

5.5 RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS (SUBMISSION #664 - #1326)

Submission 664 Stanley Hiroshi Wada

- 664-1 Submission 352 includes the same comments from the same commenter. See responses to Comment Letter 352.
- 664-2 See response to Comment 664-1.
- 664-3 See response to Comment 664-1.
- 664-4 See response to Comment 664-1.
- 664-5 See response to Comment 664-1.
- 664-6 See response to Comment 664-1.
- 664-7 See response to Comment 664-1.

Submission 665 Richard Maeda

- 665-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-9: Light Rail Security; and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 666 Susana Quintanar

- 666-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
- 666-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
- 666-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
- 666-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
- 666-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
- 666-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
- 666-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 667 Carmen Reyes

- 667-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
- 667-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
- 667-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
- 667-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

667-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

667-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

667-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 668 Melissa Hope

668-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

668-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

668-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

668-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

668-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

668-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

668-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 669 Danny Hom

669-1 Metro is committed to ensuring that bus access is optimized, regardless of the final station locations. Metro would continue to engage with local transit providers to optimize bus access.

669-2 Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The project would provide safe and ADA-compliant access for passengers with disabilities.

Submission 670 Eric Haaland

670-1 While Metro acknowledges the advancements in automated vehicle technology, light rail was selected as the preferred mode due to its ability to provide the most benefits and its compatibility with the current Metro system. Additionally, while automated vehicle systems show promise, implementing this technology on a large scale would present significant challenges in terms of costs, feasibility, and staying within the project time frame. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 671 Anna Mavromati Duncan

671-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

671-2 Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, thoroughly evaluates the potential impacts of the project, including noise and vibration, and identifies mitigation measures to

minimize significant effects wherever feasible. The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade-separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. 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 LPA would be comparable to those of the Trench Option and would be less than significant with mitigation. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

- 671-3 Section 3.7, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR, analyzes the removal and replacement of trees along the Metro ROW on sensitive biological resources and determines impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. Although some trees would be removed under the Metro ROW alignment options, 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 defined was two trees for every tree removed. This policy also prioritizes planting strategies that maximize the use of native species. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character. Section 4.11, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR has included the Metro Tree Policy as a project feature for the protection of biological resources.
- 671-4 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.
- 671-5 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 672 Amy LaCoe

- 672-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW 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.

Submission 673 Rosalia Merino

- 673-1 Construction and operational noise is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1: (Noise Control Plan) would be implemented to control noise during construction, including noise reducing measures and monitoring to ensure compliance with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) construction noise impact criteria to the maximum extent feasible. Similarly, operational noise mitigation measures would be included to reduce noise during operations. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

- Regarding roadway access, as specified in Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan, described in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, Metro would ensure that vehicle and pedestrian access is available for all properties in proximity to the alignment. This includes worksite traffic control plans and development of alternative access routes for vehicular traffic, pedestrians, and bicyclists.
- 673-2 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-10: Changes to Community Character.
- 673-3 The commenter's opposition to siting the project in a residential area has been noted for the record. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives for more information on the Metro Board's selection of the Hybrid Alternative as the LPA.

Submission 674 David Mach, City of Torrance

- 674-1 The commenter's (Bernas) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 674-2 See response to Comment 674-1.
- 674-3 The commenter's (Dianne and Jerry Baltz) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 674-4 The commenter's (Jo Anne Naka) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 674-5 The commenter's (Sharon I.) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 674-6 The commenter's (Sharon I.) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and opposition to the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Visual effects of the project are addressed in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. See MR-17: Response to Torrance Community Letter and MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.
- 674-7 The commenter's (Susan Hale) opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 674-8 The commenter's (Francesco Aiello) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 674-9 The commenter's (T. Elder) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 674-10 The commenter's (Helen Itabashi) 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.
- 674-11 See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service.
- 674-12 The commenter's (Tim Calkins) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 674-13 The commenter's (Tim Calkins) 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.
- 674-14 The commenter's (Oliver King) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Hawthorne Option and opposition to the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 674-15 The commenter's (Janet Sieffent) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 674-16 The commenter's (Federick A. Mohit) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 674-17 The commenter's (Timothy McAtee) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. A minimum of 40% of all project work hours would be local hire workers as per Metro's Local Hire Initiative.
- 674-18 The commenter's (Anonymous) opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 674-19 The commenter's (Jenny Sakamoto) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 675 can be found in Section 5.3 Responses to Public Agencies

