therefore, further mitigation is not necessary. For the Metro ROW alignments, the project would enable local cities to establish Quiet Zones with FRA, as part of Project Feature PF-NV-1: Quiet Zone Equipment Installation and Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

39-7 The project would provide an alternate mode to single-occupant vehicle travel throughout the region in an area currently unserved by the regional rail network. While a station is proposed near 182nd Street at the Redondo Beach Transit Center, this location would provide pedestrian access to nearby neighborhoods and businesses with the opportunity to arrive by local and regional buses as well. As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, Metro would not create additional vehicle parking at the Redondo Beach Transit Center.

Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

The LPA would fully grade separate light rail from all roadways, and would not increase traffic congestion nor affect emergency access. See MR-12: Emergency Access. In addition, as explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions.

39-8 See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 40 Donald Szerlip

40-1 As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA would fully grade separate light rail from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions.

Hawthorne Boulevard is a typical transportation corridor within the region with four or more traffic signals within short distances. The impacts assessments in the Draft EIR associated with the Hawthorne Option accounted for the proposed redevelopment project at the South Bay Galleria site. Metro would continue to coordinate with the South Bay Galleria as applicable in future phases of design.

Submission 41 John Schreiber

41-1 Although some residents use the Metro ROW for recreational activities, this use is not authorized or compliant with freight safety standards. Pedestrian safety is addressed in Section 3.1, Transportation, and Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. The LPA, Trench Options, and Hawthorne Option light rail guideways would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists.

As discussed in Section 3.2, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, the project would replace or repair existing security fencing and add soundwalls in some locations, which would limit unauthorized access into the Metro ROW to ensure safety near operating rail. This does not constitute physically dividing a community because residents would still be able to cross the Metro ROW at all existing designated rail crossings located at Inglewood Avenue, Manhattan Beach Boulevard, 159th, 160th, 161st, 162nd, 170th, and 182nd Streets. Land uses would not be altered so as to isolate any one part of the community from the other. The alignments evaluated along the Metro ROW alignments would result in less than significant impacts related to physical division of communities.

41-2 Under CEQA, the analysis of aesthetic impacts focuses on changes to views from publicly accessible locations. As the project is located in an urbanized area, the analysis in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, evaluates whether the project would conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality. This analysis considers visual character and scenic quality impacts from public vantage points but does not extend to private views or views from within residences. The detailed analysis, set forth on pages 3.3-55 through 3.3-114 of the Draft EIR, including visual simulations, concludes that none of the alignment options would conflict with applicable policies or regulations governing scenic quality. Therefore, this impact was determined to be less than

significant. As also described in the Draft EIR, there are no protected views within the resource study area. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 42 John Schreiber

42-1 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. The project does not involve an increase in freight train traffic, nor does it alter existing freight operations, speeds, or loading patterns. Freight trains would continue to operate under existing regulatory safety requirements, including those imposed by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). In addition, the design of the light rail alignment would meet applicable standards for track separation and safety barriers, and the project would be coordinated with BNSF to ensure continued safe operations. Any design variances would be made in consultation with BNSF, CPUC, and other third parties such as utility owners, as applicable, with safety as the key priority.

42-2 The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11 Utilities and Service System, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, these clarifications do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that impacts related to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

Submission 43 Kevin Mitchell

43-1 Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

While change in community character does not constitute a significant impact under CEQA, Section 3.2, Land Use, and Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, analyzes the project's potential to physically divide communities and to affect visual quality and character. As discussed in these sections of the Draft EIR, the project would result in less than significant impacts. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

43-2 As discussed on pages 2-12 and 2-26 of the Draft EIR, freight track modifications would be necessary to implement the Metro ROW alignments. Existing freight tracks would be shifted within the Metro ROW to accommodate the light rail tracks; the distances vary depending on the location. However, the freight track modifications would not encroach into residential properties, and the project is designed to avoid displacement of residents. Additionally, the proposed freight track modifications would be completed in accordance

with applicable Federal Rail Administration regulations and Metro's stringent design criteria, ensuring the new design meets safety requirements for both freight and light rail operations. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks. Any design variances would be made in consultation with BNSF, CPUC, and other third parties such as utility owners, as applicable, with safety as the key priority. In Spring 2025, Metro conducted a survey of property boundaries. That information is reflected in the Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative. Metro would continue with property owners as design progresses.

43-3 The potential for noise impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. As described in those sections, construction of each alignment option, including the LPA, would result in temporary noise levels that may exceed the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) construction impact criteria at some locations, despite the implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan. The EIR concludes that this impact would be significant and unavoidable, consistent with CEQA's requirement to disclose residential impacts that cannot be fully mitigated. Regarding operational noise impacts, the Draft EIR identifies that the combined noise from freight and light rail operations under the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in significant and unavoidable impacts at 170th Street due to the need for audible warning devices and the gap in the soundwall necessary to maintain vehicle access. In contrast, during operation the Trench Option, Hawthorne Option, and LPA would have less than significant noise impacts after mitigation. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would grade separate the light rail from all roadways, eliminating the need for light rail crossing bells and gates. As described in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR and Section 4.21, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, the operational noise impacts of the LPA would be comparable to those of the Trench Option and would be less than significant with mitigation. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives for additional information regarding the identification of the LPA, and MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures for more information.

43-4 As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, the only location where the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in significant and unavoidable vibration impacts related to structural damage would occur at Grant Avenue, where pile driving would be required to construct a new freight bridge under that alignment. Mitigation Measure MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys would require contractors to document any damage resulting from construction vibration and repair it. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would avoid this significant and unavoidable impact, as they do not require relocation of the Grant Avenue bridge. During operations, the relocated freight track would not result in vibration levels that could cause structural damage. See MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks.

43-5 The commenter's opposition to Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 44 Janice Tanabe

44-1 The proposed light rail bridge would be built within Metro ROW, where there is sufficient space, and the existing freight bridge would remain unchanged. See Appendix 2-A, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings, of the Draft EIR for more details on the proposed light rail bridge and existing freight bridge located at Artesia Boulevard.

Submission 45 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 46 Yumiko Omatsu

46-1 The commenter's photos show the Metro ROW in Redondo Beach and adjacent areas. The comment is noted for the record. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 47 Yumiko Omatsu

47-1 The commenter's photos show the Metro ROW in Redondo Beach and adjacent areas. The comment is noted for the record. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 48 Yumiko Omatsu

48-1 While privacy is not considered an environmental impact under CEQA, Metro understands that this may be a concern for residents and is committed to minimizing potential intrusions where feasible. During construction, activities near residential properties, including work on the berm, would be temporary and limited to specific phases of construction. Construction contractors would adhere to standard codes of conduct to ensure professional behavior on construction sites. During operation, privacy impacts from the light rail vehicles themselves are expected to be minimal. Trains would be in motion and would not stop or slow near residential properties, greatly limiting opportunities for riders or operators to observe private activities. In addition, light rail vehicles are generally enclosed and would be elevated or grade-separated, further reducing the potential for visual intrusion. The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11 Utilities and Service System, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, these clarifications do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that impacts related to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety, MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes, and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks.

48-2 The LPA avoids shifting the freight tracks closer to Breakwater Village, which is one reason staff recommended the Hybrid Alternative as the LPA. Potential air quality impacts,

including dust and exhaust emissions, are addressed in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, and Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Potential noise and vibration impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. As required by CEQA Guidelines, the Draft EIR fully analyzes potential impacts related to noise, vibration, air quality (including dust emissions), greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and geological conditions, and where significant impacts are identified, the Draft EIR proposes mitigation measures to reduce the potential impact to the extent feasible. For example, potential noise and vibration impacts have been addressed with mitigation measures such as soundwalls, quiet zones, resilient fasteners, and ballast mats to minimize noise and vibration impacts. Potential construction air quality impacts, including dust during construction, would be controlled through best available control measures, in accordance with Metro's Green Construction Policy and South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, which would substantially reduce emissions and fugitive dust. With implementation of the mitigation measures established by the Draft EIR, construction air quality impacts of the ROW alignments and the LPA would be less than significant. Potential operational noise impacts of the LPA would also be less than significant with mitigation. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality and MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design. Potential soil stability impacts are addressed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information.

Submission 49 James Divine

49-1 The width of the Metro ROW varies throughout the corridor and thus the distances between rail tracks and property lines varies along the corridor. Light rail and freight tracks are designed according to Metro's design criteria with appropriate clearances, which includes space for maintenance. Any design variances would be made in consultation with BNSF, CPUC, and other third parties such as utility owners, as applicable, with safety as the key priority. See Appendix 2-A, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings, of the Draft EIR and Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative, for more details on the placement of relocated freight and light rail tracks, including specific design clearances.

The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11 Utilities and Service System, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, these clarifications do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that impacts related to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

49-2 See response to Comment 49-1.

Submission 50 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 51 Janice Tanabe

51-1 Pacific Crest Cemetery is included as Cluster F1 in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. As shown on page 3.6-60 of the Draft EIR, noise impacts at this sensitive land use would be less than significant with mitigation. The mitigated hourly noise level would be approximately 55.0 dBA, L_{eq}, which is comparable to normal speech at a distance of 3 feet, as shown in Figure 3.6-1. Additionally, noise levels at Pacific Crest Cemetery would be similar to those currently generated by existing local roadways bordering the cemetery, such as Inglewood Avenue, 182nd Street, and Grant Avenue. Metro has incorporated Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls and MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs to reduce noise impacts to less than significant with mitigation, allowing for a respectful atmosphere for mourners and cemetery activities.

According to FTA Guidance, ground-borne vibration is primarily a concern within buildings, where structural elements can amplify perceptual motion. Train-generated vibration may occasionally be perceptible outdoors, but it is very rare for it to cause annoyance complaints in outdoor areas. For this reason, vibration annoyance impacts are typically not assessed for outdoor areas such as cemeteries and parks. In this case, Pacific Crest Cemetery does not include occupied structures where vibration levels would be evaluated under FTA threshold. Potential noise impacts to the cemetery and associated mitigation measures are addressed in Section 3.6-4.1.2 of the Draft EIR.

Submission 52 Eddie Jira

52-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 53 Martha Edmundson

53-1 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security. As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the entire light rail guideway would be enclosed by physical barriers, such as fencing, soundwalls, or a combination of both, to prevent unauthorized access. In addition, CEQA does not require an analysis of safety in terms of crime, as it is not an environmental issue, and therefore the Draft EIR does not make any conclusions regarding this topic.

Submission 54 Molly Jameson

54-1 The commenter's support for the project and the Trench Option specifically is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Traffic safety is assessed in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 55 Paige Kaluderovic

55-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project, including construction activities. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

55-2 Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 56 Valerie Lee

56-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project. While change in community character does not constitute a significant impact under CEQA, Section 3.2, Land Use, and Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, assess the project's potential to physically divide communities and to affect visual quality and character. As discussed in these sections of the Draft EIR, the project would result in less than significant impacts. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character and MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service.

Submission 57 Bob Wolfe

57-1 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

57-2 See response to Comment 57-1 regarding selection of the LPA. The LPA would include a light rail station at the Redondo Beach Transit Center to allow for convenient bus/rail connections. As described in Section 2.3-1.1 of the Draft EIR, the project would include a multi-use recreational path that would provide direct access to the light rail station via Grant Avenue and 182nd Street. Bicycle parking would be provided at all stations. If the Hawthorne Option is selected for implementation, Metro would continue to coordinate with the South Bay Galleria on station access in future phases of design. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

57-3 See response to Comment 57-1. The LPA would include a light rail station at the Redondo Beach Transit Center.

57-4 The project would provide direct connection to the LAX Automated People Mover via the K Line.

57-5 See response to Comment 57-2.

57-6 Providing a signalized crossing reduces the walking distance for the many travelers who would be traveling to and from the south of the station. This is also supported by the analysis of vehicle-pedestrian collisions along the corridor, as shown in detailed Figure 3.1-

14 in the Draft EIR. Without a signalized crossing at the south end of the station, transit passengers approaching the station from the south (from around 177th Street) would be more likely to attempt to unsafely cross Hawthorne Boulevard because of the long distance to signalized crossings at Artesia Boulevard.

In the segment of Hawthorne between approximately 162nd Street and Redondo Artesia Boulevard (which has more crossings), there were far fewer collisions total than in a comparable distance from Artesia Boulevard south to 182nd Street (which has fewer crossings). The project seeks to reduce the risk of unsafe crossing behavior by providing safe crossing locations as close to the station as possible.

57-7 Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, describes that transit bus routes would likely continue to provide a direct connection between the proposed station and the Redondo Beach Transit Center; a transit passenger would not need to transfer through the Galleria between the two stops. During future design phases, further coordination with the South Bay Galleria would occur.

Submission 58 Lori Zaremski

58-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 59 Fred Montalto

59-1 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 60 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Public Agencies

Submission 61 Janice Tanabe

61-1 See response to Comment 45-3.

Submission 62 William and Mary Hall

62-1 The width of the Metro ROW varies throughout the corridor and thus the distances between rail tracks and property lines varies along the corridor. All light rail and freight tracks are designed according to Metro's design criteria with appropriate clearances, which includes space for maintenance. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and Appendix 2-A, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings, of the Draft EIR and Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative, for more details on the placement of relocated freight and light rail tracks, including specific design clearances.

62-2 See response to Comment 62-1. Metro's design standards account for any maintenance needed.

62-3 Refer to response to Comment 62-1.

Submission 63 Bob Cutler

63-1 Metro has received and reviewed the article accompanying this submission. The commenter's opposition to the ROW alignments is noted for the record. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board.

The concerns expressed regarding Breakwater Village, referenced in the article, are addressed in the Draft EIR. The Breakwater Village Apartments are represented as Clusters E2 and E3 in the noise analysis set forth in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. As shown in Figure 3.6-22 (Elevated/At-Grade Alignment) and Figure 3.6-26 (Trench Option), operational noise impacts at Breakwater Village would be mitigated to less than significant with mitigation. Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls and MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs would reduce operational noise at light rail crossovers. Predicted noise levels for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Trench Option are provided on pages 3.6-60 and 3.6-73 of the Draft EIR for Clusters E2 and E3).

Construction noise contours for Breakwater Village are shown on page 3.6-37 of the Draft EIR. Metro would implement Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan to reduce construction noise and limit disturbance of sensitive receptors. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would not require the reconstruction of the Grant Avenue freight bridge, a major source of construction vibration.

Potential vibration impacts from operation analyzed in the Draft EIR. For the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, vibration impacts are discussed on page 3.6-24. For the Trench Option, vibration impacts are discussed on pages 3.6-95 and 3.6-96 of the Draft EIR. The vibration impacts of the LPA are discussed on pages 4-43 to 4-44 of the Draft EIR and pages 4-88 through 4-118 of the Final EIR. Operational vibration impacts of each alignment option, including the LPA, would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation.

With respect to air quality and dust, Project Features PF-AQ-1: Use of Tier 4 Engines and PF-AQ-2: Best Practices for Dust Control would minimize the potential for significant construction air quality impacts. As detailed in Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR, the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Trench Option would have less than significant air quality impacts related to localized dust emissions during construction (although the Trench Option would have a significant and unavoidable construction air quality impact with respect to NOx). Construction of the LPA would result in less than significant air quality impacts, including impacts related to localized dust emissions.

The LPA avoids the need to relocate the existing freight tracks closer to Breakwater Village. This benefit is one of the reasons staff recommended the Hybrid Alternative as the LPA.

Submission 64 Mindy Fang

64-1 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 65 Ray Hollar

65-1 The alignment transitions from an elevated guideway at the Redondo Beach (Marine) Station to an at-grade configuration to provide sufficient clearance from existing overhead high voltage transmission lines located south of the station. The change in elevation follows Metro design standards, which account for passenger comfort.

Submission 66 Jan, Thomas and Amanda Kurth

66-1 The width of the Metro ROW varies throughout the corridor and thus the distances between rail tracks and property lines varies along the corridor. Light rail and freight tracks are designed according to Metro's design criteria with appropriate clearances, which includes space for maintenance. Any design variances would be made in consultation with BNSF, CPUC, and other third parties such as utility owners, as applicable, with safety as the key priority. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and Appendix 2-A, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings, of the Draft EIR and Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative of the Final EIR, for more details on the placement of relocated freight and light rail tracks, including specific design clearances.

66-2 See response to Comment 66-1. Metro's design standards account for any maintenance needed.

66-3 See response to Comment 66-1.

Submission 67 Jose Dennis Alabaso

67-1 The comment does not pertain to the Draft EIR or the potential environmental impacts of the project. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR includes construction duration information for the LPA. Metro has published refined cost estimates, concurrent with the Final EIR.

Submission 68 Jan Kurth

68-1 The commenter's preference for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The width of the Metro ROW varies throughout the corridor and thus the distances between rail tracks and property lines varies along the corridor. All light rail and freight tracks are designed according to Metro's design criteria with appropriate clearances, which includes space for maintenance. See Appendix 2-A, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings, of the Draft EIR and Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative, for more details on the placement of relocated freight and light rail tracks, including specific design clearances.

The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11 Utilities and Service System, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the

LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, these clarifications do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that impacts related to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

68-2 See response to Comment 68-1. Metro has been and would continue to coordinate with all utility owners. A Draft EIR is not required or intended to provide precise utility mapping for design purposes. However, the cross-sections in the Draft EIR provide sufficient information to identify the location and general configuration of utilities within the ROW for the purposes of environmental analysis. It is important to note that some utility information, including detailed locations and specifications, is not publicly disclosed due to confidentiality and security considerations. However, the level of detail provided in the Draft EIR allows for adequate evaluation of potential environmental impacts associated with pipeline relocation, including temporary construction-related emissions, disruptions to roadway circulation, and possible service interruptions. These impacts were analyzed conservatively to account for uncertainties inherent in conceptual design.

68-3 Section 3.11-3.6 on page 3.11-18 of the Draft EIR accurately states, "There are numerous privately-owned oil pipelines located within the Resource Study Area (RSA). Owners of the oil pipelines are Crimson Pipeline, Chevron, Shell, and Plains All American. There are no publicly owned oil pipeline utility infrastructures in the RSA." Page 3.9-16 of Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR, also states that "Oil and gas pipelines including a 10-inch Shell crude oil, 8-inch ExxonMobil jet fuel, and 20-inch Chevron gas lines run within the Metro ROW." This sentence has been added to Section 3.11-3.6 of Chapter 3, Design Refinements, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR. This revision does not change the meaning or conclusions of the Draft EIR.

68-4 See response to Comment 68-3.

68-5 An RSA is the specific geographic area in which impacts on a particular resource could occur and are therefore analyzed. Since each resource may have different geographic considerations, separate RSAs are identified for each resource type. Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR, defines the RSA as the project footprint, as it is the area needed to construct, operate, and maintain the project; this RSA includes the entire Metro ROW.

Section 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR includes multiple RSAs to account for the different types of utilities involved. These RSAs are based on the utility providers' service areas.

68-6 The commenter's photos show the Metro ROW with various petroleum pipeline warning signs. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

68-7 See response to Comment 68-1. The terms “several,” “numerous,” and “including” are used in the Draft EIR to reflect the data available during the environmental analysis phase, which is based on ACE drawings and coordination with utility providers. As required by Project Feature PF-US-1: Utility identification and Coordination, the construction contractor would confirm the precise locations of all utilities, including petroleum pipelines, prior to construction activities. This process includes coordination with utility owners and the use of field verification methods, such as potholing, to ensure comprehensive identification of all utilities. These measures provide confidence that any potential conflicts with utilities would be addressed before construction begins. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety for additional information.

68-8 See response to Comment 68-1.

