

5.5 RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS (SUBMISSION #1327-#1989)

Submission 1327 Frederick A. Mohit

- 1327-1 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 1328 Tim Calkins

- 1328-1 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.
- 1328-2 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 1329 Oliver King

- 1329-1 The commenter's support for either the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment or the Hawthorne Option is noted. The opposition to the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1330 T. Elder

- 1330-1 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 1331 Helen Itabashi

- 1331-1 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.
- 1331-2 The commenter states that the Trench Option is the best choice, although the comment also notes that the Trench Option and Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would bring more traffic and crime to Torrance. 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 and Trench Option are fully grade-separated from all roadways and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions. The Hawthorne Option is likewise grade-separated; however, its proposed changes in traffic signals and roadway modifications could affect circulation patterns, as described in MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service. 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 1332 Susan Hale

- 1332-1 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 1333 Francesco Aiello

- 1333-1 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 1334 JoAnne Naka

- 1334-1 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 1335 Sharon I.

- 1335-1 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.
- 1335-2 The commenter's preferences and concerns have been noted. Regardless of alignment, Metro would comply with all applicable safety regulations, including those established by the California Public Utilities Commission and the Federal Railroad Administration, to ensure safe operations. The Metro Board will consider multiple factors in their final determination on the project, including environmental impacts, benefits, and costs. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 1336 L. Hawkes

- 1336-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), 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. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1337 Julie Tuttle

- 1337-1 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 1338 Ros Barry

- 1338-1 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 1339 Cheryl Petrucelli

- 1339-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), TIRCP Grant from the California State Transportation Agency Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, and 3% match contributions from local jurisdictions. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule. 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. 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission 1340 Kevin Brown

- 1340-1 The commenter selected all three boxes indicating support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1340-2 The project's consistency with existing land use plans and zoning designations is assessed in Section 3.2, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR. The project would not require zoning changes. Furthermore, land use and zoning decisions, including any potential zone changes, are under the jurisdiction of local agencies such as cities or counties. Metro does not have the authority to impose or prevent zoning changes. Local jurisdictions retain full control over their zoning decisions and any future changes would be subject to their respective public review and approval processes.
- 1340-3 Police services would be provided by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) under Metro's existing contract service agreement with this agency. See MR-9: Light Rail Security. The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), 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. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1341 Richard Rudshagen

- 1341-1 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 1342 Gerri Yarborough

- 1342-1 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1343 J. Myatt

- 1343-1 The commenter's statement to take the light rail to Carson instead of Torrance is noted. Metro has considered multiple alignment options, starting with the 2009 Alternatives Analysis, which identified the C Line Extension to Torrance within the Metro ROW as a priority project. An extension further south past Torrance was considered, but currently does not have funding to be evaluated further.

Submission 1344 Dawson J.

- 1344-1 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. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.
- 1344-2 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology. Comments related to Torrance Transit should be directed to the City of Torrance.

Submission 1345 Michael Lituin

- 1345-1 The commenter's opposition to money going to public transportation is noted. The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), a Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) Grant from the California State Transportation Agency Transit, 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. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1346 Judith Shoemaker

- 1346-1 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.
- 1346-2 The commenter's preference for an improved bus system is noted. A High-Frequency Bus Alternative on local arterials is evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 1347 Don White

- 1347-1 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 1348 Wilmes LLC

- 1348-1 The commenter checked the box supporting the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment but also expressed opposition to all choices. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1348-2 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1349 Priscilla Sena

- 1349-1 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 1350 Scott Tan

- 1350-1 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 1351 Laurie Lehmer

- 1351-1 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1352 John & Emeli Anagnost

- 1352-1 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. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1353 Susan Gibson

- 1353-1 The commenter checked the box supporting the Trench Option but also expressed opposition to all choices. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1353-2 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. 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.

Submission 1354 Anonymous

- 1354-1 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.
- 1354-2 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security. The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), a Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) Grant from the California State Transportation Agency Transit, 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. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and

Schedule. 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission 1355 Terrian Ferren

- 1355-1 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.
- 1355-2 The commenter's opposition to rail in Torrance is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.
- 1355-3 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1356 D. Weirick

- 1356-1 The commenter's support for the No Project Alternative is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1356-2 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-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1357 Concerned Citizen

- 1357-1 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 1358 Ray K

- 1358-1 A High-Frequency Bus Alternative on local arterials, which is not "fixed" light rail infrastructure, is evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1359 Michael Mitani

- 1359-1 The commenter's stated support for public transit and selection of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option without preference, are noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1360 Richard Beaver

- 1360-1 The commenter's recommendation for a subway in Redondo Beach is noted. See Table 4.2-1, Summary of Alternatives Considered and Rejected, on page 4-2 of the Draft EIR, which explains that a deep bore tunnel alignment was considered but rejected because it was expected to have significantly higher costs, higher-real estate needs, and increased construction-related impacts without corresponding benefits compared to a trench configuration. See also MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1361 Anonymous

1361-1 You can reference a map illustrating the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option on the Metro project website, as well as in different sections of the Final EIR. The web maps are interactive and can be zoomed in for detailed viewing. If accessing the online maps is difficult, printed maps with larger formats can be made available at the project's outreach events or by contacting Metro directly at greenlineextension@metro.net. Additionally, Metro staff members are available to assist with reviewing maps in person at public meetings or by phone at 213-922-4004 to help ensure the maps are accessible for all.

The Torrance Transit Center is not included in the map since it is not a Metro station, but the proposed light rail station would be adjacent to the Torrance Transit Center and is included in the project maps in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR.

Submission 1362 Sudduth

1362-1 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.

1362-2 The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), a Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) Grant from the California State Transportation Agency Transit, 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. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1363 F. Ron

1363-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

1363-2 None of the alignments evaluated in the Draft EIR would require roadway reconfigurations that would eliminate general-purpose traffic lanes. However, 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. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways.

1363-3 See response to Comment 1363-1. An option to connect to the Del Amo Mall was considered during the 2021 scoping period for the project, but was not studied as other transit lines connect to the mall and the route would not connect to the City's transit center.

Submission 1364 Anonymous

1364-1 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 1365 Richard Foryell

- 1365-1 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 1366 Charles Bauman

- 1366-1 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 1367 F. Blaek

- 1367-1 The commenter marked boxes for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1367-2 The commenter's concerns regarding project costs and values are noted. 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology; see MR-19: Project Benefits, and MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1368 Barry Buth

- 1368-1 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.
- 1368-2 For clarification, commuter rail would not run on this track. Metro light rail trains would operate within the Metro ROW. 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 and Trench Option light rail guideway is fully grade-separated from all roadways and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions. 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 1369 Shirley Mitchell

- 1369-1 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.
- 1369-2 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1370 Vicki Smith

- 1370-1 The commenter's opposition to light rail in Torrance is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1371 Mrs. David C. Dupuls

- 1371-1 Comments related to sidewalk construction should be directed to the city with jurisdiction.

Submission 1372 Karen Robinson

- 1372-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The cities of Lawndale, Redondo Beach, and Torrance plan, construct, and maintain sidewalks within their respective jurisdiction.
- 1372-2 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.
- 1372-3 The commenter's concern about project costs and value are noted. See MR-19: Project Benefits and MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1373 Rick & Lori Kamrath

- 1373-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. This is not a vote but a request to the public to participate in the environmental review process required by CEQA. The Metro Board will consider the findings of the Final EIR, along with all public comments and community input received throughout the process, before making any final decision on the project. Potential impacts associated with all the project alternatives and options are summarized in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 1374 Member of Madrone Homeowner Assoc.

- 1374-1 The commenter's opposition to light rail in Torrance is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1375 Vicke Wallace

- 1375-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1376 Kathleen Kenny

- 1376-1 The commenter marked boxes indicating support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Hawthorne Option, although also states unhappiness with the project. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1377 J. Armandores

- 1377-1 The commenter's opposition to light rail in Torrance is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1378 Anonymous

- 1378-1 The commenter's opposition to light rail in Torrance is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1379 Anonymous

- 1379-1 The commenter marked a box indicating support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, although also states opposition to the project. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1379-2 See response to Comment 1379-1.

Submission 1380 Anonymous

- 1380-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1381 James Lews

- 1381-1 The commenter's opposition to light rail and preference for a bus terminal is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1381-2 The project would provide benefits to Torrance. The project would connect to the new regional bus transit center in Torrance. See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter and MR-19: Project Benefits. A High-Frequency Bus Alternative is discussed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 1382 Anonymous

- 1382-1 This commenter's opposition to the project has been noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1383 Ernest Yuska

- 1383-1 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.
- 1383-2 See Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, for a thorough analysis of the noise and vibration impacts of the three light rail alignment options, as well as mitigation measures to reduce the noise and vibration impacts. The Metro Board selected an LPA for purposes of the Final EIR. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option significantly reduce noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because they avoid 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 detailed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, and Chapter 4, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, the noise and vibration impacts of the LPA would be comparable to those of the Trench Option.

Submission 1384 Jon R.

- 1384-1 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 1385 Carol Vega

- 1385-1 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.
- 1385-2 The commenter states opposition to the project and also confirms preference for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment. The project is partially funded by Measure R, as well as Measure M, another ballot measure passed by over 71% of voters in Los Angeles County to fund mobility projects.

Submission 1386 Leanna Smith

- 1386-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1387 Sharon L. Guzman

- 1387-1 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. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1388 Debre Cowrin

- 1388-1 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. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1389 David Ortiz

- 1389-1 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-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1390 Monica Steele

- 1390-1 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.
- 1390-2 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1391 M. Page, LCSW, BCD

- 1391-1 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 and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1392 Judith Lanfried

- 1392-1 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. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1393 Miriam Lengle

- 1393-1 The commenter marked boxes expressing support for all light rail alignments. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1394 Carolyn Lewis (Trustee for Althea Boehm)

- 1394-1 The commenter's opposition to light rail in Torrance 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 1395 Craig Stanton

- 1395-1 South Bay Estates is included in the Draft EIR's noise and vibration analysis as Clusters G27 through G30. As shown on Figure 3.6-23 of the Draft EIR, a soundwall is proposed along the eastern boundary of the Metro ROW near South Bay Estates and would be required by Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls. The soundwall locations are also shown in Table 3.6-26 of the Draft EIR. Operational noise impacts at Clusters G27 through G30 would be less than significant with mitigation.

Submission 1396 Sherry Roberts

- 1396-1 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.
- 1396-2 See response to Comment 1396-1. 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. Neither the LPA nor the

Trench Option would increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions, as both alignments fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways and do not require modifications to existing intersections or traffic lanes.

Submission 1397 T. Fox

- 1397-1 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1398 Sofia

- 1398-1 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.
- 1398-2 The commenter's preference for the No Build Alternative is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1399 Glass

- 1399-1 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.
- 1399-2 The commenter's opposition to the project in Torrance is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1400 Mark and Diana

- 1400-1 This 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.
- 1400-2 This commenter's support for elevated rail is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1401 Linda Mandel

- 1401-1 This 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 1402 Paul Halpern

- 1402-1 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.
- 1402-2 Metro values public participation and input. All comments received on the Draft EIR during the public comment period are reviewed and considered as part of the preparation of the Final EIR. The Metro Board will make a decision on the project with consideration of the Final EIR and all public comments and feedback received during the engagement.

Submission 1403 Katherine McKinney

- 1403-1 This 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 1404 Keith Lee

- 1404-1 The commenter's support for the ROW alignment and secondary 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.

- 1404-2 See response to Comment 1404-1.

Submission 1405 Ismat Madhani

- 1405-1 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 1406 Kevin Morrow

- 1406-1 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.

- 1406-2 All light rail options and alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIR provide a direct connection to the LAX/Metro Transit Center. When the project opens, it would operate as part of the K Line, traveling north-south between the Expo/Crenshaw Station 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.

Submission 1407 Fred M. Gravett

- 1407-1 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 1408 Robert Tashiro

- 1408-1 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 1409 Ryan Moon

- 1409-1 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.

