5.5 Responses to Individual Comments (Submission #338- #663)

Submission 338 Mark Nelson

338-1 CEQA does not require an analysis of safety in terms of crime, as it is not an environmental issue, and therefore the Draft EIR does not make any conclusions regarding this topic. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 339 Mark Nelson

339-1 See response to Comment 338-1. It should also be noted that assertion that the presence of a Metro light rail line would attract criminal activity such as child abduction is not supported by evidence. The project does not include features that would increase such risks.

Submission 340 Mark Nelson

340-1 See response to Comment 338-1.

340-2 See response to Comment 338-1. The commenter provided several links to crimes that occurred on Metro's system. The comment has been provided to the Metro Board for their consideration; articles cited in the comment are included in the administrative record.

Submission 341 Michael Garlan

341-1 The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option avoid the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells.

For freight operations, Project Feature PF-NV-1: Quiet Zone Equipment Installation and Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment would be implemented to reduce freight noise at the 182nd crossing by eliminating routine train horn at that crossing.

Noise generated by light rail and relocated freight operations was included in the predicted noise levels for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and the Trench Option. The analysis found that even with grade-separated light rail crossing, the combined light rail and freight relocation noise would still affect clusters F2, F3, and F5. However, as shown on page 3.6-53 (Elevated/At-Grade Alignment) and page 3.6-67 (Trench Option) of the Draft EIR, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation, including the establishment of a Federal Railroad Administration quiet zone. As described in Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, the LPAs operational noise impacts would be comparable to those of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Trench Option, meaning operational noise impacts of the LPA would be less than significant with mitigation.

See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds and MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

341-2 See response to Comment 341-1. The potential for noise impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of Draft EIR. The noise standards used in the analysis in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, are based on exterior noise levels, meaning that impacts were evaluated without assumed closed windows or air conditioning. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Submission 342 Michelle Hughes

342-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. In the previous planning stages, stations were proposed in Lawndale as part of the 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis, but at the request of Lawndale were removed from consideration. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

342-2 Metro recognizes that construction activities could be disruptive and has included project features and mitigation measures to minimize these disruptions and impacts as much as feasible. Construction noise impacts are analyzed in detail in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. Although construction noise is expected to be temporary, it has been identified as a significant and unavoidable impact. To reduce these effects, Metro would implement Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan.

Regarding construction traffic impacts, as described in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, the project includes Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan, which would be submitted to the local cities and include measures manage construction-related traffic, such as establishing detour routes, providing advance notice and signage, maintaining access for residents, businesses, and emergency services, and scheduling deliveries and pick-ups during non-peak hours.

342-3 The LPA is similar to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, except the light rail would be grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding the need for audible light rail warnings such as routine train horns and crossing bells. As described in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR and Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, operational noise impacts of the LPA would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation at all sensitive receptors, including families with young children, elderly residents, and those working from home. See Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR and MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

342-4 As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-

Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions.

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

See response to Comments 342-2 and 342-3.

342-5 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to Comments 342-2 through 342-4.

Submission 343 Monique Negrete-Mitchell

343-1 Submission 98 includes the same comments from the same commenter. See responses to Comment Letter 98.

Submission 344 Morgan Schultz

344-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Potential noise and vibration impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds; and MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design.

Potential air quality impacts are addressed in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. 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.

Potential water quality impacts are addressed in Section 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR. The project would not result in significant impacts on water quality.

See MR-19: Project Benefits for additional information regarding Metro's commitment to equity. Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

344-2 See MR-10: Changes to Community Character and MR-19: Project Benefits.

344-3 Metro is committed to equity and would continue to prepare inclusive outreach and engagement strategies. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality, MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes and response to Comment 344-1, and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks.

344-4 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 response to Comment 344-1.

344-5 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the entire light rail guideway would be enclosed by physical barriers, such as fencing or soundwalls, or a combination of both, to prevent unauthorized access. While these barriers are primarily intended to restrict human intrusion, they would also serve to deter or prevent land animals from entering the guideway. In many areas, the existing fencing has been breached, and would be repaired under the project, which would limit unauthorized access into the Metro ROW relative to existing conditions.

344-6 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The Draft EIR does not analyze a "Torrance Boulevard Option," but rather an option on Hawthorne Boulevard.

Submission 345 Paul Miller

345-1 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.

345-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. To clarify, the Hawthorne Option would not result in the widening of Hawthorne Boulevard. However, no additional bike path or pedestrian improvements are proposed for the Hawthorne Option. As noted in the comment, construction for the Hawthorne Option would take longer than alignments using the Metro ROW. Potential greenhouse gas emission impacts are addressed in Section 3.5, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

345-3 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 Draft EIR analyzes the long-term air quality effects of operating the Hawthorne Option and concludes that it would result in a net decrease in regional air pollutant emissions, as passenger vehicle trips would be displaced by the new light rail line. Table 3.4-20 of the Draft EIR summarizes these reductions.

Regarding vehicle idling, the primary pollutant of concern related to idling is CO. 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. Regarding CO "hot spots," Caltrans developed a methodology, the Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol (CO Protocol) (Caltrans, 2010; available at https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/env/co-protocol-searchable-a11y.pdf) for assessing CO hot spots at intersections. According to the CO Protocol, a detailed CO hot-spot analysis is not required unless background CO concentrations, traffic volumes, or other conditions approach those in existence in 2003, when CO attainment was demonstrated. For the Hawthorne Option, these conditions would not be met due to the following:

> Lower background CO concentrations: Current maximum 1- and 8-hour CO concentrations (1.8 and 1.5 ppm, respectively) are substantially below the levels observed in 2003 during the attainment demonstration (10.8 ppm and 9.9 ppm respectively). Compare Draft EIR Table 3.4-13 with Table 4-4 of the 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) Attainment Demonstration.

> Lower traffic volumes: Traffic volumes at intersections in the project area do not exceed 10,000 vehicles per hour, which is well below the peak modeled volume of 10,601 vehicles per hour used in the attainment demonstration.

> Improved vehicle emissions technology: Since 2003, advancements in vehicle emission controls have significantly reduced CO emissions, further lowering the potential for hot-spot formation.

> Comparable modeling protocols: The CO Protocol requires receptor locations to be modeled at least three meters (10 feet) from the roadway edge. The project's receptor locations meet or exceed this distance, ensuring conditions are consistent with or less impactful than those evaluated in the attainment demonstration.

Because CO concentrations, traffic volumes, and vehicle emissions technology have improved significantly since the attainment demonstration, there is no potential for the project to exceed the CO concentration thresholds set by the CO Protocol. Therefore, a detailed CO hot-spot analysis was not required, and localized operational air quality impacts related to vehicle idling are not anticipated along Hawthorne Boulevard if the Hawthorne Option is implemented. The removal of the landscape buffer would not result in elevated CO concentrations reaching nearby residents based on the factors discussed above.

In 2022, Metro adopted a Metro Tree Policy which outlines Metro's commitment to protecting trees, when possible, or replacing trees removed as a result of Metro construction and maintenance. For non-heritage trees, the policy requires a replacement

ratio of two trees for every tree removed. As described in the 2023 Urban Design Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, should the Hawthorne Option be pursued, south of Artesia Boulevard, the center median and landscaping would be maintained, with vertical columns installed the median where needed.

The project, including the Hawthorne Option, would result in greater accessibility to public transportation, thus a reduction of on-road vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled. See Sections 3.4, Air Quality, and 3.5, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of the Draft EIR.

345-4 During construction, some lanes would need to be temporarily closed on Hawthorne Boulevard. However, as described in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan requires contractors to develop a construction management traffic plan. Metro and its contractors would coordinate with local businesses and residents as well as relevant jurisdictions to manage access and the effects of temporary closures and identify reasonable accommodations or alternatives, which could include limiting construction hours, providing alternate routes or temporary easements, or other strategies. These are identified as part of the preliminary engineering work and addressed in the development of the Construction Traffic Management Plan

345-5 See response to Comment 343-3.

345-6 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. The LPA provides grade separations for all light rail crossings to eliminate light rail bell use. It also includes "quiet zone ready" improvements to existing freight rail, such as the elimination of freight horns. Crossing signal bells would continue to generate a minimum noise level of 75 dBA (a-weighted decibel) at 10 feet per American Railway Engineering and Maintenance of Way requirements.

345-7 See response to Comments 345-1 through 345-6.

Submission 346 Ray Hollar

346-1 Under CEQA, potential economic effects including residential real estate would not constitute an effect to the physical environment and therefore do not need to be analyzed. The Draft EIR uses land use classifications in several analyses, collected from the cities' general plans, which include categories such as commercial businesses and residential housing. The analysis typically focuses on impacts to sensitive land uses, and specific business types were not considered.

346-2 See response to Comment 346-1.

346-3 See response to Comments 346-1. Despite residential rental properties functioning as sources of income, they are generally classified based on their zoning designation rather than their function as a business. As noted in the comment, much of Lawndale is zoned R-2, which is a residential zoning designation. Under this zoning, residential properties are considered residential use, not commercial businesses. Local zoning ordinances are legally binding and dictate the permissible uses of a property. The Draft EIR evaluates potential impacts to residential areas, including rental properties, under the appropriate

environmental topics such as noise, air quality, and construction impacts, and includes mitigation measures where applicable.

Commercial businesses would not be compensated during construction unless they are entitled to compensation under federal and state laws governing property acquisition and regulatory takings. Metro would continue to coordinate with affected parties to minimize disruptions wherever feasible.

Submission 347 Ray Hollar

347-1 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, which discusses studies regarding the effects of nearby light rail stations on property values.

Submission 348 George Gillen

348-1 Consistent with the standard approach for EIRs, which are prepared pursuant to the requirements of the CEQA Guidelines, the Draft EIR evaluates potential impacts on the physical environment in accordance with the standards of significance established by the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G environmental checklist. Such should be noted by the commenter, as specific references to effects on physical human health are primarily limited in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G to Section III, Air Quality (question 'c') and Section IX, Hazards and Hazardous Materials (questions 'a,' 'b,' and 'c'). As such, consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the Draft EIR explicitly evaluates the potential for the project to result in impacts on physical human health in Section 3.4, Air Quality, and Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, as well as, to a limited extent, in Section 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems (see Section 3.11.1.1 for an analysis on disposal of contaminated soils). These analyses assess potential for interaction with hazardous materials during construction and operation, and any related impacts, including cumulative impacts, are fully disclosed and addressed. Furthermore, although specific references to effects on physical human health are primarily limited to Sections III and IX of Appendix G, it is important to also note that several environmental issue areas required for analysis under CEQA also relate to human health. For example, analysis of noise-level increases generated by a project evaluates potential impacts on sensitive noise receptors, which accounts for the mental strain a project's noise effects has on residents and/or those at schools, hospitals, places of worship, and outdoor recreation areas in the project's vicinity. The evaluation of hydrology and water quality effects considers potential deleterious effects to a region's water supplies, including drinking water, which, in turn, accounts for effects to human health. Further, analysis of geology and soil impacts considers a project's potential to result in injuries or death due to placement of new structures along active faults, within seismically active regions, or on unsuitable soil. Analyses of the foregoing potential impacts, among others, are provided in the applicable technical sections of the Draft EIR. As such, the Draft EIR adequately analyzes the potential for the project to substantially affect human health, both directly and indirectly.

Additionally, the comment incorrectly associates human health risk assessments with the energy analysis. There is no nexus between potential energy effects associated with implementing the project and effects on human health that would need to be studied in human health impact studies, including regarding exposures to hazardous materials. The distribution of energy itself does not directly produce emissions or hazardous materials on-site that could affect nearby residents. Instead, energy would be supplied through the electricity grid, where emissions from power generation are regulated by state and federal standards, including California's Renewable Portfolio Standard that minimizes public health risks from energy-related emissions through decreasing reliance on fossil fuels. Potential energy impacts are evaluated in Section 3.12, Energy, of the Draft EIR. The one mention of "human health" on Page 3.12-10 of the Draft EIR occurs in the context of the Metro Green Construction Policy, which aims to reduce emissions from construction activities through the use of cleaner equipment and practices.

348-2 This comment is duplicative of Comment 325-1. See responses to Comments 325-1 and 348-1.

348-3 The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. The LPA and the Trench Option would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase traffic congestion nor affect emergency access. See MR-12: Emergency Access. For the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the frequency of the railroad crossing gate down time would increase relative to existing conditions, but it would not result in the permanent closure of emergency access. All homes and businesses on either side of the 182nd Street railroad crossing are accessible by alternate routes within a half mile that are grade-separated crossings and therefore not affected by train frequency.

The LPA construction duration is estimated to be six years. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule for additional information. The LPA includes grade separating the light rail at 170th Street and 182nd Street using two short trenches. The excavation required for the LPA would be significantly less extensive than that required for the Trench Option. Additionally, this excavation would occur during an early stage of construction and would be limited in duration. The localized emissions analysis provided in the Draft EIR, which focuses on emissions from sources located within the construction sites, determined that air quality impacts would be less than significant. See Section 4.21, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR for more details on the LPA construction emissions.

The Draft EIR determined that all construction activities required for the Trench Option, not just solely trenching, would have a significant and unavoidable impact with regards to air quality during construction. While the Metro Board selected the Hybrid Alternative as the LPA in May 2024, should the Trench Option be pursued, Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-1: Zero or Near Zero Emissions Haul Trucks, described in Section 3.4.5, would be implemented to reduce impacts to the extent feasible.

Regarding the duration of construction activities, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) conformity rule requires that construction emissions persisting for longer than five years at a particular location be fully analyzed. The Draft EIR discloses a comprehensive analysis of the emissions that would be generated during construction of

the project in accordance with CEQA requirements. Furthermore, although the total duration of project construction would be longer than five years, this accounts for construction of the entire alignment and sources would not be active in a specific location for five years or more.

348-4 Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project, including noise effects. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

348-5 See response to Comment 348-4. The link provided in the comment appears to refer to a private or personal email resource and is not accessible to Metro. If you intended to reference specific information or a publicly available document, please provide additional details or an accessible link so Metro can review and respond appropriately.