Submission 70 Kevin Mitchell

70-1 Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

While change in community character does not constitute a significant impact under CEQA, Section 3.2, Land Use, and Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, analyzes the project’s potential to physically divide communities and to affect visual quality and character. As discussed in these sections of the Draft EIR, the project would result in less than significant impacts. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

70-2 The comment is noted for the record. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

70-3 As discussed on pages 2-12 and 2-26 of the Draft EIR, freight track modifications would be necessary to implement the Metro ROW alignments. Existing freight tracks would be shifted within the Metro ROW to accommodate the light rail tracks; the distances vary depending on the location. However, the freight track modifications would not encroach into residential properties, and the project is designed to avoid displacement of residents. Additionally, the proposed freight track modifications would be completed in accordance with applicable Federal Railroad Administration regulations and Metro’s stringent design criteria, ensuring the new design meets modern safety requirements for both freight and light rail operations. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks. In Spring of 2025, Metro conducted a survey of property boundaries. That information is reflected in the Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative. Metro would continue with property owners as design progresses.

70-4 The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11 Utilities and Service System, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, these clarifications do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that impacts related to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

70-5 The comment copies the oil and gas pipeline analysis from the Draft EIR. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

70-6 Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. Every aspect of the project has been and would continue to be designed to address potential risks and ensure that construction and operation are conducted safely. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety, MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety, and MR-13 Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

70-7 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to Comment 70-1.

Submission 71 Bob Cutler

71-1 Submission 63 includes the same comments from the same commenter. See response to Comment 63-1.

Submission 72 S Martin

72-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The comment does not raise any significant environmental issues or specific concerns related to the EIR analysis. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 73 Irene Evans

73-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 74 Todd Bassman

74-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, includes ridership estimates for each alignment option. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 75 Yumiko Omatsu

75-1 Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. Before making a final determination on the project, the Metro Board will review the comments and responses included in the Final EIR and will consider multiple factors, including environmental impacts, benefits and costs.

75-2 Potential noise and vibration impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds; MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design, and MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety. While privacy is not considered an environmental impact under CEQA, Metro understands that this may be a concern for residents and is committed to minimizing potential intrusions where feasible. During construction, activities near residential properties, including work on the berm, would be temporary and limited to specific phases of construction. Construction contractors would adhere to standard codes of conduct to ensure professional behavior on construction sites. During operation, privacy impacts from the light rail vehicles themselves are expected to be minimal. Trains would be in motion and would not stop or slow near residential properties, greatly limiting opportunities for riders or operators to observe private activities. In addition, light rail vehicles are generally enclosed and would be elevated or grade-separated, further reducing the potential for visual intrusion.

75-3 See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 76 Yumiko Omatsu

76-1 Submission 76 includes the same comments from the same commenter. See responses to Submission 75.

Submission 77 Courtney Allen

77-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character and MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 78 David Clasby

78-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

78-2 Metro has designed the project to avoid displacement of residents. See the 2023 Real Estate Acquisition Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, and the 2025 Real Estate Acquisition Report, published concurrently with this Final EIR for more detailed information on proposed property acquisitions. Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

78-3 Metro owns the ROW, which is an existing railroad corridor, and its use is not subject to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency jurisdiction. As discussed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls requires soundwalls and other source-based measure to reduce operational noise impacts to less than significant levels with mitigation for the LPA, the Trench Option and Hawthorne Option. No additional mitigation measure would be required for those alignments. Although the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in a significant and unavoidable operational noise impact, retrofitting residences with sound-insulating windows is not considered a feasible mitigation measure. Such an approach would require property-by-property assessments, extensive coordination with property owners, significant costs, yet would still yield inconsistent and uncertain results. Metro cannot compel property owners or tenants to participate in a retrofit program, limiting its ability to ensure the measure's effectiveness. Additionally, window insulation is ineffective when windows are open, and requiring residents to keep windows closed could interfere with ventilation, comfort, and personal preference, further undermining the measure's reliability. Even with windows shut, insulation may still fail to achieve adequate noise reduction if other building components, such as unsealed doors, walls, or structural gaps, allow noise to enter. These factors make residential retrofitting an unreliable and impractical mitigation strategy. Under CEQA, mitigation measures that cannot be successfully implemented within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors, are not considered feasible. This is the case with a window retrofitting program.

Submission 79 Diane Smith

79-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. Metro is responsible for installing soundwalls for the project as required by Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls. As required by Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls would be installed where noise levels are predicted to exceed the Federal Transit Administration noise impact criteria.

Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. To

address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

79-2 The project does not propose to reduce any through traffic lanes on Hawthorne Boulevard. Some adjustments to left and right turn pockets are necessary to accommodate the project footprint without further widening and causing secondary impacts to the street width that would otherwise affect neighboring homes and businesses. As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA light rail guideway is fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions.

Submission 80 Isobel Dozier

80-1 The commenter's support for an elevated/at-grade configuration of the project in the Metro ROW is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

80-2 Light rail has different operating requirements than freight, such as different vehicle types and power systems. Other transit vehicle technologies capable of sharing tracks with the existing freight were studied prior to the Draft EIR, and eliminated for multiple reasons. See the 2023 Alternatives Considered and Eliminated Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for more details.

Regarding rebuilding the ex-Santa Fe Railway track, it is not within the scope of the project. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Metro ROW alignments include a multi-use recreational path between Grant Avenue and 182nd Street on the east side of the light rail tracks.

Submission 81 Leslie Higginns

81-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Potential air quality impacts are addressed in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, including dust control during construction. Compliance with Project Features PF-AQ-1: Tier 4 Engine Standards and PF-AQ-2: Dust Control Best Practices would ensure that

construction activities comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District and Metro standards controlling emissions and dust. Operationally, the light rail vehicles would be powered by electricity and would not produce localized emissions. Regional air quality would improve with implementation of the project due to a shift from passenger vehicles to light rail in the corridor.

Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, addresses potential transportation impacts. As detailed by Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan, access would be maintained and disruptions reduced during construction. As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA is fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions.

Submission 82 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Public Agencies

Submission 83 Steven Boll

83-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The potential for noise and vibration impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. The Metro ROW alignments would include upgrades to existing freight crossings, allowing for the establishment of a Federal Railroad Administration quiet zone. This would eliminate routine freight train horn noise along the Metro ROW in the area. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. As described in Section 3.6, implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys through MM-VIB-6: Ballast Mats would reduce operational vibration impacts for the Metro ROW alignments to less than significant with mitigation.

83-2 Metro has designed the project to avoid displacement of residents. Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

Potential impacts associated with construction noise and vibration are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The project includes extensive mitigation measures to minimize effects. See response to Comment 83-1, MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Threshold; and MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design.

Construction debris and waste materials would be properly transported and disposed of in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations, as described in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR.

As discussed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, the project design process would include thorough site geotechnical investigations to ensure the stability of nearby structures. Per Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, site-specific geotechnical investigations would be conducted to address foundation and structural safety. The investigation would include engineering and construction recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged.

83-3 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 84 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Public Agencies

Submission 85 Vickie Vega

85-1 Metro has designed the project to avoid displacement of residents. See the 2023 Real Estate Acquisition Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, and the 2025 Real Estate Acquisition Report, published concurrently with this Final EIR for more detailed information on proposed property acquisitions. The width of the Metro ROW varies throughout the corridor and thus the distances between rail tracks and property lines varies along the corridor. All light rail and freight tracks are designed according to Metro's design criteria with appropriate clearances, which includes space for maintenance. See Appendix 2-A, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings, of the Draft EIR and Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative, for more details on the placement of relocated freight and light rail tracks, including specific design clearances.

85-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

85-3 As a point of clarification, while it is accurate that portions of the freight track in the City Torrance primarily pass through commercial and industrial areas, there are also residential properties adjacent to the existing freight track in the City of Torrance, primarily between 182nd and 190th Streets.

The Draft EIR fully assesses potential construction and operational impacts, including noise, air quality, and vibration, for all alignment options. These analyses are set forth in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, and Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan and MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls would be implemented to minimize noise and vibration impacts for sensitive receptors, including residents adjacent to Metro ROW. Project Feature PF-AQ-2: Dust Control Best Practices would ensure construction complies with best available control technology to control emissions and dust during construction. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

The LPA and Trench Option would significantly reduce operational noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because they eliminate the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option, avoid the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. As described in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR and Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, the operational noise impacts of the LPA would be comparable to those of the Trench Option and would be less than significant with mitigation.

The frequency of freight operations on the Metro ROW is determined by BNSF, subject to existing agreements and applicable regulatory constraints. Metro does not control the freight train schedule or operations but coordinates with BNSF to ensure continued safe and efficient use of the Metro ROW. The Draft EIR's analysis of freight train operations is based on existing operating patterns, developed in consultation with BNSF and based on observed conditions. While BNSF has the right to operate within the Metro ROW, any substantial increase in freight traffic would require major infrastructure modifications, scheduling adjustments, and regulatory approvals (e.g., from the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and the California Public Utilities Code (CPUC)) that are not reasonably foreseeable at this time. The project would replace freight tracks as needed, in kind, with newer tracks, but it would not increase track capacity. The demand for freight movement along this corridor has remained stable for years, and no changes to freight operation are anticipated.

Under the Metro ROW alignments, the project would upgrade existing freight crossings to be "quiet zone" ready (see Project Feature PF-NV-1: Quiet Zone Equipment Installation). Pursuant to Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment, Metro would assist the local cities to establish a quiet zone from north of Inglewood Avenue to south of 182nd Street. The establishment of a Quiet zone would reduce overall freight train noise levels compared to existing conditions by eliminating the need for train horns, which produce noise levels of up to 110 dBA (a-weighted decibel). See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

85-4 The commenter is correct; the Metro Board of Directors is the decision-making body for the project. The Metro Board will consider certifying the Final EIR and approving the project in 2025 with consideration of all public comments and feedback received from public engagement throughout the environmental review process.

85-5 Appendix 2-A of the Draft EIR includes cross-sections showing the general location and configuration of utilities, including petroleum pipelines, within the Metro ROW. These cross-sections provide sufficient detail for environmental analysis, but are not intended to provide exact locations, depths, or specifications, as such information is not typically disclosed publicly due to confidentiality and security concerns.

The specific installation date, inspection schedule, and repair history of the fuel pipelines are managed by the pipeline operator in compliance with regulations overseen by agencies such as the California State Fire Marshal and the U.S. Department of

Transportation's Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. Questions about inspection and maintenance schedules, including the date of the last inspection or repair, should be directed to the pipeline operator or the relevant regulatory agency.

As described in Section 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR, Project Feature PF-US-1: Utility Identification and Coordination requires the construction contractor to verify the locations of all utilities potentially affected by construction activities before work begins. This includes conducting field verification (e.g., potholing) and coordinating with utility providers to determine setbacks and protection or relocation measures. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety for additional information.

85-6 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

85-7 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

85-8 Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

85-9 Metro is aware of the Friendship Campus, which is currently under construction and located approximately 550 feet from the Metro ROW at its nearest point. The presence of this new school facility has been acknowledged in Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR. The presence of the Friendship Campus within a quarter-mile of the project footprint does not result in any new significant impact or substantially more severe significant impacts beyond what was identified in the Draft EIR.

Although the under-construction Friendship Campus was not specifically modeled in the Draft EIR, its location approximately 550 feet from the Metro ROW is beyond the distances used for identifying significant noise and vibration impacts. According to FTA guidance and the modeling presented in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, groundborne vibration impacts are typically limited to areas within 100 feet of the tracks, and noise-sensitive impacts to schools are based on interior noise levels, which decrease significantly with distance. During construction, activities generating high noise or vibration levels would be temporary and intermittent, and typically limited to work areas much closer to the alignment. As described in the Draft EIR, construction vibration and noise levels attenuate rapidly with distance, and at a setback of over 500 feet, the Friendship Campus would not be expected to experience levels that exceed FTA thresholds for significance. Therefore, both construction and operational noise and vibration impacts to the Friendship Campus are expected to be less than significant with mitigation. Furthermore, the project would implement Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls and MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs to reduce noise levels, and MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment, which would collectively reduce noise levels for affected sensitive receptors.

Nor would construction of any of the alignments cause a significant air quality impact to the Friendship Campus. Although the Trench Option would result in a significant and

unavoidable regional NOx impact, that impact is based on region-wide pollutant emissions and does not reflect localized pollutant concentrations at specific receptor sites. As explained in Section 3.4-4.11, of the Draft EIR, localized impacts from construction emissions, including those related to particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) and carbon monoxide (CO), would not exceed applicable South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) significance thresholds. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors at that location to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction.

In addition, as discussed in Section 3.9-4.3 of the Draft EIR, the project includes Project Features such as PF-HHM-2: Demolition Plans, PF-AQ-1: Metro Green Construction Policy Compliance, and PF-HHM-1: Handling, Storage, and Transport of Hazardous Materials and Wastes. These features are integral components of the project and reflect standard practices Metro incorporates into its construction activities. The Draft EIR concludes that the project as proposed, including Project Features PF-HHM-2: Demolition Plans, PF-AQ-1: Metro Green Construction Policy Compliance, and PF-HHM-1: Handling, Storage, and Transport of Hazardous Materials and Wastes, impacts related to hazardous materials near existing schools would be less than significant.

For these reasons, the proximity of the under-construction Friendship Campus does not change the technical conclusions or impacts determinations presented in the Draft EIR. The analyses remain valid for all sensitive receptors within the project vicinity, including this facility.

85-10 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

85-11 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 86 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 87 Janet Lindquist

87-1 Submission 12 includes the same comment from the same commenter. See response to Comment 12-1.

Submission 88 Dr. Eric Homier

88-1 Submission 36 includes the same comments from the same commenter. See responses to Submission 36.

Submission 89 Eugene Balfour

89-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

89-2 See response to Comment 89-1. The LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways.

Submission 90 Thelma Mericle

90-1 The project simulation video is intended to provide a high-level overview of the alignments studied in the Draft EIR, with buildings shown in white to represent their general location. The video is not intended to depict the full details of existing or planned structures. Metro would preserve existing trees where possible and plant new trees and landscaping, per Metro's tree replacement policy, as described in Section 3.7, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR. While new plantings cannot fully replace mature trees in the near-term, the policy aims to restore greenery in affected areas. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

With respect to ridership, the 2023 Ridership Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, projects between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings) in 2045. Metro continues to expand its transit network to provide viable alternatives to car travel and reduce traffic congestion in the region. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Metro prepared cost estimates in 2022 for all rail alignments and shared them with the Metro Board at the May 2024 Board meeting. The cost estimate for the LPA at the time was $2.23B. Metro is continuing to refine the cost estimate as design progresses, and will provide an update to the Metro Board when the Final EIR is completed; see MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 91 Gretchen Gerull

91-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Similar to the Hawthorne Option, the LPA and Trench Option would fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways.

As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion, and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA is fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions.

The potential for noise and vibration impacts is assessed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The Metro ROW alignments include upgrades to existing freight crossings, allowing for the establishment of a Federal Railroad Administration quiet zone. As discussed in Section 4.10, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, the LPA would reduce operational noise impacts to a less than significant level with mitigation, and would include quiet zone ready improvements at the existing freight crossings, which would allow for the elimination of freight horns throughout the corridor. This is also the case for the Trench Option. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Metro has designed the project to avoid displacement of residents. See the 2023 Real Estate Acquisition Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, and the 2025 Real Estate Acquisition Report, published concurrently with this Final EIR for more detailed information on proposed property acquisitions. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 92 Grace Peng, PhD

92-1 Submission 20 includes the same comments from the same commenter. See responses to Submission 20.

Submission 93 Mark Johnston

93-1 Freight trains today terminate at the Chevron El Segundo Refinery north of the project.

93-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

93-3 As discussed in Section 3-6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, the project includes Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls to reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level with mitigation. For the Metro ROW alignments, the project would enable local cities to establish Quiet Zones with Federal Rail Administration (FRA), as part of Project Feature PF-NV-1: Quiet Zone Equipment Installation and Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

93-4 When the project opens, it would operate as part of the K Line, traveling north-south between the Expo/Crenshaw Station Line and the proposed station at Torrance. It would connect to the LAX/Metro Transit Station, providing service to LAX. The C (Green) Line currently travels east/west between the LAX/Metro Transit Station and the Norwalk Station.

93-5 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 94 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Public Agencies

Submission 95 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 96 Yumiko Omatsu

96-1 The commenter's photos show the Metro ROW in Redondo Beach and adjacent areas. This comment and the photos are noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 97 Ashley Neff

97-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and the Trench Option, and support for the Hawthorne Option, is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

97-2 Washington Elementary School and Adams Middle School are located approximately 1,200 feet from the Metro ROW. At these distances, noise from light rail operations and construction activities would be attenuated to levels below thresholds of significance due to the dissipation of sound energy over distance and the presence of intervening structures that further buffer noise. Similarly, vibration generated by the project during both construction and operations would have dissipated at the distances where the schools are located. The resource study areas for both noise and vibration are described in Section 3.6-2.1, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The maximum area of analysis considered is approximately 500 feet. The schools are well outside of this distance. Additionally, as explained Section 3.6 in the Draft EIR, the project would implement Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls and MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs to reduce noise levels, and MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment, which would collectively reduce noise levels for affected sensitive receptors (which the foregoing schools are located beyond). It should be noted that for the ROW alignments, the Draft EIR concluded that noise impacts, including to some homes within proximity to the Metro ROW, would be significant and unavoidable, even with these mitigation measures. However, for the LPA, and the Trench Option, operational noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, analyzes the localized pollutant emissions during construction. Construction of each alignment option under consideration would not generate emissions in excess of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) localized significance thresholds. For additional details, see Section 3.4-4.3.1 of the Draft EIR and Chapter 2, Description of Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR. The localized emissions analysis presented in Table 3.4-21 of the Draft EIR evaluated sensitive receptors within 50 feet of the construction zone, which is much closer than the schools referenced in the comment. See the analyses and conclusions therein. Based on the results of the localized screening analysis, students and faculty at Washington Elementary School and Adams Middle School would not experience significant air quality impacts related to pollutant exposures. The same can be said of residents with homes adjacent to the alignment construction zone in eastern portions of Redondo Beach and in the City of Lawndale, as the localized emissions analysis utilized the most conservative and protective thresholds published by the SCAQMD.

Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. The LPA light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists. The presence of a station could also benefit

access to schools for residents and parents. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

97-3 The commenter's preference for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. As discussed in Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Impact Analyses, of the Draft EIR, alignments on the Metro ROW and on Hawthorne Boulevard could both result in significant impacts, though most could be mitigated to less than significant.

Submission 98 Mark Nelson

98-1 The existing Metro ROW is a current active railroad corridor and that land use would not change with implementation of the project. The potential for aesthetic impacts is addressed in Section 3.3, Aesthetic, of the Draft EIR. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

98-2 The Metro ROW is not recognized or protected as a visual resource by any local, regional or state policies; as described in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, there no visual resources within this area, and there are no unique views of the local mountains or coastline, and no protected views. The project would alter the visual character of the area, but would not degrade the visual character and quality.

The South Bay Cities Council of Governments 2002 Study identifies this portion of the Harbor Subdivision as an area where a pedestrian or bike trail could be implemented. As part of this project, multi-use recreational paths would be added in several parts of the corridor, which would provide safe paths for recreational users.

This project has been public knowledge for over 15 years: Metro first began studying a transit option within this corridor in 2008. Multiple studies have been published since then, with public outreach included with each phase of the study.

The South Bay Cities Council of Governments and BNSF do not have jurisdiction or property rights to convert the Metro ROW from its current use as a railroad corridor. Any study by these entities would be informational only.

For clarification, although the 2002 South Bay Cities Rail Study acknowledges the potential for alternative uses in the Metro ROW, the report clearly states that "Freight rail operations will continue on the Harbor Subdivision" (Section 4.1.2), Additionally, the study recognizes that any uses of the Metro ROW "must incorporate freight rail operations" Section 4.1.5). Metro is explicitly mentioned as studying the potential use of the corridor for transit, including the Green Line extension to LAX. Therefore, while a linear green space was one of several concepts considered in the study, it was never proposed as a definitive or standalone use for the Metro ROW. The study consistently emphasized the continued use of the Metro ROW for freight operations and acknowledged Metro's exploration of transit options along the corridor.