- 1409-2 See response to Comment 1409-1. The environmental impacts of each option and alternative were analyzed in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR. See the Executive Summary in the Draft EIR for a summary of the impacts of each project option.

Submission 1410 Cynthia Angel

- 1410-1 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 1411 Bob Habel

- 1411-1 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 1412 Charlene Rhodus

- 1412-1 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 1413 Michael Mahkorn

- 1413-1 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 1414 Kirk Jensen

- 1414-1 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 1415 Lonnie Nakasone

- 1415-1 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.
- 1415-2 As described in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR, a Phase I Site Investigation was conducted for the length of the project to determine the presence of contaminated soils that may be disturbed by the project. As noted in Section 3.9-4.4 of the Draft EIR, Project Feature PF-HHM-3: Property Acquisition Phase II Site Investigation would require a Phase II Site Investigation to be conducted prior to construction during the preliminary engineering phase for sites that would be used for the project. If the Phase II Site Investigation concludes that a site to be acquired/utilized by the project is contaminated, Project Feature PF-HHM-3: Property Acquisition Phase II Site Investigation requires that remediation or corrective action (e.g., removal of contamination, in-situ treatment, capping) be conducted prior to or during construction in accordance with

applicable regulations. Additionally, Project Feature PF-HHM-5: Disposal of Groundwater would ensure that contaminated groundwater would be managed appropriately according to federal and state regulations.

Submission 1416 Christian Chlup

- 1416-1 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 1417 Robin Eisenberg

- 1417-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The project is proposed by Metro and not the City of Torrance. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1418 Daniel Evans

- 1418-1 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 1419 Robert Feldman

- 1419-1 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.
- 1419-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignments is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1420 Yogesh Patel

- 1420-1 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 1421 Brandon Beers

- 1421-1 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 1422 Lesli Curry

- 1422-1 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 1423 Shatiana Bedgood

- 1423-1 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 1424 Dave Sato

- 1424-1 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 1425 Gary Hawkins

- 1425-1 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.
- 1425-2 The commenter expresses support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment over the Trench Option and Hawthorne Option, based on costs, noise, and convenience considerations. See response to Comment 1425-1.

Submission 1426 Simon Hsu

- 1426-1 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 1427 Michael McGee

- 1427-1 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.
- 1427-2 A station option along Hawthorne Boulevard in Lawndale had been evaluated in the 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis, but was eliminated from further consideration at the request of the City of Lawndale. The South Bay Galleria Station would provide access to the South Bay Galleria and shopping area adjacent to the station area.

Submission 1428 Wayne Chen

- 1428-1 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 1429 K. Sinn

- 1429-1 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.

- 1429-2 The Trench and Hawthorne Options were studied in direct response to requests from local jurisdictions and the public to evaluate alternatives to the Metro ROW. The Draft EIR evaluates the environmental impacts of each alignment studied in accordance with CEQA. The Draft EIR does not evaluate costs or broader economic and social considerations, which are not required under CEQA.

However, those additional factors were considered by Metro outside of the EIR, as documented in public Metro Board reports published in September 2023 and April 2024. These reports, which are available on the project website, summarize the opportunities and challenges associated with each alignment. The Metro Board considered these factors, along with the environmental analysis in the Draft EIR and public feedback, in selecting the LPA in May 2024.

The Metro Board will consider the findings of the Final EIR, along with all public comments and community input received throughout the process, before making any final decision on the project.

Submission 1430 Adair Johnson

- 1430-1 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 1431 Walt Lapovich

- 1431-1 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 1432 Rajakumar Ganesan

- 1432-1 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.
- 1432-2 The commenter's support for an at-grade alignment within the Metro ROW due to cost and traffic concerns is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1433 Angeline Diana Velu

- 1433-1 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.
- 1433-2 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment due to cost and traffic concerns is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1434 Tim Mochizuki

- 1434-1 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 1435 Roxanne Morrison

- 1435-1 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 1436 Nick Morrison

- 1436-1 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 1437 Sandy Kast

- 1437-1 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 1438 Sam Lee

- 1438-1 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.
- 1438-2 The commenter's recommendation for Metro to select the most cost-efficient project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1439 Erika Magana

- 1439-1 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 1440 Ronald Cline

- 1440-1 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 1441 Christopher J. Spitzer

- 1441-1 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 1442 Janet Closs

- 1442-1 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 1443 Dr. Eric Homier

- 1443-1 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.
- 1443-2 See response to Comment 1443-1. 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-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 1444 Scott Robertson

- 1444-1 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 1445 Franco Macchia

- 1445-1 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.
- 1445-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1446 Anjali Bhardwaj

- 1446-1 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.
- 1446-2 Potential impacts associated with the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment are summarized in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. 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 1447 Carol Gilles

- 1447-1 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.
- 1447-2 Metro does not collect data on Torrance Transit usage as Torrance Transit falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Torrance rather than Metro. For the light rail extension, 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.

Submission 1448 Marcus

- 1448-1 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 1449 Allison Madrid

- 1449-1 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 1450 Benjamin Madrid

- 1450-1 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.
- 1450-2 The commenter's preference for both the light rail and freight rail tracks trenched is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1451 Emilio Moyers

- 1451-1 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 1452 Jim Steenhoek

- 1452-1 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 1453 Huali Tian and Phillip Harris

- 1453-1 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 1454 James Kinnings

- 1454-1 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 1455 Bill Tymczyszyn

- 1455-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission 1456 Stanley Paez

- 1456-1 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 1457 Stanley Paez

- 1457-1 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 1458 Marilyn Rafkin

- 1458-1 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 1459 Bryon Sargent

- 1459-1 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 1460 Louis Lansang

- 1460-1 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 1461 Michele Smith

- 1461-1 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.

- 1461-2 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission 1462 Eileen Dann

- 1462-1 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 1463 Cynthia Baran

- 1463-1 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.
- 1463-2 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-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 1464 Darren Bracken

- 1464-1 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. Metro is designing the terminus station at the Torrance Transit Center to allow the line to continue further south, should funding become available in the future. Potential extensions from the Torrance Transit Center to San Pedro, Long Beach, and the Los Angeles/Orange County line are included in the unfunded portion of the 2009 Metro Long Range Transportation Plan. Metro may consider these projects in the future, if additional funding becomes available.

Submission 1465 Cheryl Neese

- 1465-1 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 1466 Ken Yang

- 1466-1 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 1467 Johnny Rodriguez

- 1467-1 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 1468 Grace Eze

- 1468-1 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 1469 Debby Zagorin

- 1469-1 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 1470 Marshall Holladay

- 1470-1 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.
- 1470-2 The commenter's support for a Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 1471 Kathryn Wathen

- 1471-1 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.
- 1471-2 Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1472 U.A. Garred Sexton

- 1472-1 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.
- 1472-2 Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1473 Erik Gara

- 1473-1 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 1474 Norris Blake

- 1474-1 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 1475 N.

- 1475-1 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 1476 Victor Kiuhan

- 1476-1 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.
- 1476-2 Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.
- 1476-3 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and secondary support for the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See responses to Comments 1476-1 and 1476-2.
- 1476-4 See response to Comment 1476-3. Previous studies also examined routes to Del Amo Mall, but those options were screened out as they did not provide ridership benefits.

Submission 1477 Gary Sisson

- 1477-1 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.
- 1477-2 As discussed in Section 3.2, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, the Metro ROW alignments 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 anyone part of the community from the other.

Submission 1478 Cynthia Benon

- 1478-1 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 1479 Dan

- 1479-1 The commenter's opposition to light rail in Torrance is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. 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 and Trench Option light rail guideway is fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1480 Chris Jenne

- 1480-1 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 1481 Steve

- 1481-1 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 1482 Huong Do

- 1482-1 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 1483 Kazuhiro Tominaga

- 1483-1 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 1484 Don Hanson

- 1484-1 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 1485 Mohammad Sarfaraz Siddiqui

- 1485-1 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.
- 1485-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1486 Dawn Ng

1486-1 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 1487 William M. Weed

1487-1 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 1488 Denise Weed

1488-1 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 1489 Thomas N. Bailey

1489-1 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 1490 Zubiar

1490-1 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 1491 Evelyn Kelly

1491-1 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 1492 Wayne Nakatsu

1492-1 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 1493 Ron Kawasaki

1493-1 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 1494 Isabel Balboa

- 1494-1 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. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project.

Submission 1495 Lee Huniu

- 1495-1 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 1496 Derrick Yamauchi

- 1496-1 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 1497 Diana Yamauchi

- 1497-1 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 1498 Gary Motowaki

- 1498-1 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 1499 Michael Hikido

- 1499-1 The commenter's opposition to the light rail in Torrance is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1499-2 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.
- 1499-3 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 LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with school-age pedestrians and cyclists. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.
- 1499-4 See response to Comment 1499-1.

- 1499-5 The commenter's preference for a bus lane is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. A High-Frequency Bus Alternative is evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 1500 Jaycob

- 1500-1 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 1501 John V. Shaw

- 1501-1 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 1502 Cecelia Ruiz

- 1502-1 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 1503 Lauren Lopez

- 1503-1 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 1504 Barbara Asada

- 1504-1 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.
- 1504-2 The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), 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. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1505 Todd Zylman

- 1505-1 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 1506 Dweejal Torado

- 1506-1 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.
- 1506-2 The proposed stations are located at the Redondo Beach Transit Center or South Bay Galleria and Torrance Transit Center. The proposed stations were selected based on proximity to activity centers, ridership potential, ability to provide seamless and efficient service, and physical fit. Metro does not have plans to add another station at this time.

Submission 1507 Dorota Wiercinska

- 1507-1 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 1508 Sean O'Connell

- 1508-1 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 1509 Linh Tu

- 1509-1 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.
- 1509-2 Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1510 Judy Chai

- 1510-1 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 1511 Pei Shao

- 1511-1 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 1512 Traci Barr

- 1512-1 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 1513 Michael Van Dyke

- 1513-1 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 1514 Amber

- 1514-1 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 1515 Benjamin

- 1515-1 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 1516 Anna Silhavy

- 1516-1 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 1517 Mika Yukimura

- 1517-1 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.
- 1517-2 As described in Section 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR, subsections 3.10-4.4 and 3.10-4.6, none of the alignment options evaluated would alter drainage patterns in manner that could result in flooding or redirect flood flows. Each alignment option would include integrated stormwater management systems designed to address changes in impervious surfaces and ensure compliance with applicable stormwater management regulations. These systems must be designed to accommodate stormwater runoff volumes associated with current and projected conditions, including the potential for more severe weather patterns. Therefore, impacts related to flooding or redirected flood flows would be less than significant for each alignment option. As discussed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, Subsection 4.5-3.10, the hydrology and water quality impacts of the LPA would be similar to those of the Trench Option and would be less than significant.

Submission 1518 Mauricio Padilla

- 1518-1 This commenter's opposition to light rail in the South Bay but a preference for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1519 Sandhya Pathak

- 1519-1 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 1520 Monique Sharf

- 1520-1 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 1521 Nicolas Cerveaux

- 1521-1 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 1522 Ray Licon

- 1522-1 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 1523 John Alter

- 1523-1 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 1524 Chris Alter

- 1524-1 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 1525 Myra Masuyama

- 1525-1 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 1526 Sylvia Wagner

- 1526-1 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 1527 Tina Wu

1527-1 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 1528 Nancy Carr

1528-1 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 1529 Natalie Brecher

1529-1 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 1530 Sandeep Pangala

1530-1 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 1531 Gina Gualtiere

1531-1 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 1532 Russel Lear

1532-1 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 1533 Michael Hering

1533-1 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.

1533-2 The commenter's opposition to the project and support for protected bike lanes is noted. The project would provide benefits to Torrance. The project would connect to the new regional bus transit center in Torrance. See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter and MR-19: Project Benefits. 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology. See response to Comment 1533-1.

Submission 1534 Nicolas M. Garcia

- 1534-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Comments related to increasing development density along the project should be directed to the city with jurisdiction over the land use zoning.