Submission 676 Khela Guirguis

- 676-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 677 Anissa Blanco

- 677-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 678 Rari Matic

- 678-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 679 Jose Vera

- 679-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 680 Bianco Blanco

- 680-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 681 Angie Aragon

- 681-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 682 Akende Foluso

- 682-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 682-2 See response to Comment 682-1.

Submission 683 Jordi Nus Garrell

- 683-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 683-2 See response to Comment 683-1.

Submission 684 Silvestre Hidalgo

- 684-1 The commenter’s opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 685 Silvestre Hidalgo

- 685-1 Submission 684 includes the same comments from the same commenter. See response to Comment Letter 684.

Submission 686 Anonymous

- 686-1 The commenter’s opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 687 R.W. Way

- 687-1 The commenter’s support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 688 Michael Valdez

- 688-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
688-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
688-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
688-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
688-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
688-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
688-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 689 Victor Akende

- 689-1 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
689-2 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
689-3 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.
689-4 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

689-5 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

689-6 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

689-7 See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission 690 M. Tuckett

690-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

690-2 Pricing is standardized within the Metro Rail system. Currently one ride is \$1.75 and capped at \$5 a day when using the Metro TAP card. Any ride paid for by using the TAP card after spending \$5 in a day on Metro fare is free. Seniors 62+, Medicare, and customers with disabilities can apply for a Reduced Fare TAP Card. With this TAP card, a reduced fare for one ride is \$0.75 and is capped at \$2.50 a day or \$5 within seven days. More information is available at <https://www.metro.net/riding/fares/seniors/>.

Submission 691 Barbara J. Halligan

691-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

691-2 Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, includes an updated schedule for the LPA. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 692 Fred G. Richards

692-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 693 J.C & M.M. Kelly

693-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

693-2 See response to Comment 693-1. Construction impacts for the project are discussed in Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Impact Analyses, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 694 Jose A. Algire

694-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 694-2 The comment is noted for the record. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. All alignments studied in the Draft EIR would have similar levels of access and maintenance requirements.

Submission 695 Michael Kim

- 695-1 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Metro retains qualified civil and structural engineering professionals (both in-house and contracted consultants) who have extensive experience designing and implementing complex rail infrastructure projects. Metro also coordinates closely with BNSF Railway, which operates freight service on the line, to ensure that any design and construction involving freight infrastructure meets or exceeds applicable safety criteria. Any freight track segments affected by the project would be reconstructed in compliance with applicable safety standards, including the Metro Rail Design Criteria (MRDC), California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), and the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) standards. It is expected that these reconstructions could be accommodated within the existing Metro ROW, with the exact configuration, including any needed design variances, to be determined as design advances with safety as the key priority. The project would not increase the frequency of freight operations on the Metro ROW. Metro also coordinates closely with BNSF Railway to ensure that any design and construction involving freight infrastructure meets or exceeds applicable safety criteria. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

- 695-2 See response to Comment 695-1.

Contrary to the suggestion in the comment, the project is a light rail transit system, and not a commuter rail system like Metrolink. Unlike commuter rail systems, light rail vehicles are smaller, lighter, and operate at lower speeds, with more frequent stops. These operational characteristics inherently reduce risks and potential impacts compared to heavier rail systems. As discussed in more detail in MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety, the project is and would continue to be designed to coexist safely alongside the freight line within the Metro ROW, with both systems operating independently.