98-3 Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, includes both visual simulations and a detailed discussion of the changes in ground-level conditions and above-ground features. For

example, the visual simulations presented and discussed in Section 3-4.3.2 illustrate before-and-after views of areas along the Metro ROW, including changes to roadway surfaces, medians, and ground-level elements within the Metro ROW. These simulations are intended to provide a conservatively realistic portrayal of the project's visual impact from publicly accessible locations.

Specific to the Trench Option, pages 3.3-86 and page 3.3-88, discuss visible changes such as freight crossing gates, signage, safety fencing, the trench, and in some cases soundwalls. These elements would also apply to the trench segment of the LPA; see Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR.

Regarding the commenter's preference for native grass, landscaping for the project would comply with Metro's Tree Preservation Policy, which prioritizes native vegetation. Details regarding landscaping improvements would be further defined during the design phase. Also, Metro would engage communities as applicable in the design process.

98-4 Chapter 2, Project Description, Tables 2.4-1 through 2.4-3 of the Draft EIR and Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, Table 2.4-1 of the Final EIR show the durations of the various construction activities required to build the project. As shown, there is no individual construction activity that would last the full duration of the construction period. Instead, construction activities would proceed in phases and occur at different locations along the alignment, limiting the intensity of activities in any one area at a given time.

Regarding the aesthetic impacts of construction, Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR acknowledges temporary visual changes associated with construction activities, including the presence of equipment, materials, and workers. These impacts would be temporary and would cease once construction is completed. Additionally, the project includes Project Features PF-AQ-1: Metro Green Construction Policy Compliance and PF-AQ-2: SCAQMD Rule 403 Compliance, which would ensure the project implement best management practice to limit dust and particulate matter, which would minimize any potential for visible "brown clouds." Other project features and mitigation measures that would address potential construction-related nuisances include Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan and Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality. In addition, construction fencing would be installed prior to work beginning, which would assist limiting views into private homes.

Regarding the concern about workers being on a higher-grade berm than the commenter's wall, while privacy is not considered an environmental impact under CEQA, Metro understands that this may be a concern for residents, and is committed to minimizing potential intrusions where feasible. During construction, activities near residential properties, including work on the berm, would be temporary and limited to specific phases of construction. Construction contractors would adhere to standard codes of conduct to ensure professional behavior on construction sites. During operation, privacy impacts from the light rail vehicles themselves are expected to be minimal. Trains would be in motion and would not stop or slow near residential properties, greatly limiting opportunities for riders or operators to observe private activities. In addition, light

rail vehicles are generally enclosed and would be elevated or grade-separated, further reducing the potential for visual intrusion. Metro would continue to evaluate ways to minimize disruptions in accordance with applicable legal requirements and as part of the project's ongoing planning and outreach efforts.

98-5 The commenter's concerns about the length of the environmental review process are noted. Metro understands that major infrastructure projects can be complex and, at times, stressful to affected communities. Metro appreciates the time and effort that residents have put into participating in the public review process. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project. Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Impact Analyses, of the Draft EIR analyzes the impacts that would occur during construction, and identifies mitigation measures that would be required to reduce impacts. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

98-6 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 99 Akemi Pradhan

99-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and preference for the Hawthorne Option is noted. As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, Metro would implement mitigation measures such as Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls and MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs to reduce operation noise levels at adjacent residential properties to meet Federal Transit Administration thresholds for residential areas. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. The vibration analysis in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR concluded that, with implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-VIB-4: Low Impact Frogs, MM-VIB-5: Resilient Fasteners, and MM-VIB-6: Ballast Mats vibration impacts caused by the light rail and realigned freight tracks would not exceed Federal Transit Administration (FTA) thresholds for human damage or human annoyance. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Metro respects the cultural and community concerns raised in the comment. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 100 Holly Osborne

100-1 A covered trench could be built with special ventilation located approximately every 1,000 feet. More detailed studies would be needed to confirm the design for this scenario if this was directed by the Metro Board.

Submission 101 Holly Osborne

101-1 Submission 100 includes the same comment from the same commenter. See the response to Submission 100.

Submission 102 Kylee Kirby

102-1 The commenter's opposition to the project within Lawndale is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 103 Marvin E. Badawi

103-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

Submission 104 Joanna Velazco

104-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. As discussed in Section 3.2, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, the project would replace or repair existing security fencing and add soundwalls in some locations, which would limit unauthorized access into the Metro ROW to ensure safety near operating rail. However, this does not constitute physically dividing a community, because residents would still be able to cross the ROW at all existing designated rail crossings located at Inglewood Avenue, Manhattan Beach Boulevard, 159th, 160th, 161st, 162nd, 170th, and 182nd Streets. Land uses would not be altered so as to isolate any one part of the community from the other. The Metro ROW is not recognized or protected as a scenic vista by any local, regional, or state policies. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

104-2 As part of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, there are two potential at-grade rail crossings located at 170th and 182nd Streets. All other streets in the project area would have light rail movement separated from vehicular and pedestrian activity with either an elevated rail structure or a below-grade trench. As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, freight and at grade crossings would feature gates and other crossing protection, and pedestrian upgrade on both sides of the tracks and street, including a continental striped crosswalk. The LPA light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

104-3 Section 3.7, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR, discusses implementation of mitigation measures that include general protection measures to avoid and minimize impacts on

sensitive biological resources and nesting bird season restrictions, and pre-construction surveys. Potential visual impacts are addressed in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 105 Eugene Balfour

105-1 Submission 89 includes the same comments from the same commenter. See the response to Submission 89.

Submission 106 Tara

106-1 The Metro Board will consider certifying the Final EIR and approving the project in 2025 with consideration of all public comments and feedback received from public engagement throughout the environmental review process. There is not a voting process to approve the project.

106-2 See response to Comment 106-1. The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-9: Light Rail Security; MR-10: Changes to Community Character; and MR-18: Homelessness.

106-3 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The Draft EIR acknowledges that light rail projects may result in localized changes to the surrounding environment and analyzes these impacts throughout the Draft EIR, including within Section 3.3, Aesthetics, 3.4, Air Quality, and 3.6, Noise and Vibration. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 107 Tara

107-1 Submission 106 includes the same comments from the same commenter. See the response to Submission 106.

Submission 108 Aaron McCain

108-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment and the Trench Option is noted. As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, noise impacts for both the at-grade Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Trench Option would be similar after mitigation, although not identical. For the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, which includes at-grade light rail crossings at 170th and 182nd streets, soundwalls would be installed to block the line-of-sight between the train and receptors, reducing noise levels. See Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls. However, as noted on page the 3.6-50 of the Draft EIR, the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would still result in a significant and unavoidable noise impact at two receptor clusters near the at-grade crossing at 170th Street, as the noise levels would exceed Federal Transit Administration noise impact criteria, even with mitigation. In contrast, the Trench Option would locate the train below grade for the majority of its alignment, which would reduce noise impacts to less than significant with mitigation.

The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning

at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. As described in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR and Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, the operational noise impacts of the LPA would be comparable to those of the Trench Option and would be less than significant with mitigation.

108-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignments and opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

108-3 As described in Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, the Metro ROW alignments include multi-use recreational paths between 159th Street and 170th Street, between Grant Avenue and 182nd Street and between the Torrance Transit Center and Crenshaw Boulevard. Per Metro's Tree Policy, Metro would preserve existing trees, where possible, and plant new trees and landscaping.

Submission 109 Hank Ramey

109-1 The current Metro Board adopted a new operating pattern, which would provide a direct connection from Expo/Crenshaw to Torrance and Norwalk to LAX. Norwalk would be accessible from Expo/Crenshaw via transfer in the LAX area.

Submission 110 Alexandros Martinez

110-1 The current Metro Board adopted a new operating pattern, which would provide a direct connection from Expo/Crenshaw to Torrance and Norwalk to LAX. A connection between Redondo Beach and Norwalk could be made with a transfer in the LAX area.

110-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 111 Jan Kurth

111-1 Noise monitoring at locations 17, 18, and 23 were conducted in the City of Redondo Beach, as shown in Figure 3.6-7 in the Draft EIR. Noise monitoring location 23 is specifically located on the west side of the Metro ROW. These measurements were conducted in accordance with the Federal Transit Administration Transit (FTA) Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018), which permits the use of representative measurement to establish existing noise levels for areas with similar noise conditions. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds.

Sensitive receptors in Redondo Beach, including residential areas near the Metro ROW, are fully analyzed in the Draft EIR as Clusters E1 through E8 F1 through F19 and G1 through G15. Noise impacts in these areas would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation, as shown in Figure 3.6-22 and Figure 3.6-23 of the Draft EIR.

Regarding the existing freight train noise, including horn noise at at-grade crossings, the project design includes quiet-zone ready crossings. This allows freight horn noise to be

eliminated via the designation of a Federal Rail Administration (FRA) quiet zone. Project Feature PF-NV-1: Quiet Zone Equipment Installation includes the installation of this quiet-zone ready equipment, and Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment commits Metro to working with the cities to facilitate the FRA quiet zone application. Pursuant to federal regulations (49 CFR 222), if all necessary safety features are installed, the quiet zone could qualify for automatic approval. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

With regard to concerns about structural stability near Fisk Court and the project's proximity to residential properties, the relocated freight track would be properly supported along the south side of the Metro ROW, using either a retaining wall or sloped fill consistent with existing conditions. As described in Section 3.8, Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources, of the Draft EIR, pursuant to Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, engineering designs, including retaining walls and track support structures, would comply with Metro's safety and engineering standards, and final design would address stability and safety considerations. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks.

111-2 Section 3.9-4.1 of the Draft EIR evaluates the potential for the project to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. See the analysis therein, as well as MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety for additional information.

Submission 112 Mark Nelson

112-1 While Metro acknowledges Beach Cities Health District (BCHD) aim to promote community health, Metro cannot comment on BCHD's decisions or actions, as it is an independent entity. Therefore, questions regarding BCHD's decisions and priorities would best be directed to BCHD.

See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

112-2 The referenced study considers the potential for railway noise, particularly freight trains, to contribute to health effects through increased oxidative stress and cardiovascular risk. The project under consideration is a light rail transit line to be operated by Metro, not a heavy rail line operated by Metrolink or freight rail. Light rail vehicles are quieter, electrically powered trains that generate less noise compared to larger, diesel operated Metrolink trains and freight operators. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Ai Quality.

Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, evaluates noise impacts from the project in accordance with the Federal Transit Administration Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018). Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls and MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs would ensure operational noise and vibration levels remain within acceptable levels for residential areas to the maximum extent feasible.

The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade

separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells, similar to the Hawthorne Option and Trench Option. As described in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR and Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, operational noise impacts of the LPA would be less than significant with mitigation at all locations, including residential areas.

Submission 113 Angie Souza

113-1 Metro recognizes the importance of fostering community connections and social engagement, particularly for senior residents. The design of the project aims to minimize disruption to the surrounding neighborhoods during construction and operation. As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, the project would implement Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls and MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs, which would reduce operational noise to less than significant levels with mitigation for most sensitive receptors along the Metro ROW. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. As described in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, and Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, with mitigation, the operational noise impacts of the LPA would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation at all sensitive receptors, including within residential areas.

The project is intended to enhance mobility and access, including for seniors. With convenient connections to nearby transit hubs and services, the light rail extension may improve access to local destinations, providing new opportunities for social interaction and community engagement.

See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

113-2 Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

Submission 114 Jane Alfonso

114-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 115 William Daniel Mack

115-1 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro puts the highest priority on public safety and security. See MR-8 Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 116 Rosario

116-1 The Draft EIR analyzes the potential impacts of the project. A summary of potential impacts is included in Chapter ES, Executive Summary, of the Draft EIR. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Submission 117 Cheryl Williamson

117-1 The project is not within the City of Inglewood. Construction would not commence until the project is approved and funded by the Metro Board.

Submission 118 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 119 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 120 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 121 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Public Agencies

Submission 122 Kevin Mitchell

122-1 The comment suggests an alternative alignment for the Hawthorne Option. The only feasible way for the alignment to transition back to the Metro ROW is through the Volvo property. The route suggested by the commenter would not be feasible as the required track geometry would not allow for the turning radius and curvature required for safe and efficient light rail operations. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

122-2 See response to Comment 122-1.

122-3 See response to Comment 122-1.

122-4 See response to Comment 122-1.

122-5 See response to Comment 122-1.

122-6 See response to Comment 122-1.

Submission 123 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Public Agencies

Submission 124 Jan and Thomas Kurth

124-1 The property referenced in the comment was included in the vibration analysis conducted for the Draft EIR; however, it was inadvertently not clearly described in the vibration analysis in Appendix 3.6-C, due to the aerial imagery used in the analysis, which included a wide tree canopy that obscured the building. To clarify this, Figures 3.6-C17 and, 3.6-C18, and 3.6-C19 and tables 3.6-24 and 3.6-25 have been updated, as shown in Chapter 3, Correction and Revisions, of the Final EIR. These clarifications do not change the conclusions of the Draft EIR, which concluded there would be significant and unavoidable vibration annoyance impacts during construction and that implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys through MM-VIB-6: Ballast Mats would reduce operation vibration annoyance impacts to less than significant with mitigation.

Regarding the property lines depicted in the Draft EIR figures, the mapping was based on Metro's most current ROW information at the time of preparation. This information was sufficient to inform the Draft EIR's evaluation of environmental impacts. In Spring 2025, Metro conducted a survey of property boundaries, which is reflected in the Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative. If a Metro ROW alignment is approved for implementation, Metro would continue to coordinate with property owners as design progresses.

124-2 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks.

124-3 The noted residence is included in the noise analysis as part of Cluster G7, as shown on page 3.6-53 and page 3.6-67 of the Draft EIR. To mitigate noise impacts, the project would install soundwalls along both sides of the Metro ROW, as required by Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls. Additionally, Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs, requires the installation of low-impact frogs to minimize noise associated with light rail crossovers near the noted residence. Low-impact frogs work by using specialized rail components to reduce the noise and vibration caused by train wheels crossing over switches and other track components. This technology dampens the impact noise that typically occurs at crossovers. With these measures in place, noise impacts to the noted residence would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation, meaning noise levels would not exceed the Federal Transit Administration noise criteria for residential land uses. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds and response to Comment 124-1.

Submission 125 Jan and Thomas Kurth

125-1 Submission 124 includes the same comments from the same commenter. See the response to Submission 124.

Submission 126 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Public Agencies

Submission 127 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Public Agencies

Submission 128 Isabel (Douvan) Shwartz

128-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

128-2 See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

128-3 See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

128-4 See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

Submission 129 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 130 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Public Agencies

Submission 131 John Schreiber

131-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

131-2 The potential for aesthetics impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and the Trench Option are addressed in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. The potential for aesthetics impacts for the LPA are addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. None of the alignment options or alternatives would result in temporary or permanent significant aesthetic impacts.

131-3 Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR evaluates baseline conditions of the existing Metro ROW as an active railroad corridor. This includes not only the current freight train operations, but also the visual characteristics inherent to a railroad corridor, such as railroad tracks and associated infrastructure. The implementation of the project would not fundamentally change the use of the Metro ROW as a transportation corridor. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

The Draft EIR provides sufficient information to assess potential impacts related to landscaping. Project Feature PF-AES-2: Metro Design Standards further commits the project to implementing Metro's design policies, which ensure high-quality landscaping and visual appeal. Section 3.3-4.3.2 of the Draft EIR provides details concerning landscaping, as relevant, in the text and corresponding visual simulations. The project's unified design elements and landscaping would contribute positive visual enhancements, such as unform landscaping landscaped public spaces. In addition, as relevant to the City of Lawndale, the 2023 Urban Design Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, provides that the project design would focus on preserving the open space character

along Condon Avenue by retaining mature trees, where feasible, and introducing additional shade trees to enhance the corridor's visual character. CEQA does not mandate a detailed landscape and maintenance plan at the EIR stage, and such details would be determined during final design.

See response to Comment 41-2, which explains the thresholds of significance used in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR to assess aesthetics impacts. While the Draft EIR concludes that the change to visual quality is neutral due to the existing visual character of the Metro ROW and the anticipated appearance of the light rail system, Metro acknowledges that individual experiences of aesthetics may differ. However, through the implementation of Metro design policies to ensure a high quality in design, the project would be consistent with local policies regarding visual character and quality and would not result in a significant impact.

131-3 As noted on page 3.3-71 and several other locations within the Draft EIR's aesthetics analysis, Metro's Tree Policy requires a minimum tree replacement ratio of 2:1 (or 4:1 if the tree is considered a heritage tree). While it is true that young trees take time to reach the height of mature trees, Metro's policy prioritizes planting strategies that maximize the use of drought tolerant and native species, thereby enhancing the local ecosystem. Trees would also be replanted along the corridor to preserve and enhance the aesthetic character of the community.

131-4 Metro's Project Team has conducted many field reviews of the Metro ROW and surrounding community. The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 132 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Public Agencies

Submission 133 Lillian Katzenmeyer

133-1 Potential noise and vibration impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Light rail vehicles are significantly quieter than freight trains and result in far less vibration due to the weight of the vehicles. Light rail lines operate throughout Los Angeles County in close proximity to schools, parks, and residences. The presence of the light rail system does not inhibit outdoor enjoyment or activities. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

133-2 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

133-3 The project under consideration is a light rail transit line to be operated by Metro, not a heavy rail line operated by Metrolink or freight rail. Light rail vehicles are quieter, electrically powered trains that generate less noise compared to larger, diesel operated Metrolink trains and freight operators. Mitigation Measure MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys require contractors to document damage resulting from vibration impacts during construction and repair them. In addition, as discussed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, the project design process would include thorough site

geotechnical investigations to ensure the stability of nearby structures. Per Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, site-specific geotechnical investigations would be conducted to address foundation and structural safety. The investigation would include engineering and construction recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged.

Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and response to Comment 133-2.

133-4 See response to Comment 133-3. Metro acknowledges the vibration demonstrated in the linked video created by existing freight train vibration. As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, the analysis of operational vibration impacts followed the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (FTA, 2018). The vibration levels from light rail operations would be significantly lower than those generated by freight trains, due to the lighter weight. Operational vibration levels from the project would not exceed FTA thresholds.

133-5 Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR describes the anticipated construction durations.

While the total duration of construction could be up to six years, construction would occur in phases and activities would be distributed throughout the entire project area. This means construction would not occur continuously in any one location.

As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan would be implemented to control noise during construction. The Noise Control Plan would include noise reducing measures, such as noise-reducing equipment and implementing temporary barriers. The Noise Control Plan would also include noise monitoring to ensure compliance with the Federal Transit Administration's construction noise limits.

133-6 As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, Federal Transit Administration has defined vibration thresholds for human annoyance and structural damage. As shown in Table 3.6-6, the threshold for vibration annoyance is 65 vibration decibels for "frequent events." The threshold for construction vibration damage is shown in Table 3.6-5, which expresses vibration in terms of peak particle velocity inches per second. The analysis in the Draft EIR evaluates construction vibration impacts based on these established thresholds. For operational vibration impacts, vibration impacts are assessed in terms of human annoyance, as building damage thresholds are much greater than annoyance thresholds and are typically limited to construction activities which generate higher peak vibration levels than freight or light rail trains.

The commenter's interpretation of the vibration data is inaccurate. Vibration levels were elevated at the El Nido Park measurement location for both northbound and southbound trains, indicating that the observed levels were not solely attributable to variations in train weight. For both loaded and unloaded trains, the highest vibration levels typically occurred with the passage of the locomotive, which is generally the heaviest part of the train.