Submission 1535 Clifford Yamamoto

- 1535-1 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 1536 Kathy Yandell

- 1536-1 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 1537 Vicki Momary

- 1537-1 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 1538 Michael Bawolski

- 1538-1 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 1539 Bob D. Turnbull

- 1539-1 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.
- 1539-2 See response to Comment 1539-1.

Submission 1540 Fred Deninger

- 1540-1 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 1541 David W. Tressel

- 1541-1 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 1542 Marsha Kraus

- 1542-1 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 1543 Cyndi and Michael Runyan

- 1543-1 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 1544 Jeffery Ly

- 1544-1 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 1545 Karyn Campbell

- 1545-1 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 1546 Michael Navarrete

- 1546-1 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.
- 1546-2 The environmental impacts of each project option and alternative are analyzed in Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Impact Analyses, of the Draft EIR. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project.

Submission 1547 Onofre Ramirez

- 1547-1 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 1548 John

- 1548-1 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 1549 Kristina Nakao

1549-1 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 1550 Jean Garcia-Gomez

1550-1 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 1551 Ingrid Aquino-Gomez

1551-1 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 1552 Christopher Olsen

1552-1 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 1553 Eric Loew

1553-1 The commenter's support for the Trench Option. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1554 Glenn Murakami

1554-1 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 1555 Dory Ann Volpe

1555-1 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 1556 Diana

1556-1 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 1557 Jeff Pierce

1557-1 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 1558 Sharon Obatake

1558-1 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 1559 Steve Harmon

1559-1 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 1560 Lilian Harmon

1560-1 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 1561 Jonathan Harmon

1561-1 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 1562 Wendy Ito

1562-1 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 1563 Eric McLeod

1563-1 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 1564 Yuji Kato

1564-1 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 1565 Eric Hambly

- 1565-1 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.
- 1565-2 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted, along with a preference for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment.

Submission 1566 Alexis Hambly

- 1566-1 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.
- 1566-2 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1567 Giselle L. Henry

- 1567-1 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 1568 Alison & Michael Kasterko

- 1568-1 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.
- 1568-2 See response to Comment 1568-1.

Submission 1569 Gary Nakamura

- 1569-1 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 1570 Robert Munoz

- 1570-1 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 1571 Hakjoon Song

- 1571-1 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 1572 Jongmi Kim

- 1572-1 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 1573 Peter Farb

- 1573-1 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.
- 1573-2 The project has been designed to improve overall connectivity, including safe and convenient access to the Torrance Transit Center for pedestrians and cyclists. The project's design has taken accessibility into account, and Metro will continue to assess opportunities for further enhancing connections as the design progresses.

Submission 1574 Rod Royales

- 1574-1 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 1575 Dena Bialick

- 1575-1 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.
- 1575-2 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. Neither the LPA nor the Trench Option would increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions, as both alignments fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways and do not require modifications to existing intersections or traffic lanes. Regarding access to the Torrance Transit Center, as described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the project would provide a direct connection. Cities with a light rail station are required to make a local contribution to funding through the Measure M 3% Local Match as part of the Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan Ordinance (#16-01).

Submission 1576 C.B.

- 1576-1 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.

- 1576-2 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission 1577 Krishna Kallury

- 1577-1 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 1578 Rebecca Ward

- 1578-1 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.
- 1578-2 Metro recognizes the importance of minimizing impacts from light rail and relocated freight operations. Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, provides a detailed noise analysis and identifies mitigation measures to reduce significant noise impacts. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Submission 1579 Martin Gutierrez

- 1579-1 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 1580 Brian Gillman

- 1580-1 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 1581 Jeff Etherington

- 1581-1 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.
- 1581-2 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1582 Angela Stark

- 1582-1 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 1583 Steven Birenbaum

- 1583-1 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 1584 Eileen

- 1584-1 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 1585 Ryan

- 1585-1 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.
- 1585-2 See the Executive Summary of the Draft EIR for an overview of the analysis and a description of each option. See MR-19: Project Benefits.

Submission 1586 Mark Kohagura

- 1586-1 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 1587 Andrea Korntheuer

- 1587-1 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 1588 Dori

- 1588-1 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 1589 Michael Powe & Barbara Dyer

- 1589-1 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.
- 1589-2 Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR analyzes the project's transportation impacts. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service for information addressing traffic concerns. Neither the LPA nor the Trench Option would increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions, as both alignments fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways and do not require modifications to existing intersections or traffic lanes.

Submission 1590 Kelly L. Dewing Wedel

- 1590-1 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.
- 1590-2 The comment reiterates support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment due to cost considerations. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1591 Fernando

- 1591-1 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.
- 1591-2 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. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 1592 Jafet Rosado De Van

- 1592-1 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 1593 Carolina Olaya

- 1593-1 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 1594 Maria Brown

- 1594-1 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 1595 Steven Rosales

- 1595-1 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 1596 Kevin Knapp

- 1596-1 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 1597 Michele Starkey

- 1597-1 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 1598 Jackie

- 1598-1 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.
- 1598-2 Metro does not have authority to plan for green space within the local jurisdictions. However, as part of the project, Metro would include multi-use paths along the Metro ROW where there is space (between 159th Street and Condon Avenue and between Grant Avenue and 182nd Street, to create recreational space for walking and cycling in the neighborhoods. 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 and Trench Option light rail guideway is fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions, nor require modifications to existing traffic lanes.

Submission 1599 Paul

- 1599-1 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.
- 1599-2 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1600 Kathleen Franczak

- 1600-1 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 1601 Jenny Lee

- 1601-1 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 1602 Nitin Dua

- 1602-1 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 1603 Nolan Miya

- 1603-1 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.
- 1603-2 The comment reiterates support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment as the economical choice.

Submission 1604 Thomas W. Broyles

- 1604-1 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 1605 Nes Banta

- 1605-1 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 1606 Michael Flynn

- 1606-1 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.
- 1606-2 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 only light rail alignment option studied in the Draft EIR is the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 1607 Adam Reed

- 1607-1 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 1608 Brandon Foster

- 1608-1 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.
- 1608-2 All light rail alternatives and options, except the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, would be fully grade-separated, meaning that the light rail would be separated from vehicular and pedestrian crossings. For the at-grade crossings proposed under the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the light rail would have signal priority.

Submission 1609 Matthew Lin

- 1609-1 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 1610 Steven Deuel

- 1610-1 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 1611 Kyle Richardson

- 1611-1 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.
- 1611-2 See response to comment 1611-1.
- 1611-3 The comment reiterates support for locating the alignment in the Metro ROW and connecting to the new Redondo Beach Transit. The comment also emphasizes the importance of service frequency and clear wayfinding to support a successful transit system.
- 1611-4 The Redondo Beach Transit Center Station would be fully Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant, regardless of alignment. The station would include features such as pedestrian pathways, ramps, and stairs to ensure safe and convenient access for all users.
- 1611-5 While this project would include measures to address noise impacts specifically associated with the light rail transit line and relocated freight operations, addressing noise from the Interstate 405 Freeway is outside the scope of this project because it is not part of the proposed project. For freight rail noise, the project includes Project Feature PF-NV-1: Quiet Zone Equipment Installation and Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment to reduce freight noise impacts by eliminating the need for the routine sounding of freight train horns. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.
- 1611-6 Metro has proposed two multi-use recreational paths, one between 159th Street and 170th Street and another between Grant Avenue and 182nd Street. The multi-use paths follow the route of the Metro ROW, which is straight rather than curved.

- 1611-7 The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways, meaning, under those alignment options, there would be no conflict between light rail and vehicular traffic at intersections. As a result, raised pedestrian crossings would not be necessary in areas where the light rail crosses for those alignment options. However, pedestrian enhancements would be included at freight crossings for the Metro ROW alignments, and along Hawthorne Boulevard for the Hawthorne Option to improve safety and accessibility. The Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would also include pedestrian enhancements at the two at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. Refer to Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, for more information.
- 1611-8 As described in Section 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR, landscaping within the project footprint would meet all relevant regulations, including stormwater retention and infiltration.
- 1611-9 See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes and MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety. 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.

Submission 1612 Donald Isozaki

- 1612-1 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 1613 Jon Robertson

- 1613-1 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 1614 Garrick McLaughlin

- 1614-1 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 1615 Ron Carroll

- 1615-1 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 1616 Al Stahl

- 1616-1 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.

- 1616-2 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. None of the alignment options would increase vehicle miles traveled.

Submission 1617 Mark Kimura

- 1617-1 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 1618 Lia

- 1618-1 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.
- 1618-2 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 fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways.

Submission 1619 Richard Reinhardt

- 1619-1 The No Project Alternative was analyzed in the Draft EIR as required by CEQA. As concluded in the Draft EIR, the No Project Alternative would have significant and unavoidable impacts related to transportation, land use and planning, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, while it would avoid the significant and unavoidable noise and vibration impacts of the project and options. The Metro Board does not have to approve the project and retains the authority to approve the No Project Alternative. This decision will be made after a thorough review of the environmental analysis contained in the Draft and Final EIR and community input.

Current Metro line ridership information can be found at the website: <https://opa.metro.net/MetroRidership/>. 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

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. Neither the LPA nor the Trench Option would increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions, as both alignments fully grade separate the

light rail from all roadways and do not require modifications to existing intersections or traffic lanes.

Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1620 George Pimentel

1620-1 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.

1620-2 The Metro Board has selected an LPA for purposes of the Final EIR, although it has not yet approved the project, including any of the options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. The final decision will be made after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which will include responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter.

Submission 1621 James Hallman

1621-1 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 1622 Annette Porter

1622-1 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 1623 Patrick Porter

1623-1 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 1624 Robert Suyehara

1624-1 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.

1624-2 Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project.

Submission 1625 Norig B. Karakashian

1625-1 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 1626 James Thistle

- 1626-1 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.
- 1626-2 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission 1627 Sandra Radford

- 1627-1 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.
- 1627-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment and opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, provides a detailed noise analysis and identifies mitigation measures to reduce significant noise impacts. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. Relative to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the LPA and Trench Option significantly reduce noise impact to residence near the Metro ROW because they eliminate the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. The Hawthorne Option is also fully grade-separated. 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.

Submission 1628 Madu Chanani

- 1628-1 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 1629 Katerina Yu

- 1629-1 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 1630 Adeline Chappell

- 1630-1 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 1631 Ben Gunter

- 1631-1 The commenter's support for the Trench Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Comments related to Torrance Transit should be directed to the City of Torrance.

Submission 1632 Yacgley Valdes

- 1632-1 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 1633 Current Resident

- 1633-1 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 1634 Seema S. Turner

- 1634-1 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 1635 Amy

- 1635-1 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 1636 Kimberly Wimmer

- 1636-1 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.
- 1636-2 The commenter's secondary support for the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1637 Joel Carlson

- 1637-1 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 1638 Drew Hettinger

- 1638-1 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 1639 Marlena Allen

- 1639-1 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 1640 Lisa DiFranco

- 1640-1 The commenter's opposition to the project has been noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

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 traffic disruption from at-grade light rail crossings would not occur under the LPA, Trench Option or Hawthorne Option, as all of these alignment options fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways.

Chapter 3, Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, analyzes air quality impacts and found no significant impacts during operations. Regarding vehicle idling, the primary pollutant of concern related to idling is carbon monoxide (CO). However, CO concentrations in the South Coast Air Basin have been well below federal and state standards for over two decades and the region has been designated as attainment/maintenance of the CO standards since 2007. Even with potential for localized vehicles idling near stations or drop-off areas, or at grade-crossings under the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the project would reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), which, in turn reduces total emissions. As a result, any localized idling effects are not anticipated to outweigh the project's broader air quality and mobility benefits.

Submission 1641 J. Imai

- 1641-1 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 1642 Max Huang

- 1642-1 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 1643 Andrew Zakim

- 1643-1 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 1644 David Gutierrez

- 1644-1 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 1645 Geri Harmon

- 1645-1 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.
- 1645-2 Construction traffic would be managed through a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), required by Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan, described in Section 3.1, Transportation. That said, 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. Neither the LPA nor the Trench Option would increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions, as both alignments fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways and do not require modifications to existing intersections or traffic lanes.