- 695-3 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 695-4 The project involves the construction and operation of light rail trains, not freight trains. The Draft EIR does not assume any changes in freight volumes as it would be speculative. The frequency of freight operations on the Metro ROW is determined by BNSF, subject to existing agreements and applicable regulatory constraints. Metro does not control the freight train schedule or operations but coordinates with BNSF to ensure continued safe and efficient use of the Metro ROW. The Draft EIR's analysis of freight train operations is based on existing operating patterns, developed in consultation with BNSF and based on observed conditions. While BNSF has the right to operate within the Metro ROW, any substantial increase in freight traffic would require major infrastructure modifications, scheduling adjustments, and regulatory approvals (e.g., from the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and the California Public Utilities Code (CPUC)) that are not reasonably foreseeable at this

- time. The project would replace freight tracks as needed, in kind, with newer tracks, but it would not increase track capacity. The demand for freight movement along this corridor has remained stable for years, and no changes to freight operation are anticipated.
- 695-5 The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). Since the COVID pandemic, Metro transit ridership levels have grown every year and are nearly at pre-COVID levels. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.
- 695-6 CEQA does not require the evaluation of the impacts of the environment on the project. Safety concerns related to crime are not considered environmental issues under CEQA, and therefore the Draft EIR does not make any conclusions regarding this topic. Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-9: Light Rail Security; and MR-18: Homelessness. Regarding project funding and destinations, the C Line Extension is identified as a priority in Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan and is funded in part by voter-approved Measures R and M, which earmark funds for specific corridors. While other destinations, such as SoFi Stadium, are served or are planned to be served by other transit projects, the purpose of this project is to improve connectivity in the South Bay and provide expanded access to regional transit. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 695-7 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.
- 695-8 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.
- 695-9 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option or the High-Frequency Bus Alternative is noted. As described in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, the High-Frequency Bus Alternative would not be within dedicated bus lanes but would be a local express service. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 695-10 See response to Comment 695-6.
- 695-11 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 Comment 695-9.
- 695-12 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 and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Explosions and fires typically result from significant pipeline damage, such as a rupture or puncture, combined with an ignition source. Train operations, which occur above the

ground and at a safe distance from pipelines, do not directly create conditions for fires and explosions.

695-13 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 696 - David Mach, City of Torrance [multiple people]

- 696-1 The commenter's (Marian Kravitz) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 696-2 The commenter's (Scott Wood) opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-9: Light Rail Security
- 696-3 The commenter's (Anonymous) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 696-4 See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.
- 696-5 The commenter's (Shawn Denny) opposition to the project and its cost is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.
- 696-6 The commenter's (Steve Oshiro) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 696-7 The commenter's (W. Hamada) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 696-8 The commenter's (Marc R. Chavez) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 696-9 The commenter's (Jah Ja) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 696-10 The commenter's (Robin R. Fields) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 696-11 The commenter's (Paul Matsumoto) 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.
- 696-12 The commenter's (David Sakai) 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.
- 696-13 The commenter's (Anonymous) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1:

Selection of Alternatives. Regarding South Bay Green Marijuana dispensary, Metro does not have authority over South Bay Greens Marijuana Dispensary.

- 696-14 The commenter's (Nicki Noble) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 696-15 The commenter's (Craig Kazin) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 696-16 The commenter's (Janet Dirks) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 696-17 The commenter's (L.D. Rowe) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 696-18 The commenter's (Stan Ponegalek) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 696-19 The commenter's (David Sakai) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 696-20 The commenter's (Frieda Wang) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 696-21 The commenter's (Allen Triebull) support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 697 Janette Kurth

- 697-1 As described in Sections 3.1-4.3 and 4.5-3.1.2 of the Draft EIR, none of the light rail alignment options or alternatives would result in significant impacts related to bicycle and pedestrian access. It should be noted that the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would fully grade separate light rail from all roadways, eliminating the need for light rail crossings. The freight track would remain at-grade, but the project would include new pedestrian safety infrastructure to improve safety compared to existing conditions where no pedestrian safety infrastructure often exists. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.
- 697-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to Comment 697-1.

Submission 698 Colleen M. Villegas

- 698-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. As part of the Draft EIR preparation, Metro conducted numerous field

surveys and site visits throughout the project corridor, including residential areas in Lawndale and Redondo Beach, to document existing conditions and inform the environmental analysis. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 699 Suzan Hubert

699-1 Metro's Tree Policy prioritizes the use of native plants. 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 described on page 3.3-2 of the Draft EIR, Metro's Tree Policy prioritizes the use of native plants. 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 respond to the light rail station's location and its adjacent area.