348-6 Metro is committed to planning and constructing projects and operating and maintaining facilities and vehicles in a manner that would protect human health and the environment. See Response to Comment 348-1.

348-7 See response to Comment 348-6.

348-8 See response to Comment 348-4. Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR considers a reasonable range of project alternatives that are capable of achieving most of the project's basic objectives while avoiding or minimizing one or more of its environmental effects.

348-9 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 349 Roy Bolling

349-1 Potential lighting impacts are discussed in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. As stated in Section 3.3-2.4, Project Feature PF-AES-2: Metro Design Standards would require all lighting be compliant with Metro Design Standards. The lighting would also comply with applicable lighting regulations, if any, that would be verified during the permitting process relative to each jurisdiction the project traverses, and would be hooded, angled away from adjacent land uses. Lighting industry standards and best practices for transit project lighting in light-sensitive or residential areas would be followed, in compliance with Metro design Standards.

349-2 As indicated by the comment, Section 3.6. Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, discloses that each alignment option would result in potentially significant construction-related noise and vibration annoyance and vibration damage impacts. To address these impacts, the project would implement Mitigation Measures MM NOI-1: Noise Control Plan, MM-VIB-1: Vibration Control Plan, MM-VIB-2: Construction Equipment Location, and MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post- Construction Surveys. While implementation of these measures would reduce the construction noise and vibration impacts to the maximum extent feasible, some noise and vibration impacts during construction would remain significant and

unavoidable. These impacts would be temporary and would cease upon the completion of construction activities. Of the alignment options studied, only the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in a significant and unavoidable vibration damage impact.

For operational noise, the project includes Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls to reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level with mitigation. For the Metro ROW alignments, the project would enable local cities to establish Quiet Zones with the Federal Railroad Administration, 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, MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds, and MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design. With respect to operational vibration impacts, as detailed on pages 3.6-105 through 3.6-109, with mitigation, operational vibration levels would not exceed the thresholds that could cause structural damage to buildings, including heavily cantilevered structures.

It is important to clarify that there is no "passing" of an EIR. Instead, the Metro Board of Directors will consider the Final EIR, including all environmental impacts identified and the comments received during the Draft EIR's public comment period, and decide whether to approve the project. If the Board approves the project, it must also adopt all feasible mitigation measures necessary to reduce the significant environmental impacts identified in the EIR. If any significant impacts cannot be reduced to less than significant levels through feasible mitigation measures or alternatives, the Metro Board would need to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations. This statement would acknowledge the significant and unavoidable environmental impacts and explain why the benefits of the project outweigh those impacts.

349-3 Impacts associated with soil stability are addressed in Section 3.8, Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources, of the Draft EIR. The project would incorporate Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, which ensures that the project complies with Metro's Geotechnical Design Standards as outlined in the Metro Rail Design Criteria (MRDC). These standards require thorough geotechnical investigations to assess and address risks such as settlement, slope, instability, and lateral deformations, as well as detailed stability analyses of retaining walls and embankments and incorporation of design features, as necessary, to ensure long-term stability and safety. Retaining walls would be designed with drainage features to manage groundwater and prevent water accumulation behind the walls, thereby maintaining stability during various weather events, including heavy rains. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

349-4 See response to Comment 349-3.

349-5 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and bus transit is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 350 Ruby

350-1 Metro welcomes and appreciates all public input received throughout the environmental review and project development process. Comments submitted during the public comment period on the Draft EIR that raise significant environmental issues or otherwise address the adequacy of the Draft EIR are responded to in the Final EIR as required by CEQA. However, all public comments – whether or not they were made during the Draft EIR's public comment period or raise specific environmental issues – are shared with the Metro Board of Directors for consideration. The final decision on whether to approve the project is a policy determination made by the Board, which takes into account both the environmental analysis and the full range of community perspectives, values, and concerns raised throughout the planning process.

350-2 Responses to all comments received on the Draft EIR, regardless of the commenting method, are published with the Final EIR. Metro also published responses to Frequently Asked Questions on the project website, metro.net/clineext during the public comment period to support community understanding and engagement. All comments – whether submitted as a comment on the Draft EIR or otherwise – are part of the administrative record and will be considered by the Metro Board prior to any decision on the project.

Submission 351 Ryan Rodriguez

351-1 The commenter's opposition to implementing the project along the Metro ROW is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro puts the highest priority on public safety and security. With respect to the potential for explosions, train operations occur above the ground at a safe distance from pipelines and, thus, would not directly create conditions for explosions. Additionally, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR addresses potential impacts related to oil and gas pipelines by amplifying the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR through clarifications of 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-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 352 Stanley Hiroshi Wada

352-1 The commenter's concerns about the frequency and duration of light rail operations near their home are noted. The project is expected to operate similarly to other Metro lines, with anticipated service hours from approximately 4:00 a.m. one day to 1:00 a.m. the following day. System headways would be reduced during early morning (4:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m.) and late-night hours (7:00 p.m. to 1:00 a.m.) to approximately 15 minutes. Peak-hour system headways would be 5 minutes during peak travel hours. Weekend system headways would be reduced compared to weekdays due to reduced commuter demand. It is important to note that light rail vehicles are electrically powered and significantly quieter than freight trains, which are currently the primary source of rail noise in the corridor.

The potential for operational noise impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The project includes Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls to reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level with mitigation. For the Metro ROW alignments, the project would enable local cities to establish Quiet Zones with the Federal Railroad Administration, 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; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character. The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells.

See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

352-2 Metro puts the highest priority on public safety and security. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. The LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways. The freight track would remain at-grade, but the project would include new pedestrian safety infrastructure, such as gates, which would improve safety compared to existing conditions, where no pedestrian safety infrastructure exists.

352-3 See responses to Comments 352-1 and 352-2.

352-4 CEQA requires the EIR to evaluate and disclose potential environmental impacts, and where necessary, incorporate mitigation measures to reduce significant effects. The comment does not raise any concerns regarding the adequacy of the EIR or significant environmental issues, requiring further response. However, for informational purposes only, it is noted that the legal framework governing public infrastructure projects, including this one, establishes clear regulatory processes and does not impose personal liability on individual decision-makers for actions taken in their official capacities. The project would be developed in compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations, including Metro's own design and safety standards, and the standards of California Public Utilities Commission and the Federal Railroad Administration.

352-5 See responses to Comment 352-1 and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration and Air Quality.

352-6 See response to Comment 352-2.

352-7 See responses to Comments 352-1 and 352-2. All comments are shared with the Metro Board for their consideration in certifying the EIR. CEQA lawsuits challenging the adequacy of an EIR must be filed within 30 days of the filing of a Notice of Determination (NOD), or approval of the Final EIR, if an NOD is not filed, within 180 days from the date of the agency's decision to carry out or approve the project. Metro, as a public agency, follows all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations in the planning, approval, and implementation of transportation projects. There is no legal requirement to respond to comments within 14 days or any other specific time period. Nor is there a requirement to

respond to demands outside of the CEQA Process. Non-response does not imply agreement or acceptance of personal liability, or any other type of liability. The project is being developed in accordance with all relevant laws, and the environmental analysis has been conducted following CEQA's established framework to identify and mitigate potential environmental effects.

Submission 353 Jeanne Bellemin

353-1 The commenter's interest in providing native species shelter and resources is noted. Section 3.7, Biological Resource, 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. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

353-2 As discussed in Section 3.7-3.5, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR, the Metro Tree Policy outlines Metro's commitment to protecting trees, when possible, or replacing trees removed as a result of Metro construction and maintenance. For non-heritage trees, the replacement ratio is two trees for every tree removed. This policy also prioritizes planting strategies that maximize the use of native species. As further detailed in the project's 2023 Urban Design Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, Southern California native trees, shrubs and groundcovers would be selected for the project's landscaping based on site-specific conditions and micro-climates. Unique landscape colors, textures and forms, would be considered to highlight and response to the light rail station's location and its adjacent area.

353-3 See response to Comment 353-2.

353-4 See response to Comment 353-2.

Submission 354 Mr. & Mrs. G. Floratos

354-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 355 Anonymous

355-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 356 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Public Agencies

Submission 357 April Kubachka

357-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

357-2 See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; MR-9: Light Rail Security; See MR-10: Changes to Community Character; MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service; and MR-19: Project Benefits.

357-3 The commenter makes the claim that the Draft EIR's impact analyses rely upon "made up or skewed data" is not supported by any specific evidence. The Draft EIR's impact analyses are based on established methodologies, technical studies prepared by qualified subject matter experts, and data from reputable sources. All assumptions, methodologies, and data sources are documented in the Draft EIR and its appendices, consistent with CEQA. The Draft EIR's impact analysis applies significance thresholds that are informed by the CEQA Guidelines and tailored to the specific context of the project. The threshold referenced in the comment is found in Section 3.1, Transportation of the Draft EIR, and evaluates whether the project design could introduce risks, such as those from sharp curves or incompatible uses, which could affect transportation safety. The Draft EIR concludes that the project would not substantially increase such hazards, based on site-specific conditions, project design features, and the incorporation of safety improvements. The LPA would further reduce potential risks by fully grade separating the light rail system, thereby eliminating at-grade light rail crossings.

Metro puts the highest priority on public safety and security. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

357-4 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 358 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Agency Comments

Submission 359 Keith Kubachka

359-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

359-2 CEQA requires analysis of physical environmental impacts, such as air quality, noise, and aesthetics, which are evaluated in detail throughout the Draft EIR. Social conditions such as crime and revitalization outcomes are outside the scope of CEQA analysis. However, Metro is committed to ensuring the safety of its transit system. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

359-3 As described in subsections 3.6.5 and 3.6-6 of the Draft EIR, Mitigation Measure MM-VIB-3: Pre and Post Construction Surveys would determine whether construction causes any damage and remediate it. The Draft EIR analyzes light rail train operations per Federal Railroad Administration guidelines and determines operational vibration would not cause damage to nearby structures. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

359-4 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 360 Lesley Phillips

360-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the light rail guideway would be fully enclosed with physical barriers, such as fencing, soundwalls, or a combination of both. These barriers would prevent unauthorized access to prevent both people and animals from entering the tracks. For more information regarding the project's rail safety, see MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

360-2 See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. The LPA would significantly reduce noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade light rail crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells.

Submission 361 Mark Nelson

361-1 See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality. The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells.

Submission 362 Michael Kim

362-1 The commenter's support for the No Project Alternative is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. While the commenter expresses concerns about project staffing, Metro is advancing this project with dedicated teams of experienced professionals, including engineers, planners, and safety experts, who would continue to work in coordination with regulatory agencies, contractors, and local jurisdictions to ensure safe and effective project implementation. In addition to Metro's own design and safety standards, Metro is working in coordination with the standards of California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) to ensure that the project follows all safety standards. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

362-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Safety is a top priority for Metro. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 363 Randall Abram

363-1 There are several existing Metro rail lines that run adjacent to a freight line, including the existing Metro C Line (Green) in El Segundo and Redondo Beach. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

363-2 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 364 Ray Hollar

364-1 CEQA guidelines requires a Draft EIR to include in its summary "Areas of controversy known to the lead agency including issues raised by agencies and the public; and Issues to be resolved including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects."

Areas of controversy are based on issues raised during scoping, other feedback from the community, and issues not resolved by the Draft EIR. Metro records all feedback received through official channels and does its best to summarize any areas of controversy. Parking is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and is not addressed in the Draft EIR. Metro understands that parking is often a point of concern for communities. See the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, as well as the Draft EIR Executive Summary for a discussion of lost parking spaces.

Submission 365 Ray Hollar

365-1 Submission 65 includes the same comment from the same commenter. See response to Comment 65-1.

365-2 The transition the commenter refers to is necessary in order to avoid high-power utility lines, as explained in response to Comment 365-1, and is not proposed as a cost-savings measure.

Submission 366 Ray Hollar

366-1 The commenter requested information on the meaning of user benefits in the context of taking the train versus driving a car. Metro's technical team provided clarification by email on March 1, 2023, so that the commenter could effectively comment on the methodology behind the user benefits, explaining that Metro uses the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) definition and method[1] for calculating user benefits, which reflects the improvements in regional mobility which is measured by the weighted in- and out-of-vehicle changes in travel-time for users of the regional transit system caused by the implementation of the proposed new project. This methodology does factor in waiting for transit as well as travel time to the project, whether by car or other means of transportation, such as walking or bus

366-2 The commenter provided their assessment of how Metro should calculate user benefits and shared their conclusions with Metro in the comment. In order to clarify the methodology used by Metro so the commenter could comment more specifically on Metro's methodology, the Metro's technical team included in the March 1, 2023 clarification email an explanation that FTA has a specific methodology for calculating user

[1] https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/FY12_Evaluation_Process(2).pdf

benefits. Per the FTA, user benefits consider all components of travel such as drive time, access time, wait time, time in the vehicle, egress time, etc. The total region or systemwide changes are estimated and expresses as minutes of system user benefits. In Metro's email response, an example of a user benefits calculation was provided for further understanding.

366-3 In response to Metro's clarification email, the commenter discussed the differences between their methodology for calculating user benefits and Metro's. Metro would continue to use the definition and methodology provided by the FTA for calculating user benefits, as it is the industry standard.

366-4 In response to Metro's clarification email, the commenter requested budget, and a breakdown of components used for Metro's user benefit per project trip. User benefit is a measure of the combined savings for existing as well as new riders from all modes, not just for a trip-by-trip basis, so this value cannot be provided in the context of user benefits.

366-5 In response to Metro's clarification email, the commenter asked about Metro's confidence in its ridership modeling methodology in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic's impact on rail ridership and transit ridership recovery toward pre-pandemic values. As a global pandemic scenario is infrequent, the model does not consider future pandemic scenarios in the ridership projections. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission 367 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 368 Karen Ruby

368-1 The commenter's opposition to using the Metro ROW for the project is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option avoid the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

368-2 While the freight train passes by about twice a day, light rail systems are electrically powered and generate lower noise and vibration levels than freight, which are heavier and typically diesel-powered. The anticipated hours of operation are 4:00 a.m. one day to 1:00 a.m. the following day. System headways would be reduced during early morning (4:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m.) and late-night hours (7:00 p.m. to 1:00 a.m.) to approximately 15 minutes. This would result in a reduced frequency of trains during these hours and reduced overall noise compared to peak-hour system headways of 5 minutes.