As described on page 3.6-28 of the Draft EIR, the FTA general assessment methodology does not require vibration measurements. Vibration measurements were primarily conducted to collect samples of vibration generated by the existing freight train pass-bys and not as a requirement to prepare the analysis. As described on page 3.6-31, where higher vibration propagation was predicted compared to the predicted vibration levels, adjustments were made to calibrate the model such that it reflected higher vibration levels in the vicinity of El Nido Park.

See response to Comment 133-3 regarding vibration mitigation and vibration effects related to annoyance and damage during operations.

The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 134 Angelica Vicente

134-1 Metro has designed the project to avoid displacement of residents. See the 2023 Real Estate Acquisition Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, and the 2025 Real Estate Acquisition Report, published concurrently with this Final EIR for more detailed information on proposed property acquisitions. The Metro ROW is wide enough to accommodate both the relocated freight and the proposed light rail. Figure 2.3-4 of the Draft EIR shows an example of where the freight track would be relocated to the west within the existing Metro ROW, along with space for a multi-use recreational path up to 20 feet wide. wide.

Figure 2.3-5 in the Draft EIR accurately represents various locations between 170th Street and Artesia Boulevard, where the Metro ROW narrows to about 75 feet. Even in the narrower section, Metro has designed the project to avoid displacement of residents. In Spring 2025, Metro conducted a survey of property boundaries. That information is reflected in the Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative.

It should be noted that economic impacts are outside CEQA's purview, which focuses on impacts to the physical environment. However, Metro is committed to serving low-income and black, indigenous, and people of color communities, who make up the majority of Metro's rail ridership. The project aims to provide improved transit access for these communities. See MR-19: Project Benefits.

134-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 135 Angelica Vicente

135-1 As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, the only location where a significant and unavoidable vibration impact related to structural damage would occur is at Grant Avenue, where the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would relocate the freight bridge, requiring the use of high-vibration equipment such as an impact pile driver. Mitigation Measure MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post- Construction Surveys would require contractors to document any damage resulting from construction vibration and repair it.

For the rest of the corridor, the potential for building damage under the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would be significantly reduced because the types of construction equipment would generate lower vibration levels. Unlike the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option, would not require reconstruction of the Grant Avenue Bridge and their vibration-related damage impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. Vibration annoyance during construction would remain significant and unavoidable for all options.

135-2 The project under consideration is a light rail transit line to be operated by Metro, not a heavy rail line operated by Metrolink or freight rail. Light rail vehicles are quieter, electrically powered trains that generate less noise compared to larger, diesel operated Metrolink trains and freight operators. Mitigation Measure MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys require contractors to document damage resulting from vibration impacts during construction and repair them. In addition, as discussed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, the project design process would include thorough site geotechnical investigations to ensure the stability of nearby structures. Per Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, site-specific geotechnical investigations would be conducted to address foundation and structural safety. The investigation would include engineering and construction recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged.

The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11 Utilities and Service System, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, these clarifications do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that impacts related to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety, MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety; and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

135-3 The impact counts provided in Table 3.6-24 of the Draft EIR are correct. As shown in Appendix 3.6-C of the Draft EIR, 23 residences west of the Metro ROW between 170th and Artesia were identified as experiencing operational vibration annoyance impacts. The commenter notes that there are 28 houses in this area; however, not all of these homes are directly adjacent to the Metro ROW or within the impact contour for ground-borne vibration.

Metro has designed the project to avoid displacement of residents. See the 2023 Real Estate Acquisition Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, and the 2025 Real Estate Acquisition Report, published concurrently with this Final EIR for more detailed information on proposed property acquisitions. for more detailed information on proposed property acquisitions.

Submission 136 Angelica Vicente

136-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

136-2 The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11 Utilities and Service System, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, these clarifications do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that impacts related to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information.

136-3 See response to Comments 136-1 and 136-2, as well as MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety.

136-4 The project would not expose any pipelines or other underground utilities, except briefly during early construction to relocate or protect in place. Such work would occur in advance of rail construction. See response to Comments 136-1 and 136-2, as well as MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety.

136-5 The light rail's adjacency to BNSF freight trains would not affect the Metro light rail train operating speed, as the light rail and BNSF freight trains would operate on separate tracks.

136-6 The commenter's photos of petroleum warning signs are noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. These pipelines are included in the Advanced Conceptual Engineering that informs analysis in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. See response to Comment 136-2 and MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety.

Submission 137 Joan Marks

137-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

137-2 See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

137-3 See response to Comment 137-2.

137-4 See response to Comment 137-2.

Submission 138 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Public Agencies

Submission 139 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 140 Jan Kurth

140-1 This comment is duplicative of Comment 111-1. See response to Comment 111-1.

140-2 The commenter's opposition to using the Metro ROW and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

140-3 See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

140-4 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks. As indicated in the article cited by the commenter, Metro appropriately suspended rail service in the area in response to the freight rail incident and provided bus bridges to ensure continued passenger service between affected stations.

140-5 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option or No Build Alternative is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 141 Lisa Francois

141-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

141-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

141-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

141-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

141-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

141-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

141-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 142 Luis Marroquin

142-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

142-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

142-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

142-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

142-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

142-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

142-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 143 Michael Kim

143-1 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

143-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option or High-Frequency Bus Alternative is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 144 Monique Negrete-Mitchell

144-1 The project incorporates commitments to ensure that dust and particulate matter emissions during construction are controlled. With respect to fugitive dust control, Project Feature PF-AQ-2: South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403 Compliance includes a suite of best management practices, such as regularly applying water to active construction areas to suppress dust, limiting vehicle speeds on unpaved surfaces to 15 mph, covering haul trucks to prevent dust from escaping during transport, and sweeping streets to prevent dust accumulation.

Regarding emissions from construction equipment, Project Feature PF-AQ-1: Metro Green Construction Policy Compliance would require that all off-road construction equipment utilize engines that meet or exceed Tier 4 emissions standards, significantly reducing particulate emissions compared to older equipment. While construction activity would be temporary, Metro recognizes the potential burden on nearby residents. For this reason, the project incorporates stringent and effective dust and emissions control measures available. The anticipated reduction in fugitive dust emissions from these practices is substantial, ranging from 36% to 91% depending on the activity, as described in Section 3.4-4.1.1 of the Draft EIR. The localized emissions analysis included in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR was conducted in accordance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thresholds and evaluated impacts to sensitive receptors (e.g., residences) within 50 feet of construction activities. That analysis determined that localized PM_{10} emissions would remain below the SCAQMD's significance thresholds. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

With respect to cumulative impacts, the Draft EIR concluded that construction of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in a less-than-significant impact related to a cumulatively considerable net increase in emissions of particulate matter.

See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

144-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option or High-Frequency Bus Alternative is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 145 Otto Asencio

145-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

145-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

145-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

145-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

145-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

145-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

145-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 146 Ray Hollar

146-1 Metro prepared cost estimates in 2022 for all rail alignments and shared them with the Metro Board at the May 2024 Board meeting. The cost estimate for the LPA at the time was $2.23B. Metro is continuing to refine the cost estimate as design progresses, and will provide an update to the Metro Board prior to a final determination on the project; see MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

146-2 See response to Comment 146-1.

146-3 See response to Comment 146-1.

Submission 147 Tatiana Gomez

147-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

147-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

147-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

147-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

147-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

147-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

147-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 148 Sam and Eloise Elder

148-1 This commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and High-Frequency Bus Alternative is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

148-2 The LAX/Metro Transit Center Station is expected to open in early 2025 and would connect to the K and C Lines directly, which would provide a connection to LAX.

148-3 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 149 Traci Fuentes

149-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The project under consideration is a light rail transit line to be operated by Metro, not a heavy rail line operated by Metrolink or freight rail. Light rail vehicles are quieter, electrically powered trains that generate less noise compared to larger, diesel operated Metrolink trains and freight operators. Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, includes a detailed and project-specific analysis of noise and vibration impacts and their potential effects on sensitive receptors, such as residences, consistent with CEQA and the Federal Transit Administration Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018). The proposed mitigation measures in the Draft EIR would mitigate potential noise impacts along the Metro ROW. In addition, the project would enable the local jurisdictions along the Metro ROW to obtain a "quiet zone" designation, which would reduce existing freight noise overall along the corridor, by eliminating freight horn soundings, which as noted previously, produces noise levels of up to 110 dBA (a-weight decibel). The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Submission 150 Angelica Vicente

150-1 The commenter incorrectly notes that the Trench Option's operational noise impact would be significant. Table ES-2 in the Executive Summary of the Draft EIR shows that the Trench Option's operational noise impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

150-2 Yes. Metro is committed to proactive communication with communities affected by construction. As part of the project's construction management, Metro would conduct outreach to notify residents and businesses of upcoming construction activities. This outreach would include advance notice of construction schedules, duration, and potential disruptions through mailers, signage, community meetings and online updates.

150-3 Soundwalls have been successfully implemented for various Metro projects and have been demonstrated to reduce noise compared to locations with no soundwalls. An example of soundwalls that have been implemented on an active Metro light rail transit line is the Metro E Line between Military Avenue and Westwood Boulevard in the City of Los Angeles. The decibel (dB) reduction is highly dependent on the locations of the source, receptor, and wall. As noted on page 3.6-100 of the Draft EIR, "soundwalls, which according to the Federal Transit Administration Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018), provide up to 12-dB of reduction for non-absorptive barriers and 15 dB for absorptive barriers".

Regarding earthquake safety, as described in Section 3.8, Geology, Soils and Paleontological Resources, of the Draft EIR, in accordance with Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, all elements of the project, including soundwalls, would be designed and constructed in accordance with Metro's geotechnical and seismic design criteria to ensure they are seismically resistant, stable, and could withstand liquefaction and its effects. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

150-4 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. The potential for noise impacts is assessed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The Metro ROW alignments include upgrades to existing freight crossings, allowing for the establishment of a Federal Railroad Administration quiet zone. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 151 Alejandra Zuniga

151-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

151-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

151-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

151-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

151-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

151-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

151-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 152 Arohi Sharma

152-1 The commenter's support for using the Metro ROW and the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

152-2 See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

152-3 See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

152-4 See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

Submission 153 Colleen Malone-Villegas

153-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Although Metro understands that some residents use the freight corridor for recreational activities, this use is not authorized and is not compliant with freight safety standards. The

Metro ROW is not a park, but rather an active freight corridor. To enhance recreational opportunities, the project would include two multi-use recreational paths and new landscaping in areas where space allows, providing safe and accessible amenities for the community. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character. In addition, the LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians.

As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, the project would not result in operational vibration that could damage structures. Mitigation Measure MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys requires contractors to document damage resulting from vibration impacts during construction, and repair them. In addition, as discussed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, the project design process would include thorough site geotechnical investigations to ensure the stability of nearby structures. Per Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, site-specific geotechnical investigations would be conducted to address foundation and structural safety. The investigation would include engineering and construction recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged.

153-2 Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, includes a detailed and project-specific analysis of noise impacts and their potential effects on sensitive receptors, such as residences, consistent with CEQA and the Federal Transit Administration Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018). As discussed on page 3.6-48 of the Draft EIR, it is unlikely for light rail noise to result in noise-induced hearing loss, but acknowledges that increased levels in noise could increase stress at affected uses. The proposed mitigation measures, including Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls, MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs, and MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment would reduce these effects.

See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Submission 154 Blake Jung

154-1 As discussed in Section 3.7, Biological Resource, of the Draft EIR, the Resource Study Area for biological resources is not located within any areas designated within Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plannings. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

154-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The Draft EIR considers and analyzes noise and vibration impacts in Section 3.6. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Submission 155 Chelsea Schreiber

155-1 The commenter's opposition to the project alignment along the Metro ROW is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

155-2 Metro extends its sympathies to the commenter for their loss. Safety along the rail corridor is a top priority. Although Metro does not have specific safety features for pets,

as described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the entire light rail guideway would be enclosed by physical barriers, such as fencing, soundwalls, or a combination of both, to prevent unauthorized access. Although these barriers are primarily intended to restrict human intrusion, they would also serve to deter or prevent land animals from entering the guideway. In many areas, the existing fencing has been breached, and would be repaired under the project, which would limit unauthorized access into the Metro ROW to ensure safety near operating rail. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. The LPA, Hawthorne Option, and Trench Option light rail guideways would all be fully grade-separated from the roadways.

155-3 See response to Comment 155-2.

155-4 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to 155-1. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 156 Chris Horsman

156-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

156-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

156-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

156-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

156-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

156-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

156-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 157 Clement Alaba

157-1 The commenter's support of the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

The commenter did not identify which business would be affected or its location relative to the project. As part of the project development process, Metro prioritized minimizing acquisitions and effects to residents and businesses. The alignment options would have minimal real estate impacts to businesses, as described in the 2025 Real Estate Acquisitions Report.

Submission 158 Clement Alaba

158-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. The proposed mitigation measures in the Draft EIR would mitigate potential noise impacts along the Metro ROW. In addition, the project would enable the local jurisdictions along the Metro ROW to obtain a "quiet zone" designation, which would reduce existing freight noise overall along the corridor, by

eliminating freight horn soundings, which as noted previously, produces noise levels of up to 110 dBA (a-weighted decibel). See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-4 Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Submission 159 David Barajas

159-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

159-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

159-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

159-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

159-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

159-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

159-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 160 DeNise

160-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

160-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

160-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

160-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

160-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

160-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

160-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 161 Glenn E. Stanfield

161-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

161-2 The commenter's opposition to the Trench and Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 162 Gianna Mitchell

162-1 Metro recognizes that individuals with increased auditory sensitivity, such as those with sensory disorders, may be particularly affected by noise, and that there are other

potentially vulnerable populations, including children, seniors, and people with disabilities.

Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, provides a detailed and project-specific analysis of noise impacts, including their potential effects on sensitive receptors like residences, consistent with CEQA and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018). Metro acknowledges that increased noise levels could contribute to stress and other health effects, as noted on page 3.6-48 of the Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR also includes several mitigation measures intended to reduce noise impacts during construction and operation of the project, including Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan to reduce noise levels generated by construction to below the FTA construction noise criteria, Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls to minimize operational noise impacts along impacted segments of the Metro ROW, Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs to reduce wheel noise and light rail crossovers, and Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment to establish a "quiet zone" along the Metro ROW from north of Inglewood Avenue to south of 182nd Street, to prevent routine sounding of freight horns. With the establishment of a quiet zone, freight train noise along the Metro ROW would be reduced overall compared to current conditions. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

It is not technically feasible to correlate project-specific noise impacts to specific health outcomes, given the complexity of factors contributing to these conditions. However, with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, noise levels associated with construction and operation of the project would be reduced. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

162-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 163 Janice Tanabe

163-1 The Draft EIR is not required to analyze destination points, but activity centers are discussed in the 2023 Project Need and Purpose Report, published alongside the Draft EIR. Riders at the Redondo Beach Transit Center would also be able to access the South Bay Galleria via a short walk or transit connection, and Metro would continue to assess opportunities for further enhancing connections as the design progresses.

Submission 164 Ana Maria Houck

164-1 Metro has designed the project to avoid displacement of residents. See the 2023 Real Estate Acquisition Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR and 2025 Real Estate Acquisition Report, published concurrently with this Final EIR, for more detailed information on proposed property acquisitions. Although not anticipated, should any changes that affect private property arise, Metro would notify property owners and

perform additional environmental analysis, as required. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses..

Submission 165 Jimmy Gow

165-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

165-2 See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

165-3 See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

165-4 See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

Submission 166 John Clifford

166-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

166-2 See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

166-3 See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

166-4 See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

Submission 167 Jose Vera

167-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

167-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

167-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 168 Kevin Mitchell

168-1 The significance threshold referenced in the comment— "substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature"—is evaluated in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. This threshold pertains to transportation safety, such as the introduction of sharp curves, dangerous intersections, or conditions that could degrade the safety of pedestrians, bicyclists, or vehicles.

The Draft EIR analyzes potential transportation safety impacts at locations such as the at-grade light rail crossings at 170th Street and 182nd Street (proposed under the "Proposed Project" in the Draft EIR). The analysis considers factors such as visibility, traffic flow, and interactions between pedestrians, vehicles, and trains. The analysis explains that the

Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would include safety improvements at at-grade light rail crossings, such as upgraded crossing gates, advanced warning signals, and physical barriers to separate different modes of travel. Based on these enhancements, the Draft EIR concludes that the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would not substantially increase transportation hazards related to geometric design features or incompatible uses (see Draft EIR, pages 3.1-51 to 3.1-53.). Thus, the Draft EIR's analyses and conclusions of potential impacts related to substantially increasing hazards due to a geometric design feature are adequate. It should also be noted that the 170th/182nd Grade-Separated Light Rail Transit Alternative has been selected as the LPA. The LPA eliminates at-grade light rail crossings entirely, but provides a trench at the 170th and 182nd Street crossings.

Although the significance threshold mentioned pertains to transportation safety, the comment also raises concerns about freight operations and pipelines within the Metro ROW. These issues are addressed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, these clarifications do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that impacts related to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information.

168-2 See response to Comment 168-1, as well as MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. Regarding the concern over changes in a "quiet neighborhood," see MR-10: Changes to Community Character and MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

168-3 See MR-12: Emergency Access. The addition of the light rail service to the existing at-grade crossing at 182nd Street would increase the frequency of the railroad crossing gate down time relative to existing conditions but would not permanently close emergency access. The homes and businesses on either side of the 182nd Street railroad crossing are accessible by alternate routes within ½ mile that are grade-separated crossings and not affected by train frequency.

The LPA light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways. There would be no change to existing emergency vehicle delays at 182nd Street.

168-4 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 169 Phillips

169-1 The potential for noise impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 170 Lisa Francois

170-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

170-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

170-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

170-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

170-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

170-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

170-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 171 Carlos Cruz-Aedo

171-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

171-2 Before making a final determination on the project, the Metro Board will review the comments and responses included in the Final EIR and will consider multiple factors, including environmental impacts, benefits and costs. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 172 Mike Kim

172-1 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

172-2 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 173 Betty Fisk

173-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

Submission 174 Anonymous

174-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. This comment does not raise any significant environmental issues requiring a response.

Submission 175 Mark Nelson

175-1 Although Metro is not subject to local zoning ordinances, pursuant to Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1: Construction Noise Control Plan, Metro would obtain a variance from the applicable local jurisdiction when nighttime work is required. Section 4-24.604 of the City of Redondo Beach Noise Ordinance specifies that the provisions cited by the comment do not apply to any activity that is preempted by state or federal law. State law preempts Metro from compliance with the local zoning ordinance (see Rapid Transit Advocates, Inc. v. Southern California Rapid Transit District (1986) 185 Cal.App.3d 996). Therefore, the standards cited by the comment do not apply.

The Draft EIR acknowledges that the operational noise impact of the light rail alignment along the Metro ROW with at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Street would result be significant and unavoidable. However, the LPA operational noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation.

See Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR; MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

175-2 See response to Comment 175-1.

175-3 See response to Comment 175-1.

Submission 176 Lena Poland

176-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-9: Light Rail Security; MR-10: Changes to Community Character; and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 177 Mike Cook

177-1 The cost estimates presented in the Draft EIR are based on conceptual-level design and reflect reasonable assumptions regarding construction, operations, and maintenance. Impacts related to drainage patterns alterations are addressed in Section 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR. The project would increase impervious surfaces compared to existing conditions. However, most of the stormwater runoff would be retained within the project footprint, through an integrated low-impact development (LID) drainage system. This system would be designed to accommodate the stormwater quality design in volume, consistent with the MS4 Permit requirements established by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB). This system would minimize the potential for flooding both on-site and off-site, including in sumps. Maintenance of

drainage infrastructure would also comply with applicable regulatory requirements to ensure long-term functionality.