Although, as described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, the project would result in significant and unavoidable noise impacts during construction for all alignment options, construction noise would be managed pursuant to Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan, which establishes performance standards based on the Federal Transportation Administration’s (FTA) 1-hour Leq criteria and requires preparation of a site-specific plan, continuous noise monitoring, and responsive actions to reduce noise to the maximum extent feasible. However, because construction conditions can vary and some activities may temporarily exceed those thresholds, the impact is conservatively considered significant and unavoidable even with mitigation. With respect to long-term operational noise, the Draft EIR finds that only the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in a significant and unavoidable operational noise impact. Operational noise impacts of the Trench Option, Hawthorne Option, and the LPA would be less than significant with mitigation.

Submission 1646 Tanya Sue Cyre

- 1646-1 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 1647 Sarah Huante-Bimat

- 1647-1 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.

- 1647-2 Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project.

Submission 1648 Ed Tobias

- 1648-1 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 1649 Jan Tobias

- 1649-1 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 1650 Isabel Torres

- 1650-1 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 1651 Paul Hutchins

- 1651-1 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 1652 John Phillip Van Deusen

- 1652-1 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.
- 1652-2 Metro is designing the terminus station at the Torrance Transit Center to allow the line to continue further south, should funding become available in the future. Potential extensions from the Torrance Transit Center to San Pedro, Long Beach, and the Los Angeles/Orange County line are included in the unfunded portion of the 2009 Metro Long Range Transportation Plan. Metro may consider these projects in the future, if additional funding becomes available.

Submission 1653 Karne Holley

- 1653-1 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 1654 Lisa Li

- 1654-1 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 1655 Lois & Ron Jones

- 1655-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The project would provide benefits to Torrance. The project would connect to the new regional bus transit center in Torrance. See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter and MR-19: Project Benefits. The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), 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. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1656 Phil Hong

- 1656-1 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 1657 Randy Garrett

- 1657-1 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 1658 Maya Yanez

- 1658-1 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 1659 Judith Gerber

- 1659-1 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 1660 Michael and Nancy Bergan

- 1660-1 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 1661 Richard Leroy Lujan

- 1661-1 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 1662 Stephanie Seki

- 1662-1 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 1663 Andrew Maxwell

- 1663-1 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.
- 1663-2 The comment reiterates support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment despite noise impacts due to schedule and cost. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project, including noise.

Submission 1664 Leah Glavan

- 1664-1 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, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians.

Submission 1665 Jawad Jilani

- 1665-1 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 1666 Nancy Gutierrez

- 1666-1 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 1667 Pirza Castro

- 1667-1 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 1668 Chirstos Sbarounis

- 1668-1 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.
- 1668-2 The proposed stations are located at the Redondo Beach Transit Center or South Bay Galleria and Torrance Transit Center. The proposed stations were selected based on ridership potential, ability to provide seamless and efficient service, physical fit, and community impacts. Metro does not have plans to add another station at this time.

Submission 1669 Jonathan Turcios

- 1669-1 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 1670 Sumit Kalra

- 1670-1 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 1671 Deborah Wearn

- 1671-1 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.
- 1671-2 The comment reiterates support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment due to avoiding delays and incremental funding.

Submission 1672 Mitch Koch

- 1672-1 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 1673 Steven Dillow

- 1673-1 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. The commenter also notes that the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is the most cost-effective method. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1674 DarLynn Nemitz

- 1674-1 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.

- 1674-2 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 would be designed and constructed in compliance with Metro’s geotechnical and seismic design criteria to ensure seismic resistance and stability. In addition, the Metro Rail Design Criteria and associated Metro seismic stability and safety guidelines provide specific requirements to prevent structural failure and protect public safety during seismic events.

Submission 1675 Jay Kim

- 1675-1 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.
- 1675-2 The comment reiterates support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment.

Submission 1676 Erik Aguillon

- 1676-1 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 1677 Scott Fukuda

- 1677-1 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 1678 Connie Noehren

- 1678-1 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 1679 Libra Washington

- 1679-1 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 1680 Lily Lau

- 1680-1 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 1681 Ana Sorto

- 1681-1 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.
- 1681-2 Metro is committed to engaging communities as part of the project development process to inform design and decision-making. Metro collected public comments as part of the Draft EIR public comment process and shared summaries of public input with the Metro Board. 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.

Submission 1682 Badrinath Ramamoorthy

- 1682-1 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 1683 Yi Chen Pao

- 1683-1 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.
- 1683-2 The commenter correctly notes that the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment includes grade crossings. The LPA and Trench Option light rail guideway is fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions.

Submission 1684 Estela Lopez

- 1684-1 The commenter's preference for enhanced regional bus service is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. A High-Frequency Bus Alternative on local arterials is discussed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1685 Alissa Pappadake

- 1685-1 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.
- 1685-2 See response to Comment 1685-1.

Submission 1686 Jeff Hovsepian

- 1686-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, Hawthorne Option, and Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1687 Emanuel Rodriguez

- 1687-1 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.
- 1687-2 All light rail options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR have two proposed stations: one in Redondo Beach and one in Torrance adjacent to the Torrance Transit Center. Alignments that use the Metro ROW stop at the Redondo Beach Transit Center, adjacent to and west of the South Bay Galleria. The alignment that uses the Hawthorne Option stops on Hawthorne in front of and east of the South Bay Galleria.

Submission 1688 Kathy Miya

- 1688-1 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 1689 Ben Nye

- 1689-1 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.
- 1689-2 The commenter's opposition to the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1690 Layne Sakamoto

- 1690-1 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 1691 Jose Dennis Alabaso

- 1691-1 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 and MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1692 Molly

- 1692-1 The commenter's opposition to the light rail in Torrance is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1693 Matthew J. Davis

- 1693-1 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.

1693-2 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1694 Jon Robertson

1694-1 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.

1694-2 The commenter's support for public transit in Torrance is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1695 Michelle

1695-1 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.

1695-2 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1696 Esther

1696-1 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 1697 Patrick Llorens

1697-1 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 1698 James Kotekci

1698-1 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 1699 Mary Kotekci

1699-1 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 1700 Karen Blanchard

1700-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment, Hawthorne Option, and Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1701 Miguel A. Perez

- 1701-1 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.
- 1701-2 See response to Comment 1701-1.

Submission 1702 Michael Guzman

- 1702-1 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 1703 Fred Mosley

- 1703-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology and MR-19: Project Benefits. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1704 Richard Rodriguez

- 1704-1 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.
- 1704-2 Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule. The intent of the project is to provide an alternative to driving which would reduce the likelihood of future increases in traffic. 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 Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. However, Metro's goal is to help businesses continue to operate throughout construction and post-construction.

Submission 1705 Maria Gordon

- 1705-1 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.
- 1705-2 The project would provide an alternative to driving which would reduce the likelihood of future increases in traffic. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for discussion on traffic conditions. 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology and MR-19: Project Benefits. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1706 Constance Reynolds

- 1706-1 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 1707 Joseph Yamashiro

- 1707-1 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.
- 1707-2 Like the Trench Option, the LPA fully grade separates the light rail from all roadways, as does the Hawthorne Option. See response to Comment 1707-1 and MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service.

Submission 1708 Lisa Scherer

- 1708-1 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 1709 Carlos Delgado

- 1709-1 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.
- 1709-2 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1710 Ryan Shiroma

- 1710-1 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 1711 Tony & Karen Herrada

- 1711-1 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.
- 1711-2 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology and MR-19: Project Benefits. A High-Frequency Bus Alternative on local arterials is evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology for more information regarding ridership trends.

Submission 1712 Katie Pandolfo

- 1712-1 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 1713 Graham DesErnia

- 1713-1 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 1714 Trang Le

- 1714-1 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 1715 Gianna Valenzuela

- 1715-1 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.
- 1715-2 The commenter's opinion that the additional cost of the Hawthorne Option is worth the ability to keep streets available for cars is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1716 Carol Erickson

- 1716-1 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.
- 1716-2 The commenter's primary support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and secondary support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1717 Brad Aniya

- 1717-1 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.
- 1717-2 The commenter's support for light rail is noted. All light rail options and alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIR provide a direct connection to the LAX/Metro Transit Center. When the project opens, it would operate as part of the K Line, traveling north-south between the Expo/Crenshaw Station 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. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1718 Yukihisa Aokusa

- 1718-1 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 1719 Lisa Barry

- 1719-1 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 1720 Eileen Jaynes

- 1720-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1721 Deborah Pasienski

- 1721-1 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 1722 Harry Yee

- 1722-1 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 1723 Mamatha Amrutham

- 1723-1 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 1724 Jennifer Bullivant

- 1724-1 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 1725 Edwin Rosas

- 1725-1 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 1726 Maria Alarcon

- 1726-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project.

Submission 1727 GN

- 1727-1 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 1728 James Baker

- 1728-1 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 1729 Heng Baker

- 1729-1 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 1730 Brad Shimbukuro

- 1730-1 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 1731 Melanie Drieke

- 1731-1 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.
- 1731-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives for more information regarding how the LPA would avoid impacts to the Breakwater Village senior living community. Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule. The commenter's support for the lowest cost and impact to businesses and residents is noted. Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project.

Submission 1732 Jackie Eckland

- 1732-1 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.
- 1732-2 Metro worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 1733 West Torrance Homeowners Association

- 1733-1 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.
- 1733-2 This comment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to Comment 1733-1.

Submission 1734 Fink Family

- 1734-1 The commenter's support for Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1734-2 See response to Comment 1734-1.

Submission 1735 Cori Talbot

- 1735-1 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.
- 1735-2 The commenter's concern for residents along the Metro ROW is noted. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 1736 C. Henderson

- 1736-1 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.
- 1736-2 No additional bike path improvements are proposed for the Hawthorne Option. The Metro ROW alignment includes two multi-use paths along where there is space (between 159th Street and Condon Avenue, between Grant Avenue and 182nd Street, and adjacent to the Torrance Transit Center), to create recreational space for walking and cycling in the neighborhoods.

Submission 1737 Gari Tani

- 1737-1 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 1738 Margaret Heflinger

- 1738-1 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.
- 1738-2 Elevated structures are used where grade separations are required. There are elevated tracks for both the Hawthorne Option as well as parts of the Metro ROW alignments.

Submission 1739 Michael A. Serufine

- 1739-1 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.
- 1739-2 See response to Comment 1739-1.

Submission 1740 Donald Heflinger

- 1740-1 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.
- 1740-2 Elevated structures are used where grade separations are required. There are elevated tracks for both the Hawthorne Option as well as parts of the Metro ROW alignments.

Submission 1741 Dennis LoPiccolo

- 1741-1 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.
- 1741-2 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1742 Florence Tebbets

- 1742-1 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 1743 Eric Homier

- 1743-1 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.
- 1743-2 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. Also see MR-10: Changes in Community Character.

Submission 1744 Bruce Lagarte

- 1744-1 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 1745 Irene Griffith

- 1745-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorn Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1745-2 Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project.

Submission 1746 Emily Durbin

- 1746-1 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.
- 1746-2 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 fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts between the light rail and pedestrians and cyclists. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 1747 Carol Booser

- 1747-1 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 1748 Gary Maclean

- 1748-1 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.
- 1748-2 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1749 Pam Combar

- 1749-1 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.

- 1749-2 Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR acknowledges alluvial soils in the project resource study area. As detailed in Section 3.8-4.6 of the Draft EIR, which evaluates the potential for the project to be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, the project would result in a less than significant impact. The project includes Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, which requires preparation of a site-specific geotechnical investigation. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.
- 1749-3 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 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.

Submission 1750 Harumi Nishikan

- 1750-1 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 1751 Douglass Coreas

- 1751-1 The commenter's support for the Trench Option and Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1752 Tom O'Neill

- 1752-1 The commenter's support for the Trench Option and Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1752-2 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology. 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 in Community Character.