368-3 Metro puts the highest priority on public safety and security. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality, MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety, and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

368-4 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

368-5 The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) Grant from the California State Transportation Agency Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, and 3% match contributions from local jurisdictions. Metro 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.

368-6 See response to Comment 368-1.

368-7 Metro understands the importance of maintaining an environment conducive to professional and educational performance and focus for residents of all ages. Noise levels in areas near the alignment options have been carefully modeled, and where mitigation is necessary, measures have been proposed to reduce noise impacts to less than significant where possible.

The Hybrid Alternative, referred to in the Draft EIR as the 170th/182nd Light Rail Transit Alternative in the Draft EIR, has been selected as the LPA for the purposes of the Final EIR. The Hybrid Alternative eliminates at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets, thereby removing the need for audible light rail at-grade warnings, including light train horns and crossing bells, which significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Proposed Project. As described in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR and Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, the operational noise and vibration impacts of the Hybrid Alternative would be comparable to those of the Trench Option and would be less than significant with mitigation. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration and Air Quality. See MR-4 for more information regarding health effects from noise and vibration.

368-8 See response to Comment 368-2.

Submission 369 Theodore Otvos

369-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Section 3.6. Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, discloses that each Metro ROW alignment option would result in potentially significant construction-related noise and vibration impacts. To address these impacts, the project would implement Mitigation Measures MM NOI-1: Noise Control Plan, MM-VIB-1: Vibration Control Plan, MM-VIB-2: Construction Equipment Location, and MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post- Construction Surveys. While implementation of these measures would reduce the construction noise and vibration impacts to the maximum extent feasible, some noise and vibration impacts during construction would remain significant and unavoidable. These impacts would be temporary and would cease upon the completion of construction activities.

For operational noise and vibration, the project includes Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls to reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level with mitigation. For the Metro ROW alignments, the project would enable local cities to establish Quiet Zones with the Federal Railroad Administration, 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; MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds; and MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design. The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 370 Theodore Otvos

370-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to implementing project along the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, 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-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 371 Yumiko Omatsu

371-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

There is sufficient space for the proposed light rail and freight track within the Metro ROW. See Appendix 2-A, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings, of the Draft EIR and Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings- Locally Preferred Alternative, for more details. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

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

The Draft EIR fully assesses potential construction and operational impacts, including noise, air quality, and vibration, for all alignment options. These analyses are set forth in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, and Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan and MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls would be implemented to minimize noise and vibration impacts for sensitive receptors, including residents adjacent to Metro ROW. Project Feature PF-AQ-2: Dust Control Best Practices would ensure construction complies with best available control technology to control emissions and dust during construction. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality. The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Safety is a top priority for Metro. Metro puts the highest priority on public safety and security. MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 372 Adam Karp

372-1 Submission 372 includes the same comments from the same commenter. See responses to Comments 298-1 through 298-10.

Submission 373 Monique Negrete-Mitchell

373-1 While overall construction would occur over multiple years, work at any given location would be temporary, and would shift over time as construction progresses through different aspects and locations of the project.

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

373-2 The Draft EIR has identified significant and unavoidable impacts during construction for all rail alignment options and alternatives studied along the Metro ROW and Hawthorne Boulevard related to noise and vibration. As described in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, the LPA (the 170th/182nd Grade-Separated Light Rail Transit Alternative) would have significant and unavoidable construction impacts related to noise and vibration. Under CEQA, when a project has significant and unavoidable impacts, the Lead Agency (here, Metro), may not approve the project unless it finds that the benefits of the project outweigh the significant and unavoidable impacts. See also MR-1: Selection of Alternatives, and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

373-3 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. As outlined in the Executive Summary of the Draft EIR, the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in significant and unavoidable noise impacts during both construction and operation. In contrast, the Hawthorne Option would result in a significant and unavoidable noise impact only during construction. The LPA would also result in a significant noise impact during construction

but is expected to have a less-than-significant noise impact during operation, because the light rail system would be fully grade-separated. Additionally, while the establishment of a quiet zone (intended to reduce noise from freight rail operations), is the responsibility of the local cities, the project would provide all the necessary upgrades at freight crossings needed to support the establishment of a quiet zone, should the cities choose to pursue it.

373-4 The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, 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 for more information.

With respect to soil conditions related to clay conditions, Section 3.8-3.2, Local Geology, of the Draft EIR describes the geologic units underlying the RSA, which consist of Quaternary deposits composed (from the bottom to the surface) of the 1,400-foot-thick early Pleistocene-aged San Pedro formation, the 1,000-foot-thick late Pleistocene Lakewood formation and older sand dunes, and approximately 300 feet of Holocene-aged alluvium, which is capped by aeolian (i.e., wind-blown) deposits. As detailed in Section 3.8-3.2 of the Draft EIR, the San Pedro formation is primarily stiff clay with interbedded sand and gravel. The Lakewood formation is dense to very dense sand, clayey sand, silty sand (interbedded with very stiff to hard silty to sandy clay), and clayey silt. The Pleistocene old alluvium (map symbol Qoa) moderately consolidated, moderately dissected clay, silt, sand and gravel, and sand dune (eolian) deposits (Qoe) are primarily composed of medium-dense to very dense, well-sorted, medium- to coarse-grained sand with some silt and silty sand. Thus, the Draft EIR acknowledges the presence of clay within the RSA. Pursuant to 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 address existing soil conditions and ensure surrounding structures are not damaged. The geotechnical report recommendations would be incorporated into the project plans and specifications, which would prevent potential impacts related to soil conditions, including clay, from occurring, should such conditions be present. Regarding the potential for sinkholes, see MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

373-5 Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, analyzes potential impacts related to vibration and concludes that all the Metro ROW alignments and Hawthorne alignment would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to vibration damage during construction. The same impacts, however, would be less than significant with mitigation for the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information.

373-6 While privacy is not considered an environmental impact under CEQA, Metro understands that this may be a concern for residents, and is committed to minimizing potential

intrusions where feasible. During construction, activities near residential properties, including work on the berm, would be temporary and limited to specific phases of construction. Construction contractors would adhere to standard codes of conduct to ensure professional behavior on construction sites. During operation, privacy impacts from the light rail vehicles themselves are expected to be minimal. Trains would be in motion and would not stop or slow near residential properties, greatly limiting opportunities for riders or operators to observe private activities. In addition, light rail vehicles are generally enclosed and would be elevated or grade-separated, further reducing the potential for visual intrusion. Metro would continue to evaluate ways to minimize disruptions in accordance with applicable legal requirements and as part of the project's ongoing planning and outreach efforts.

373-7 The estimate of 101 dump trucks per day refers to project-wide construction activities and does not reflect the volume of trucks or equipment at a single location along the alignment. Detailed information on construction scheduling would be provided to the community in advance of any construction activities, if the project is approved for implementation.

As described in the Draft EIR's construction analyses, the project includes project features and would implement mitigation measures to address construction-related disruptions and impacts, including noise, dust, and vibration. Even with implementation of construction Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan and MM VIB-1: Vibration Control Plan through MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys, construction of the project would result in significant and unavoidable noise and vibration impacts. In the event the Metro Board decides to approve the project, it would be required to adopt a Statement of Overriding Consideration, finding that the project's benefits outweigh its significant and unavoidable environmental impacts.

Regarding privacy, see response to Comment 373-6.

373-8 See response to comment 373-6.

373-9 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Submission 374 Angelica Vicente

374-1 No traction power substations located on private property would be within residential property. Section 2.3-4.4.2, Traction Power Substations, of the Draft EIR, provides a description of the location of each proposed traction power substation (TPSS). See Appendix 2-A, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings, of the Draft EIR, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings and Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings- Locally Preferred Alternative, for more detailed information on the location of the traction power substations.

Submission 375 Holly Osborne

375-1 Structures that would be potentially affected by construction and operational vibration in the vicinity of Breakwater Village have been correctly identified and identified impacts mitigated. Importantly, mitigation is applied to the rail tracks, which would mitigate effects for all surrounding sensitive uses and not solely at individual residences. Regardless of the specific unit count, the analysis is applied for the entire row of structures. Mitigating the effect at the source is the most effective way to reduce vibration propagation to nearby sensitive uses.

Based on the general assessment conducted for the Draft EIR, only a construction vibration impact would potentially occur at this location and operational impact contours would not extend beyond the Metro ROW. The operational analysis considers both the potential shift of freight rail tracks and the addition of light rail transit tracks to result in vibration annoyance. As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, Section 3.6-5, the project would be required to implement vibration mitigation measures MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys through MM-VIB-6: Ballast Mats, which would require low impact frogs, resilient rail fasteners, and/or ballast mats. Operational vibration impacts would be reduced to less than the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) vibration annoyance impact threshold and would be less than significant with mitigation.

375-2 This townhouse was mistakenly counted as two units, based on aerial imagery. The total count of residences affected was updated to 268 in Section 4.10, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR. This correction does not change the conclusions of the Draft EIR, as the analysis and mitigation measures remain applicable to the revised total. See response to Comment 375-1.

375-3 The Draft EIR identified seven structures along the west side of the Metro ROW between Grant Avenue and Artesia Boulevard that would be potentially impacted by groundborne vibration damage during construction based on aerial imagery. Breakwater Village fronting the Metro ROW appears to be only one structure. As the structure has an approximately 400 foot long frontage along the Metro ROW, two analytical points were added for this one structure to ensure potential vibration was evaluated adequately at different points of the building. It is important to note that only the structures immediately adjacent to the Metro ROW were identified as affected in the analysis. Regardless of the specific unit count, the vibration analysis correctly analyzed the potential for vibration damage impacts at the identified structures. The construction vibration contours were assessed for the entire building structure, in accordance with the FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (FTA, 2018). The specific number of units is not required to be identified because the concern is damage to the building structure, not specific units; therefore, the conclusions of the Draft EIR are still valid.

375-4 See response to Comment 375-3.

375-5 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration,

of the Draft EIR, analyzed the project's potential impacts on structures, and concluded that with mitigation measures, the majority of structural damage impacts from construction vibration would be mitigated to below the threshold for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment. However, it would not be possible to fully mitigate vibration impacts at one structure adjacent to the Grant Avenue freight bridge reconstruction, and therefore there would be a significant and unavoidable impact related to vibration damage during construction for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment. The Trench Option and LPA would not require the Grant Avenue freight bridge to be reconstructed, and the impact would be less than significant with mitigation. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR and Chapter 4, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR. See MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds and MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design.

375-6 See response to Comment 375-3.

Submission 376 Steve & Michelle Polcari

376-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 377 Blake Jung

377-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Potential noise and vibration impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; 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.

377-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

377-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

377-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

377-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

377-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

377-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

377-8 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 378 Conor Sullivan

378-1 It is unclear what is meant by "P1/18 Utilities," as used in the comment. The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, 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. Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the analysis in Section 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR appropriately focuses on the potential physical environmental effects that could be caused by relocation or construction of new or expanded natural gas and oil facilities. Based on this criterion, the Draft EIR concludes that none of the project options would result in significant impacts, as indicated on pages 3.11-20, 3.11-22, and 3.11-24 of the Draft EIR. This determination reflects the inclusion of project features, such as PF-US-1: Utility Identification and Coordination, which would ensure proper utility identification, coordination, and relocation measures prior to construction. For more information, refer to MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety.

Hazards related to privately owned pipelines, including the risk of fire and explosion, are analyzed in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR. As detailed on pages 3.9-35 through 3.9-40 of the Draft EIR, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Moreover, the project would comply with all applicable laws, including State regulations specifically designed to prevent gas explosions. (See Draft EIR, p. 3.9-3.) These laws include stringent standards for utility relocation and construction near gas pipelines, which would be adhered to throughout the project's implementation. As noted above, additions related to the risk of fire and explosion due to pipelines were added to Chapter 4, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR.

Regarding the commenter's suggestion to remove pipelines as part of the project, CEQA requires that the analysis evaluate the project's potential to cause new or worsened environmental impacts, rather than addressing pre-existing conditions. The Draft EIR concludes that the project would not increase the risk of hazards associated with gas pipelines to a level that constitutes a significant impact. Therefore, no additional mitigation, including pipeline removal, is required under CEQA.

378-2 See response to Comment 378-1.

378-3 The Draft EIR evaluates reasonably foreseeable risks associated with construction activities, including excavation work, and identifies project features and measures to minimize those risks. Construction would be subject to extensive safety requirements under federal, state, and local regulations, including worker safety standards, soil stability

and excavation protocols, and public safety measures. While human error can never be entirely eliminated, adherence to these strict regulatory standards, combined with Metro's construction management practices, would minimize the likelihood and severity of potential incidents. As such, the Draft EIR appropriately evaluates the project's construction-related risks consistent with CEQA requirements. See response to Comment 378-1, as well as MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety, MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety; and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

378-4 See response to Comment 378-1.

378-5 While change in community character does not constitute a significant impact under CEQA, Section 3.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, analyzes the project's potential to physically divide communities. The project would result in less than significant impacts. Under the LPA, Trench Option and Hawthorne Option, the light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways. Pedestrians would cross streets at-grade and avoid any conflicts with light rail trains. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

378-6 The commenter's opposition to the project in Lawndale is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

378-7 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. Metro is committed to equity and would continue to prepare inclusive outreach and engagement strategies as Metro advances the project. See MR-19: Project Benefits.

Submission 379 David Bailey

379-1 The commenter's support for the project, and for the Metro ROW alignment, is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The same transit lines would serve all alignments, with stops at either the South Bay Galleria station for the Hawthorne Option or the Redondo Beach Transit Center Station for the Metro ROW alignments.