As discussed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, in the Draft EIR, the hydrology and water quality impacts of the LPA would be similar to those of the Trench Option. Impacts would be less than significant because this alternative would also include stormwater retention systems consistent with regional LID requirements.

177-2 The cost estimates presented in the Draft EIR are based on conceptual-level design and reflect reasonable assumptions regarding construction, operations, and maintenance. These estimates include the proposed noise and vibration mitigation measures. Triple-pane windows were not included in the cost estimate as they are not proposed for this project. Operational noise impacts would be mitigated through the use of soundwalls, low-impact frogs, and the establishment of quiet zones.

The mitigated noise level estimates included in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, and Appendix 3.6-B, of the Draft EIR, account for the implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls, MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs, and MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment (for the Metro ROW alignments). See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

177-3 In January 2023, concurrent with the Draft EIR, Metro published a C Line (Green) Extension to Torrance Cost Estimates Summary. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

In May 2024, the Metro Board selected the Hybrid Alternative as the LPA. The LPA was not the least costly option; cost estimates presented to the Board included: Elevated/At-Grade Alignment ($1.96 billion), Trench Option ($2.84 billion), Hawthorne Option ($2.96 billion), and the LPA ($2.23 billion), as estimated in 2022. Before making a final determination on the project, the Metro Board will review the Final EIR, including all public comments and responses, and consider a range of factors including environmental impacts, cost, benefits, and community feedback.

177-4 See response to Comment 177-2.

177-5 See response to Comment 177-1.

Submission 178 Ninnette Martinez

178-1 The commenter's opposition to the project in Lawndale is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. The LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with children and other pedestrians or cyclists. In addition, the freight crossing at 182nd Street would include new

safety equipment. Although Metro had initially considered a station in the City of Lawndale, at the request of the City, that station was removed from further consideration.

178-2 Noise is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. Moreover, the LPA light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby eliminating the need for light rail warning bells at the intersection of 170th Street by grade separating the tracks there. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 179 Ninnette Martinez

179-1 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 180 Ninnette Martinez

180-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 181 Rita Hidalgo

181-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 182 Rita Hidalgo

182-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 183 Rita Hidalgo

183-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

183-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

183-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

183-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

183-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

183-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

183-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 184 Sukrit Verma

184-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Boulevard Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

184-2 See response to Comment 184-1.

Submission 185 Tammy Harrison

185-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses. Regarding health effects, see MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

185-2 The potential for noise and vibration impacts of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds; and MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design.

185-3 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 186 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 187 Alejandro

187-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

187-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

187-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

187-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

187-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

187-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

187-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 188 Anna Maria Vicente

188-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

188-2 See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

188-3 See response to Comment 188-1.

Submission 189 Betty Lam

189-1 As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, all roadway crossings along the Metro ROW would include pedestrian safety infrastructure, such as gates and warning devices for light rail and freight. The LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways. Metro would provide safety enhancements for the existing at-grade freight crossing at 170th Street. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

189-2 The Metro ROW has sufficient space for the project. Refer to Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR for more details on the alignment near 170th Street.

189-3 Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

189-4 See response to Comment 189-3. Mitigation Measure MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys requires contractors to document damage resulting from vibration impacts during construction, and repair them. In addition, as discussed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, the project design process would include thorough site geotechnical investigations to ensure the stability of nearby structures. Per Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, site-specific geotechnical investigations would be conducted to address foundation and structural safety. The investigation would include engineering and construction recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged. Operation of the project would not result in damage to properties; see MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for more information.

189-5 The comment does not raise any significant environmental issues requiring a response.

189-6 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

189-7 See response to Comment 189-1.

189-8 See response to Comment 189-6.

189-9 Lawndale High School is approximately 1/4 mile north of the project, on the opposite side of the Interstate 405; the commenter does not clarify how the high school would be affected.

189-10 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 190 Doris Hofmann

190-1 The commenter's opposition to the project in Lawndale is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

190-2 Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

190-3 Construction and operational noise and vibration levels are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

190-4 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

190-5 The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) Grant from the California State Transportation Agency Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, and 3% match contributions from local jurisdictions. Metro would continue to explore funding opportunities for the project. Metro is committed to the responsible use of public funds and to managing project costs efficiently, while continuing to pursue additional funding sources to support project delivery.

190-6 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 191 Rita Hidalgo

191-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 192 Manuel Hidalgo

192-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 193 Radka Samuel

193-1 The project would connect to the Redondo Beach Transit Center and the Torrance Transit Center, which are the cities' transit hubs that provide bus service throughout the region. Riders would also be able to access the rest of Los Angeles County on the rail network system.

193-2 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. Construction and operational noise levels are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

The following commenter made their comment in Spanish. Its response is given first in Spanish. An English translation follows.

Propuesta 194 Humberto Barrera

194-1 Se toma nota de la oposición del comentarista al proyecto. Todos los comentarios se han compartido con la Junta de Metro para su consideración. Consultar MR-1: "Selección de alternativas."

194-2 Los carriles-guías de la alternativa preferida a nivel local del tren ligero estarían completamente separados a desnivel de la red vial. Los niveles de ruidos causados por las actividades de construcción y operativas se abordan en la Sección 3.6, «Ruidos y vibraciones», en el Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental. La iluminación se trata en la Sección 3.3, "Estética", de dicho borrador. La posibilidad de impactos de la alternativa preferida a nivel local se aborda en el Capítulo 4, "Evaluación de las alternativas", también en dicho borrador.

Submission 194 Humberto Barrera

194-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

194-2 The LPA light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways. Construction and operational noise levels are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. Lighting is discussed in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 195 Daniel G.

195-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 196 Alex Medina

196-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 197 Joanna Velazco

197-1 The commenter's opposition to a Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 198 Bryan Henry

198-1 The commenter's opposition to a Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

198-2 As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA is fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions.

198-3 See response to Comment 198-1.

Submission 199 Alberto Maldonado

199-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. The project would add new safety fencing or other barriers, such as soundwalls. Construction and operational noise levels are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

199-2 The LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways. All existing roadway crossings would be maintained so that the community would not be physically divided. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 200 Megan N. Jorge

200-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 201 Chris Horsman

201-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 202 William Kolinsky

202-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 203 Anonymous

203-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Additional stations were proposed in Lawndale as part of the 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis, but at the request of Lawndale were removed from consideration. Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, and Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, evaluates potential noise impacts of the project, options, and alternatives, and recommend Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan to reduce noise levels. The operational impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

Submission 204 Jose Valenzuela

204-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 205 Jounnna Sanchez

205-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 206 Michael Stary

206-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

206-2 The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) Grant from the California State Transportation Agency Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, and 3% match contributions from local jurisdictions. Metro is committed to the responsible use of public funds and to managing

project costs efficiently, while continuing to pursue additional funding sources to support project delivery.

Submission 207 Lily Navarro

207-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 208 Betty Lam

208-1 As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, all roadway crossings along the Metro ROW would include pedestrian safety infrastructure, such as gates and warning devices for light rail and freight. The LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways. Metro would provide safety enhancements for the existing at-grade freight crossing at 170th Street. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

208-2 The Metro ROW has sufficient space for the project. Refer to Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR for more details on the alignment near 170th Street.

208-3 Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

208-4 See response to Comment 208-1.

208-5 The comment does not raise any significant environmental issues requiring a response.

208-6 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

208-7 See response to Comment 208-1.

208-8 See response to Comment 208-6.

208-9 Lawndale High School is approximately 1/4 mile north of the project, across on the opposite side of the Interstate 405; the commenter does not clarify how the high school would be affected.

208-10 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 209 Blake Jung

209-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

209-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

209-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

209-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

209-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

209-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

209-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

209-8 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 210 Carlos Gomez

210-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, analyzes impacts related to air quality. The light rail would be powered by electricity and would not generate tailpipe emissions. The commenter makes the general reference to "disruption" as a reason for opposing using the Metro ROW for the project, but does not clarify if it refers to noise, traffic, or any other topic. The Draft EIR fully evaluates potential impacts related to transportation, noise, and air pollution and proposes mitigation measures, where necessary, to reduce potentially significant impacts to the extent feasible. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds; and MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service for more information.

Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 211 Carmen Reyes

211-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

211-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

211-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

211-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

211-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

211-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

211-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 212 Clement Alaba

212-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

To minimize noise impacts, Metro has committed to implementing all reasonable and feasible mitigation measures. With these measures in place, operational noise impacts of the Trench Option, Hawthorne Option, and the LPA would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation. This means the anticipated change in noise levels would remain within acceptable thresholds established by the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA).

Submission 213 David Barajas

213-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

213-2 Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

213-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

213-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

213-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

213-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

213-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

213-8 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 214 Doug Boswell

214-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Project effects related to air quality, noise, and soil stability are addressed in Sections 3.6, 3.4, and 3.8, respectively, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety; and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

Submission 215 Jacqueline Caro

215-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

215-2 Soundwalls would be implemented to mitigate noise generated by the light rail and, to some extent, noise generated by the freight trains as required by Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls. However, two primary sources of freight train noise – diesel engines and the horn – are less effectively mitigated by soundwalls due to the height of the engines and horn as well as the decibel level of the horn.

The project includes Project Feature PF-NV-1: Quiet Zone Equipment Installation, which provides that the project would include the upgrades to at-grade freight crossing necessary to allow for a quiet zone to be established. In addition, pursuant to Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment, Metro would support the local cities in applying for the quiet zone establishment made possible by the project's upgrades to the existing freight crossings. Establishing a quiet zone would reduce freight noise overall along the Metro ROW by eliminating one of the primary sources of noise from freight trains, the horn, which produces a noise level of 110 dBA (a-weighted decibel). See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

215-3 The commenter's support for the High-Frequency Bus Alternative is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

215-4 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

215-5 Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, includes a detailed evaluation of the potential for visibility obstructions, starting on page 3.1-48. Based on the evaluation, the potential for significant impacts related to hazards associated with geometric design features, including those related to visibility obstructions would be less than significant.

As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA light rail guideway is fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

215-6 Cut-through traffic would not occur from vehicles avoiding the train, as the Hawthorne Option would be elevated and fully grade-separated from vehicles.

215-7 The light rail guideway includes walkways for maintenance. Traffic lanes would not need to be shut down during operation of the Hawthorne Option.

215-8 Cost for utility relocation of both public and private utilities was included in the total cost published in the 2023 Cost Estimates Summary for all alternatives and options. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 216 Jimmy Gow

216-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

216-2 See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

216-3 See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

216-4 See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

Submission 217 Jonathon Chue

217-1 The commenter's support of the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

217-2 See response to Comment 217-1.

217-3 Metro would continue to coordinate with the South Bay Galleria in future phases of design regarding pedestrian connections.

217-4 The LPA includes a station at the Redondo Beach Transit Center. Before making a final determination on the project, the Metro Board will review the comments and responses included in the Final EIR and will consider multiple factors, including environmental impacts, benefits, and costs.

217-5 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 218 Wendy Mretandes

218-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

The following commenter made their comment in Spanish. Its response is given first in Spanish. An English translation follows.

Propuesta 219 Teresa Gutierrez

219-1 Se toma nota de la oposición del comentarista al proyecto. Todos los comentarios se han compartido con la Junta de Metro para su consideración. Consultar MR-1: "Selección de alternativas", MR-3: "Elementos del proyecto relacionados con el ruido de las operaciones y medidas de mitigación", MR-10: "Cambios en el carácter de la comunidad" y MR-12: "Acceso a los servicios de emergencia."

Submission 219 Teresa Gutierrez

219-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, MR-10: Changes to Community Character, and MR-12: Emergency Access.

Submission 220 Jessica L. Ray

220-1 The commenter's opposition to the project in their neighborhood is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

220-2 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

220-3 Noise is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

220-4 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 221 Juan Benitez

221-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, and Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR describes the noise impacts of the project, options, and alternatives. Operational noise impacts for all alternatives and options would be reduced to less than significant or less than significant with mitigation, except the Metro Elevated/At-Grade Alignment. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft

EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. The project would connect to the existing bus system, as well as the regional rail network, expanding access to different parts of the region. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character and MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service.

221-2 See response to Comment 221-1.

The following commenter made their comment in Spanish. Its response is given first in Spanish. An English translation follows.

Propuesta 222 Carmen M.

222-1 Se toma nota de la oposición del comentarista al proyecto. Todos los comentarios se han compartido con la Junta de Metro para su consideración. Consultar MR-1: "Selección de alternativas."

Submission 222 Carmen M.

222-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 223 Fernando

223-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

223-2 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 224 James Johnson

224-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 225 Guillermo Chavez

225-1 Noise is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Submission 226 Macario Gastelum

226-1 The comment is illegible. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

The following commenter made their comment in Spanish. Its response is given first in Spanish. An English translation follows.

Propuesta 227 Albely Cobon

227-1 Tal como se detalla en la Sección 3.6, “Ruidos y vibraciones”, en el Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental, el proyecto implementaría medidas de mitigación para minimizar los impactos del ruido. Medidas de mitigación MM-NOI-2: Muros contra sonido y MM-NOI-3: Corazones de cruzamiento de bajo impacto que reducirían el ruido operativo por debajo de los umbrales de significancia para la mayoría de los receptores vulnerables, incluidos los ubicados en zonas residenciales, tanto de día como de noche. Consultar MR-3: “Elementos del proyecto relacionados con el ruido de las operaciones y medidas de mitigación” y MR-4: “Posibles efectos negativos a la salud relacionados con el ruido, las vibraciones y la calidad del aire.”

Según la alternativa preferida a nivel local, la opción de trinchera y la opción de Hawthorne, los carriles-guías del tren ligero estarían completamente separados a desnivel de la red vial, eliminando así la necesidad de usar las alarmas a nivel en los cruces del tren ligero. Tal como se describe en el capítulo 4, “Evaluación de alternativas” en el Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental y en el capítulo 2, “Descripción de la alternativa preferida a nivel local” del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental Final, los impactos del ruido causado por las actividades operativas de la alternativa preferida a nivel local se reducirían a “insignificantes con mitigación” para todos los receptores vulnerables. Consultar MR-1: “Selección de alternativas.”

Submission 227 Albely Cobon

227-1 As detailed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, the project would implement mitigation measures to minimize noise impacts. Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls and MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs, which would reduce operational noise to below the daytime and nighttime noise thresholds of significance for most sensitive receptors, including those in residential areas. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Under the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option, the light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, eliminating the need for light rail at-grade bell crossing bells. As described in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, in the Draft EIR, and Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, operational noise impacts of the LPA would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation at all sensitive receptors. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 228 Anonymous

228-1 The commenter’s opposition to using the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 229 Juan Guzman

229-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA light rail guideway is fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions.

Submission 230 Ashley Guzman

230-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA is fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions.

The following commenter made their comment in Spanish. Its response is given first in Spanish. An English translation follows.

Propuesta 231 Arcelia Martinez

231-1 Se toma nota de la oposición del comentarista al proyecto. Tal como se explica en la página 3.1-3 del Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental, las demoras en el tráfico (frecuentemente medidas por el nivel del servicio) ya no se consideran como un criterio de impacto conforme a la Ley de Calidad Ambiental de California y, por lo tanto, este análisis y temas relacionadas no se abordan en dicho borrador. Consultar MR-11: «Demoras en el tráfico y nivel de servicio» y «Reporte detallado de transporte de 2023» publicados conjuntamente con el Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental para tratar las condiciones de tránsito. Los carriles-guías del tren ligero de la alternativa preferida a nivel local están completamente separados a desnivel de la red vial y no aumentarían las demoras de los vehículos en comparación con las condiciones existentes. El ruido se aborda en la Sección 3.6, «Ruidos y vibraciones», en el Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental. La posibilidad de impactos de la alternativa preferida a nivel local se aborda en el Capítulo 4, «Evaluación de las alternativas», también en dicho borrador. Consultar MR-1: «Selección de alternativas», MR-3: "Elementos del proyecto relacionados con el ruido de las operaciones y medidas de mitigación", MR-10: "Cambios en el carácter de la comunidad" y MR-12: "Acceso a los servicios de emergencia."

Submission 231 Arcelia Martinez

231-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation

Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA light rail guideway is fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions. Noise is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, MR-10: Changes to Community Character, and MR-12: Emergency Access.

Submission 232 Wendy Martinez

232-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 233 Adelina Rodriguez

233-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

The potential for air quality and noise impacts is addressed in Sections 3.4, Air Quality, and 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Submission 234 Frank A. Rodriguez

234-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The potential for air quality and noise impacts is addressed in Sections 3.4, Air Quality, and 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. Metro understands the importance of maintaining a quiet environment at night, and Metro is committed to minimizing the noise impacts of the project. Metro would implement Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls and MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs to reduce nighttime noise levels at sensitive receptors along the alignment. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Submission 235 Fredy Rojas

235-1 The commenter's opposition to Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

235-2 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

The following commenter made their comment in Spanish. Its response is given first in Spanish. An English translation follows.

Propuesta 236 Guadalupe Alvaro

236-1 Se toma nota de la oposición del comentarista a la alineación en el derecho de paso de Metro y su apoyo a la Opción de Hawthorne. Todos los comentarios se han compartido con la Junta de Metro para su consideración. Consultar MR-1: "Selección de alternativas."

Submission 236 Guadalupe Alvaro

236-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 237 Rose Molina

237-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 238 William Tiernan

238-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 239 Lorena Rodriguez

239-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 240 Rebeca Aquino

240-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. The potential for air quality and noise impacts is addressed in Sections 3.4, Air Quality, and 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft

EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA is fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 241 Bryan Chavez

241-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The potential for noise impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Submission 242 Dodeo Doviz

242-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The potential for noise and vibration impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of Draft EIR. The Metro ROW alignments would include upgrades to existing freight crossings, allowing for the establishment of a Federal Railroad Administration quiet zone. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

The following commenter made their comment in Spanish. Its response is given first in Spanish. An English translation follows.

Propuesta 243 Jorge Garcia N.

243-1 Se toma nota de la oposición del comentarista a la alineación en el derecho de paso de Metro y su apoyo a la Opción de Hawthorne. Consultar MR-1: "Selección de alternativas." Los posibles impactos causados por el ruido y las vibraciones se abordan en la Sección 3.6, "Ruidos y vibraciones", en el Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental. La posibilidad de impactos de la alternativa preferida a nivel local se aborda en el Capítulo 4, "Evaluación de las alternativas", también en dicho borrador. Consultar MR-3: "Elementos del proyecto relacionados con el ruido de las operaciones y medidas de mitigación" y MR-4: "Posibles efectos negativos a la salud debido al ruido, las vibraciones y la calidad del aire."

Submission 243 Jorge Garcia N.

243-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The potential for noise and vibration impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

The following commenter made their comment in Spanish. Its response is given first in Spanish. An English translation follows.

Propuesta 244 Marychuy Orendain

244-1 Se toma nota de la oposición del comentarista al proyecto. Todos los comentarios se han compartido con la Junta de Metro para su consideración. Consultar MR-1: "Selección de alternativas."

244-2 Se toma nota de la oposición del comentarista al proyecto. Consultar la Sección 3.6 "Ruidos y vibraciones", la Sección 3.9 "Peligros y materiales peligrosos" en el Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental, MR-4: "Posibles efectos negativos a la salud relacionados con el ruido, las vibraciones y la calidad del aire"; MR-9: "Seguridad del tren ligero"; y MR-10: "Cambios en el carácter de la comunidad." La posibilidad de impactos de la alternativa preferida a nivel local se aborda en el Capítulo 4, "Evaluación de las alternativas", también en dicho borrador.