Submission 1753 Janet Sue

- 1753-1 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 1754 Patricia Carlini

- 1754-1 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 1755 The Browns

- 1755-1 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 1756 Franco and Kim Reitz

- 1756-1 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 1757 Geoffrey M. Hefler

- 1757-1 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.
- 1757-2 Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, and Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR further describe the impacts of the LPA, which, for operational noise and aesthetic impacts, would be similar to the Trench Option. The LPA and Trench Option significantly reduce operational noise impacts to residential land uses along the Metro ROW compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because they eliminate the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. The Hawthorne Option also fully grade separates the light rail. 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 light rail train horns and crossing bells.

Submission 1758 Ophelia Biomort

- 1758-1 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 1759 Frank Kraus

- 1759-1 The commenter's preference for the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1759-2 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1760 Jerry Morrison

- 1760-1 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 1761 Seok Jeong Lim

- 1761-1 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 1762 Juno & Ethel Uyematsu

- 1762-1 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.
- 1762-2 The commenter's opinion that the Trench Option is aesthetically better is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.
- 1762-3 The commenter's opinion that the Trench Option would generate less noise is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1763 Louis V. Martel

- 1763-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1764 Alan Sarkisian

- 1764-1 The commenter's preference for the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1764-2 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. No alignment has been approved at this time. The Metro Board selected the LPA for purposes of the Final EIR. 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. A bus would cost less than rail but would offer significantly reduced benefits. As described in the 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, the light rail extension would serve 11,500 and 15,600 daily project trips in 2042 compared to the High-Frequency Bus Alternative, which attracts 3,700 to 4,000 daily project trips. Buses would need to travel within already congested streets, and would not have the same capacity to support anticipated growth in the South Bay. See MR-19: Project Benefits.

Submission 1765 Dana LaRoche

- 1765-1 The commenter's support for the Trench Option and Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1766 William Nichols

- 1766-1 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.

- 1766-2 The commenter's support for the trench option due to noise reduction is noted. Similar to the Trench Option, 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. Unlike the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the under the LPA, Trench Option and Hawthorne Option would grade separate the light rail from all roadways, thereby eliminating the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine light rail train horns and crossing bells. Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1767 Steven Sack

- 1767-1 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 1768 Eric Orchard

- 1768-1 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.
- 1768-2 See Section 3.3, Aesthetics, and Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, along with MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 1769 Lisa Loewner

- 1769-1 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 1770 Merry Passage

- 1770-1 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.
- 1770-2 The commenter's opposition for the Trench Option is noted despite the prior comment indicating support. As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the entire light rail guideway would be enclosed with some kind of barrier, such as fencing or a soundwall in areas where noise mitigation is proposed. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 1771 Chuck Salisbury

- 1771-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1771-2 As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the entire light rail guideway would be enclosed in a physical barrier, such as fencing, soundwalls, or a combination of both, thereby preventing unauthorized intrusion. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 1772 David Burrows

- 1772-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1772-2 The commenter's opposition to the Trench Option is noted. It is unclear what the commenter means about the Hawthorne Option connecting to the Redondo Green line; the Hawthorne Option would start at the Redondo Beach (Marine) Station, and would have a stop at Artesia Boulevard, where riders could walk to the Redondo Beach Transit Center or connect there via transit.

Submission 1773 K. Nelson

- 1773-1 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 1774 Joe & Mary

- 1774-1 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 1775 Camillia Lee

- 1775-1 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 1776 B. O'Brien

- 1776-1 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.
- 1776-2 The commenter's support for the Torrance City Council's approved route is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1777 Lisa Pedion

- 1777-1 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.
- 1777-2 The Hawthorne Boulevard Median Project beautified medians located on Hawthorne Boulevard between Del Amo Boulevard and Torrance Boulevard. The Hawthorne Option would avoid this area and south of 190th Street would run adjacent to the existing freight tracks.

Submission 1778 Kathy

- 1778-1 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 1779 James Cook

- 1779-1 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 1780 Nancy Fengler

- 1780-1 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 1781 H. & J. Taga

- 1781-1 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.
- 1781-2 The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), 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. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule. The environmental impacts of each project option and alternative are analyzed in Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Impact Analyses, of the Draft EIR. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project.

Submission 1782 Susan Ludwig

- 1782-1 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.
- 1782-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment as the most cost effective and least impactful to traffic and parking is noted.

Submission 1783 Anonymous

- 1783-1 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 1784 Geoff Guerrero

- 1784-1 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 1785 Christine Brenk

- 1785-1 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 1786 Michael Brenk

- 1786-1 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 1787 Madison Brenk

- 1787-1 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 1788 Diana L. Seyb

- 1788-1 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 1789 Michael Brenk

- 1789-1 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 1790 Jane Readeur

- 1790-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

The project's potential relationship to increased density is discussed in Section 3.16, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR. The project would improve and facilitate opportunities for growth around transit while helping to reduce reliance on personal automobiles in the region. Senate Bill (SB) 9 and SB 10 are state housing laws that facilitate the development of additional housing units on certain parcels, but their applicability is not determined or driven by the presence of light rail transit. Instead, these laws are part of broader efforts to address California's housing shortage. While the project would support

growth management goals of the affected jurisdictions, and help to reduce potential environmental impacts associated with such foreseeable growth, the project would not cause unplanned or excessive growth. Rather, the project would be consistent with local and regional planning efforts, such as those of the Southern California Association of Governments, to manage growth. These efforts prioritize transit-oriented development to create walkable communities near transit hubs, consistent with local growth management goals. Therefore, no adverse effects associated with growth-inducement are anticipated. See MR-19: Project Benefits.

Submission 1791 Thomas Penland

- 1791-1 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.
- 1791-1 The commenter's opposition to light rail in Torrance and secondary support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1792 Timothy Cunningham

- 1792-1 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 1793 Ted Potcovaru

- 1793-1 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 1794 Eric Caro

- 1794-1 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.
- 1794-2 This commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. The comment also notes support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment due to cost and noise considerations. 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. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule. See Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, for a thorough analysis of potential noise impacts, as well as mitigation measures to reduce the noise impacts. 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. Neither the LPA nor the Trench Option would

increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions, as both alignments fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways and do not require modifications to existing intersections or traffic lanes. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1795 Allen Perlstein and James Goodrich

1795-1 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.

1795-2 See response to Comment 1795-1.

Submission 1796 William Champlin

1796-1 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 1797 Victoria Fox

1797-1 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 1798 James Vaughan

1798-1 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 1799 Henry Martinez

1799-1 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.

1799-2 The commenter's concerns regarding delays and cost increases are noted. Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1800 Mike Madrigal

1800-1 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.

1800-2 Presently, the Metro C Line links with the Metro J Line at the Harbor Freeway Station, two stations north of Harbor Gateway Transit Center. Operating as part of the Metro K Line,

riders could connect to the Metro C Line at Aviation/Century, to then connect to the Metro J Line and access the Harbor Gateway Transit Center. Torrance Transit, which provides bus service within this project's study area, also connects to the Harbor Gateway Transit Center.

Submission 1801 David Sanders

- 1801-1 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.
- 1801-2 The Redondo Beach and Torrance Transit Centers both provide existing parking spaces that could be used for transit customers. Metro will coordinate with the cities on transit parking based on demand. The project would include infrastructure and design features that facilitate access for varying modes of transportation. Metro will continue to engage with the community to identify opportunities for improving station access and connectivity. It does not provide term parking for LAX.

Submission 1802 Margaret Kline

- 1802-1 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 1803 Sue Walters

- 1803-1 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 1804 Kelly Wu

- 1804-1 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 1805 Eva Wuertz

- 1805-1 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 1806 Kurt Michel

- 1806-1 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 1807 Jose Dennis Alabaso

- 1807-1 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.
- 1807-2 The Metro K Line Aviation/Century Station opened in Fall 2024.

Submission 1808 Lisa Whitfield

- 1808-1 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.
- 1808-2 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 and Trench Option are fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions, nor would they require modifications to existing traffic lanes.

Submission 1809 Sandra Schreyer

- 1809-1 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 1810 Han Wen Tsao

- 1810-1 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 1811 Dan Criotoru

- 1811-1 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 1812 Tana Rice

- 1812-1 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.
- 1812-2 The environmental impacts of each project option and alternative are analyzed in Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Impact Analyses, of the Draft EIR. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project. As part of the project development process in

preparing the alignment routes, Metro emphasized 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 1813 Grace Weltman

- 1813-1 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.
- 1813-2 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. 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 Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, for a thorough analysis of potential noise impacts, as well as mitigation measures to reduce the noise impacts. For the Metro ROW alignments, the project would enable local cities to establish Quiet Zones with Federal Railroad Administration (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.

Submission 1814 Nancy Wilcox

- 1814-1 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.
- 1814-2 See response to Comment 1814-1. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security. 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 would be designed and constructed in compliance with Metro's geotechnical and seismic design criteria to ensure seismic resistance and stability. In addition, the Metro Rail Design Criteria and associated Metro seismic stability and safety guidelines provide specific requirements to prevent structural failure and protect public safety during seismic events. Routine maintenance has been factored into the cost assumptions for the project. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1815 Milton Aineruhanga

- 1815-1 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 1816 Marco

- 1816-1 The commenter's opposition to a rail system and support for buses or bus lanes is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. A High-Frequency Bus Alternative on local arterials is evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Metro takes public safety very seriously. 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. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project, including those related to construction. 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. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 1817 Stefan Eckland

- 1817-1 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.
- 1817-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment due to cost considerations is noted. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1818 David Dewitt

- 1818-1 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 1819 Masaru Iwanaga

- 1819-1 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.
- 1819-2 The project would provide benefits to Torrance. The project would connect to the new regional bus transit center in Torrance. See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter and MR-19: Project Benefits.

Submission 1820 Susan Eriksen

- 1820-1 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 1821 Leslie Chavez

- 1821-1 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 1822 Sandra Yoshioka

- 1822-1 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 1823 Patty Zaremski

- 1823-1 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 1824 Cristian Guerrero

- 1824-1 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 1825 Kent Oliver

- 1825-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1825-2 The commenter's preference for grade-separated transit is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways.

Submission 1826 Brad M.

- 1826-1 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 1827 Wolfgang Fengler

- 1827-1 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 1828 Bexsi Fujiwara

- 1828-1 The commenter's support for the Trench Option and Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1829 Linda & David Ortega

- 1829-1 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 1830 Karl D. Albert

- 1830-1 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.
- 1830-2 See response to Comment 1830-1.

Submission 1831 Adrienne Luther

- 1831-1 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.
- 1831-2 The commenter's support for the project is noted. TAP machines are a requirement for all Metro Rail stations.

Submission 1832 Brenden Baltimore

- 1832-1 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 1833 Mr. James T. Wright

- 1833-1 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.
- 1833-2 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment but preference for no light rail is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1834 Christopher J. Pon

- 1834-1 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 1835 Anonymous

- 1835-1 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 1836 Robin Solomon

- 1836-1 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.
- 1836-2 This commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1837 Mr. Richard Smisek

- 1837-1 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 1838 N. Maloney

- 1838-1 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.
- 1838-2 The Metro ROW alignments would directly connect to the new Redondo Beach Transit Center.

Submission 1839 Luis Garcia

- 1839-1 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 1840 Irene Brucks

- 1840-1 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.

- 1840-2 This commenter's preference for cost savings is noted. The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), 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. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1841 Marianne Moscynski

- 1841-1 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 1842 Jane K. Hashimoto

- 1842-1 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.
- 1842-2 The commenter's support for the project is noted.

Submission 1843 George Williams

- 1843-1 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 1844 Bill Sorosky

- 1844-1 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 1845 Joseph Palsulich

- 1845-1 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 1846 Sung J. Hong

- 1846-1 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 1847 Linda Zelk

1847-1 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 1848 Kathy H. Ujiye

1848-1 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 1849 Anonymous

1849-1 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 1850 Anonymous

1850-1 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 1851 Keith

1851-1 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 1852 Mr. & Mrs. William B. Campbell

1852-1 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 1853 Jaclynn Miller Madoni

1853-1 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.