Submission 380 Denise

380-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

380-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

380-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

380-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

380-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

380-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

380-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 381 Doug Boswell

381-1 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.

381-2 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). The Hawthorne Option would generate slightly higher ridership. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission 382 Frank Fuentes

382-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignments and preference for the Hawthorne Option is noted. Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. In addition, similar to the Hawthorne and Trench Options, the LPA's light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives, MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Submission 383 Ian Stern

383-1 Metro understands the importance of minimizing noise impacts during sensitive nighttime hours, including for families with children. Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. Along the Metro ROW, the LPA and Trench Option significantly reduce noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because they eliminate the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. In addition, the Metro ROW alignments would enable the local jurisdictions along the Metro ROW to obtain a "quiet zone" designation, which would reduce existing freight noise overall along the corridor, by eliminating freight horn soundings, which typically produces noise levels of up to 110 dBA (a-weighted decibel). See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

383-2 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 (ADA), and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. In

addition, similar to the Trench and Hawthorne Options, the LPA would fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

383-3 See response to Comment 383-1.

Submission 384 Ignatius Lin

384-1 The commenter's support for a station within the City of Lawndale is noted. In the previous planning stages, stations were proposed in Lawndale, including as part of the 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis, but at the request of Lawndale was removed from consideration.

384-2 There is sufficient space for the proposed light rail and freight track at-grade within the Metro ROW. See Appendix 2-A, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings, of the Draft EIR and Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings-Locally Preferred Alternative, for more details regarding the alignment and design considerations in this area.

It should be noted that, as shown in Draft EIR, Table 4.2-1, *Summary of Alternatives Considered and Rejected*, Metro considered a deep-bore tunnel alignment during scoping for the Draft EIR. However, this alignment was not selected for further study due to significantly higher costs, real estate needs, and the potential for increased significant impacts.

384-3 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option, and secondarily for the Trench Option, and opposition to an at-grade or elevated project in Metro ROW is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 385 James Hill

385-1 The commenter's support for using the Metro ROW and the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

385-2 See response to Comment 385-1.

385-3 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

385-4 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 386 Janice Tanabe

386-1 Section 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, does not evaluate impacts to emergency response times, as those are evaluated in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.

Similar to the Trench and Hawthorne Options, the LPA light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. There would be no change to existing emergency vehicle delays at 182nd Street. For the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the addition of the light rail service to the existing at-grade crossing at 182nd Street would increase the frequency of the railroad crossing gate down time relative to existing conditions but would not permanently close emergency access. The homes and businesses on either side of the 182nd Street railroad crossing would remain accessible by alternate routes within ½ mile that are grade-separated crossings and not affected by train frequency. With respect to emergency access during construction, as discussed in Section 3.1-4.4 of the Draft EIR, construction traffic management plans under Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan would ensure that adequate emergency access is maintained. See MR-12: Emergency Access.

386-2 See response to Comment 386-1.

Submission 387 Jeanette McGuire

387-1 Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives, MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

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.

Finally, also see MR-10: Changes to Community Character and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks.

387-2 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment, and support for the Hawthorne Option, is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

387-3 Metro carefully considered the potential environmental impacts of the project in the Draft EIR. As described in Chapter 3, Environmental Impacts, of the Draft EIR, Metro analyzed potential environmental impacts to various resource areas, including air quality, noise and vibration, and transportation. Mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce or

avoid significant impacts to a less than significant level where feasible. The Metro Board will consider the conclusions of the EIR, as well as all public comments received, when deciding whether to approve the project.

Submission 388 Jennifer Chung

388-1 The commenter's support for using the Metro ROW and the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

388-2 See response to Comment 152-1.

388-3 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

388-4 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 389 Karen

389-1 The commenter's opposition to the project in Lawndale is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. See also MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

389-2 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 (ADA), and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. In addition, the LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists. The light rail under the Trench Option and Hawthorne Option would also be grade-separated. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 390 Karen Ruby

390-1 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.

390-2 The Draft EIR was published in 2023. Analysis was conducted from 2020 through 2022 and is based on the most recent available data. The source years of data range from the 1990s through the 2020s. The Draft EIR addresses potential impacts that could occur along the entire length of the project alignment; however, the Draft EIR does not rely upon a project-specific geotechnical investigation. Rather, the Draft EIR incorporates information from previous geotechnical studies of other projects whose study areas encompassed the project alignment. The Draft EIR also incorporates information from relevant government maps and databases, including those published by the U.S. Geological Survey and California Geological Survey. Exact dates and sources are provided in Chapter 5, References, of the Draft EIR.

Furthermore, as required by Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, the project would be designed and constructed consistent with the applicable standards set forth by the MRDC, including completion of a project-specific geotechnical investigation by a state-licensed civil engineer and incorporation of all recommendations contained therein. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information.

390-3 See response to Comment 390-2.

390-4 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security. As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the entire light rail guideway would be enclosed by physical barriers, such as fencing, soundwalls, or a combination of both, to prevent unauthorized access. In addition, CEQA does not require an analysis of safety in terms of crime, as it is not an environmental issue, and therefore the Draft EIR does not make any conclusions regarding this topic.

390-5 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.

390-6 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

390-7 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

390-8 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

390-9 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

390-10 The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) Grant from the California State Transportation Agency Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, and 3% match contributions from local jurisdictions. Metro would continue to explore funding opportunities for the project.

390-11 Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, the project would enable the local jurisdictions along the Metro ROW to obtain a "quiet zone" designation, which would reduce existing freight noise overall along the corridor, by eliminating freight horn soundings, which typically produces noise levels of up to 110 dBA (a-weighted decibel). See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

390-12 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 391 Kayla Mangione

391-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

391-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

391-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 392 Ken Prinzi

392-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

392-2 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). Since the COVID pandemic, Metro transit ridership levels have grown every year and are nearly pre-COVID levels. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

392-3 The commenter's concern regarding the use of public funds 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.

Metro would continue to explore funding opportunities for the project.

Submission 394 Megan

394-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

394-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

394-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

394-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

394-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

394-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

394-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 395 Michael Sullivan

395-1 The commenter's opposition to implementing the project along the ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro puts the highest priority on public safety and security. See MR-8 Light Rail and Freight Train Safety, MR-10: Changes to Community Character, and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks for additional information.

395-2 See response to Comment 395-1.

395-3 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.

395-4 See response to Comment 395-1, as well as MR-8 Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks for additional information.

395-5 As discussed on pages 2-12 and 2-26 of the Draft EIR, freight track modifications would be necessary to implement the Metro ROW alignments. Existing freight tracks would be shifted within the Metro ROW to accommodate the light rail tracks; the distances vary depending on the location. However, the freight track modifications would not encroach into residential properties, and the project is designed to avoid displacement of residents. Additionally, the proposed freight track modifications would be completed in accordance with applicable Federal Rail Administration regulations and Metro's stringent design criteria, ensuring the new design meets modern safety requirements for both freight and light rail operations. See MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks. In Spring 2025, Metro conducted a survey of property boundaries, reflected in the Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative. Metro would continue to coordinate with property owners as design progresses.

395-6 Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

395-7 See MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design; MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks; MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes; and response to Comment 396-6.

395-8 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

395-9 While privacy is not considered an environmental impact under CEQA, Metro understands that this may be a concern for residents, and is committed to minimizing potential intrusions where feasible. During construction, activities near residential properties, including work on the berm, would be temporary and limited to specific phases of construction. Construction contractors would adhere to standard codes of conduct to ensure professional behavior on construction sites. During operation, privacy impacts

from the light rail vehicles themselves are expected to be minimal. Trains would be in motion and would not stop or slow near residential properties, greatly limiting opportunities for riders or operators to observe private activities. In addition, light rail vehicles are generally enclosed and would be elevated or grade-separated, further reducing the potential for visual intrusion. Metro would continue to evaluate ways to minimize disruptions in accordance with applicable legal requirements and as part of the project's ongoing planning and outreach efforts.

Submission 396 Michael Sullivan

396-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. While change in community character does not constitute a significant impact under CEQA, Section 3.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, analyzes the project's potential to physically divide communities. As discussed in these sections of the Draft EIR, the project would result in less than significant impacts. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

396-2 Although some residents use the Metro ROW for recreational activities, this use is not authorized or compliant with freight safety standards. As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Metro ROW alignments include a multi-use recreational path between Grant Avenue and 182nd Street on the east side of the light rail tracks.

396-3 As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Metro ROW alignments include a multi-use recreational path between Grant Avenue and 182nd Street on the east side of the light rail tracks. The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted.

396-4 See MR-10: Changes to Community Character. The project under consideration is a proposed light rail transit line, not commuter rail. Light rail systems, such as the one proposed for the project, are distinct from commuter rail in that they involve smaller, lighter vehicles, more frequent service, and lower speeds, and therefore generally result in lower levels of noise, vibration, and other environmental impacts compared to commuter rail system. See also response to Comment 396-1.

396-5 The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, the revisions do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that the impact related to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant. Train operations occur above the ground at a safe distance from pipeline and, thus, would not directly create conditions for fires and explosions. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information.

396-6 William Green Park is approximately 0.07 miles (350) feet from the Metro ROW. William Green Elementary School is 0.13 miles (686 feet) away, as noted in Table 3.15-9 of the Draft EIR.

396-7 See response to Comment 396-1. There are currently no legal crossings between 162nd Street and 170th Street.

396-8 The project would add new safety fencing or other barriers, such as soundwalls, to the Metro ROW. However, access across the railroad corridor would still be maintained at all existing crossings, and no evacuation routes would be eliminated.

396-9 In the previous planning stage (2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis), Metro studied proposed stations in the City of Lawndale between Inglewood Avenue and Manhattan Beach Boulevard along the Metro ROW and at Hawthorne Boulevard/166th Street. However, at the request of the City of Lawndale, Metro removed these proposed stations from further study.

Metro is adhering to all CEQA requirements. As of the publication of the Draft EIR in 2023, Metro has not purchased property adjacent to the Metro ROW. Furthermore, Metro's design and planning process complies with all applicable safety regulations. See MR-8: Light Rail Security.

396-10 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

396-11 The comment does not raise significant environmental issues, but is noted for the record. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 397 Michael Sullivan

397-1 The commenter's opposition to implementing the project along the Metro ROW alignment is noted. The commenter's request to "consider updating the DEIR to add HazMat 3.9-1.1 Federal Regulations to section to the assessment" is unclear, as the Draft EIR discusses the applicable federal regulations to which the project would be subject in Section 3.9-1.1, including the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, cited in Submission 397. The foregoing regulations are also considered as part of the analysis of potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials, which is detailed in Section 3.9-4 of the Draft EIR.

See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information.

397-2 See responses to Comments 397-3 to 397-5.

397-3 See response to Comment 397-1, as well as MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks.

397-4 See response to Comment 397-1.

397-5 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

397-6 Metro puts the highest priority on public safety and security. See MR-8 Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 398 Holly Osborne

398-1 Submission 375 includes the same comments from the same commentor. See responses to Comment Letter 375.

Submission 399 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 400 Jeanne Bellemin

400-1 Submission 353 includes the same comments from the same commentor. See responses to Comment Letter 353.

Submission 401 Janice Tanabe

401-1 The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, 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 for additional information.

401-2 See MR-12: Emergency Access. Similar to the Trench Option and Hawthorne Option, the LPA would fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways, and would not affect emergency access. See response to Comment 401-1.

Submission 402 Eugene Balfour

402-1 Submission 89 includes the same comments from the same commentor. See responses to Comment Letter 89.

402-2 The LPA would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts for pedestrians and emergency vehicles. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security. See MR-12: Emergency Access.

Submission 403 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 404 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 405 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 406 Janice Tanabe

406-1 Potential visual impacts of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. The analysis considers changes to visual character and quality from publicly accessible vantage points, consistent with CEQA guidelines, including changes associated with the relocation of the freight tracks and the introduction of the light rail, as well as the introduction of the light rail trains within the corridor. The relocation of freight tracks would occur within the existing Metro ROW, which is already characterized by transportation infrastructure, including freight operations. The analysis in Section 3.3-4.2 determined that while the proximity of tracks to residential and retirement communities may increase slightly, the overall change in visual character would remain consistent with the existing baseline of a transportation corridor.

See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 407 Burch

407-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 408 Lauren Faith Niro

408-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 409 Chris Ng

409-1 The commenter's preference for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. In the event the Hawthorne Option is approved for implementation by the Metro Board, Metro would work with the City of Redondo Beach to provide safe access to the South Bay Galleria. Including a pedestrian bridge at the South Bay Galleria Station would require an additional level at the station platform and vertical circulation elements at the Galleria, which would result in right-of-way acquisitions and increased cost. Transportation impacts, including those related to pedestrian safety, are analyzed in Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR.

409-2 The commenter's preference for the Trench Option as a second choice over the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. It is infeasible to put the freight train in a trench with the light rail due to cost, time, and ROW constraints. Freight has different requirements than light rail for track spacing and grades. There is insufficient space to

lower the freight tracks without causing additional significant environmental impacts, such as air quality and property impacts. Therefore, it is not feasible to put the freight tracks in a trench due to cost, time, and ROW constraints and therefore, this was not considered in the design of the Trench Option.

Submission 410 Janice Tanabe

410-1 The commenter's preference for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations.

See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks for additional information.

Submission 411 Jeanne Merchant

411-1 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.

411-2 See response to Comment 411-1. All of the light rail alignment options under consideration utilize existing infrastructure in some form.

411-3 The potential for noise and vibration impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. The analysis determined that with mitigation, vibration levels from the project would not exceed the thresholds that could cause structural damage during operation, see MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds. Noise impacts are also analyzed in detail. Mitigation Measures such as MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls and MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs, and MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Implementation would be proposed to reduce noise levels to less than significant with mitigation wherever feasible. Although the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in a significant and unavoidable operational noise impact, none of the other options or alternatives studied in the EIR, including the LPA, would result in significant operational noise impacts after mitigation.