Submission 700 Tri Vo

700-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 701 Tania Rodas

701-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

701-2 The commenter's opposition to siting the project within a residential area is noted. The Draft EIR evaluates potential environmental effects on the residential areas adjacent to the Metro ROW. The project would maintain all existing designated rail crossings across the Metro ROW, including at Inglewood Avenue, Manhattan Beach Boulevard, 159th, 160th, 161st, 162nd, 170th, and 182nd Streets. Notably, the LPA and Trench Option both fully grade separate light rail from streets to avoid any conflicts with pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles. As described in Section 3.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the project would not physically divide any established communities. Construction would proceed in phases and, pursuant to project feature PF-T-1 (Construction Traffic Management Plan), Metro would coordinate closely with local jurisdictions to ensure access and safety are maintained during construction. For the alignments along the Metro ROW, the light rail would be fully enclosed by fencing, soundwalls, or a combination of both, to restrict unauthorized access to the tracks and enhance safety for nearby residents. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character for more information regarding potential changes to neighborhoods.

Submission 702 Crystal McInerney

- 702-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 703 Glen Schnekenburger

- 703-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 704 Colin McGee

- 704-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 704-2 While change in community character does not constitute a significant impact under CEQA, Section 3.2, Land Use and Section 3.3, Aesthetics of the Draft EIR analyze the project's potential to physically divide communities and to affect visual quality and character. As discussed in these sections of the Draft EIR, the project would result in less than significant impacts. Noise and vibration are discussed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. Mitigation measures would be included to reduce operational noise and vibration. Although the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in a significant and unavoidable operational noise impact, the operational noise impacts of the remaining light rail options and the LPA would be less than significant with mitigation See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 705 Nancy Leonardo

- 705-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 706 Andy Merida

- 706-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 707 Luz Barrera

- 707-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 708 Kathy Leon

- 708-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 708-2 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 and avoids conflicts with pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles. As described in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, and Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, the operational noise impacts of the LPA would be comparable to those of the Trench Option and would be less than significant with mitigation. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character. Section 3.7, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR evaluates impacts to biological resources, including wildlife. Metro does not have specific safety features for pets. As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the entire light rail guideway would be enclosed by physical barriers, such as fencing, soundwalls, or a combination of both, to prevent unauthorized access. Although these barriers are primarily intended to restrict human intrusion, they would also serve to deter or prevent land animals from entering the guideway. In many areas, the existing fencing has been breached, and would be repaired under the project, which would limit unauthorized access into the Metro ROW to ensure safety near operating rail.

Submission 709 Talin Gil

- 709-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 709-2 The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. As described in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, and Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, the operational noise impacts of the LPA would be comparable to those of the Trench Option and would be less than significant with mitigation. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 710 Mario Alvarez

- 710-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 711 Mark Nelson

- 711-1 Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Impact Analyses, of the Draft EIR, analyzes impacts from the project. See the Executive Summary in the Draft EIR for a summary of the potential impacts on pages ES-1 through ES-50. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Submission 712 Ruby

- 712-1 The commenter's concern for environmental impacts along the Metro ROW is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives for more information on how the Metro Board selected the Hybrid Alternative as the LPA.

The Draft EIR evaluates several physical environmental topics related to the concerns implicated in this comment, including pedestrian safety (Section 3.1, Transportation), land use compatibility (Section 3.2, Land Use), visual quality (Section 3.3, Aesthetics), noise and vibration (Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration), and wildlife (Section 3.7, Biological Resources). These sections assess how the project may affect surrounding neighborhoods. Although the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in a significant and unavoidable operational noise impact, none of the other alignments studied – including the LPA – would result in significant and unavoidable operational impacts. Temporary construction-related impacts would be reduced to the maximum extent feasible through implementation of mitigation measures.

See MR-10: Changes to Community Character, for additional information on these topics.

- 712-2 See response to Comment 712-1
- 712-3 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.
- 712-4 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to Comment 712-1.

Submission 713 Samuel Wise

- 713-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 714 Dana Thayer

- 714-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 714-2 Of all light rail options and alternatives considered, only the Hawthorne Option would remove on-street parking (approximately 20 spaces on Hawthorne Boulevard based on conceptual design).