1853-2 The commenter's support for the Torrance City Council's approved route is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1854 Jennifer Silver

- 1854-1 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 1855 Judy & Bob June

- 1855-1 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 1856 Carol Campbell

- 1856-1 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.
- 1856-2 Routine maintenance has been factored into the cost assumptions for the project. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1857 Mary Hileman

- 1857-1 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.
- 1857-2 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment due to cost and disruption concerns is noted.

Submission 1858 Patrick Westfahl

- 1858-1 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 1859 Zalatan Sehovic

- 1859-1 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 1860 Nancy Brock

- 1860-1 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.
- 1860-2 This commenter's support for the project is noted.

Submission 1861 Maureen Wilson

- 1861-1 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.
- 1861-2 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1862 Mrs. Dana Chambers

- 1862-1 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 1863 Keiko Kono

- 1863-1 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 1864 Genie Valdez

- 1864-1 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.
- 1864-2 As described in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, the project would be designed to accommodate high seismic ground motion and associated consequences in accordance with Metro's geotechnical design standards and thresholds, Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards. Site-specific geotechnical investigations would be performed in accordance with the Metro Rail Design Criteria (MRDC) Section 5.6 to incorporate seismic demands and provide engineering solutions. The project would comply with the latest versions of local and state building codes and regulations.

Submission 1865 Randy Degasperin

- 1865-1 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 1866 Kristen Papac

- 1866-1 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 1867 Celia Caampued

1867-1 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 1868 Gary E. Kaloostian

1868-1 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 1869 Harry Bellows III

1869-1 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.

1869-2 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment due to cost and constructability concerns is noted.

Submission 1870 Michael Goguen

1870-1 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 1871 Maurine Swilley

1871-1 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 1872 Harold Jason

1872-1 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 1873 Samuel Gnerre

1873-1 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 1874 Anonymous

1874-1 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 1875 Carol Halfabe

1875-1 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 1876 John Warren

1876-1 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 1877 David Oster

1877-1 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 1878 Bill & Fran Arrowsmith

1878-1 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.

1878-2 The commenter's support for the Torrance City Council's approved route is noted.

Submission 1879 Linda Jung

1879-1 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 1880 Beverly A. Borton

1880-1 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 1881 Danelle Berch

1881-1 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 1882 Fazlo Edber

- 1882-1 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.
- 1882-2 This commenter's preference for cost savings is noted. The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), 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. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1883 Randy & JoanAnn Hart

- 1883-1 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 1884 Kerry Croucer

- 1884-1 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 1885 Sam Marteland

- 1885-1 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 1886 Joann and Mike Tripp

- 1886-1 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.
- 1886-2 See MR-18: Homelessness, for details on how Metro is addressing concerns related to homeless populations.

Submission 1887 Gail Serrano Vasquez

- 1887-1 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 1888 Mr. Gary McKenzie

- 1888-1 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 1889 Chris Tam

- 1889-1 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 1890 Arelen Dubas

- 1890-1 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 1891 Kit Chan

- 1891-1 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 1892 Tomi Kawaski

- 1892-1 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.
- 1892-2 Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the Americans with Disabilities Act and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts between light rail and pedestrians. In addition, for the Metro ROW alignments, the freight crossing at 182nd Street would include new safety equipment. The Hawthorne Option would also include pedestrian enhancements, as discussed in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 1893 Leonard Zak

- 1893-1 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 1894 Denny Hallmark

- 1894-1 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.
- 1894-2 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment due to cost, constructability, and traffic concerns is noted.

Submission 1895 Peter Gregoris

- 1895-1 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 1896 Michele Urbina

- 1896-1 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 1897 Shoreh Zareh

- 1897-1 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 1898 Ann Clark

- 1898-1 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 1899 Heather Albright

- 1899-1 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.
- 1899-2 The Draft EIR includes quantitative analyses by subject matter experts on the effects of the project on air quality. With respect to actions that would be taken to reduce air pollution during construction, the project's contractor would comply with all applicable air quality control measures adopted by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and Metro. These measures include requiring all construction equipment to meet or exceed Tier 4 emission standards, which represent the cleanest available technology for off-road equipment, as outlined in Project Features PF-AQ-1: Metro Green Construction Policy Compliance and PF-AQ-2: SCAQMD Rule 403 Compliance in the Draft EIR. Additionally, best management practices for controlling fugitive dust emissions, such as regular watering of exposed surfaces, covering of stockpiles, and limiting vehicle speeds on unpaved surfaces,

would be enforced. Relative to non-compliance, these practices are expected to reduce dust emissions by up to 91%, as detailed in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR determined that although construction activities would result in temporary emissions, these emissions would not exceed regional or localized thresholds established by SCAQMD for each light rail alignment option considered, other than the Trench Option. As discussed in Chapter 3 of the Final EIR, the LPA would have less than significant construction air quality impacts.

For operations, the project is expected to improve regional air quality by reducing vehicle miles traveled and encouraging a shift from car travel to clean, electric-powered light rail transit. This would result in a net decrease in air pollutants and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions over the long term. See Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, for a detailed analysis of both construction and operational air quality impacts.

- 1899-3 Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character. The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), a Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Project (TIRCP) Grant from the California State Transportation Agency Transit 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. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1900 X

- 1900-1 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 1901 Hanif Haji

- 1901-1 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.

- 1901-2 This comment is noted. See response to Comment 1901-1.

Submission 1902 Oluynika Sorunke

- 1902-1 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 1903 John Usui

- 1903-1 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 1904 Robert Jung

- 1904-1 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 1905 Brandon Folkman

- 1905-1 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 1906 Samantha Folkman

- 1906-1 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 1907 Ralph

- 1907-1 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology. 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 and Trench Option are fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions, nor require modifications to traffic lanes.
- 1907-2 The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), 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. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.
- 1907-3 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. It is important to note that while the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment has been selected as the LPA, the Metro Board has not yet approved the project, including any of the options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. The final decision will be made after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which will include responses to all public comments.

Submission 1908 Christine Tokunaga

- 1908-1 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.

- 1908-2 The commenter's opposition to providing a station in Torrance is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1909 Cynthia Kringen

- 1909-1 The commenter's opposition to light rail in the South Bay is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1910 Isaac Ng

- 1910-1 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.
- 1910-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Trench Option is noted. The project includes two stations for all three options studied in the Draft EIR: one in Redondo Beach and one at the Torrance Transit Center.

Submission 1911 Mahesh Tyagi

- 1911-1 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 1912 Rajani Patel

- 1912-1 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 1913 Vinh Cam

- 1913-1 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.
- 1913-2 Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project.

Submission 1914 Lori Bowker

- 1914-1 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 1915 Daniel Bowker

- 1915-1 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 1916 Ellen Tran

- 1916-1 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 1917 Cynthia A. Lim

- 1917-1 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 1918 Sam

- 1918-1 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 1919 Rachel LaCoe

- 1919-1 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 1920 Melissa Brymer

- 1920-1 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.
- 1920-2 See response to Comment 1920-1.

Submission 1921 Potato Jim

- 1921-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1921-2 The project would provide an alternative to driving which would reduce the likelihood of future increases in traffic. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for discussion on traffic conditions.

Submission 1922 Frank Putz

- 1922-1 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 1923 B. Stacy

- 1923-1 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.
- 1923-2 This comment's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment due to cost considerations is noted.

Submission 1924 Rebecca Poirier

- 1924-1 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 1925 Marian Eskander

- 1925-1 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.
- 1925-2 The commenter's opposition to light rail in Torrance is noted. The Draft EIR considers and analyzes a No Project Alternative, which was presented to the Metro Board along with all other options prior to the Board's selection of the LPA. It is important to note that while the Metro Board has selected an LPA for purposes of the Final EIR, it has not yet approved the project, including any of the options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. The final decision will be made after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which will include responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter.

Submission 1926 Linda Holliday

- 1926-1 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.
- 1926-2 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1927 Cheng-Wen Huang

- 1927-1 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 1928 Jenifer Roberts

- 1928-1 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.
- 1928-2 No light rail stations are proposed within predominantly residential areas. Soundwalls would be implemented to reduce noise associated with the light rail transit line as required by Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures for information regarding noise project features and mitigation measures.

Submission 1929 Lauren Faith Niro

- 1929-1 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 1930 Linda Hurnbeck

- 1930-1 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 1931 John Carter

- 1931-1 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 1932 Frank Yanai

- 1932-1 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 1933 James C. Reidy

- 1933-1 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 1934 Lilia Lucero

- 1934-1 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.
- 1934-2 The commenter's preference for using the existing tracks on the Redondo side is noted.

Submission 1935 Sally Matsumoto

- 1935-1 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 1936 Gus Mesch

- 1936-1 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.
- 1936-2 The commenter's support for the project is noted.

Submission 1937 Thomas & Cheryl Lenahan

- 1937-1 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 1938 Douglas Lowder

- 1938-1 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 1939 Dorcas Huang

- 1939-1 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 1940 Richard Astin

- 1940-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1941 R. Parke

- 1941-1 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 1942 Mr. Kenneth F. Darr

- 1942-1 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 1943 Bryan Griebenow

- 1943-1 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 1944 Bruce Pettingale

- 1944-1 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 1945 Patrick Healy

- 1945-1 Metro has designed the project to avoid displacement of residents. See the 2025 Real Estate Acquisition Report 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.
- 1945-2 This commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment and secondary support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. A gondola has not been studied as the transit mode for the project as it would not meet the objectives of the project, in particular related to providing a direct connection to the existing regional transit network. See Section 4.2, Alternatives Considered and Rejected, of the Draft EIR, for a discussion of alternative studied by Metro starting in 2009.
- 1945-3 Metro has prioritized designing the project to fit within the existing Metro ROW to reduce disruption to nearby homes and businesses and reduce property acquisition needs. Redevelopment is not proposed by the project.

Submission 1946 Mark Nelson

- 1946-1 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 Air Quality.
- 1946-2 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. Metro, as the CEQA Lead Agency, has the responsibility to determine the appropriate criteria for the project. The Metro ROW is owned by Metro and is not regulated by the City of Redondo Beach. The Redondo Beach Municipal Code does not apply to the Metro ROW and state law preempts Metro from local zoning requirements.

1946-3 See response to Comments 1946-1 and 1946-2.

Submission 1947 Holly Osborne

1947-1 Metro prepared cost estimates in 2022 for all rail alignments and shared them with the Metro Board prior to the May 23, 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. While the LPA is more costly than the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, it remains over half a billion dollars less expensive than the Trench or Hawthorne Options.

1947-2 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

1947-3 See response to Comment 1947-2.

The commenter refers to presentation materials that were shared at the Draft EIR public hearings. The materials summarized the range of ridership projections for all alignment options. The May 2024 Board Report, available to the public prior to the Metro Board meeting and reviewed by the Metro Board prior to selecting an LPA, included detailed ridership information for all alignment options and alternatives.

Submission 1948 Jennifer L. Dodge

1948-1 All light rail and freight tracks are designed according to Metro's design criteria with appropriate clearances, and would fit within the existing Metro ROW. See Appendix 2-A, Select ACE 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 relocated freight and light rail tracks. See also MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

1948-2 Potential impacts related to soil conditions are evaluated in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety for utility relocation details in the Metro ROW, as well as information concerning construction and operational vibration effects on underground utilities. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for a detailed discussion of how construction and operation within the corridor would be managed in consideration of local soil conditions. Potential noise impacts, along with noise mitigation measures, are described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. See also MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

1948-3 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. As described in Section 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, existing freight tracks would need to be shifted to accommodate light rail tracks; the distances vary depending on the location. 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 constructions recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged.

- 1948-4 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 1949 Ray Hollar

- 1949-1 Submission 346 includes the same comment from the same commentor. See response to Comment 346-1.

Submission 1950 Ray Hollar

- 1950-1 The potential loss of on-street parking is part of the Hawthorne Option, thus was included in the description of this option. The 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, includes an inventory of on-street parking spaces and the number of parking spaces along this segment of the Hawthorne Option. However, this loss of parking spaces in the context of a public transit project in an urban environment is not considered an environmental impact under CEQA that needs to be mitigated.

With regards to inclusion of Areas of Controversy, see the response to Comment 364-1.