Regarding visual impacts, Section 3.3, Aesthetics, evaluates potential changes to visual quality and public views. The project would be designed in accordance with Metro design criteria, which aim to integrate the project into the surrounding environment. For additional information on the issues raised in this comment and Metro's responses thereto, see MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

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.

411-4 See response to Comment 411-1.

Submission 412 Kim Wong

412-1 The commenter's preference for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The C Line Extension, now planned to operate as the K Line, would connect to the LAX Metro Transit Station, providing service to LAX. This extension would enhance connectivity and improve access to important destinations for South Bay residents, including Redondo Beach and Torrance.

Submission 413 Angeline Souza

413-1 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 and vibration compared to larger, diesel-operated Metrolink trains and freight operators. Regarding operational vibration impacts, those impacts were assessed in accordance with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (FTA, 2018), which is the industry standard for evaluating noise and vibration impacts from transit projects. This guidance provides a well-established and widely accepted framework for determining the potential effects of noise and vibration on sensitive receptors, including residential properties. As concluded in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, Mitigation Measures MM-VIB-2: Construction Equipment Location and MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys would reduce vibration damage and annoyance impacts to less than significant levels for the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option studied in the Draft EIR.

As indicated by the comment, Section 3.6. Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, discloses that each alignment option would result in potentially significant construction-related noise and vibration impacts. To address these impacts, the project would implement Mitigation Measures MM NOI-1: Noise Control Plan, MM-VIB-1: Vibration Control Plan, MM-VIB-2: Construction Equipment Location, and MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post- Construction Surveys. While implementation of these measures would reduce the construction noise and vibration impacts to the maximum extent feasible, some noise and vibration impacts during construction would remain significant and unavoidable. These impacts would be temporary and would cease upon the completion of construction activities.

413-2 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.

413-3 The noise standards used in the analysis in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, are based on exterior noise levels, meaning that impacts were evaluated without

assumed closed windows or air conditioning. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Submission 414 Angeline Souza

414-1 Submission 413 includes the same comments from the same commentor. See responses to Comment Letter 413.

Submission 415 Alan Ruiz

415-1 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 416 Colleen M. Villegas

416-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

416-2 See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

416-3 Mitigation Measure MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys requires contractors to document damage resulting from vibration impacts during construction and repair them. In addition, as discussed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, the project design process would include thorough site geotechnical investigations to ensure the stability of nearby structures. Per Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, site-specific geotechnical investigations would be conducted to address foundation and structural safety. The investigation would include engineering and constructions recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged. Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, 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.

416-4 See responses to Comment 416-2. It is not technically feasible to correlate project-specific noise impacts to specific health outcomes, given the complexity of factors contributing to these conditions. However, with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, noise levels associated with construction and operation of the project would be reduced.

See response to Comment 95-19 for information regarding the cited articles, which do not address light rail transit noise. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality for information regarding health effects from noise.

Submission 417 Ints Luters

417-1 The proposed alignments along the Metro ROW, including the LPA, propose a multi-use path between 182nd Street and Grant Avenue to expand pedestrian and cycle access to the station. Vehicular drop-off would be available at the Redondo Beach Transit Center.

417-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW 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 418 Janice Tanabe

418-1 See MR-10: Changes to Community Character. The analysis in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, follows federal guidance, specifically the Federal Transit Administration Transit (FTA) Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018) to assess transit impacts. This methodology evaluates whether projected noise and vibration levels would exceed FTA's impact thresholds for sensitive receptors. The analysis ensures a consistent, objective approach to determine potential noise impacts and identify when mitigation measures are required. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; 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.

Submission 419 Lillian Katzenmeyer

419-1 Metro understands the concerns of residents regarding noise, vibration, and proximity of the proposed Metro ROW light rail alignment to homes in neighborhoods, including Franklin Park. The potential for noise and vibration impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds; and MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project.

419-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 420 Michael Sullivan

420-1 The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, 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 for additional information. Routine maintenance has been factored into the cost assumptions for the project. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

420-2 Mitigation Measure MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys requires contractors to document damage resulting from vibration impacts during construction and repair them. In addition, as discussed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, the project design process would include thorough site geotechnical investigations to ensure the stability of nearby structures. Per Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, site-specific geotechnical investigations would be conducted to address foundation and structural safety. The investigation would include engineering and construction recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged.

Regarding operational vibration impacts, those impacts were assessed in accordance with the Federal Transportation (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (FTA, 2018), which is the industry standard for evaluating noise and vibration impacts from transit projects. This guidance provides a well-established and widely accepted framework for determining the potential effects of noise and vibration on sensitive receptors, including residential properties. Operational vibration annoyance impacts would be less than significant with mitigation for all Metro ROW alignments.

420-3 Section 3.8-4.7 of the Draft EIR evaluates the potential for the project to be located on expansive soil, creating a substantial direct or indirect risk to life or property. As detailed therein, Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards would ensure that site-specific geotechnical investigations are completed to verify the potential for expansive soils and, if necessary, remediations steps to address the potential impact. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information.

420-4 As part of the site-specific geotechnical investigations, a state-licensed civil engineer would include recommendations for addressing potential geological issues along the project alignment, including requirements for safely addressing issues related to expansive soils, if present. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information.

420-5 Section 3.8-3.2, Local Geology, of the Draft EIR describes the geologic units underlying the RSA, which consist of Quaternary deposits composed (from the bottom to the surface) of the 1,400-foot-thick early Pleistocene-aged San Pedro formation, the 1,000-foot-thick late Pleistocene Lakewood formation and older sand dunes, and approximately 300 feet of Holocene-aged alluvium, which is capped by aeolian (i.e., wind-blown) deposits. As detailed therein, the San Pedro formation is primarily stiff clay with interbedded sand and gravel. The Lakewood formation is dense to very dense sand, clayey sand, silty sand (interbedded with very stiff to hard silty to sandy clay), and clayey silt. The Pleistocene old alluvium (map symbol Qoa) moderately consolidated, moderately dissected clay, silt, sand

and gravel, and sand dune (eolian) deposits (Qoe) are primarily composed of medium-dense to very dense, well-sorted, medium- to coarse-grained sand with some silt and silty sand. Thus, the Draft EIR acknowledges the presence of clay within the RSA. Pursuant to 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 address existing soil conditions and ensure surrounding structures are not damaged. The geotechnical report recommendations would be incorporated into the project plans and specifications, which would prevent potential impacts related to soil conditions, including clay, from occurring, should such conditions be present. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information.

420-6 The comment is noted for the record. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 421 Michael Sullivan

421-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

421-2 The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, 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.

421-3 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 construction recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged.

421-4 See response to Comment 421-1. 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 vibration compared to larger, diesel-operated Metrolink trains and freight operators.

421-5 See responses to Comment 421-4. As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) has defined vibration thresholds for human annoyance and structural damage. As shown in Table 3.6-6, the threshold for vibration annoyance is 65 vibration decibels, for "frequent events." The thresholds for construction vibration damage are shown in Table 3.6-5, which expresses vibration in terms of peak particle velocity inches per second. The analysis 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.

421-6 The commenter's interpretation of the vibration data is inaccurate. Vibration levels were elevated at the El Nido Park measurement location for both northbound and southbound trains, indicating that the observed levels were not solely attributable to variations in train weight. For both loaded and unloaded trains, the highest vibration levels typically occurred with the passage of the locomotive, which is generally the heaviest part of the train.

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

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

421-7 See responses to Comments 421-1 to 421-6.

Submission 422 Michael Kim

422-1 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). Since the COVID pandemic, Metro transit ridership levels have grown every year and are nearly pre-COVID levels. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

422-2 See MR-9: Light Rail Security. In addition, CEQA does not require an analysis of safety in terms of crime, as it is not an environmental issue, and therefore the Draft EIR does not make any conclusions regarding this topic.

422-3 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 423 Phyllis Shoemaker

423-1 Submission 367 includes the same comments from the same commentor. See response to Comment Letter 367.

Submission 424 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Public Agencies

Submission 425 Sabrina Henriquez

425-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

425-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

425-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

425-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

425-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

425-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

425-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 426 Theodore Otvos

426-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The potential for noise impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 427 Theodore Otvos

427-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthrone Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro has designed the project to avoid displacement of residents. See the 2025 Real Estate Acquisition Report, published concurrently with this Final EIR, for more detailed information on proposed property acquisitions. In some areas along the Metro ROW, property owners have built out past their property lines and encroached into Metro ROW.

Submission 428 Wally Marks

428-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

428-2 See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 429 Lillian Katzenmeyer

429-1 Submission 419 includes the same comments from the same commentor. See response to Comment Letter 419.

Submission 430 Mike Jamgochian

430-1 Appendix 3.6-C shows the potential vibration impacts prior to mitigation. Mitigation measures include MM-VIB-4: Low Impact Frogs, MM-VIB-5: Resilient Fasteners, and MM-VIB-6: Ballast Mats. The use of these mitigation measures would reduce vibration at the source either by closing the gap at crossovers, securing tracks to reduce vibration, and reducing the vibration transfer from tracks to the ground. Vibration mitigation measures and locations where they would apply are included on Pages 3.6-106 through 3.6-108 of the Draft EIR. With implementation of mitigation measures, operational vibration annoyance impacts would be reduced to below the level of significance.

430-2 As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, and Section 4.10, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, all alignment options, including the LPA, would have less than significant operational vibration impacts with mitigation. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

430-3 Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

430-4 CEQA requires that an EIR identify the Environmentally Superior Alternative and discuss the facts that support that selection. The EIR does not reject or dismiss the High-Frequency Bus Alternative; rather, it presents a full analysis of each alternative evaluated, including how well each alternative would meet the project's objectives. Ultimately, the decision on which alternative to approve rests with the Metro Board, who will consider both the environmental analysis and the ability of each alternative to meet the project's objectives.

430-5 The commenter's opposition to the project and support for a two-lane busway in the Metro ROW is noted. A bus line within the Metro ROW was studied in the 2009 Alternatives Analysis, and was screened out in the first phase. Implementing a busway adjacent to the active freight line had safety challenges, required a transfer at the Redondo Beach (Marine) Station, would result in localized emissions from bus vehicles, and did not provide increased ridership. A High-Frequency Bus Alternative on local arterials is discussed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

430-6 See response to Comment 430-5.

Submission 431 Daniil Kozhemyako

431-1 Metro puts the highest priority on public safety and security. 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 (ADA), and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

431-2 To clarify, the project is not a subway project. Rather, the project would extend Metro's light rail service through a combination of at-grade, trench, and aerial alignments (depending on the alignment option), none of which involves subway tunneling. Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR evaluates the potential for noise and vibration impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

431-3 See response to Comment 431-2.

431-4 As described in Section 3.1, Transportation of the Draft EIR, Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan requires contractors to develop a construction management traffic plan. The commenter does not specify which street they are concerned about, but Metro and its contractors would ensure that access to all properties would remain during construction.

431-5 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 (ADA), and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. Under the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option, the light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with school-age pedestrians and cyclists. The presence of a station could also benefit access to schools for residents and parents.

431-6 See response to Comment 431-1.

Submission 432 Holly Osborne

432-1 See responses to Comments 432-2 to 432-13 for specific responses to the issues raised.

432-2 The comment is correct in identifying an error in Table 3.6-16 of the Draft EIR. Due to a copy-and-paste mistake, the "Mitigated Freight and LRT Combined" column in that table incorrectly included noise levels associated with the Trench Option. The correct values, which reflect the "Mitigated Freight and LRT Combined" column should have included the numbers from the "Mitigated Freight and LRT Combined" noise levels for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, and are provided in Table 5 of Appendix 3.6-B. This error has been corrected in Section 4.10, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR. Importantly, the impact determinations in the Draft EIR were based on the correct noise levels and are accurately reflected in the "Impact Threshold" column of Table 3.6-16. As a result, the impact conclusion presented in the Draft EIR remains valid and unchanged. This correction

does not alter the EIR's analysis or deprive the public of information necessary to make informed decisions.

432-3 The measured noise levels in the "Existing" column represent real-world noise levels, which are accurately reported to the first decimal place in Appendix 3.06-B. According to the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018), Page 95, noise impacts should be assessed by tabulating "existing ambient noise exposure (rounded to the nearest decibel) at all receivers." The rounding presented in Table 3.6-16 is thus consistent with FTA's guidance and does not affect the accuracy of the data or the conclusions of the analysis. No revisions were made to this methodology in the Final EIR.

432-4 The designation of "Significant and Unavoidable" for Cluster D29 in the Draft EIR was a copy-and-paste error. This has been corrected in Section 4.10, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR to reflect that the mitigated noise level of 55 dB is below the threshold of 59 dB, making the impact "Less than Significant with Mitigation." The correction does not change the overall conclusions of the Draft EIR.

432-5 The designation "Significant and Unavoidable" for Cluster D32 in the Draft EIR was a copy-and-paste error. This has been corrected in Section 4.10, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR to reflect that the mitigated noise level of 55 dB is below the threshold of 59 dB, making the impact "Less than Significant with Mitigation." The revision does not change the overall conclusions of the Draft EIR.

432-6 The comment is correct that Cluster D35 is appropriately designated as "Less than Significant with Mitigation," similar to Cluster D32. See response to Comment 432-5 regarding Cluster D32, the corrected designation reflects that the mitigated noise level of 55 dB is below the threshold of 59 dB. Clusters D32 and D35 are both along the ROW and have similar existing noise conditions.

432-7 See response to Comment 432-2.

432-8 The only mis-copied column in Table 3.6-16 is the "Mitigated Freight and LRT Combined" column. The impact thresholds in Table 5 in Appendix 3.6-B correctly match the impact thresholds in Table 3.6-16.

432-9 See response to Comment 432-2.

432-10 The only mis-copied column in Table 3.6-16 is the "Mitigated Freight and LRT Combined" column. The column "Unmitigated Freight and LRT Combined" in Table 5 in Appendix 3.6-B correctly matches the "Unmitigated Freight and LRT Combined" in Table 3.6-16.