Submission 715 Prakash Belur

- 715-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 716 Sang Wol Han

- 716-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 716-2 This comment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to comment 716-1.

Submission 717 Isabel Guterrez

- 717-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 718 Donna Minson

- 718-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 719 Stanley R. Kelley

- 719-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 720 Jack Lyons

- 720-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 721 Linda Crickmore

- 721-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 721-2 See MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 722 Rahul Simlote

- 722-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 723 Jill Reed

- 723-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 724 Rose Stein

- 724-1 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 725 Wendy Carrillo

- 725-2 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 726 Peter and Patricia Martini

- 726-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 726-2 The commenter's opposition to the Trench and Hawthorne Options is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to Comment 726-1.

Submission 727 Beth Sandoval

- 727-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 728 Sharon Wu

- 728-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 729 Seema Turner

- 729-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 730 Adam Garrison

- 730-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 730-2 The elevated Hawthorne Option would make some modifications to intersections and traffic flow but would not substantially alter traffic capacity or flow. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for discussion on traffic conditions.

Submission 731 Fred Peitzman

- 731-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 731-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to comment 731-1.

Submission 732 Alexandros Martinez

- 732-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 733 Patricia Spiegel-Giglio

- 733-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 734 Wilson Ly

- 734-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 735 Joshua Gomez

- 735-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 736 Joseph Tevita Rocha

- 736-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 736-2 This commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to Comment 736-1.

Submission 737 James Fearn

- 737-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 738 Jenifer Frial

- 738-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 739 Shauna Law

- 739-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 740 Jeanne Fisher

- 740-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 741 Jacques Monier

- 741-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 742 Paula Gates

- 742-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 743 Michael Wegnes

- 743-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 744 Bill Reynolds

- 744-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 745 N. Maas

- 745-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 746 Frank L. Newman Jr.

- 746-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 746-2 Metro is designing the terminus station at the Torrance Transit Center to allow the line to continue further south, should funding become available in the future. Potential extensions from the Torrance Transit Center to San Pedro, Long Beach, and the Los Angeles/Orange County line are included in the unfunded portion of the 2009 Metro Long Range Transportation Plan. Metro may consider these projects in the future, if additional funding becomes available.

Submission 747 Nancy Dykstra-Curtin

- 747-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 748 Robert Hanmer

- 748-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 749 Michele Kidman

- 749-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 750 J. Gardinale

- 750-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 751 David Lin

- 751-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 752 Mark Navarra

- 752-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 752-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. See response to Comment 752-1.

Submission 753 Annette Weisse

- 753-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 753-2 This comment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The LPA would directly connect to the Redondo Beach and Torrance transit centers.

Submission 754 Tommy Louviere Jr.

- 754-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. You can find more about Metro's training programs and career opportunities at www.metro.net/about/careers/students/.

Submission 755 Jacqueline Cysneros

- 755-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 756 Anson Tran

- 756-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 756-2 See response to comment 756-1. As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA fully grade separates light rail from all roadways and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions.

Submission 757 Peter Nguyen

- 757-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 757-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to Comment 757-1.

Submission 758 Zac Lee

- 758-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 759 Phat M.

- 759-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives
- 759-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. See response to Comment 759-1. 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 760 Anne Swanson

- 760-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 760-2 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. The LPA fully grade separates light rail from all roadways and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions.

Submission 761 Eddie Harris Jr.

761-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 762 Andrei Yermakov

762-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 763 Lilia Yermakov

763-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 764 Norberto Estrada

764-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 765 Martha Shetter

765-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

765-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to Comment 765-1.

Submission 766 Nao Pabalan

766-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 767 Alan Pabalan

767-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 768 Randy Shetter

768-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

768-2 As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, the project would result in significant and unavoidable noise impacts during construction for all alignment options. Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan would require contractors to prepare and implement a Noise Control Plan, which includes the use of quieter equipment, temporary noise barriers, and restrictions on construction hours to reduce noise exposure to below the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) construction noise criteria to the maximum extent feasible. Construction activities would also be phased and would not occur continuously in any one location for the full construction period.