- 1950-2 In the context of a public transit project in an urban environment, parking impacts are not considered an environmental impact that requires mitigation under CEQA. The potential loss of on-street parking is mentioned as an element of the Hawthorne Option's description, not an impact. It is also described in the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR.

With regards to inclusion of Areas of Controversy, see the response to Comment 364-1.

Submission 1951 Margie Alexander

- 1951-1 Regarding changes in community character, health impacts, and property values, see MR-10: Changes to Community Character, MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality and MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses, respectively. It should also be noted that the LPA would avoid shifting the freight tracks closer to the Breakwater Village Senior Complex. For additional information, see MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 1951-2 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. As described in Section 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, existing freight tracks would need to be shifted to accommodate light rail tracks; the

distances vary depending on the location. 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 constructions 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, the revisions do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that the impact 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.

- 1951-3 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; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety; and MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

It should also be noted that the LPA would avoid shifting the freight tracks closer to the Breakwater Village Senior Complex.

- 1951-4 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

- 1951-5 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1952 Janice Tanabe

- 1952-1 Passengers at the Redondo Beach TC Station would exit the station toward the city's transit center, where they could connect with other modes of transit. A multi-use recreational path would be located between Grant Avenue and 182nd Street along the east side of the Metro ROW, which would provide access to the station.

There is sufficient room to construct and operate a trench under 182nd Street to allow the light rail to travel below the street. With respect to the embankment near Breakwater Village, a new retaining wall would be constructed to accommodate the grade changes and ensure safe operation of the light rail and freight. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

All light rail and freight tracks are designed according to Metro’s design criteria with appropriate clearances, and would fit within the existing Metro ROW. See Appendix 2-A, Select ACE 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 relocated freight and light rail tracks. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 1953 Monique Negrete-Mitchell

1953-1 The commenter’s opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. 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, the revisions do not change the Draft EIR’s conclusion that the impact 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.

1953-2 This regulation applies to the project and is referenced in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR. As outlined in Project Feature PF-HHM-1: Handling, Storage, and Transport of Hazardous Materials and Wastes, handling, storage, and transport of any identified hazardous materials and waste would comply with applicable federal and state regulations.

In Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR, the following text pertaining to the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act’s regulations has been added to Project Feature PF-HHM-1: Handling, Storage, and Transport of Hazardous Materials and Wastes for clarity: “The transportation of hazardous materials and waste shall be conducted in accordance with the applicable regulations codified in 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 101, 106, 107, and 171 to 180, including, but not limited to, those related to packagings, pre-transportation functions, transportation functions, and functions not subject to the requirements of the federal Hazardous Materials Regulations.” This addition does not change the meaning or conclusions of the Draft EIR. The impact is still less than significant.

Submission 1954 Giana Mitchell

1954-1 Urbanized avian species, including resident birds of prey such as red-tailed hawks, great-horned owls, and barn owls (as noted in the article provided), are protected under the Migratory Birds Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code (CFGC). As discussed in Section 3.7, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR, species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code (CFGC) have potential to occur within the SA. This includes resident birds of prey, such as red-tailed hawks and great-horned owls. As stated on page 3.7-22 of the Draft EIR, portions of the Resource Study Area (RSA) provide urbanized avian species with both suitable breeding and foraging habitat in the form of trees, vegetation, and man-made structures. The Draft EIR acknowledges that construction activities could temporarily disturb these habitats. To address this, Mitigation

Measure MM-BIO-2: Nesting Bird Season Restrictions and Pre-Construction Surveys establishes protections for nesting birds, including seasonal restrictions and pre-construction surveys to identify active nests. Given the existing anthropogenic disturbance (e.g., vehicular traffic, train traffic, human presence) throughout the RSA, these measures are anticipated to mitigate potential impacts on local avian species to less than significant. The project does not propose any permanent changes that would preclude birds from returning to the area after construction is completed.

Submission 1955 Jan Kurth

- 1955-1 The commenter's opposition to the project in Torrance is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1955-2 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.
- 1955-3 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). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology
- 1955-4 See response to Comment 1955-2.
- 1955-5 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.
- 1955-6 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 1956 Marie Puterbaugh

- 1956-1 Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1957 Maria Savage

- 1957-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Metro recognizes the concerns of residents near the Metro ROW, including those on 182nd Place and Firmona Avenue. The Draft EIR evaluates all alignment options, including the Hawthorne Option, which is referenced in the comment. For additional information related to the issues raised in this comment, see Section 3.1, Transportation, Section 3.3, Aesthetics, Section 3.4, Air Quality, Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, and Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the LPA significantly reduces operational noise impacts because, like the Trench Option, it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade-separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA, as well as the Trench and Hawthorne Options, removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine light rail 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. As further 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 impacts of the LPA would be comparable to those of the Trench Option.

Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project, including noise and vibration. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule for details on the construction schedule for the project.

Submission 1959 Mike

1959-1 The commenter does not provide specific information on which properties are of concern, but there are two gas stations along Inglewood Avenue that would be affected by the project. One property on the north side of Inglewood Avenue would be affected by the Hawthorne Option, and would be fully acquired for construction and operations. The other gas station on the south side of Inglewood Avenue would be affected by the Metro ROW alignments, including the LPA, with a small portion of the property identified as being needed for grade crossing infrastructure, as well as for a temporary construction easement. See the 2025 Real Estate Acquisitions Report for more information.

The project email included in the comment is correct, and Metro checks it frequently and on a regular basis for comments, including for comments on the Draft EIR.

Should property acquisition be required, Metro would comply with all applicable laws and regulations, including the California Relocation Act (Gov. Code subsection 7260 et seq.) and Metro's internal policies. Metro would provide relocation assistance and compensation to eligible displaced property and business owners, in accordance with these regulations. Just compensation would be based on the fair market value established by an approved appraisal, and all affected property owners would be notified in advance and informed of their rights and eligibility for assistance and benefits

Submission 1960 Ray Hollar

1960-1 As stated on page 3.3-54 of the Draft EIR, there are no designated scenic vistas in the resource study area (RSA). Views of the mountains and other landmarks the commenter mentioned are located relatively long distances from the Metro ROW in Lawndale, which makes any possible views of them quite distant. For example, the Hollywood Sign is located approximately 17 miles north/northeast of the Metro ROW in Lawndale. Nonetheless, those distant views would remain available from public streets and sidewalks, even with the addition of project elements such as soundwalls and elevated structure.

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 uniform 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. Such details would be determined during final design.

- 1960-2 The commenter’s opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. 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. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 1961 Kylee Kirby-Smith

- 1961-1 The commenter’s opposition to the project is noted. 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. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.
- 1961-2 Although some residents use the Metro ROW for recreational activities, this use is not authorized or compliant with freight safety standards. See response to Comment 1961-1.
- 1961-3 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.

Submission 1962 Janice Tanabe

- 1962-1 Urbanized avian species, including resident birds of prey such as red-tailed hawks and great-horned owls, are protected under the Migratory Birds Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code (CFGF). As discussed in Section 3.7, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR, species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code (CFGF) have potential to occur within the Resource Study Area (RSA). This includes resident birds of prey, such as red-tailed hawks and great-horned owls. As stated on page 3.7-22 of the Draft EIR, portions of the RSA, such as El Nido Park, provide urbanized avian species with both suitable breeding and foraging habitat in the form of trees, vegetation, and man-made structures. The Draft EIR acknowledges that construction activities could temporarily disturb these habitats. To address this, Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-2: Nesting Bird Season Restrictions and Pre-Construction Surveys establishes protections for nesting birds, including seasonal restrictions and pre-construction surveys to identify active nests. Given the existing anthropogenic disturbance (e.g., vehicular traffic, train traffic, human presence) throughout the RSA, these measures are anticipated to mitigate potential impacts on local avian species to less than significant. The project does not propose any permanent

changes that would preclude birds from returning to the area after construction is completed. Further, El Nido Park is a landscaped area consisting of ornamental vegetation and located adjacent to the existing Metro ROW where disturbance from ongoing freight activity and anthropogenic use occurs daily; terrestrial wildlife species utilizing the park are adapted to living in an urban environment; therefore operational impacts would be less than significant. See MR-10: Changes in Community Character.

Submission 1963 Colleen Villegas

- 1963-1 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 Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. The analysis concludes that, with mitigation, vibration levels from light rail and relocated freight operations would be well below thresholds that could cause structural damage to buildings. 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 constructions recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged.

The Draft EIR identifies potential construction noise and construction vibration impacts as significant and unavoidable. However, Metro's contractor would implement Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan and MM-VIB-1: Vibration Control Plan to reduce these impacts to the extent feasible. The vibration control plan would include monitoring vibration levels to ensure compliance with the damage and annoyance thresholds to the maximum extent feasible. Additionally, construction-related activities would proceed in phases, limiting the duration of any impacts at a given location.

The commenter provides a link to a National Geographic Encyclopedia Entry, which discusses the global issue of noise pollution, particularly its high-intensity effects on human health, wildlife, and marine life. In contrast, the noise generated by the project would be intermittent, localized, and mitigated through soundwalls, quiet zones, and low-impact technologies. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

- 1963-2 Metro has extensive experience overseeing the design and construction of light rail projects and has successfully managed utility relocations for similar transit projects throughout the region. Potential soil stability impacts are addressed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes. 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.

- 1963-3 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. 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. See response to Comments 1963-1 and 1963-2.
- 1963-4 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 1964 Armando Vicente

- 1964-1 The commenter's opposition to the project using the Metro ROW is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1964-2 Noise and vibration are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration of the Draft EIR. Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR evaluates these impacts with respect to the LPA. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project, including noise and vibration. 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; MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds; and MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design.

As discussed in Section 3.2, Land Use, of the Final EIR, the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would not physically divide the 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 to isolate any one part of the community from the other. See also MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

For clarification, commuter rail would not run on this track. Metro light rail trains would operate within the Metro ROW, and would operate every five minutes during peak periods. 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.

- 1964-3 The commenter's support for shuttle buses is noted. A High-Frequency Bus Alternative is discussed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1964-4 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for increased bus circulation is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1965 Ana Maria Houck

- 1965-1 Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project.

All light rail and freight tracks are designed according to Metro's design criteria with appropriate clearances, and would fit within the existing Metro ROW. See Appendix 2-A, Select ACE 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 relocated freight and light rail tracks. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Metro has extensive experience overseeing the design and construction of light rail projects and has successfully managed utility relocations for similar transit projects throughout the region. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials.

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 the 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.

Submission 1966 Sirley Cuevas

- 1966-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials.

Submission 1968 Nancy Skiba

- 1968-1 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.
- 1968-2 The commenter's concerns are noted. The issues raised in the response are addressed in the following master responses: MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks, 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; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.
- 1968-3 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.
- 1968-4 A fully underground alignment option was not considered as it would have significantly more impacts on surrounding communities during construction, as well as significantly higher costs. Metro takes public safety very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1969 Mike Kim

- 1969-1 Metro has extensive experience overseeing the design and construction of light rail projects and has successfully managed utility relocations for similar transit projects throughout the region. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials.