432-11 The measured noise levels in the "Existing" column of Table 3.6-16 represent real-world noise levels, which are accurately reported to the first decimal place. According to the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018), Page 95, noise impacts should be assessed by tabulating "existing ambient noise exposure (rounded to the nearest decibel) at all receivers." The rounding presented in Table 3.6-16 is thus consistent with FTA's guidance and does not affect the accuracy of

the data or the conclusions of the analysis. No revisions were made to this methodology in the Final EIR.

432-12 See responses to Comments 432-3 and 432-11 regarding the rounding of numbers. Table 3.6-17 in the Draft EIR correctly matches Table 9 in Appendix 3.6-B.

432-13 See responses to Comments 432-2 through 432-12. The presented data in Appendix 3.6-B is correct and accurate. The error that occurred in Table 3.6-16 was an incorrect copy of Trench Option Noise Levels into the Proposed Project Table. Only the "Mitigated Freight and LRT Combined" column was affected. The impacts presented in Table 3.6-16 were accurately presented and represent the Proposed Project's (Elevated/At-Grade Alignment) operational noise impacts. These impact determinations were based on the predicted "Mitigated Freight and LRT Combined" noise levels for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment compared to the FTA noise impact criteria. The Draft EIR refers readers to the correct information on Page 3.6-50 of the Draft EIR, which included the correct Mitigated Freight and LRT Combined noise levels in Table 5 of Appendix 3.6-B. The Draft EIR has provided accurate conclusions overall.

Submission 433 Karen Reed

433-1 The commenter's preference for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

The potential for noise impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. 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.

The potential for air quality impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Compliance with Project Features PF-AQ-1: Tier 4 Engine Standards and PF-AQ-2: Dust Control Best Practices would ensure that construction activities comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District and Metro standards controlling emissions and dust. Operationally, the light rail vehicles would be powered by electricity and would not produce localized emissions. Regional air quality would improve with implementation of the project due to a shift from passenger vehicles to light rail in the corridor.

Potential lighting impacts of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR provides an analysis of potential light and glare impacts informed by the Metro Design Standards, as stated on page 3.3-11. These standards ensure that project lighting and materials would be consistent with other Metro light rail projects currently in operation, which avoid significant light and glare impacts. Best practices, such as using non-reflective surfaces where feasible, would be incorporated to minimize glare.

Additionally, the project would comply with applicable lighting regulations, which would be verified during the permitting process and would include industry standards and/or technical lighting specification standards that are determined during the final design process.

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.

433-2 Washington Elementary School and Adams Middle School are located approximately 1,200 feet from the Metro ROW. At these distances, noise from light rail operations and construction activities would be attenuated to levels below thresholds of significance due to the dissipation of sound energy over distance and the presence of intervening structures that further buffer noise. While project-related construction noise may occasionally be audible at these locations, it would not result in a substantial change from existing conditions. Similarly, vibration generated by the project during both construction and operations would have dissipated at the distances where the schools are located. The resource study areas for both noise and vibration are described in Section 3.6-2.1, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The maximum area of analysis considered is approximately 500 feet. The schools are well outside of this distance. Additionally, as explained in Section 3.6 in the Draft EIR, the project would implement Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls and MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs to reduce noise levels, and MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment, which would collectively reduce noise levels for affected sensitive receptors (which the foregoing schools are located beyond). It should be noted that for the ROW alignments, the Draft EIR concluded that noise impacts, including to some homes within proximity to the Metro ROW, would be significant and unavoidable, even with these mitigation measures. However, for the LPA, and the Trench Option, operational noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation.

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 (ADA), and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. Under the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option, the light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists. The presence of a station could also benefit access to schools for residents and parents. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

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. As noted, the LPA light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions. In addition, as detailed by Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction

Traffic Management Plan, access would be maintained and disruptions reduced during construction.

433-3 The project would not cause changes to BNSF's freight operations. While Metro owns the ROW, BNSF has operating rights and determines operating needs and schedules. BNSF's future operations are beyond the scope of this project. As part of the project, Metro would relocate and rebuild the existing freight track. Relocated freight tracks would be replaced with newer tracks, which would provide added benefits such as efficiency and safety; however, the project does not increase the capacity of freight traffic. Contrary to the assertion of the comment, the Draft EIR discusses the frequency of freight traffic, for instance on page 4-2 of Project History.

433-4 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. However, Metro recognizes the importance of safety and security for transit users and the surrounding communities and provides the following information to clarify the existing measures in place. In June 2024, the Metro Board of Directors unanimously approved the establishment of the Metro Transit Community Public Safety Department (TCPSD). The objectives of the Metro TCPSD are increased visibility, accountability, and consistent service delivery, which would result in a safer transit system for Metro employees and customers using a specialized transit community public safety workforce who are trained specifically to address the needs of transit riders, as well as care-based strategies.

As described on Page 3.15-17 of the Draft EIR, the Los Angeles County Sherriff Department's Transit Policing Division provides contract transit policing services to the Metro public transit system. Deputies provide transit police services for both the light rail and bus transportation systems throughout 1,433 square miles, where Metro provides transit service. Los Angeles County Sherriff Department deputies conduct routine patrols of Metro facilities and transit vehicles and respond to emergency calls placed on Metro's public transit system. Police departments not contracted with Metro are also available for 9-1-1 emergency responses.

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

Submission 434 Barb Bush

434-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. Metro has considered retrofitting residences with sound-proofing glass as a mitigation measure for the operational noise impacts of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment but has determined that this measure would not be feasible or appropriate because they would not reduce the exterior noise levels upon which the Draft EIR's noise impact determinations were based. As such, even with retrofitting, the identified noise levels – and thus the impact conclusion under CEQA – would remain unchanged. In addition, modern construction practices, including standard windows and insulation materials required by the California Building Code, typically reduce interior noise levels well below thresholds of concern. As such, window retrofits would not provide a measurable or necessary benefit in this context. The LPA would eliminate this impact by fully grade separating the light rail guideway from roadways.

See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

434-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. If the Hawthorne Option were approved for implementation by the Metro Board, the mid-block crossings would be signalized, creating safer pedestrian crossings. The Redondo Beach Transit Center Station would be located adjacent to the City of Redondo Beach's new regional transit center. This would allow for convenient transfer to other local transit lines. The Hawthorne Option would run adjacent to the freeway and would not cause any conflicts or impacts to freeway operations.

434-3 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 435 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 436 Jay Gould

436-1 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. None of the alignment options studied would result in the displacement of residential properties. The Metro Board has not yet made a final decision on whether or how to move forward with the project. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives

Submission 437 Kimiko Shiozaki

437-1 Potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. Metro has considered retrofitting residences with sound-proofing glass as a mitigation measure for the operational noise impacts of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment but has determined that this measure would not be feasible or appropriate because they would not reduce the exterior noise levels upon which the Draft EIR's noise impact determinations were based. As such, even with retrofitting, the identified noise levels – and thus the impact conclusion under CEQA – would remain unchanged. In addition, modern construction practices, including standard windows and insulation materials required by the California Building Code, typically reduce interior noise levels well below thresholds of concern. As such, window retrofits would not provide a measurable or necessary benefit in this context. The LPA would eliminate this impact by fully grade separating the light rail guideway from roadways.

In addition, the project would enable the local jurisdictions along the Metro ROW to obtain a "quiet zone" designation, which would reduce existing freight noise overall along the corridor, by eliminating freight horn soundings, which typically produces noise levels of up to 110 dBA. The operational noise impacts of the LPA would be less than significant with mitigation and further mitigation would not be required. Should the Meto Board approve the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment for implementation, it would need to

determine that the benefits of that alignment outweigh its significant environmental impacts, including the significant and unavoidable noise impact. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

437-2 See MR-9: Light Rail Security. In addition, CEQA does not require an analysis of safety in terms of crime, as it is not an environmental issue, and therefore the Draft EIR does not make any conclusions regarding this topic.

437-3 The commenter's concern regarding the use of public funds is noted. Metro recognizes that this project is funded by taxpayer-approved measures, including Measures R and M, which were passed by Los Angeles County voters to expand and improve the region's transportation network. The project aims to close a longstanding gap in the Metro Rail system by connecting to the Metro A and E Lines, and to better connect South Bay communities to the broader regional transit system.

The Metro Board made the LPA selection with consideration to all public comments, each alternative's ability to meet the project objectives, as listed in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and other considerations, including costs. Based on these factors, the Hybrid Alternative was chosen as the LPA. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. However, selection of the LPA does not constitute project approval. All alternatives, including the No Project Alternative, remain under consideration until the Final EIR is certified and the Metro Board takes final action on the project.

Submission 438 Mark Nelson

438-1 Although some studies have linked excessive and unpredictable noise to stress-related health outcomes, the commenter does not provide evidence that the noise levels associated with this project would reach the intensity, frequency, or duration evaluated in those studies. As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, the project would incorporate highly effective mitigation measures, including the installation of Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls, to reduce noise impacts to below the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) thresholds of significance to the maximum extent feasible. Although the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in a significant and unavoidable operational noise impact, the operational noise impacts of the LPA, the Trench Option and the Hawthorne Option would be less than significant with mitigation. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

438-2 Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project. See response to Comment 438-1 and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

438-3 See response to Comment 438-1.

438-4 While Metro acknowledges Beach Cities Health District (BCHD) aims to promote community health, Metro cannot comment on BCHD's decisions or actions, as it is an independent entity. Therefore, questions regarding BCHD's decisions and priorities would best be directed to BCHD.

438-5 The commenter's opposition to the project in the Metro ROW is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 439 Maureen Smith

439-1 See MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight. The potential for operational noise impacts associated with the relocation of the freight tracks under the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and the Trench Option is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. For the LPA, this analysis is provided in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. As described in those sections, with implementation of mitigation, operational impacts related to freight relocation would not be significant.

Potential operational air quality impacts associated with relocation of the freight tracks under the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and the Trench Option are addressed in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. For the LPA, these impacts are addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. As detailed in those sections, operational air quality impacts, including impacts associated with the relocated freight operations, would be less than significant. The project would not cause direct or indirect changes in freight operations. Freight activity along the Metro ROW is expected to remain at its current level of two to four passages daily, meaning emissions from freight operations would not increase due to the project. Finally, soundwalls constructed as part of the project in certain locations would serve as physical barriers, reducing the dispersion of both air pollutants and noise beyond the Metro ROW.

439-2 While Metro does not have specific safety features for pets, as described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the entire light rail guideway would be enclosed with physical barriers, such as fencing or soundwalls, or a combination of both, to prevent unauthorized access. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

439-3 In the previous planning stages, stations were proposed in Lawndale, including as part of the 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis, but at the request of the City Lawndale were removed from consideration.

439-4 The commenter's opposition to the project in the Metro ROW is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 440 Monique Negrete-Mitchell

440-1 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. Metro acknowledges the sensitivity of the workspace. See response to Comment 440-2.

440-2 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.

Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, identifies locations where potential operational vibration impacts related to structural damage and annoyance could occur and recommends Mitigation Measures MM-VIB-4: Low Impact Frogs through MM-VIB-6: Ballast Mats to reduce the operational annoyance impacts to less than significant with mitigation. The analysis in the Draft EIR considers both the potential shift of freight rail tracks and the addition of light rail transit (LRT) tracks. Operational vibration impacts would be reduced to less than Federal Transit Administration (FTA) impact threshold and less than significant with mitigation. Regarding potential for structural impacts during operations, see MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds. See MR-6: Vibration Analysis during Final Design.

Metro acknowledges the vibration demonstrated in the linked video created by existing freight train vibration. As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, the analysis of operational vibration impacts followed the FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (FTA, 2018). The vibration levels from light rail operations would be significantly lower than those generated by freight trains, due to the lighter weight.

440-3 See MR-10: Changes to Community Character. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project. See response to Comments 440-4 through 440-9.

440-4 See MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight. 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. The Draft EIR acknowledges the potential for both construction and operational vibration impacts and evaluates those impacts using the methodology in the Federal Transit Administration's Transit Noise and Vibration Assessment Manual (2018), the industry standard for transit-related vibration analysis. For the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and the Trench Alignment, this analysis of found in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. For the LPA, this impact is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR found that implementation of the identified mitigation measures, including MM-VIB-4: Low Impact Frogs, MM-VIB-5: Resilient Fasteners, and MM-VIB-6: Ballast Mats, vibration impacts from light rail operations would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation. The project is not expected to result in increased freight activity along the Metro ROW; freight operations are projected to remain at their current frequency of two to four trains per day. Therefore, while the physical location of the freight track may shift slightly, the nature and extent of freight operations, and associated vibration, would not increase as a result of the project.

Regarding construction-related vibration, the Draft EIR acknowledges that certain activities, such as pile driving and heavy equipment use, could result in temporary vibration levels that cause annoyance or discomfort for nearby residents. These impacts are addressed through Mitigation Measures MM-VIB-1: Vibration Control Plan, MM-VIB-2: Construction Equipment Location, and MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys. These measures are designed to minimize vibration during construction and ensure that any damage to nearby structures is identified and repaired. While temporary

construction-related vibration annoyance impacts could remain significant and unavoidable, such impacts would be localized and of limited duration.

As noted in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, the project would also incorporate site-specific geotechnical investigations (Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards) to ensure that nearby structures remain stable and safe during construction. These investigations would include design and engineering recommendations tailored to site conditions.

Finally, the comment's suggestion that the project could not be "proven safe without the option to undo" is understood, but CEQA does not require absolute certainty. Rather, it requires a good-faith effort to evaluate reasonably foreseeable impacts and identify feasible mitigation. The Draft EIR complies with the standard and includes enforceable mitigation to reduce vibration-related impacts to the extent feasible.

440-5 The project is a light rail transit line operated by Metro and would use electrically powered light rail vehicles, which generate substantially lower vibration levels than existing freight or diesel-powered trains, such as those operated by Metrolink. As such, the operational vibration from the project would be considerably lower than the levels currently experienced with freight activity along the corridor. The Draft EIR follows the FTA's industry-standard assessment methodology and includes site-specific vibration measurements to reflect real-world conditions.