Submission 244 Marychuy Orendain

244-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

244-2 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. See Sections 3.6, Noise and Vibration, and 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; MR-9: Light Rail Security; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 245 Martha Dilger

245-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 246 Annette Owens

246-1 Metro acknowledges the historical concerns raised about infrastructure projects disproportionately affecting lower-income communities. Over the years, Metro has taken meaningful steps to ensure that its projects are equitable and benefit all residents. For this project, Metro has engaged in extensive community outreach to understand and address local concerns. The project design includes numerous features to minimize disruption and maximize safety, environmental benefits, and mobility for the surrounding neighborhoods. The Draft EIR thoroughly evaluates the potential impacts raised in this comment in Section 3.2, Land Use, Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems. As discussed in Chapter 3.0, Affected Environment and Environmental Impact Analyses, of the Draft EIR,

Metro proposes mitigation measures and project features to reduce or avoid impacts from the project.

See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality, MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety, and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety for additional information.

Submission 247 Traci Fuentes

247-1 The commenter's opposition to the project in Lawndale is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The potential for noise and vibration impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

247-2 The potential for noise and vibration impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Submission 248 Iris Sosa

248-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 249 Frank Fuentes Jr.

249-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. The LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, removing the need for light rail at-grade crossing bells and gates. None of the light rail alignment options under consideration would affect traffic waiting times at the existing at-grade freight crossings. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

The potential for noise and vibration impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. The Metro ROW alignments would include upgrades to existing freight crossings, allowing for the establishment of a Federal Railroad Administration quiet zone. None of the light rail alignment options under consideration would affect traffic waiting times at the existing at-grade freight crossings. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service. Moreover, the LPA would eliminate the need for light rail warning bells at the at-grade crossings by grade separating the tracks there. Therefore, the LPA, as mitigated, would have a less than significant operational noise impact with mitigation. The Trench Option and Hawthorne Option would likewise have less than significant operational noise impacts with mitigation. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

249-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Although some residents use the Metro ROW for recreational activities, this use is not authorized or compliant with freight safety standards. The project would add multi-use recreational paths parallel to the rail tracks at several points along the alignment, which would improve the functionality of the space while ensuring public safety. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 250 Derrick Gregory

250-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 251 Humberto Barrera Jr

251-1 Metro understands the importance of maintaining an environment conducive to professional performance and focus. As detailed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, noise levels in areas near the alignment options have been carefully modeled, and where mitigation is necessary, measures have been proposed to reduce noise impacts to less than significant where feasible. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. As described in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR and Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, the operational noise impacts of the LPA would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 252 Ana Barrera

252-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

The following commenter made their comment in Spanish. Its response is given first in Spanish. An English translation follows.

Propuesta 253 Juan Almaraz

253-1 Se toma nota de la oposición del comentarista al proyecto. El ruido se aborda en la Sección 3.6, "Ruidos y vibraciones", en el Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental. La posibilidad de impactos de la alternativa preferida a nivel local se aborda en el Capítulo 4,

"Evaluación de las alternativas", también en dicho borrador. Consultar MR-1: "Selección de alternativas", MR-3: "Elementos del proyecto relacionados con el ruido de las operaciones y medidas de mitigación", MR-10: "Cambios en el carácter de la comunidad" y MR-12: "Acceso a los servicios de emergencia."

Submission 253 Juan Almaraz

253-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. Noise is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, MR-10: Changes to Community Character, and MR-12: Emergency Access.

Submission 254 Oscar Barrera

254-1 Noise is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 255 Anthony Fuentes

255-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 256 Piles J. Dilger

256-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 257 Susana Barrera

257-1 The commenter's opposition to the proposed light rail extension within the City of Redondo Beach is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

See Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, for a detailed noise analysis associated with the project. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, MR-10: Changes to Community Character, and MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service.

Submission 258 Veronica Lopez

258-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

Submission 259 Dominic Sanchez

259-1 The commenter's opposition to a Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 260 Robert A. Salone

260-1 As demonstrated in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, operation of the proposed light rail project would have a beneficial effect on air quality within the region due to a switch from passenger vehicles to light rail transit. See Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-10: Changes to Community Character; and MR-18: Homelessness. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 261 Marquise Riley

261-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. See Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR; Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 262 Judy Wells

262-1 See Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; and MR-9: Light Rail Security. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 263 Scott

263-1 Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has

prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses. Also see MR-10: Changes to Community Character and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

263-2 The potential for air quality, noise, and vibration impacts are addressed in Sections 3.4, Air Quality, and 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality, MR-9: Light Rail Security, MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 264 Elizabeth Meister

264-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

264-2 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 265 Jeremy Brown

265-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 266 Jeffrey Braude

266-1 The commenter's opposition to Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

266-2 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 267 Jennifer Lamb

267-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 268 Andrew Nunez

268-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

The following commenter made their comment in Spanish. Its response is given first in Spanish. An English translation follows.

Propuesta 269 Delfina de Leon

269-1 Se toma nota de la oposición del comentarista a la alineación en el derecho de paso de Metro. Consultar la Sección 3.6, "Ruidos y vibraciones", en el Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental y MR-10: "Cambios en el carácter de la comunidad." La posibilidad de impactos de la alternativa preferida a nivel local se aborda en el Capítulo 4, "Evaluación de las alternativas", también en dicho borrador.

Submission 269 Delfina de Leon

269-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, and MR-10: Changes to Community Character. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

The following commenter made their comment in Spanish. Its response is given first in Spanish. An English translation follows.

Propuesta 270 Rosalina Gutierrez

270-1 Se toma nota de la oposición del comentarista al proyecto. Consultar MR-1: "Selección de alternativas", MR-3: "Elementos del proyecto relacionados con el ruido de las operaciones y medidas de mitigación", MR-10: "Cambios en el carácter de la comunidad" y MR-12: "Acceso a los servicios de emergencia."

Submission 270 Rosalina Gutierrez

270-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, MR-10: Changes to Community Character, and MR-12: Emergency Access.

Submission 271 Dezarae Ibarra

271-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 272 Steven Duran

272-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

272-2 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

The following commenter made their comment in Spanish. Its response is given first in Spanish. An English translation follows.

Propuesta 273 Soledad Linares

273-1 Se toma nota de la oposición del comentarista al proyecto. Consultar la Sección 3.6 "Ruidos y vibraciones" en el Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental y MR-10: "Cambios en el carácter de la comunidad." La posibilidad de impactos de la alternativa preferida a nivel local se aborda en el Capítulo 4, "Evaluación de las alternativas", en el Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental.

Submission 273 Soledad Linares

273-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. See Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, and MR-10: Changes to Community Character. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

The following commenter made their comment in Spanish. Its response is given first in Spanish. An English translation follows.

Propuesta 274 Ma Del Rosario Almaraz

274-1 Se toma nota de la oposición del comentarista al proyecto. Consultar la Sección 3.1 "Transporte" y la Sección 3.6 "Ruidos y vibraciones" en el Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental.

Tal como se explica en la página 3.1-3 del Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental, las demoras en el tráfico (frecuentemente medidas por el nivel del servicio) ya no se consideran como un criterio de impacto conforme a la Ley de Calidad Ambiental de California y, por lo tanto, este análisis y temas relacionadas no se abordan en dicho borrador. Consultar MR-11: "Demoras en el tráfico y nivel de servicio" y "Reporte detallado de transporte de 2023" publicados conjuntamente con el Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental para tratar las condiciones de tránsito. La posibilidad de impactos de la alternativa preferida a nivel local se aborda en el Capítulo 4, "Evaluación de las alternativas", en el Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental. La alternativa preferida a nivel local está completamente separada a desnivel de la red vial y no aumentaría las demoras de los vehículos en comparación con las condiciones existentes.

Submission 274 Ma Del Rosario Almaraz

274-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. See Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR and Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration of the Draft EIR.

As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in

Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. The LPA is fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions.

Submission 275 Jennifer Lee

275-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

The LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase traffic congestion. As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions.

Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, analyzes changes in noise as a result of project implementation. With mitigation, the LPA, Trench Option and Hawthorne Option would not result in significant and unavoidable operational noise impacts. In contrast the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, would require light rail warning bells at at-grade crossings, which is identified as the source of its significant, unmitigable noise impacts. These crossings would be grade-separated under the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option, thereby avoiding the need for light rail warning bells. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses. Also see MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

275-1 CEQA does not require an analysis of safety in terms of crime, as it is not an environmental issue, and therefore the Draft EIR does not make any conclusions regarding this topic. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 276 Pedro Garcia

276-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality. The Metro ROW alignments would include upgrades to existing freight crossings, allowing for the establishment of a Federal Railroad Administration quiet zone. This would eliminate routine freight train horn noise along the Metro ROW in the area. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option, would reduce operational noise impacts to less than significant with mitigation. This is because unlike the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, these alignments would avoid need for light rail warning bells at at-grade crossings, as they would fully grade separate the light rail tracks.

The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

The following commenter made their comment in Spanish. Its response is given first in Spanish. An English translation follows.

Propuesta 277 Luz Barrera

277-1 Se toma nota de la oposición del comentarista a la alineación en el derecho de paso de Metro. Consultar MR-1: "Selección de alternativas." Los posibles impactos del ruido se abordan en la Sección 3.6, "Ruidos y vibraciones", en el Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental. Consultar MR-3: "Elementos del proyecto relacionados con el ruido de las operaciones y medidas de mitigación." Las alineaciones en el derecho paso de Metro incluirían modernizaciones de los actuales cruces del tren de carga, lo cual permitiría que la Administración Federal de Ferrocarriles establezca una zona de silencio. Esto eliminaría el ruido rutinario causado por las bocinas del tren de carga a lo largo del derecho de paso de Metro en el área. Con medidas de mitigación, la alternativa preferida a nivel local, la opción de trinchera y la opción de Hawthorne evitarían los impactos significativos e inevitables del ruido causado por las actividades operativas de una alineación elevada/a nivel ya que eliminaría la necesidad de usar alarmas de alerta en los cruces del tren ligero porque estaría completamente separado a desnivel de la red vial. La posibilidad de impactos de la alternativa preferida a nivel local se aborda en el Capítulo 4, "Evaluación de las alternativas", en el Borrador del Reporte de Impacto Ambiental.

Submission 277 Luz Barrera

277-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. The Metro ROW alignments would include upgrades to existing freight crossings, allowing for the establishment of a Federal Railroad Administration quiet zone. This would eliminate routine freight train horn noise along the Metro ROW in the area. With mitigation, the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option, would avoid the significant an unavoidable operational noise impact associated with the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, as they would eliminate the need for light rail crossing warning bells, as they would fully grade separate the light rail from roadways. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 278 Kelly Kolinske

278-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

278-2 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 279 Teresa Lopez

279-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 280 Marisa Cunanan

280-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. The Metro ROW alignments would include upgrades to existing freight crossings, allowing for the establishment of a Federal Railroad Administration quiet zone. This would eliminate routine freight train horn noise along the Metro ROW in the area. With mitigation, the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option, would avoid the significant and unavoidable operational noise impact associated with the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, as they would not require light rail crossing warning bells because they would fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 281 Ninnette Martinez

281-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety; and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 282 Isabel Fernandez

282-1 The commenter's opposition to the train is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. The Metro ROW alignments would include upgrades to existing freight crossings, allowing for the establishment of a Federal Railroad Administration quiet zone. This would eliminate routine freight train horn noise along the Metro ROW in the area. With mitigation, the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option, would avoid the significant and unavoidable operational noise impact associated with the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because they would not require light rail crossing warning bells, as they would fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 283 Darry

283-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

The following commenter made their comment in Spanish. Its response is given first in Spanish. An English translation follows.

Propuesta 284 Connie Santana

284-1 Se toma nota de la oposición del comentarista al proyecto. Consultar MR-1: "Selección de alternativas", MR-3: "Elementos del proyecto relacionados con el ruido de las operaciones y medidas de mitigación", MR-10: "Cambios en el carácter de la comunidad" y MR-12: "Acceso a los servicios de emergencia."

Submission 284 Connie Santana

284-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, MR-10: Changes to Community Character, and MR-12: Emergency Access.

Submission 285 Enrique Flores

285-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 286 Justin Huh

286-1 Metro understands the importance of maintaining a quiet environment for those who work night shifts, and Metro is committed to minimizing the noise impacts of the project. As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, Metro would implement Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls and MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs to reduce daytime and nighttime noise impacts at sensitive receptors along the alignment to less than significant levels with mitigation where feasible. In addition, the LPA and Trench Option significantly reduce noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because they eliminate the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option remove the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. As described in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR and Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, operational noise impacts of the LPA would be reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation at all sensitive receptors.

Mitigation Measure MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys requires contractors to document damage resulting from vibration impacts during construction, and repair them. In addition, as discussed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, the project design process would include thorough site geotechnical investigations to ensure the stability of nearby structures. Per Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, site-specific geotechnical investigations would be conducted to address foundation and structural safety. The investigation would include engineering and construction recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged.

See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration and Air Quality; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

286-2 The commenter's preference for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

286-3 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. For clarification, the project is not configured as a subway.

Submission 287 Brandon Crockett

287-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 288 Kevin Crockett

288-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 289 Nilo Caraan

289-1 This comment is illegible. No response can be provided.

Submission 290 Mike Margiore

290-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

290-2 Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. In addition, the LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

290-3 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 291 Alex Ochoa

291-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 292 Valeria Krocak

292-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 293 Cristian Montiel

293-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets, and thus eliminates the need for light rail crossing warning devices. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR and determines that operational noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation (including the establishment of a quiet zone). The project would enable the local jurisdictions along the Metro ROW to obtain a "quiet zone" designation, which would reduce existing freight noise overall along the corridor, by eliminating freight horn soundings, which typically produces noise levels of up to 110 dBA (a-weighted decibel). See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

293-2 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 294 Charles Ellingson

294-1 The potential for noise and vibration impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds; and MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design.

Potential air quality impacts are addressed in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, including dust control during construction. Compliance with Project Features PF-AQ-1: Tier 4 Engine Standards and PF-AQ-2: Dust Control Best Practices would ensure that construction activities comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District and Metro standards controlling emissions and dust. Operationally, the light rail vehicles would be powered by electricity and would not produce localized emissions. Regional air quality would improve with implementation of the project due to a shift from passenger vehicles to light rail in the corridor.

Although some residents use the Metro ROW for recreational activities, this use is not authorized or compliant with freight safety standards. The project would add multi-use

recreational paths parallel to the rail tracks at several points along the alignment, which would improve the functionality of the space while ensuring public safety. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. In addition, the LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security. See MR-12: Emergency Access.

Submission 295 Chelsea Schreiber

295-1 Metro has undertaken extensive community outreach for potential transit service along the Metro ROW for well over a decade. Metro's outreach program also accommodates the needs of residents with limited English proficiency. Most recently, in advance of the Metro Board of Director's selection of the LPA in May 2024, Metro distributed 32,000 flyers to residents, property owners, and businesses within a one-mile radius of all alignments under study to notify the community of the LPA selection. Additionally, at the request of the City of Lawndale, Metro sent flyers to every resident within Lawndale. All outreach notifications are provided in both English and Spanish. Documentation on the outreach conducted during the environmental review process is available on the Metro project Dropbox, by visiting metro.net/clineext/#documents.

295-2 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 296 Viet Truong

296-1 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

296-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

296-3 The Torrance Transit Center was selected as the terminus to facilitate regional connectivity through existing and planned bus services. While Metro assists in identifying potential First/Last Mile (FLM) improvements during the planning and design phases, the implementation of FLM elements falls under the jurisdiction of the local cities. If the project is approved, Metro would coordinate with the local jurisdictions to assist in First/Last Mile planning. Future opportunities to enhance access to key destinations such as the Del Amo Fashion Center may be considered through local transit planning efforts.

Submission 297 Michael Kim

297-1 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. The freight incident noted in the comment was not on the Metro ROW.

Metro retains qualified civil and structural engineering professionals (both in-house and contracted consultants) who have extensive experience designing and implementing complex rail infrastructure projects. Metro also coordinates closely with BNSF Railway, which operates freight service on the line, to ensure that any design and construction involving freight infrastructure meets or exceeds applicable safety criteria. Any freight track segments affected by the project would be reconstructed in compliance with all applicable safety standards, including the Metro Rail Design Criteria (MRDC), California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), and the Federal Rail Administration (FRA) standards. The project would not increase the frequency of freight operations on the Metro ROW. Metro also coordinates closely with BNSF Railway to ensure that any design and construction involving freight infrastructure meets or exceeds applicable safety criteria.

297-2 See response to Comment 297-1 and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. The project would not "squeeze" infrastructure into the corridor at the expense of safety. There is sufficient ROW to accommodate all necessary project elements, including light rail and freight tracks, protective barriers, and maintenance access, while meeting or exceeding safety clearance. Relocated freight tracks would also be reconstructed using modern materials and methods, improving overall safety and reliability relative to the aging infrastructure currently in place. Metro and its experienced design team would continue to work closely with BNSF and regulatory agencies to ensure that both light rail and freight rail components of the project are designed and constructed safely.

It is also important to clarify that the project is a light rail transit system, and not a commuter rail system like Metrolink. Unlike commuter rail systems, light rail vehicles are smaller, lighter, and operate at lower speeds, with more frequent stops. These operational characteristics inherently reduce risks and potential impacts compared to heavier rail systems. The project is designed to coexist safely alongside the freight line within the Metro ROW, with both systems operating independently.

297-3 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 298 Adam Korp

298-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

298-2 Metro has undertaken extensive community outreach for potential transit service along the Metro ROW for over a decade. Most recently, in advance of the Metro Board of Director's selection of the LPA in May 2024, Metro distributed over 32,000 flyers to residents, property owners, and businesses within a one-mile radius of all alignments under study. Additionally, at the request of the City of Lawndale, Metro sent flyers to

every resident within Lawndale. Documentation on the outreach activities conducted during the environmental review process is available on the Metro project Dropbox, by visiting metro.net/clineext/#documents.

Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. While change in community character does not constitute a significant impact under CEQA, Section 3.2, Land Use, and Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, analyze the project's potential to physically divide communities and to affect community character. As discussed in these sections of the Draft EIR, the project would result in less than significant impacts. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

298-3 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

298-4 The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11 Utilities and Service System, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, these clarifications do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that impacts related to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information. Where retaining walls are required, they would be designed and constructed in compliance with Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards to ensure soil stability.

298-5 Impacts associated with soil stability are addressed in Section 3.8, Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information.

The Draft EIR includes a detailed evaluation of potential visual changes. Although it does not specifically isolate retaining walls as a visual element, the assessment uses the Federal Highway Administration's methodology for evaluating visual quality, based on three criteria: vividness (the memorability of the landscape), intactness (the extent to which the landscape is free from visual intrusions), and unity (the coherence and harmony of the landscape). As described in Section 3.3, Aesthetics of the Draft EIR, the project area is already highly urbanized, with a mix of residential, industrial, and commercial land uses, as well as the existing freight rail corridor. There are no designated scenic vistas or notable natural landscapes within the project's vicinity. Because the existing visual quality is

already rated low under all three criteria, permanent visual changes introduced by the project, including structural elements such as walls, would not degrade the visual environment and are considered neutral in effect.

With respect to potential shading, the creation of shade on private property, such as reduced sunlight in private yards, is generally not considered a significant environmental impact unless it affects public spaces or public resources such as parks, open space, or solar access. In addition, because the position of the sun changes throughout the day and year, any shading from the project features would be temporary and vary in duration, rather than causing continuous loss of light. Furthermore, the scale of retaining walls and soundwalls would generally be similar to the surrounding environment, and would therefore not generally be a substantial introduction of shade. Accordingly, shading of individual residences would not constitute a significant impact.