With respect to long-term operational noise, the Draft EIR finds that only the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in a significant and unavoidable operational noise impact. Operational noise impacts of the Trench Option, Hawthorne Option, and the LPA would be less than significant with mitigation.

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. MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses. Also see MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

768-3 See response to Comment 768-2. Although construction related noise and vibration impacts of each alignment option studied in the Draft EIR would be significant and unavoidable, the operational noise and vibration impacts of the Hawthorne Option would be less than significant with mitigation. Soundwalls would be installed in areas where noise levels are predicted to exceed FTA noise impact criteria for residences, as required by Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls. These soundwalls would block the line-of-sight between the light rail train and sensitive receptors, reducing noise impacts. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. See Section 3.6-6, Project Impacts Remaining After Mitigation, of the Draft EIR, for further detail about these impact conclusions.

768-4 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment and opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The City of Redondo Beach's transit center opened in January 2023.

768-5 As described in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, Project Feature PF-T-1 requires contractors to develop a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which would include coordination with local businesses and residents as well as relevant jurisdictions to manage access and the effects of temporary closures and identify reasonable accommodations or alternatives, which could include limiting construction hours, providing alternate routes or temporary easements, or other strategies. As discussed, beginning on

Page 3.1-50, construction of the Hawthorne Option would be staged to minimize traffic disruption. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level of Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR.

The Hawthorne Option would require permanent property acquisitions, as shown in the 2023 Real Estate Acquisitions Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR. These permanent property acquisitions are primarily located where the alignment transitions in a few areas: from the Metro ROW to alongside the I-405, from the I-405 to Hawthorne Boulevard and back to the Metro ROW near 190th Street.

- 768-6 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. Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.
- 768-7 This commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), TIRCP Grant from the California State Transportation Agency (CALSTA) 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 769 Jason Nishiyama

- 769-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 770 David Cobb

- 770-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 770-2 This comment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to comment 770-1.

Submission 771 Devin Valdez

- 771-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 771-2 See response to comment 771-1. The Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is the only option in the Metro ROW that would include at-grade light rail crossings. The LPA and the Trench Option would fully grade separate light rail from traffic.

Submission 772 Jordyn Kieft

772-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option light rail guideways are all fully grade-separated from the roadway network, and trains would not conflict with intersections. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 773 Jacqueline Ecklund

773-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 774 Tiffany Lopez

774-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 775 Lita Garcia

775-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 776 Melanie Drieke

776-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 777 Christopher Drieke

777-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Per the commenter's note about their preference to save taxpayer dollars, the project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), a Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) Grant from the California State Transportation Agency (CALSTA) 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 778 Rosa Fontana

778-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 779 Victoria Parrish

- 779-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 780 Abdulvahob Nabiev

- 780-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 781 MD Smith

- 781-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 781-2 The commenter's opinion regarding cost efficiency is noted. Cost efficiency is one of the objectives on which the Metro Board made its LPA selection. Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets.

Submission 782 Hunter White

- 782-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 783 Mary Napoleone

- 783-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 784 Kristina Scruggs

- 784-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 785 James Ecklund

- 785-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 786 John Flanagan

- 786-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 787 Stefan Ecklund

- 787-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 788 Stephanie Ishioka

- 788-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 788-2 See response to Comment 788-1. Under CEQA, economic effects, such as financial effects on businesses, are not considered environmental effects. Metro has created a Business Interruption Fund for major rail projects under construction in Los Angeles County to support the business community.

Submission 789 Carl Paquette

- 789-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 790 Sandra Jo Williamson

- 790-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 790-2 The commenter's opposition to the project and secondary support for the Metro ROW alignment are noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 791 Dennis Piotrowski

- 791-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 791-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment and opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 792 Elisabeth Bailly

- 792-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 792-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment and opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. Under CEQA, financial effects on businesses are not considered environmental effects. Metro has created a Business Interruption Fund for major rail projects under construction in Los Angeles County to support the business community. As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option fully grade separates light rail from all roadways and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions. Under CEQA, economic impacts, such as financial effects on businesses, are not considered environmental effects. Metro has created a Business Interruption Fund for major rail projects under construction in Los Angeles County to support the business community.