To address construction impacts, Metro would implement Mitigation Measures MM-VIB-1: Vibration Control Plan, avoid placing high-vibration equipment near homes when feasible MM-VIB-2: Construction Equipment Location, and conduct both pre- and post-construction surveys MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys to document existing conditions and repair any construction-related damage.

In addition, Metro would conduct detailed geotechnical studies before construction (Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards) to ensure that work is safe and responsive to the area's geological conditions. Operational vibration impacts from the light rail system would be mitigated to less than significant with mitigation, and Metro would remain accountable for monitoring impacts and enforcing mitigation throughout construction.

440-6 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. 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 on page 3.6-28 of the Draft EIR, the FTA general assessment methodology does not require vibration measurements. However, Metro conducted vibration measurements at selected locations, including El Nido Park, to better understand baseline

conditions, including vibration generated by the existing freight train pass-bys. As described on page 3.6-31 of the Draft EIR, the vibration model was calibrated to reflect higher propagation levels observed in this area to ensure a conservative and accurate analysis.

440-7 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety, MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes, and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks.

440-8 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.

440-9 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 441 Philip Breuer

441-1 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.

441-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR analyzes potential aesthetic impacts of the Hawthorne Option and finds them less than significant with mitigation. Regarding traffic disruptions during construction, the project is designed to minimize disruptions to the community. As part of the project, as detailed in Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan, a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan would manage construction-related traffic disruptions. This plan would ensure that traffic flow is managed efficiently, access to homes and businesses is maintained, and disruptions to the community are minimized.

441-3 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). When the project opens, it would operate as part of the K Line, traveling north-south between the Expo/Crenshaw Station Line and the proposed station at Torrance. It would connect to the LAX/Metro Transit Station, providing service to LAX.

Submission 442 Robert Sanchez

442-1 The commenter's opposition to the project and Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Comments regarding costs do not raise any significant environmental issues requiring a response. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

442-2 Figure 3.6-1. A-Weighted Decibel Scale and Common Noise Levels on page 3.6-2 of the Draft EIR shows noise levels from common urban sources of noise.

442-3 The comment does not raise significant environmental issues or address the adequacy of the Draft EIR and is noted for the record. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

442-4 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 443 Roberto Escobar

443-1 Metro is committed to conducting meaningful outreach to ensure that all community members have the opportunity to provide input on the proposed C Line (Green) to Torrance Extension. As detailed in Appendix 1-A, NOP-Scoping Summary, of the Draft EIR and Appendix A, Public Engagement Report of the Final EIR, Metro has conducted numerous outreach efforts to gather feedback, including virtual meetings, which allowed for participation from residents who could not attend in person, as well as weekend events to accommodate varying schedules. These meetings provided important opportunities for community members to share their concerns and ask questions, and the input received has been an integral part of the planning process for this project.

The Draft EIR evaluates the potential impacts of the project, including noise, transportation, and safety concerns, and identifies mitigation measures to minimize significant impacts to less than significant where feasible. The selection of the LPA reflects a balance of community feedback, technical analysis, and cost considerations to provide a transit solution that benefits the region while addressing local concerns. The Metro Board will carefully review the Final EIR, including all public comments and responses, before making a final decision on the project's approval.

See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety; MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety; and MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service. The Metro Board will make a decision on the project with consideration of all public comments and feedback received from public engagement.

443-2 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.

443-3 Metro would continue to engage with residents of Condon Avenue and all interested parties with regards to this project. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant environmental impacts of the project, including measures to minimize environmental effects within residential areas in proximity to the project. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 444 Sarah Straton

444-1 The project would not increase the frequency of freight trains operating in the corridor; the project is a light rail transit line with quieter, electrically powered trains. It is intended to improve regional connectivity by providing light rail service to the cities' transit centers in Redondo Beach and Torrance. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

The proposed use of the Metro ROW is not simply because it is available. The Metro ROW alignments evaluated in the Draft EIR were carefully selected after comprehensive analysis of multiple options, taking into consideration the project objectives and regional transit

needs. The proposed light rail would connect the Metro system to several key lines, including the Metro C, E, and K lines, which would enhance connectivity in the South Bay.

444-2 As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the entire light rail guideway would be enclosed by physical barriers, such as fencing, soundwalls, or a combination of both, to prevent unauthorized intrusion. Although these barriers are primarily intended to prevent humans from entering the tracks, they would also prevent or deter land animals from entering. In many areas, the existing fencing has been breached, and would be repaired under the project, which would limit unauthorized access into the Metro ROW relative to existing conditions.

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

Submission 445 Sharon

445-1 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 446 A. Fierro

446-1 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.

446-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 447 Yumiko Omatsu

447-1 The commenter's concerns about the frequency and duration of light rail operations near their home and their neighbors' homes are noted. The project is expected to operate similarly to other Metro lines, with anticipated service hours from approximately 4:00 a.m. one day to 1:00 a.m. the following day. System headways would be reduced during early morning (4:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m.) and late-night hours (7:00 p.m. to 1:00 a.m.) to approximately 15 minutes. Peak-hour system headways would be 5 minutes during peak travel hours. Weekend system headways would be reduced compared to weekdays due to reduced commuter demand. It is important to note that light rail vehicles are electrically powered and significantly quieter than freight trains, which are currently the primary source of rail noise in the corridor. Under the LPA, and the Trench and Hawthorne Options, the light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated in this area and, with implementation of soundwalls and other noise-reducing features, would not result in significant operational noise impacts.

447-2 The concern for the Trench Open due to underground gas pipes is also 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 Systems, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, 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.

447-3 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 448 Amy LaCoe

448-1 This commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, addresses potential transportation impacts. As detailed by Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan, access would be maintained and disruptions reduced during construction.

Submission 449 Jacqueline Caro

449-1 Submission 215 includes the same comments from the same commentor. See responses to Submission 215.

Submission 450 Carlos Torres

450-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignments and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The potential for noise and vibration impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

The project under consideration is a light rail transit line, not a commuter train. Light rail vehicles are quieter, electrically powered trains that generate less noise and vibration compared to larger, diesel-powered commuter trains.

Submission 451 Greg & Janett Paaske

451-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 452 Pat McLane

452-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 453 can be found in Section 5.4 Responses to Groups and Organizations

Submission 454 Anonymous

453-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 455 Henry Martinez

454-1 The commenter's support for a Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 456 Mark Nelson

456-1 Metro uses a standard response to email that provides additional information on the project, as not all emails received from the public are comments on the Draft EIR.

456-2 See response to Comment 438-1.

456-3 See response to Comment 438-2.

456-4 See responses to Comments 438-3 and 438-4.

456-5 See response to Comment 438-5.

Submission 457 Robert D. Stoffel

457-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 458 Nate

458-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 459 The Olsen Family

459-1 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. Under the LPA, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option, the light rail guideway is fully grade-separated from all roadways, and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions. In addition, as detailed by Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan, access would be maintained and disruptions reduced during construction.

Submission 460 Rene Arreygue

460-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Regarding visual impacts, Section 3.3, Aesthetics, evaluates potential changes to visual quality and public views. The project would be designed in accordance with Metro design criteria, which aim to integrate the project into the surrounding environment.

Should the Hawthorne Option be pursued, it would remove approximately 20 parking spaces between 162nd and 171st Streets. Metro would work with businesses along Hawthorne Boulevard to ensure minimal disruption during construction and post construction. Refer to the 2023 Torrance Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for more information on parking.

Submission 461 Holly Osborne

461-1 The noise thresholds used in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of Draft EIR, are consistent with the Federal Transit Administration Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018), which establishes industry-standard criteria for evaluating noise impacts of transit projects. The thresholds take into account existing noise conditions and are not erroneously high. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds.

461-2 See responses to Comments 432-1 through 432-13. Text was corrected in Section 4.10, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR. The correction does not change the overall conclusions of the Draft EIR.

461-3 The noise analysis in the Draft EIR follows the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018), which specifies the use of 24-hour time-averaged noise levels to assess the ambient noise environment. These levels capture all sound sources, including the occasional freight train pass-by, as part of the existing baseline. The analysis also incorporates a 10-dBA (a-weighted decibel) penalty for all sound occurring during the nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) to account for increased sensitivity to noise during these hours. The effect of the penalty is that in the calculation of 24-hour noise, any event that occurs during the nighttime hours, is equivalent to 10 of the same events during the daytime hours. This ensures the assessment reflects the potential for greater disturbance from nighttime noise events.

Although noise from freight trains is loud and increases the 24-hour average noise levels, its infrequent occurrence during the day means that it does not dominate or skew the overall noise profile. Excluding the freight noise from the existing ambient noise conditions would not comply with the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA)

methodology and would misrepresent the true ambient noise environment. The 24-hour noise measurements include both periods when the freight is not operating and periods when freight is operating.

Freight train noise must be included in the study because it is part of the existing noise environment. Removing freight noise from the analysis would misrepresent existing conditions and conflict with the impact methodology set forth in the FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual.

461-4 See response to Comment 461-3.

461-5 See response to Comment 463-3.

461-6 The receivers referred to in the Draft EIR are analytical units used to predict noise levels at representative locations for each cluster of sensitive receptors. These receivers were selected based on their ability to represent noise conditions of similar surrounding properties, considering factors such as topography, distance from the project, transit speed and other conditions that affect the noise levels. The "existing" noise levels shown in the Draft EIR are modeled values, not measured at every individual property. The values for Clusters B23 through B34 reflect consistent conditions based on their similar characteristics. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds.

461-7 The commenter is correct in noting a discrepancy between the baseline noise levels assigned to Clusters B20 and B23. In the Draft EIR, Receptor B20 was associated with monitoring location LT-5, which measured a noise level of 70.0 dBA, L_{dn} (Day-Night Average Sound Levels), likely influenced by its proximity to the I-405 freeway and existing freight train activity. In contrast, Receptor B23 was linked to LT-10, which measured 55.1 dBA, L_{dn} (day-night average sound levels) and is more shielded from freeway noise.

In response to this and other similar comments, the Final EIR conservatively reassigns a baseline of 55.1 dBA L_{dn} to Clusters B17 through B22 and B47 through B52 to reflect a more uniform ambient condition along that portion of the Metro ROW. Even using this lower baseline, predicted noise levels from combined LRT and freight train operations would remain less than significant with mitigation. Thus, while the Draft EIR's assignment of baseline conditions has been refined, the conclusions regarding noise impacts remain unchanged.

The Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would implement Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls to block the line-of-sight between the train and receptors, reducing noise levels. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures for more information.

461-8 See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds. As part of Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) guidance, existing measurements are permitted to be representative of similar sensitive receptors with similar existing noise conditions. This is fully disclosed on Page 3.6-17 of the Draft EIR under Section 3.6-2.2.1 Existing Noise Conditions.

461-9 See response to Comment 461-3.

461-10 See response to Comment 461-3. Although freight trains are loud, their infrequent daytime operation means they do not dominate the 24-hour average noise levels. Excluding freight noise from the existing ambient noise conditions would not comply with FTA methodology and would misrepresent the true ambient noise environment. The 24-hour noise measurements used in the analysis capture both periods when freight trains are operating and periods when they are not, providing a balanced and representative assessment of existing conditions.

461-11 See response to Comment 461-3.

Submission 462 Jan Tanabe

462-1 The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, 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 for additional information.

Submission 463 Dan & Karen Pryor

463-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 464 Tara

464-1 Submission 106 includes the same comments from the same commentor. See response to Comment Letter 106.

Submission 465 Dana Icaza

465-1 The potential for noise impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. 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.

465-2 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 466 Ryan Mendivil

466-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

466-2 See MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 467 Helen Evans

467-1 The commenter's preference for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

467-2 See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 468 Jeffrey Katz

468-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

468-2 See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 469 Angel La Canfora

469-1 The comment does not raise significant environmental issues or otherwise 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 470 Marcelo Calcagnotto

470-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 471 Adrian Rops

471-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

471-2 See response to Comment 471-1.

Submission 472 Robert Jung

472-1 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.

472-2 The terminus station at the Torrance Transit Center would allow the line to continue further south, should funding and approvals become available. Any future extensions would be subject to their own environmental review and planning processes.

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.

Submission 473 Judith and William A Hying

473-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 474 Richard Ree-Uk Kim

474-1 The commenter's preference for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

474-2 Hazardous Materials are addressed in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety.

Submission 475 Gary Duncan

475-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

475-2 See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 476 Debra Powers

476-1 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.

476-2 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). Since the COVID pandemic, Metro transit ridership levels have grown every year and are nearly pre-COVID levels. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission 477 Arif I Shaikh

477-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

477-2 See response to Comment 477-1 and MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 478 Tom Hascup

478-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

478-2 The comment does not raise significant environmental issues or otherwise 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 479 Brian D. Gee

479-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 480 David Hannum

480-1 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.

480-2 See response to Comment 480-1, MR-9: Light Rail Security, and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 481 Mark Roulette

481-1 The commenter's support for the Trench Option as a primary choice and Elevated/At-Grade Alignment as a second choice is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

481-2 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. Regarding health risks, see MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Submission 482 Phil Garner

482-1 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.

482-2 See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 483 John McLaughlin

483-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 484 Yvonne W. Zoon

484-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

484-2 Adding new stations to the project would require Metro Board direction, and they would need to be evaluated through the CEQA review process. Further analysis of the scope and schedule would be needed to develop a cost estimate. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 485 James Lake

485-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

485-2 Access to the trench would be restricted, and would minimize unauthorized objects or trespassers entering the right-of-way. 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. Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR also describes the trench, which would include drainage systems to adequately remove water that enters the trench to minimize the potential for water accumulation.