Impacts related to alterations of drainage patterns are addressed in Section 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR. Each alignment option would increase impervious surfaces but would include a low-impact development (LID) drainage system designed to retain most stormwater runoff within the project footprint. This system would meet the stormwater quality design volume requirements under the MS4 Permit established by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board, minimizing flooding on-site and off-site, including in sumps, per Project Feature PF-HWQ-6: Low Impact Development (LID) BMPs per Regional Requirements. Additional runoff from the project would continue to be collected by storm drain facilities. Elevated portions of the alignment would include down drains. Discharge locations of underdrains installed along the alignment would be the same as existing discharge locations. The retainment of the majority of stormwater runoff within the project footprint and preservation of existing discharge locations reduces the potential for erosion and sedimentation to occur on or off site. Thus, the impact of the addition of impervious surfaces in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation would be less than significant. Regarding stormwater management for the Trench Option, Project Feature PF-HWQ-7: Trench Operation Runoff Collection and Treatment would ensure proper collection, treatment, and rerouting of excess runoff, which would prevent flooding, reduce strain on sump pumps and help maintain natural water absorption.

As detailed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, the LPA would have similar hydrology impacts to the Trench Option, with less than significant impacts. The project would comply with regional LID standards. For more information on Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) requirements, see Section 3.10-1.2 of the Draft EIR.

298-6 Residences located along Ruxton Lane to the west of the Metro ROW are represented by Clusters E2 and E3 in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The multi-story building height was accounted for in the analysis and noise levels were predicted based on the third story of the building. The proposed source height (light rail tracks), receiver height (residences), and soundwall height and locations were all accounted for in the soundwall noise attenuation prediction per the Federal Transit Administration Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018). As shown on Page 3.6-52 of the Draft EIR, soundwalls are proposed along both the west and east side of the Metro ROW to mitigate

light rail noise. As shown in Appendix 3.6-B of the Draft EIR, Table 4, pages 27-28, impacts to the residential buildings cited by the commenter would be less than significant with mitigation. For the Metro ROW alignments, the project would enable local cities to establish Quiet Zones with FRA, as part of Project Feature PF-NV-1: Quiet Zone Equipment Installation and Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

298-7 As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase traffic congestion nor affect emergency access. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service; the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR; and MR-12: Emergency Access.

298-8 See response to Comment 298-2.

298-9 Cost is one of several factors Metro considers when evaluating alignment options, but it is not the sole determining factor. The Metro Board selected the Hybrid Alternative as the LPA based on a range of considerations, including each alternative's ability to meet the project objectives, minimize environmental impacts, and respond to community input. However, this selection does not constitute project approval. All alternatives, including the No Project Alternative, remain under consideration until the Final EIR is certified and the Metro Board takes final action on the project. Metro understands and takes seriously concerns related to potential environmental impacts of the project to adjacent land uses. These issues are evaluated in multiple sections of the Draft EIR, including Section 3.2 (Land Use), Section 3.3 (Aesthetics), and Section 3.6 (Noise and Vibration). See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives, MR-10: Changes to Community Character, and MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

298-10 See response to Comments 298-1 through 298-9.

Submission 299 Jennifer Dowd

299-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

299-2 While change in community character does not constitute a significant impact under CEQA, Section 3.2, Land Use, and Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, analyze the project's potential to physically divide communities and to affect community character. As discussed in these sections of the Draft EIR, the project would result in less than significant impacts. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

299-3 Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the

Americans with Disabilities Act, and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. The incident referenced by the commenter occurred on the Metrolink Ventura County Line in a curved, single-track segment where a passenger train and freight train were operating on the same track and collided due to operator error. In contrast, the project is being designed so that the freight and light rail vehicles will not share tracks. The project proposes separate infrastructure to maintain physical and operational separation between the freight and light rail systems, eliminating the type of conflict that contributed to the Metrolink collision. Furthermore, the Public Safety Improvement Act of 2008, which was passed directly in response to the collision, requires positive train control (PTC), a system to be implemented ensuring vastly safer monitoring and controlling of train movements. As such, the conditions that led to that incident do not apply. See also MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

299-4 Residences located along Ruxton Lane to the west of the Metro ROW are represented by Clusters E2 and E3 in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The multi-story building height was accounted for in the analysis and noise levels were predicted based on the third story of the building. The proposed source height (light rail tracks), receiver height (residences), and soundwall height and locations were all accounted for in the soundwall noise attenuation prediction per the Federal Transit Administration Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018). As shown on Page 3.6-52 of the Draft EIR, soundwalls are proposed along both the west and east side of the Metro ROW to mitigate light rail noise. As shown in Appendix 3.6-B of the Draft EIR, Table 4, pages 27-28, impacts to the residential buildings cited by the commenter would be less than significant with mitigation. For the Metro ROW alignments, the project would enable local cities to establish Quiet Zones with FRA, as part of Project Feature PF-NV-1: Quiet Zone Equipment Installation and Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Impacts associated with soil stability are addressed in Section 3.8, Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources, of the Draft EIR. The project would incorporate Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, which ensures that the project complies with Metro's Geotechnical Design Standards as outlined in the Metro Rail Design Criteria. These standards require thorough geotechnical investigations to assess and address risks such as settlement, slope, instability, and lateral deformations, as well as detailed stability analyses of retaining walls and embankments and incorporation of reinforce or other design features as necessary to ensure long-term stability and safety. Retaining walls would be designed with drainage features to manage groundwater and prevent water accumulation behind the walls, thereby maintaining stability during various weather events, including heavy rains.

299-5 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to Comments 299-1 through 299-4.

Submission 300 Bryan Lee

300-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

300-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

300-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

300-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

300-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

300-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

300-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 301 Blake Jung

301-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

301-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

301-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

301-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

301-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

301-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

301-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 302 Alejandro

302-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

302-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

302-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

302-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

302-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

302-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

302-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 303 Zein Obagi

303-1 The potential for noise impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The commenter makes a general reference to residents sleeping with their windows open during nights when “South Bay air quality is good,” but does not explicitly state a concern that residents would no longer be able to do so due to increases in air

pollutant emissions or noise attributable to the project. Nonetheless, the commenter's reference to air quality is assumed to refer to air quality levels following project completion. Noise is also assumed to be among the commenter's concerns.

The noise standards used in the analysis in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, are based on exterior noise levels, meaning that impacts were evaluated without assumed closed windows or air conditioning. As concluded in the Draft EIR, operational air quality impacts would be less than significant, and, with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, operational noise impacts of each alignment option, other than the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would be less than significant with mitigation. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

It should be noted that as Metro's light rail does not result in emissions from the vehicles or other infrastructure along the tracks, there would be no change in air quality akin to that of freight rail emissions. Unlike freight rail, which is powered by diesel along this corridor, the proposed light rail would be powered by electricity with overhead contact wires, which do not emit air pollutants.

303-2 See response to Comment 303-1. The anticipated hours of operation are 4:00 a.m. one day to 1:00 a.m. the following day. System headways would be reduced during early morning (4:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m.) and late-night hours (7:00 p.m. to 1:00 a.m.) to approximately 15 minutes. This would result in a reduced frequency of trains during these hours and reduced overall noise compared to peak-hour system headways of 5 minutes. Weekend system headways would be reduced compared to weekdays.

303-3 See response to Comment 303-1.

Submission 304 Yumiko Omatsu

304-1 Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds; and MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design.

Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. The LPA light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts for pedestrians and emergency vehicles. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety, MR-9: Light Rail Security, MR-10: Changes to Community Character, and MR-12: Emergency Access.

304-2 The width of the Metro ROW varies throughout the corridor and thus the distances between rail tracks and property lines varies along the corridor. All light rail and freight tracks are designed according to Metro's design criteria with appropriate clearances, which includes space for maintenance. Existing utilities would be protected in place or relocated within the Metro ROW. See Appendix 2-A, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings, of the Draft EIR and Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR for more details on design.

See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety.

Submission 305 Wayne Craig

305-1 The commenter's opposition to the ROW alignment is noted for the record. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. Every aspect of the project has been and would continue to be designed to address potential risks and ensure that construction and operation are conducted safely. The Draft EIR evaluates potential impacts on the environment in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines. Where potentially significant impacts are identified, the Draft EIR sets forth mitigation measures to reduce the potential impact to the extent feasible. In cases where mitigation would not reduce the impact to a less than significant level, such is disclosed in the Draft EIR. See Sections 3.4, Air Quality, Section 3.6., Noise and Vibration, 3.8, Geology and Soils, and Section 3.9, Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Also see MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. With respect to issues related to ground settlement, see MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety.

305-2 The commenter's support for an underground alignment on Hawthorne Boulevard is noted. A fully underground alignment along Hawthorne Boulevard has not been carried forward because it would be infeasible and would not substantially reduce any of the significant impacts of the alignment options and alternatives studied in the Draft EIR. Constructing a fully underground alignment would require extensive tunneling beneath an active, heavily developed corridor, leading to significant engineering challenges, major utility relocations, and substantial disruption to existing infrastructure. In addition, the cost of a fully underground alignment would far exceed available funding for the project. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

305-3 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

305-4 The comment regarding the benefits from the project and preference for the Hawthorne option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

305-5 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

305-6 The commenter's preference for a station at the South Bay Galleria is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

305-7 The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings) daily. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

305-8 The commenter's support for Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 306 Velia Gomez

306-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. Potential noise and vibration impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds; and MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design.

Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. In addition, the LPA light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists. The LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts for pedestrians and emergency vehicles. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security. See MR-12: Emergency Access.

Submission 307 Tony Galva

307-1 Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses. Also see MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Of the alignments studied in the Draft EIR, only the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in a significant and unavoidable operational noise impact. Operational noise

impacts associated with the Trench Option, Hawthorne Option, and the LPA would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation. None of the alignments analyzed in the Draft EIR would result in a significant and unavoidable operational vibration impact.

307-2 The commenter's preference for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 308 Chelsea Schrieber

308-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. Section 3.7, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR, analyzes the removal and replacement of trees along the Metro ROW on sensitive biological resources. Impacts were determined to be less than significant with mitigation. As discussed in Section 3.7-3.5 of the Draft EIR, the Metro Tree Policy outlines Metro's commitment to protecting trees, when possible, or replacing trees removed as a result of Metro construction and maintenance. For non-heritage trees, the replacement ratio is two trees for every tree removed. This policy also prioritizes planting strategies that maximize the use of native species. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

308-2 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. The Draft EIR evaluates potential impacts on the environment in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. Where potentially significant impacts are identified, the Draft EIR sets forth mitigation measures to reduce the potential impact to the extent feasible. In cases where mitigation would not reduce the impact to a level of less than significant, the impact is disclosed in the Draft EIR as significant and unavoidable. Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Air quality is addressed in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, including the consideration of dust control during construction. Compliance with Project Features PF-AQ-1: Tier 4 Engine Standards and PF-AQ-2: Dust Control Best Practices would ensure that construction activities comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District and Metro standards controlling emissions and dust. Operationally, the light rail vehicles would be powered by electricity and would not produce localized emissions. Regional air quality would improve with implementation of the project due to a shift from passenger vehicles to light rail in the corridor. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

The proposed project features and mitigation measures established by the Draft EIR are designed to protect the health and well-being of all residents, whether human or otherwise, to the greatest extent feasible.

308-3 While change in community character does not constitute a significant impact under CEQA, Section 3.2, Land Use, and Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, assess the project's potential to physically divide communities and to affect visual quality and

character. As discussed in these sections of the Draft EIR, the project would result in less than significant impacts. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character and MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service.

308-4 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

308-5 See response to Comment 308-3.

Submission 309 Ted Hofmann

309-1 The LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways and would not increase traffic congestion nor affect emergency access. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service; the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR; and MR-12: Emergency Access. In addition, as explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions.

309-2 As described in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan requires contractors to develop a construction management traffic plan (CMTP), which would include coordination with local businesses and residents as well as relevant jurisdictions to manage access and the effects of temporary closures and identify reasonable accommodations or alternatives, which could include limiting construction hours, providing alternate routes or temporary easements, or other strategies. This would occur following the selection of an LPA and certification of the Final EIR, but prior to the initiation of localized construction activities. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

During construction of the project, traffic lanes on Hawthorne Boulevard may need to be closed up to and including full roadway closures but access to property must be maintained and would be addressed through the CTMP. Following completion, Hawthorne Boulevard would be restored to the same number of lanes throughout, with limited exceptions such as the loss of one of two northbound left turn lanes at the intersection with Artesia Boulevard. See response to Comment 309-1.

309-3 As described in Section 3.2, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, the project would comply with all applicable regulations and local ordinances governing construction activities to the extent feasible. Metro does not have the authority to set a construction moratorium for local agencies.

Submission 310 Ted Hofmann

310-1 See MR-10: Changes to Community Character. The proposed overhead contact system (OCS) is a standard and proven technology used in most light rail systems around the world. The OCS infrastructure would include poles and wires, which are necessary to provide power for the operation of the light rail vehicles. Although there are emerging alternatives to OCS technology, such as on-board batteries and ground-level power supply

systems, these technologies are currently not as reliable or cost-effective as OCS for large-scale, high-capacity transit systems. Additionally, implementing such technologies could require greater construction impacts and higher long-term maintenance costs, and they may not yet be suitable for Metro's operational needs.

As discussed in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, the visual impacts of the project, including the OCS, were evaluated in terms of their compatibility with the existing visual baseline. The baseline conditions include an active transportation corridor with transportation-related infrastructure such as freight tracks, signal equipment, and utility poles, as well as existing overhead power transmission lines that are already part of the visual character of the Metro ROW and surrounding areas. Overall, the introduction of the OCS infrastructure would be consistent with the existing industrial and transportation-related visual elements within the corridor and would not substantially degrade the area's visual quality. Additionally, the OCS would be designed in accordance with Metro's design standards, which aim to integrate infrastructure into the surrounding environment and achieve a high quality of design. For a more detailed discussion, see the analysis of potential impacts to visual character and quality in Section 3.3-4.2 and associated visual simulations provided in the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

310-2 The visual character analysis and before and after visual simulation of this portion of the Hawthorne Option near the I-405/Hawthorne Boulevard intersection can be found on page 3.3-99 and page 3.3-100 of the Draft EIR. See also response to Comment 310-1. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

310-3 As discussed in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, the visual effects of the project, including the Hawthorne Option, were evaluated in terms of their compatibility with, and whether they would substantially degrade, the existing visual baseline.

Hawthorne Boulevard is located within a highly urbanized area characterized by transportation infrastructure, including a major north-south thoroughfare. The Draft EIR acknowledges that the elevated light rail tracks and light rail trains would introduce new visible vertical features that would block views to the northwest from motorists and pedestrians along Hawthorne Boulevard. However, the elevated features would not block any long-range views of prominent visual features, such as unique views of the mountains or coastline or protected views. The I-405 Bridge above Hawthorne Boulevard is an existing structure that already blocks north-facing views. The elevated structure would be consistent with other urban infrastructure in the area, such as the I-405 Freeway, existing utility lines, and Hawthorne Boulevard as a major transportation corridor.

See also response to Comment 310-2.

Submission 311 Ted Hofmann

311-1 Project Feature PF-US-1: Utility Identification and Coordination, described on page 3.11-10 of the Draft EIR would ensure proper utility identification and coordination to construction activities.

311-2 See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety.

Submission 312 Ted Hofmann

312-1 The Metro Board has the ability to select any project option or alternative described in the Draft EIR, including the No Build Alternative or High-Frequency Bus Alternative. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

312-2 All public comments received during the environmental review process—from the initial Scoping period through the Draft EIR comment period—were shared with the Metro Board prior to its selection of the Hybrid Alternative as the LPA in May 2024. At that time, the Metro Board directed staff to proceed with preparation of the Final EIR, including responses to all public comments received on the Draft EIR with respect to any alignment. The Metro Board also directed staff to further refine anticipated costs and funding for the LPA.

The Metro Board will consider certification of the Final EIR and a decision on whether to approve the project in 2025. That decision would take into account the environmental analysis presented in the Final EIR as well as all public comments and feedback received throughout the environmental review process. No final decision on the alignment or project approval has been made.

Submission 314 George Gillen

314-1 Section 3.3, Visual and Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR analyzes visual impacts. Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. The potential for changes in property value to indirectly cause such impacts is too speculative to evaluate meaningfully under CEQA. For instance, it is not reasonably foreseeable that property value changes alone would result in specific, identifiable physical alterations to homes or neighborhoods that would affect the aesthetic environment. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character and MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

314-2 Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

314-3 See response to Comment 314-1. Also, as noted on page 3.3-71 and several other locations within the Draft EIR's aesthetics analysis. Metro's Tree Policy requires a minimum tree replacement ratio of 2:1 (or 4:1 if the tree is considered a heritage tree), and the planting of California-native or other drought-tolerant trees. Trees would also be replanted along the corridor to preserve and enhance the aesthetic character of the community.

Submission 315 Glen Brackenridge

315-1 The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous

Materials, and 3.11 Utilities and Service System, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, these clarifications do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that impacts related to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant. With respect to the potential for explosions or fires, train operations occur above the ground at a safe distance from pipelines and, thus, do not directly create conditions for fires and explosions.

See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information.

Submission 316 Glen Brackenridge

316-1 This project is not subject to NEPA as it requires no federal action. Should the project evolve in such a way that requires federal action, any necessary NEPA review would be explored at that time.

316-2 It is important to note that CEQA does not prohibit environmental impacts but requires that they be thoroughly studied and mitigated where feasible. In compliance with CEQA, the Draft EIR assessed potential impacts and identified mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce those impacts to less than significant levels where feasible. Noise impacts of the LPA during operation would be less than significant with mitigation. Under CEQA, an agency may approve a project with significant and unavoidable environmental impacts, provided the agency has adopted all feasible mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce those impacts and adopt a statement of overriding considerations finding that the project's benefits outweigh its significant and unavoidable environmental impacts (Pub. Resources Code, Section 21081(b); CEQA Guidelines, Section 15091-15093).

As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions.

See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

As noted on page 3.3-71 and several other locations within the Draft EIR's aesthetics analysis, Metro's Tree Policy requires a minimum tree replacement ratio of 2:1 (or 4:1 if the tree is considered a heritage tree), and the planting of California-native or other drought-tolerant trees. Trees would also be replanted along the corridor to preserve and enhance the aesthetic character of the community.

Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

316-3 As an operating rail transportation corridor, the Metro ROW is not specifically protected by any applicable local general plans, planning and zoning codes, or other regulations; the Metro ROW is not considered to be a "natural resource."

316-4 As discussed in, Section 3.7, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR, 10 special-status wildlife species were determined to have potential to occur in the resource study area for the Metro ROW alignments. California gnatcatcher was identified as having a low potential to occur due to absence of suitable habitat. Therefore, the species is not expected to occur. This has been explicitly stated in Section 4.11, Corrections, and Additions, of this Final EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

316-5 To clarify, all light rail alignments analyzed in the Draft EIR would comply with applicable environmental regulations. The commenter's preference for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 317 Glen Brackenridge

317-1 Metro has designed the project to avoid displacement of residents. . See the 2023 Real Estate Acquisition Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, and the 2025 Real Estate Acquisition Report, published concurrently with this Final EIR for more detailed information on proposed property acquisitions. In some areas along the Metro ROW, property owners have built out past their property lines and encroached into Metro ROW. An EIR is required to evaluate the potential physical environmental impacts of a proposed project. CEQA does not require an EIR to evaluate or disclose the legal process of property acquisition, including the use of eminent domain. Decisions regarding property acquisition, including whether and how eminent domain may be used, are made after project approval and are governed by separate legal procedures. These procedures ensure that property owners are afforded due process and just compensation, consistent with applicable state and federal laws. Accordingly, the topic of eminent domain is outside the scope of environmental review under CEQA. Also see MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

If property acquisition is required, Metro would comply with all applicable laws and procedures, including the California Relocation Assistance Act (Government Code Section 7260 et seq.) and Metro's real estate policies. Before making a final determination on the project, the Metro Board will review the Final EIR, including all public comments and responses, and consider a range of factors including environmental impacts, cost, benefits, and community feedback.