- 1969-2 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 and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 1970 Mark Nelson

- 1970-1 The comment states that, “the Metro Draft EIR is defective and based on, “Redondo Beach Municipal Code (RBMC), evidence from Beach Cities Health District’s multimillion dollar investment in Blue Zones and other peer-reviewed studies as cited by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) research findings.” See responses to Comments 1970-2 through 1970-17 for responses to specific comments.
- 1970-2 The project does not violate Redondo Beach Municipal Code 10-2.2502 related to Planning Design Review. Metro, as the CEQA Lead Agency, has the responsibility to determine the appropriate criteria for the project. The Metro ROW is owned by Metro, and not regulated by the City of Redondo Beach. The Redondo Beach Municipal Code does not apply to the Metro ROW.
- 1970-3 The project does not violate Redondo Beach Municipal Code 4-24.301 related to noise. Metro, as the CEQA Lead Agency, has the responsibility to determine the appropriate criteria for the project, and has utilized the Federal Transportation Administration’s (FTA) noise impact criteria, which was specifically developed to address transit noise based on well-documented criteria and research on human response to community noise. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds. As discussed therein, application of the FTA criteria contrasts with the “brightline” operational noise thresholds used by many local jurisdictions, which set fixed operational limits without considering existing noise levels, and in many cases, these city thresholds have already been exceeded by existing conditions.
- 1970-4 The comment states that, “Project alternatives that use the existing freight right-of-way create a variety of health damages.” See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality. It is not technically feasible to correlate project-specific effects to specific health outcomes, given the complexity of factors contributing to these conditions. However, health effects related to air quality, noise, and other CEQA resources would be reduced with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures.
- 1970-5 The comment states that, “Project alternatives that use the existing freight right-of-way damage child development.” It is not technically feasible to correlate project-specific effects to specific health outcomes, given the complexity of factors contributing to these conditions. However, health effects related to air quality, noise, and other CEQA resources would be reduced with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.
- 1970-6 The commenter has not provided substantial evidence that, “adjustments must be made to project, and no use of the freight right-of-way could be selected by Metro without non-compliance with RBMC and damages to both adults and generations of children.” See response to Comments 1970-2 through 1970-5.

- 1970-7 The project does not violate Redondo Beach Municipal Code 10-2.2502 related to Planning Design Review. Metro, as the CEQA Lead Agency, has the responsibility to determine the appropriate criteria for the project. The Metro ROW is owned by Metro, and not regulated by the City of Redondo Beach. The Redondo Beach Municipal Code does not apply to the Metro ROW.
- 1970-8 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.
- 1970-9 The project does not violate Redondo Beach Municipal Code 4-24.301 related to noise. Metro, as the CEQA Lead Agency, has the responsibility to determine the appropriate criteria for the project, and has utilized the FTA’s noise impact criteria, which was specifically developed to address transit noise based on well-documented criteria and research on human response to community noise. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds. As discussed therein, application of the FTA criteria contrasts with the “brightline” operational noise thresholds used by many local jurisdictions, which set fixed operational limits without considering existing noise levels, and in many cases, these city thresholds have already been exceeded by existing conditions.
- 1970-10 The comment does not provide substantial evidence that the project would increase the risk of death and illness from chronic stress. It is not technically feasible to correlate project-specific effects to specific health outcomes, given the complexity of factors contributing to these conditions. However, health effects related to air quality, noise, and other CEQA resources would be reduced with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality. See response to Comment 1970-11 related to the cited Blue Zone Articles.
- 1970-11 The commenter provides the following quote from a book titled, “Business Engagement in Building Healthy Communities: Workshop Summary”: “... widen its main street and raise the speed limit, which, Buettner [Blue Zones CEO] said, creates stress, danger, noise pollution, and air pollution.” Metro does not dispute that excessive noise levels could cause adverse health effects. However, refer to Section 3.4, Air Quality, and Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, for project-specific analysis using health impact criteria established by the FTA and the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Also see MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

The commenter provides the following quote from an article titled, “Stress Makes us Sick”: [T]his stress can be chronic, due to a specific situation ... exposure to stress in early life can alter the normal development ... resulting in increased sensitivity to stress and lifelong health risks in offspring.” Metro does not dispute that stress could make people ill. This comment does not dispute the contents of the Draft EIR.

The commenter provides the following quote from an article titled, “Maximize Health and Longevity Using These Stress Management Strategies”: “... causes many harmful, often overlooked effects ... pain and strain ... sleep habits ... physical suffering ... headache, upset

stomach, or back pain ... stress can reduce the ability of your immune system”. Metro does not dispute that stress could cause the cited health effects. This comment does not dispute the contents of the Draft EIR.

The commenter provides the following quote from an article titled, “Fighting Chronic Stress from Current Events? You Are Not Alone”: “Although people often underestimate the influence of the mind on the body, a growing catalog of research shows that high levels of stress over an extended time can drastically alter physical function and affect nearly every organ system.” Metro does not dispute that stress could cause health effects. This comment does not dispute the contents of the Draft EIR.

- 1970-12 The link provided for the National Geographic article on rail noise and stress in East Palestine is broken. Regardless, articles such as those cited by National Geographic, often address general or cumulative effects of noise from various types of rail or transportation systems, including heavy freight, passenger rail, and light rail. The project is a proposed light rail system, which operates differently than heavy rail of freight systems, with shorter and lighter trains and electric propulsion (reducing noise compared to diesel-powered freight trains). These distinctions mean that impacts identified in general studies may not directly apply to the project. This comment does not dispute the contents of the Draft EIR.
- 1970-13 The commenter submits an article titled, “Effects of Exposure to Road, Railway, Airport and Recreational Noise on Blood Pressure and Hypertension” as evidence of project impacts. The project is a proposed light rail system, which operates differently than heavy rail of freight systems, with shorter and lighter trains and electric propulsion (reducing noise compared to diesel-powered freight trains). These distinctions mean that impacts identified in general studies may not directly apply to the project. This comment does not dispute the contents of the Draft EIR.
- 1970-14 The commenter submits an article titled, “The Effect of Aircraft, Road, and Railway Traffic Noise on Stroke – Results of a Case–Control Study Based on Secondary Data” as evidence of project impacts. The project is a proposed light rail system, which operates differently than heavy rail of freight systems, with shorter and lighter trains and electric propulsion (reducing noise compared to diesel-powered freight trains). These distinctions mean that impacts identified in general studies may not directly apply to the project. This comment does not dispute the contents of the Draft EIR.
- 1970-15 The commenter submits an article titled, “Transportation Noise and Risk of Tinnitus: A Nationwide Cohort Study from Denmark as evidence of project impacts. The project is a proposed light rail system, which operates differently than heavy rail of freight systems, with shorter and lighter trains and electric propulsion (reducing noise compared to diesel-powered freight trains). These distinctions mean that impacts identified in general studies may not directly apply to the project. This comment does not dispute the contents of the Draft EIR.
- 1970-16 The commenter submits an article titled, “A study of self-reported health problems of the people living near railway tracks in Raipur city” as evidence of project impacts. The project is a proposed light rail system, which operates differently than heavy rail of freight systems, with shorter and lighter trains and electric propulsion (reducing noise compared to diesel-

powered freight trains). These distinctions mean that impacts identified in general studies may not directly apply to the project. This comment does not dispute the contents of the Draft EIR.

- 1970-17 See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality. It is not technically feasible to correlate project-specific effects to specific health outcomes, given the complexity of factors contributing to these conditions. However, health effects related to air quality, noise, and other CEQA resources would be reduced with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. Furthermore, the project would not operate 24 hours per day for seven days per week. The proposed 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.

Submission 1971 Jiri Samuel

- 1971-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro recognizes the importance of minimizing impacts from light rail and relocated freight operations. Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, provides a detailed noise analysis and identifies mitigation measures to reduce significant noise impacts. The analysis follows the Federal Transit Administration Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual and evaluates the potential changes from existing conditions. The analysis accounts for the proposed frequency of train operation and proximity to sensitive receptors, such as residences. The noise standards used in the noise analysis are based on exterior noise levels, meaning that impacts were evaluated without assumed closed windows or air conditioning. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds and MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Submission 1972 Jiri Samuel

- 1972-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. 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 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 constructions recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged.

Submission 1973 Jan Kurth

- 1973-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. See responses to Comments 1973-3, 1973-5, 1973-6, and 1973-7 for specific

responses related to vibration. The project under consideration is a light rail transit line, not a commuter rail line, which typically consists of heavy rail. Light rail vehicles are quieter, electrically powered trains that generate less noise compared to larger, diesel operated Metrolink trains.

Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR identifies locations where potential operational vibration impacts related to structural damage and annoyance would occur and sets forth Mitigation Measures MM-VIB-4: Low Impact Frogs through MM-VIB-6: Ballast Mats. The foregoing mitigation measures would reduce vibration operational annoyance impacts to less than significant. See MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds and MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design for more information regarding the vibration analysis in the Draft EIR and during final design.

- 1973-2 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, and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.
- 1973-3 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 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 constructions recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged.
- 1973-4 Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project. The construction duration for the LPA is included in the Final EIR. Construction-related activities would proceed in phases, limiting the duration of any impacts at a given location. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.
- 1973-5 See response to Comment 1973-3. As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has defined vibration thresholds for human annoyance and structural damage. As shown in Table 3.6-6 of the Draft EIR, 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.

1973-6 See responses to Comments 1973-3 and 1973-5.

1973-7 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 of the Draft EIR, 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 1974 Michael Cowan

1974-1 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 1975 Kelly F.

1975-1 A map of the project and options is provided in Figure 1.2-1 of the Draft EIR, located on page 1-3 of the document and page 2-7 of the Final EIR. A map is also available online at Metro's website located here: Metro C Line Extension to Torrance - LA Metro. If accessing Draft EIR or the online map is difficult, printed copies of the map can be requested by contacting Metro at: greenlineextension@metro.net

Additionally, Metro staff are available to assist seniors and other community members in reviewing the map and project details, either by phone at 213-922-4004 or in person at public outreach events and meetings.

The proposed light rail tracks would be built adjacent to the freight tracks within the Metro ROW. While freight tracks would remain, in some locations the freight tracks would be shifted within the Metro ROW to accommodate the light rail tracks. For more information regarding the proposed modifications to the freight tracks, see Section 2.3-1 of the Draft EIR and Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR. Also refer to 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.

Submission 1976 Jay Gould

- 1976-1 The comment does not 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.
- 1976-2 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.
- 1976-3 The commenter's objection to the project alignment in proximity to residences is noted. The project is designed to avoid displacement of residents. However, for properties where acquisition is necessary, Metro would comply with all applicable laws and regulations, including the California Relocation Act. See the 2025 Real Estate Acquisitions Report for additional information about property needs associated with the project. See also MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.
- 1976-4 The comment does not 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.
- 1976-5 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. As described in the 2023 Alternatives Considered and Eliminated Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, Metro evaluated multiple alternatives and design options for a light rail extension in the South Bay from 2010 to the present day. Prior to the publication of the 2023 Draft EIR, reports analyzing the extension were published in 2009 and 2018. Crenshaw Boulevard would not be a feasible route, as it does not connect to the existing Redondo Beach (Marine) Station.

Submission 1977 Jay Gould

- 1977-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Vibration is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration of the Draft EIR. Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR evaluates these impacts with respect to the LPA. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project, including vibration. See MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds and MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design.

Submission 1978 Mark Car

- 1978-1 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.
- 1978-2 The comment does not 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.

Submission 1979 Stable

- 1979-1 Noise is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration of the Draft EIR. Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR evaluates these impacts with respect to the LPA. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project, including noise. See MR-2: Operational Noise

Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds and MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Metro has undertaken extensive community outreach for potential transit service along the Metro ROW for well over a decade. Metro's outreach program also takes into consideration limited English proficiency within the communities. Most recently, in notifying the community regarding the Locally Preferred Alternative decision at a Metro Board of Directors meeting in May 2024 connection with the Draft EIR open houses, Metro distributed 32,000 flyers to residents, property owners, and businesses within a one-mile radius of all the 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.

Submission 1980 Teresita Gonzales

1980-1 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 1981 Lyuamila Gurevich

1981-1 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 1982 Anne and Steve Granick

1982-1 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 1983 Ralph Giordano

1983-1 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 1984 Ricardo Gonzalez

1984-1 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 1985 R. Yanase

- 1985-1 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 1986 Ana Sofia Chappeton

- 1986-1 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 1987 Grant Glazebrook

- 1987-1 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 1988 Jason Macdonald

- 1988-1 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 1989 Anonymous

- 1989-1 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 1990 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Public Agencies

Submission 1991 Holly Osborne

- 1991-1 Figure 3.2-5 and Figure 3.2-10 incorrectly duplicated the City of Torrance percentage of existing land uses in the resource study area for the Proposed Project and Trench Option (Figure 3.2-5) and Hawthorne Option (Figure 3.2-10) totals.

This error has been corrected in Section 4.6, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR. The correction does not change the overall conclusion of the DEIR.

- 1991-2 See response to Comment 1991-1.