485-3 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

485-4 Similar to the Hawthorne Option, the light rail guideway under the LPA and Trench Option would be fully grade-separated from all roadways. See response to Comment 485-1 and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 486 Edward Miyashiro

486-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

486-2 While Metro assists in identifying potential First/Last Mile (FLM) improvements during the planning and design phases, the implementation of FLM elements, such as crosswalks, bike lanes, landscaping, and pedestrian safety enhancements, falls under the jurisdiction of the local cities. If the project is approved, Metro would coordinate with the local jurisdictions to assist in FLM planning.

The project would operate as part of the K Line, traveling north-south between the Expo/Crenshaw Station Line and the proposed station at Torrance. It would connect to the LAX/Metro Transit Station, providing service to LAX.

Submission 487 Alicia L. Baughfman

487-1 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.

487-2 See Response to 487-1 and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 488 Jeff Henges

488-1 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.

488-2 See response to 488-1 and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 489 Bryan Higgins

489-1 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.

489-2 All the light rail options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR, including the LPA, are grade-separated, except for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment at two locations: 170th Street and 182nd Street, referred to in the Draft EIR as the "Proposed Project."

Submission 490 Jeff

490-1 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.

490-2 See response to Comment 490-1. Potential air quality impacts are addressed in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. Operationally, the light rail vehicles would be powered by electricity and would not produce localized emissions. Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR analyzes impacts related to noise and vibration. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 491 Brandon Pennington

491-1 The commenter's support of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

491-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. The Hawthorne Option would include signalized crossings to the South Bay Galleria Station, including a new signalized crossing at the south end. As discussed in Section 3.1-4.3.2 of the Draft EIR, there would be a less than significant impact for hazards related to pedestrian access. The Hybrid Alternative has been selected as the LPA.

Submission 492 Mark Michaelian

492-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

492-2 The commenter's concerns regarding the use of public funds are noted. The Metro Board made the LPA selection with consideration to all public comments and each alternative's ability to meet the project objectives, as listed in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR. Based on these factors, the Hybrid Alternative was chosen as the LPA. However, this selection does not constitute project approval. All alternatives, including the No Project Alternative, remain under consideration until the Final EIR is certified and the Metro Board takes final action on the project.

The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) Grant from the California State Transportation Agency Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, and 3% match contributions from local jurisdictions. Metro is committed to the responsible use of public funds and to managing project costs efficiently, while continuing to pursue additional funding sources to support project delivery. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 493 K. Lee

493-1 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.

493-1 See response to Comment 493-1.

Submission 494 Frank Kenny

494-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

494-2 Each project option and Alternative evaluated in the Draft EIR would connect with the Metro K Line, which provides direct service to the City of Inglewood.

Submission 495 Joan Spratt

495-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

495-2 See response to Comment 495-1.

Submission 496 Allan & Stacy Holtz

496-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

496-2 See response to Comment 496-1.

Submission 497 Norman Tran

497-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

497-2 The comment is unclear.

Submission 498 Randy & Martha Shetter

498-1 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.

Submission 499 Hans G. Kuck

499-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 500 Erika Lytle

500-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

500-2 The concern for the Trench Option due to underground gas pipes is also 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 Systems, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, 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.

Submission 501 Esther Audrey

501-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The comment requesting that Torrance Transit passes and fare rates matching the project is also noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 502 Donald A. Oden

502-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

502-2 Before making a final determination on the project, the Metro Board will review the comments and responses included in the Final EIR and will consider multiple factors, including environmental impacts, benefits and costs.

Submission 503 Fred Ruby

503-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 504 Pamela Wilkerson

504-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

504-2 The project's northern terminus would be at the Redondo Beach (Marine) Station. As part of the project, Metro would include two new rail stations, one in the City of Redondo Beach and one in the City of Torrance.

Submission 505 Terry Butler

505-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 506 Rosa Sahara

506-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

506-2 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 507 Linda Hornbeck

507-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 508 Joanne Sanger

508-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

508-2 See response to Comment 508-1.

Submission 509 David Zhang

509-1 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.

509-2 Contrary to Comment 509-1, the commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted related to traffic and cost concerns. 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 510 Rick Grefsrud

510-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

510-2 The commenter's opposition to the Trench and Hawthorne Options based on cost, schedule, and inconvenience is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 511 Juan Carlos Aguila, Ph.D.

511-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

511-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

Submission 512 Hung T. Huynh

512-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

512-2 The commenter's opposition to the Trench and Hawthorne Options based on cost and constructability is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 513 Christopher L. Foley

513-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 514 Max Majcher

514-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 515 Steve Chan

515-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness. CEQA does not require an analysis of safety in terms of crime, as it is not an environmental issue, and therefore the Draft EIR does not make any conclusions regarding this topic.

Submission 516 Smitcha Buranasombati

516-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

516-2 The commenter's support for the most cost-efficient method is noted. 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 517 Linda Blumenthal

517-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 518 Merlin Bird

518-1 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.

Submission 519 Jim Mills

519-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and 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.

519-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option due to community impacts and cost is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter.

Submission 520 Ken Lucas

520-1 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.

520-2 The commenter's preference for the Hawthorne Option is noted Metro has proposed a multi-use recreational path between 159th and 170th Street and between Grant Avenue and 182nd Street to improve bicycle and pedestrian access. Metro would continue to engage with the community to identify opportunities for improving station access and connectivity. The Project Team would engage with the community on first/last mile planning to identify potential access improvements within a half-mile walk and three-mile cycle radius of the stations to strengthen linkages to the surrounding neighborhoods and key destinations. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses and MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission 521 Kay Peterson

521-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

521-2 The commenter's preference for the Trench Option over the Hawthorne Option as the second choice to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. Potential air quality impacts are addressed in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. The South Bay Galleria station is included within the capital cost estimates.

Submission 522 Raymond Peterson

522-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

522-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions.

Submission 523 Terry Dunseith

523-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 524 Mark Torres

524-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

524-2 The commenter's support for the project, and opposition to the Trench Option and Hawthorne Option, is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 525 Sean

525-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, and opposition to 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 526 William & Belinda Gonzalez

526-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment based on cost is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 527 Wudhidham Prachumsri

527-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

527-2 The ROW alignments would feature two new stops: one at the Redondo Beach Transit Center and the other at the Torrance Transit Center.

Submission 528 Justin Neems

528-1 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 529 Frances Koo

529-1 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.

529-2 The Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would not reduce traffic lanes. In addition, as explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions.

529-3 The proposed light rail stations would comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and would include the necessary vertical circulation elements, such as elevators, ramps, and stairs, to ensure accessibility.

Submission 530 Anonymous

530-1 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 531 John Farris

531-1 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. Potential air quality impacts are addressed in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 532 Ronald Chan

532-1 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.

532-2 Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, evaluates a High-Frequency Bus (HFB) Alternative. Although the HFB Alternative would reduce construction and operational impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, it would not realize the same level benefits from vehicle miles traveled reduction, air quality improvements, greenhouse gas emission reduction, and energy savings that would result from the light rail options.

Although Metro understands that some residents use the freight corridor for recreational activities, this use is not authorized and is not compliant with freight safety standards. The Metro ROW is not a park, but rather an active freight corridor. To enhance recreational opportunities, the project would include two multi-use recreational paths and new landscaping in areas where space allows, providing safe and accessible amenities for the community. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 533 Yvette Reed

533-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

533-2 The commenter's support for the most cost efficient and least disruptive option is noted. 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 534 John Farris

534-1 The commenter's perspective regarding public funding priorities is noted. The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) Grant from the California State Transportation Agency Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, and 3% match contributions from local jurisdictions. Metro is committed to the responsible use of public funds and to managing project costs efficiently, while continuing to pursue additional funding sources to support project delivery.

Submission 535 Joe Miyamoto

535-1 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 536 Paul Powers

536-1 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.

536-2 The commenter's preference for the Trench Option over the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment due to fewer grade crossings and less noise is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The LPA light rail guideway would be fully grade-separated from all roadways.

Submission 537 Bradford Eastman

537-1 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.

537-2 The commenter's support for the most cost efficient and least disruptive option is noted. 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 538 William

538-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 539 Alexa Frazier

539-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

539-2 The commenter's opposition to the project terminus in Torrance is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 540 Steven Schulz

540-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

540-2 Before making a final determination on the project, the Metro Board will review the comments and responses included in the Final EIR and will consider multiple factors, including environmental impacts, benefits and costs.

Submission 541 Liz Torres

541-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

541-2 See the Executive Summary and Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and the May 23, 2024, Metro Board Report, for an overview of the analysis and a description of each option. See MR-19: Project Benefits.

Submission 542 Steve Brueggeman

542-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

542-2 Before making a final determination on the project, the Metro Board will review the comments and responses included in the Final EIR and will consider multiple factors,

including environmental impacts, benefits and costs. The LPA includes a rail station that connects to the Redondo Beach and Torrance Transit Centers.

Submission 543 Dale Gereaux

543-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

543-2 Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 544 Richard Mink

544-1 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.

544-2 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 545 John

545-1 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.

545-2 Before making a final determination on the project, the Metro Board will review the comments and responses included in the Final EIR and will consider multiple factors, including environmental impacts, benefits and costs.

Submission 546 Chelsea

546-1 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.

546-2 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 547 Patrick

547-1 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.

547-2 Before making a final determination on the project, the Metro Board will review the comments and responses included in the Final EIR and will consider multiple factors, including environmental impacts, benefits and costs.

Submission 548 Maria Hernandez

548-1 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.

548-2 The City of Torrance prepared the mailer. It is unclear what aspects they deem not factual. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 549 Ryan Fulton

549-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

549-2 The commenter's support for the cheapest and fastest option is noted.

Submission 550 Sylvanus Finney

550-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 551 Natalia Giacomelli

551-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 552 Cheryl Shenefield

553-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 553 Sheng Lee

553-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 554 Ben Takahash

554-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 555 Al Derago

555-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 556 Betty Derago

556-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 557 Chuck Driesler

557-1 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 558 Dennis Bosch

558-1 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.

Submission 559 Amber Hernandez

559-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 560 Ronald Omatsu

560-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 561 Joni Owens

561-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 562 Juanita Leon

562-1 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 563 Masashi Kawamoto

563-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 564 Michael Woodard

564-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 565 Silvy F.

565-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 566 Izzy Flores

566-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 567 Gloria Ohe

567-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 568 Jim and Laura Ackermann

568-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 569 Zachary Mayo

569-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 570 Sandy Bruce

570-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 571 Eric Barricklow

571-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 572 Yoolee Suhr

572-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 573 Michael Serafin

573-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 574 Sara Kim

574-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 575 Albert Belanger

575-1 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.

575-2 See response to Comment 575-1.

Submission 576 Andreas

576-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 577 Marc Horton

577-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 578 Frank Tippin

578-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 579 Anthony Panipinto

579-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 580 Wm. Champlin

580-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 581 Miller

581-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 582 Philip Miyasato

582-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 583 Elaine

583-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 584 Alfonso P Gonzales

584-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 585 Makito Saito

585-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 586 Eva Gonzales

586-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 587 Cynthia Hubbard

587-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 588 Baburaji Nair

588-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 589 Donna Perkins

589-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 590 Betsy Walli Sadur

590-1 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 591 Robert Sadur

591-1 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 592 Bruce Yamasaki

592-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 593 Helen

593-1 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 594 Jeanette Garcia

594-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 595 Erika

595-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 596 Tim Goodrich

596-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 597 Josh Hoover

597-1 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 598 Carl Petry

598-1 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 599 Keith Wicker

599-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 600 Julie Kohus

600-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 601 Soad Hakim

601-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 602 Linda Eremita

602-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 603 Phil Bahng

603-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 604 Shozo Yoshikawa

604-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 605 Hans G Kuck

605-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 606 Yared

606-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 607 John Joseph

607-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 608 Marisela Smith

608-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 609 Jasper R Eanes

609-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 610 Nae Shin

610-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 611 Jing H. Chang

611-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

611-2 Before making a final determination on the project, the Metro Board will review the comments and responses included in the Final EIR and will consider multiple factors, including environmental impacts, benefits, and costs.

Submission 612 Navia Davis

612-1 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 613 David Holmes

613-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 614 Jennifer Wesner

614-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 615 Dan Devries

615-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 616 Michael Handley

616-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 617 B. Enis

617-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 618 Zunilda Cossio

618-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 619 James Shu

619-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 620 Lawrence Lau

620-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 621 Geoff Rizzo

621-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 622 Gienda Fukunaga

622-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 623 Phillip Porush

623-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 624 John Fowler

624-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 625 Kelly Kohagura

625-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 626 Gailene Tofiga

626-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 627 Brian Mckibbin

627-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 628 Byron Jung

628-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 629 Guillaume Rouault

629-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 630 Curt Nimori

630-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 631 Ryan Lee

631-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 632 Ella Dixon

632-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 633 Gary Inouye

633-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 634 Harper Munro

634-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 635 Ilia Munro

635-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 636 Sue Cheng

636-1 The commenter's support for the Trench Option and the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 637 Michael Daley

637-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 638 Mr. and Mrs. Senichi Sumi

638-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 639 Se Lee

639-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 640 Sunnyra Joo

640-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 641 Aldrin Hie

641-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 642 Konstantin Majarov

642-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 643 William Brown

643-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 644 Suzette Savard

644-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 645 Stella Yang

645-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 646 Han Jo Park

646-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 647 Evan Loshin

647-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 648 Janice Lee

648-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 649 Jennifer Dahm

649-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 650 Alicia Spitzer

650-1 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 651 John Lucas

651-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 652 Gregory S. Laurinat

652-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 653 Philip and Madonna Kielty

653-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

653-2 The commenter's preference for no light rail in their neighborhood is noted. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness. CEQA does not require an analysis of safety in terms of crime, as it is not an environmental issue, and therefore the Draft EIR does not make any conclusions regarding this topic.

Submission 654 Vince Long

654-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 655 Linda Zeik

655-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 656 Mary Driggs

656-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 657 Briza Covarrubias

657-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 658 Mike Dabas

658-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 659 William & Mary Stahura

659-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 660 MaryKay Rodriguez

660-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 661 Sherri Jenkins

661-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 662 Edward Fries

662-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 663 Carl D. Paquette

663-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.