Submission 318 Glen Brackenridge

318-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning

at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. As described in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR and Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, the operational noise impacts of the LPA would be comparable to those of the Trench Option and would be less than significant with mitigation.

The noise analysis in the Draft EIR follows the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018), which specifies the use of 24-hour time-averaged noise levels to assess the ambient noise environment. These levels capture all sound sources, including the occasional freight train pass-by, as part of the existing baseline. The analysis also incorporates a 10-dBA (a-weighted decibel) penalty for all sound occurring during the nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) to account for increased sensitivity to noise during these hours. The effect of the penalty is that in the calculation of 24-hour noise, any event that occurs during the nighttime hours, is equivalent to 10 of the same events during the daytime hours. This ensures the assessment reflects the potential for greater disturbance from nighttime noise events. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds for information regarding the noise methodology.

Although noise from freight trains is loud and increases the 24-hour average noise levels, its infrequent occurrence during the day means that it does not dominate or skew the overall noise profile. Excluding the freight noise from the existing ambient noise conditions would not comply with FTA methodology and would misrepresent the true ambient noise environment. The 24-hour noise measurements include both periods when the freight is not operating and periods where freight is operating.

Existing noise conditions along Hawthorne Boulevard are shown on pages 3.6-25 and 3.6-26 of the Draft EIR (see noise monitoring locations 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 25 and 26). While Hawthorne Boulevard has higher ambient noise level due to traffic, residential neighborhoods near both alignments have comparable noise levels. (see page 3.6-23 for noise measured ambient noise levels at each noise monitoring location). See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds for information regarding the noise methodology.

Submission 319 Glen Brackenridge

319-1 As discussed in Section 3.2, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, the project would not physically divide a community because residents would still be able to cross the Metro ROW at all existing designated rail crossings located at Inglewood Avenue, Manhattan Beach Boulevard, 159th, 160th, 161st, 162nd, 170th, and 182nd Streets. Land uses would not be altered so as to isolate any one part of the community from the other. Although some residents use the Metro ROW for recreational activities or cross the tracks outside of designated crossings areas, this use is not authorized or compliant with freight safety standards.

The language quoted by the comment is from the threshold of significance that asks whether a project “would substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a *state scenic highway*”.

As discussed in Section 3.3-3.2 of the Draft EIR, the closest state-designated scenic highway is 10 miles away. Further, scenic resources are generally defined as significant natural or cultural features, such as trees designated as heritage trees or features located within a designated scenic vista. The Metro ROW itself is not a designated scenic resource. However, as discussed in Section 3.3-4.3 of the Draft EIR, a segment of the Metro ROW in Lawndale does provide a green buffer used recreationally by the community. While the project may alter the current visual character of the ROW, the design would integrate landscaping and other features to maintain compatibility with the community's urban and residential environment. Additionally, the project would include two multi-use recreational paths to enhance the pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, which would serve as new community amenities. The project would also provide high-quality landscaping, including replacement trees, in accordance with the Metro Tree Policy. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

319-2 See response to Comment 319-1.

Submission 320 Glen Brackenridge

320-1 While change in community character does not constitute a significant impact under CEQA, Section 3.2, Land Use, and Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, analyzes the project's potential to physically divide communities and to affect visual quality and character. As discussed in these sections of the Draft EIR, the project would result in less than significant impacts. The LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways. Pedestrians would cross streets at-grade and avoid any conflicts with light rail trains. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 321 Glen Brackenridge

321-1 The light rail guideway under the LPA and the Trench Option would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase traffic congestion nor affect emergency access. See MR-12: Emergency Access. For the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the frequency of the railroad crossing gate down time would increase relative to existing conditions, but it would not result in the permanent closure of emergency access. All homes and businesses on either side of the 182nd Street railroad crossing are accessible by alternate routes within ½ mile that are grade-separated crossings and therefore not affected by train frequency.

321-2 See response to Comment 321-1.

Submission 322 Glen Brackenridge

322-1 Cost for utility relocation of both public and private utilities was included in the total cost published in the 2023 Cost Estimates Summary for all alternatives and options. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 323 James Tucker

323-1 The commenter's support for the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

323-2 The potential for noise impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. According to the Federal Transit Administration Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018), light rail trains along an aerial guideway may generate slightly higher noise levels, compared to ground-level operations, with a +4 dBA adjustment applied in the analysis. This adjustment accounts for the increased noise due to the elevation and the lack of intervening structures to block sound. However, while elevated tracks could allow noise to carry further in some cases, the screening distance for potential noise impacts is 350 feet from the light rail line. Within this distance, all sensitive receptors have been fully assessed and mitigation applied where necessary to address potential impacts.

323-3 The commenter's preference for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. The project would include two new multi-purpose paths, which would provide new opportunities for outdoor activities and community enjoyment. For further information regarding multi-purpose path, see Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR. Additionally, one of the project objectives is to provide First/Last Mile facilities to connect neighborhoods to station areas. Metro would continue to engage with the community to identify opportunities for improving station access and connectivity.

The Redondo Beach Transit Center Station would be adjacent to the city's Redondo Beach Transit Center, and would be connected via pedestrian pathways, ramps, and stairs. Metro has proposed a multi-use recreational path between Grant Avenue and 182nd Street that would provide access to the Redondo Beach Transit Center Station.

323-4 The project is designed to enhance regional access by linking the proposed light rail system with the existing bus network, ensuring convenient transfers for passengers, and improving overall mobility throughout the region. By extending light rail from our existing Redondo Beach (Marine) Station to the new Torrance Transit Center, the project would create new, direct connections between the regional transit network and local transit hubs, such as Redondo Beach Transit Center and Mary K. Giordano Regional Transit Center in Torrance.

Submission 324 Jamison Hughes

324-1 The commenter's opposition to the ROW alignment and Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

324-2 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The project is intended to enhance mobility and provide improved transit options while minimizing potential impacts on the surrounding community. See MR-19: Project Benefits.

324-3 The commenter's concerns are noted. In the previous planning stages, stations were proposed in Lawndale, including as part of the 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis, but at the request of Lawndale were removed from consideration.

The potential for impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Regarding construction vibration impacts, the Draft EIR identifies temporary vibration impacts related to structural damage and annoyance that could occur from certain activities. To address these impacts, Mitigation Measures MM-VIB-1: Vibration Control Plan, MM-VIB-2: Construction Equipment Location, and MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction surveys, would be required. With implementation of these mitigation measures, potential vibration-related structural damage impacts of the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation. However, the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in significant and unavoidable construction vibration-related damage impact, even with implementation of these measures. This is due to the need for pile driving to reconstruct the Grant Avenue Bridge, which is not required for the LPA, Trench Option, or Hawthorne Option.

The Draft EIR further discloses that the construction vibration annoyance impacts of each alignment studied would be significant and unavoidable. These annoyance impacts would be temporary and limited to periods when the most vibration intensive types of equipment (e.g., pile drivers and vibratory compactors), is in use, typically for a short duration near any given property. Unlike the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option, construction of the related to both structural damage and vibration annoyance,

Regarding operational vibration impacts, those impacts were assessed in accordance with the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (FTA, 2018), which is the industry standard for evaluating noise and vibration impacts from transit projects. This guidance provides a well-established and widely accepted framework for determining the potential effects of noise and vibration on sensitive receptors, including residential properties. Mitigation measures include MM-VIB-4: Low Impact Frogs, MM-VIB-5: Resilient Fasteners, and MM-VIB-6: Ballast Mats. Operational vibration annoyance impacts would be less than significant with mitigation for the project.

As discussed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, the project design process would include thorough site geotechnical investigations to ensure the stability of nearby structures. Per Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, site-specific geotechnical investigations would be conducted to address foundation and structural safety. The investigation would include engineering and construction recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged.

See also MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds, MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

324-4 The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

324-5 The commenter's opposition to using the Metro ROW for the project is noted. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character and MR-19: Project Benefits.

Submission 325 Jan Kurth

325-1 Although CEQA does not require a separate "Human Health Impact Study," the Draft EIR thoroughly evaluates the potential environmental conditions that could affect human health, including air quality, noise, and hazardous materials.

The commenter suggests that the Draft EIR only briefly mentions potential health effects. For instance, analysis for Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR provides a detailed discussion of the potential health effects of regulated pollutants, including carbon monoxide (CO), ozone (O_3), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), particulate matter (PM), sulfur dioxide (SO_2), and lead (Pb). The analysis also evaluates toxic air contaminants (TACs), including diesel particulate matter, and applies health-based thresholds established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) to determine potential health risks. The findings conclude that the project's emissions would remain below levels associated with significant health impacts. Although construction of the Trench Option would result in a significant and unavoidable air quality impact due to unmitigable exceedances of the SCAQMD regional emissions threshold for NOx, this impact is primarily due to emissions from haul truck trips, which would travel more than 20 miles along the regional roadway network. As a result, most emissions would not occur in proximity to the communities near the construction area.

Similarly, analysis for Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR discusses potential health effects of noise exposure, including stress-related impacts at sensitive receptors. The analysis also references federal occupational safety standards to demonstrate that operational noise levels would not reach thresholds associated with hearing loss. Mitigation measures have been incorporated where necessary to minimize noise-related effects.

Analysis for Section 3.9, Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR also provides a detailed evaluation of potential health risks associated with hazardous substances. The EIR identifies potential sources of hazardous materials within the project area, including contaminated sites, soil or groundwater contamination, and the potential for accidental hazardous material releases during construction. The analysis considers applicable regulatory frameworks, such as the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), and California's hazardous waste regulations, which are designed to protect human health and the environment from exposure to hazardous substances. The EIR identifies potential exposure pathways, such as inhalation, ingestion, and dermal contact, and determines whether the project could result in conditions that pose a risk to public health. The findings conclude that, with compliance with existing regulations and adherence to the project features (PMs), which include requirements such as proper handling, storage, and

disposal of hazardous materials, the project would not result in significant health risks related to hazardous substances.

In addition to these analyses, analysis of health impacts is implicit in several of the topics addressed EIR including, the evaluation of hydrology and water quality, which considers potential deleterious effects to a region's water supplies and the analysis of geology and soil impacts, which considers a project's potential to result in injuries or death due to placement of new structures along active faults, within seismically active regions, or on unsuitable soil.

The comment incorrectly associates human health risk assessments with the energy analysis. There is no nexus between potential energy effects associated with implementing the project and effects on human health that would need to be studied in human health impact studies, including regarding exposures to hazardous materials. The distribution of energy, itself, does not directly produce emissions or hazardous materials on-site that could affect nearby residents. Instead, energy would be supplied through the electricity grid, where emissions from power generation are regulated by state and federal standards, including California's Renewable Portfolio Standard that minimizes public health risks from energy-related emissions through decreasing reliance on fossil fuels. Potential energy impacts are evaluated in Section 3.12, Energy, of the Draft EIR. The one mention of "human health" on Page 3.12-10 of the Draft EIR occurs in the context of the Metro Green Construction Policy, which aims to reduce emissions from construction activities through the use of cleaner equipment and practices. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

For additional information, see MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

325-2 Under both the LPA and the Trench Option, the light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase traffic congestion nor affect emergency access. See MR-12: Emergency Access. For the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the frequency of the railroad crossing gate down time would increase relative to existing conditions but it would not result in the permanent closure of emergency access. All homes and businesses on either side of the 182nd Street railroad crossing are accessible by alternate routes within ½ mile that are grade-separated crossings and therefore not affected by train frequency. See MR-12: Emergency Access.

The LPA construction duration is estimated to be approximately six years. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule for additional information. Although the total duration of project construction would be longer than five years, this accounts for construction of the entire alignment and sources would not be active in a specific location for five years or more. The LPA includes grade-separating the light rail at 170th Street and 182nd Street using two short trenches. The excavation required for the LPA would be significantly less extensive than that required for the Trench Option. Additionally, this excavation would occur during an early stage of construction and would be limited in duration. The localized emissions analysis provided in the Draft EIR, which focuses on emissions from sources located within the construction sites, determined that the Trench Option would not exceed the localized thresholds of significance. This would also apply to the LPA, including

the trench segment of the LPA, which would be smaller than that of the Trench Option. See Section 4.21, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR.

The Draft EIR determined that all construction activities required for the Trench Option, not just solely trenching, would have a significant and unavoidable impact with regards to air quality during construction. While the Metro Board selected the Hybrid Alternative as the LPA in May 2024, should the Trench Option be pursued, Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-1: Zero or Near Zero Emissions Haul Trucks, described in Section 3.4.5, would be implemented to reduce impacts to the extent feasible.

The EIR was prepared under state law and a federal conformity analysis is not required. Should the project seek federal funding, the project would be required to comply with all applicable federal requirements. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

325-3 Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. In addition, the LPA light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists. See MR-12: Emergency Access.

325-4 While the Draft EIR acknowledges that increased noise levels could contribute to stress, it explains that light rail noise is unlikely to result in noise-induced hearing loss (see page 3.6-48). Similarly, construction noise, as discussed on page 3.6-34, is unlikely to cause hearing loss but may temporarily increase stress levels for nearby sensitive receptors. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project, including noise effects. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

325-5 See response to Comment 325-4. The link provided in the comment appears to refer to a private or personal email resource and is not accessible to Metro. If you intended to reference specific information or a publicly available document, please provide additional details or an accessible link so Metro can review and respond appropriately.

325-6 See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

325-7 Metro appreciates the time and effort that residents have put into participating in the public review process. Metro has conducted extensive outreach to ensure that community members are informed about the project and have opportunities to provide input. Metro is committed to planning and constructing projects and operating and maintaining facilities and vehicles in a manner that would protect human health and the environment. See response to Comment 325-5. Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR considers a reasonable range of project alternatives that are capable of achieving most of the project's basic objectives while avoiding or minimizing one or more of its significant environmental effects.

325-8 See response to Comment 325-5.

325-9 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 326 Jerome Chang

326-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

326-2 This commenter's preference for rapid buses is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The Draft EIR included evaluation of a High Frequency Bus Alternative. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 327 Jose Jimenez

327-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

327-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

327-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

327-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

327-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

327-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

327-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 328 Julie Young

328-1 The Draft EIR thoroughly analyzes the relocation of the existing freight tracks; this includes the analysis set forth in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, which is based, in part, on the design in Appendix 2-A, Select ACE Drawings, of the Draft EIR. The locations and depths of existing utilities are included in and informs the conceptual engineering. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information.7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information.

328-2 The Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in significant and unavoidable noise impacts at two sensitive receptors clusters near the at-grade crossing at 170th Street, where noise levels would exceed the Federal Transit Administration noise impact criteria, even after implementation of mitigation. For all other clusters, impacts would either be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation. By grade separating the light rail tracks, the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option, remove the need for audible warnings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. As described in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR and Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, operational noise impacts of the LPA would be

comparable to those of the Trench Option and would be less than significant with mitigation. As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, the operational noise impacts of the Hawthorne Option would also be less than significant with mitigation.

See also MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

328-3 This comment does not raise any significant environmental issues requiring a response. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

328-4 The commenter's reluctance to use Metro transit services is noted. This comment does not raise any significant environmental issues requiring a response. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

328-5 The commenter's support for the High-Frequency Bus Alternative is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 329 Lily Kua

329-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. In addition, the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

329-2 The project under consideration is a light rail transit line, not a commuter train. Light rail vehicles are quieter, electrically powered trains that generate less noise and vibration compared to larger, diesel-powered commuter trains.

Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, provides a detailed analysis of potential air quality impacts from light rail operations and construction. Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, provides a detailed analysis of potential noise and vibration impacts from light rail operations and construction. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Mitigation Measure MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys requires contractors to document damage resulting from vibration impacts during construction, and repair them. In addition, as discussed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, the project design process would include thorough site geotechnical investigations to ensure the stability of nearby structures. Per Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, site-specific geotechnical investigations would be conducted to address foundation and structural safety. The investigation would include engineering and construction recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged.

Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

329-3 Metro has carefully considered potential noise and vibration impacts. See response to Comment 329-2 and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

329-4 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and response to Comment 329-2.

Submission 330 Angeline Souza

330-1 Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. In addition, the LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists. The See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. In addition, there is sufficient space for the proposed light rail and freight track within the Metro ROW. See Appendix 2-A, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings, of the Draft EIR and Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative, for more details.

330-2 See response to Comment 330-1, as well as MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks.

330-3 See response to Comment 330-1.

Submission 331 Bryan Henry

331-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

331-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

331-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

331-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

331-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

331-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

331-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 332 Dana Icaza

332-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR addresses potential transportation impacts, including pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle conflicts. As described in Section 3.1-4.3 of the Draft EIR, the project would not substantially increase hazards due to incompatible uses, because it would incorporate signalized pedestrian crossings, physical barriers, warning systems, and clear signage. Furthermore, the Draft EIR's 170th/182nd Grade-Separated Light Rail Transit Alternative has been selected by the Metro Board as the LPA. Similar to the Trench Option and Hawthorne Option, the LPA would fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways, thereby eliminating the potential for conflicts associated with light rail crossings at grade. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety for additional information.

Submission 333 Doug Boswell

333-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and the Trench Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR analyzed impacts related to vibrations and concluded that the Metro ROW alignment would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to vibration damage during construction. The same impacts, however, would be less than significant with mitigation for the Trench Option and Hawthorne Option. As explained in the Draft EIR, operational vibration impacts are generally associated with annoyance, not damage, and the analysis of building damage is typically limited to construction activity. The Draft EIR concluded that operational vibration impacts would be less than significant with mitigation for the Metro ROW alignments. Operational vibrations from the project are not expected to cause damage, as vibrations from light rail are unlikely to exceed damage thresholds for residential structures. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds.

Submission 334 Dre Nicole Amundson

334-1 The commenter's opposition to the ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

334-2 The comment does not raise significant environmental issues or address the adequacy of the Draft EIR and is noted for the record. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

334-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

334-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

334-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

334-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

334-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

334-8 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

334-9 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. The selection of the LPA reflects a balance of community feedback, technical analysis, and cost considerations. However, no final decision has been made, and all alignment options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR remain under consideration. The Metro Board will carefully review the Final EIR, including all public comments and responses, before deciding whether to certify the Final EIR and which project alignment, if any, to approve.

Submission 335 Janice Tanabe

335-1 Potential air quality impacts are addressed in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, including dust control during construction. Compliance with Project Features PF-AQ-1: Tier 4 Engine Standards and PF-AQ-2: Dust Control Best Practices would ensure that construction activities comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District and Metro standards controlling emissions and dust. Operationally, the light rail vehicles would be powered by electricity and would not produce localized emissions. The air quality analysis in the Draft EIR includes an assessment of localized emissions that would be generated from construction sites, which accounted for dust that would be generated. The localized air quality impacts were found to be less than significant when compared to the applicable South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thresholds, which were set at levels to prevent the occurrence of substantial dust concentrations reaching sensitive receptors that could cause adverse health effects. The localized impacts analysis used the most conservative receptor distance to be as protective as possible of the health of nearby residents. Regional air quality would improve with implementation of the project due to a shift from passenger vehicles to light rail in the corridor. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Submission 336 Janice Tanabe

336-1 See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. Additionally, regarding the potential for spills, the project would include Project Feature PF-HHM-1: Handling, Storage, and Transport of Hazardous Materials and Wastes, which requires the contractor to provide Metro with a hazardous waste and hazardous materials management plan. The plan must be completed in accordance with Metro contractor specifications and in compliance with the Clean Water Act Section 402 General Permit conditions and requirements for transport, labeling, containment, cover, and storage of hazardous materials during construction and operation. The Draft EIR concludes in Section 3.9-4.1 that the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during construction or operation, and a less than significant impact would occur.

Submission 337 John Schreiber

337-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to the Metro ROW Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

337-2 Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety.

337-3 See response to Comment 337-2 and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

337-4 See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.