Submission 793 William Champlin

- 793-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 794 Tiffany Jones

- 794-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 795 Stephanie Cati

- 795-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 795-2 The commenters' support for transit is noted. As indicated in Section 3.1-4.2.2 of the Draft EIR, each of the alignments under consideration would have a neutral or beneficial effect on vehicle miles traveled. See also MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level of Service. Under the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option, the light rail would be grade-separated from all roadways. For the LPA and Trench Option, this means that vehicle delay would not increase compared to existing conditions. Under the Hawthorne Option, however, changes in traffic signals and roadway modifications could affect circulation pattern, as detailed in MR-11 and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR.

Submission 796 Kevin Hernandez

- 796-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 797 Joan Hardy

- 797-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 798 Erika Hatzenbuhler

- 798-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 798-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to Comment 798-1.

Submission 799 Glenn Hatzenbuhler

- 799-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 800 Jeff Earnest

- 800-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 800-2 See response to Comment 800-1. 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 801 Susan Earnest

- 801-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 802 Daniel Lim

- 802-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 803 Daniel Gonzalez

803-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 804 Alison Brown

804-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 805 Aqsha Munshi

805-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 806 Aamir Kuriswala

806-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 807 Cornelius Fong

807-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 808 Richard Krason

808-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 809 Leonarda Krason

809-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 810 Felisha Black

810-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 811 Aguilar

- 811-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted, as well as support for more buses. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 812 Daniel Schwartz

- 812-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 813 Thomas Shigemitsu

- 813-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 814 Sapan Shah

- 814-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 815 Tam Nguyen

- 815-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 816 Paul Miller

- 816-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 816-2 See response to Comment 816-1. As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would fully grade separate light rail from all roadways. Noise is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. Air Quality is addressed in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, which finds that operational impacts of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, Trench Option and Hawthorne Option would improve air quality relative to 2042 without project conditions. This conclusion likewise applies to the LPA, as described in Section 4.5-3.4.2 of the Draft EIR, and Final EIR.

Submission 817 Mary Miller

- 817-1 The commenter’s support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 817-2 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, including a discussion of the proposed pedestrian crosswalk on Hawthorne Boulevard under the Hawthorne Option.

Submission 818 Matthew Bilodeau

- 818-1 The commenter’s support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The project would provide a direct connection to the LAX/Metro Transit Center, which would link to the LAX Automated People Mover. Both the Metro C and K Lines provide a connection to LAX.

Submission 819 Al Tatro

- 819-1 The commenter’s support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 819-2 The commenter’s opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to Comment 819-1.

Submission 820 Angela Brizuela

- 820-1 The commenter’s support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 820-2 This comment is noted. See response to comment 820-1. As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA and Trench Option would fully grade separate light rail from all roadways and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions. The Hawthorne Option would similarly grade separate the light rail; however, due to proposed changes to traffic signals and roadway modifications, the Hawthorne Option could affect circulation patterns, as described in MR-11. The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, describes the estimated ridership for each of the options. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission 821 Michale Kirby

- 821-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 821-2 This comment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to Comment 821-1.

Submission 822 Rebecca Eastman

- 822-1 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.

Submission 823 Tammy Clark

- 823-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA fully grade separates light rail from all roadways and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions.

Submission 824 Scott Clark

- 824-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA fully grade separates light rail from all roadways and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions.

Submission 825 Jason Blain

- 825-1 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.

Submission 826 Ins Luters

- 826-1 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 827 Anonymous

827-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

827-2 See response to Comment 827-1.

Submission 828 Terrence Chen

828-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 829 Daniel B. Gast

829-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 830 Richard Stenhouse

830-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 831 Isabel Gutierrez

831-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 832 Kaylyn Fukuhara

832-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 833 Margaret Schaffmeir

833-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 834 Thomas Penland

834-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. See MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 835 Justin Hollingsworth

835-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 836 Nancy Cruz

836-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 837 Vanessa Gonzalez

837-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 838 Daisy Herrera

838-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 839 Al Trato

839-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 840 Carol Truitt

840-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 841 Rebecca Reeves

841-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 842 Tim Goodrich

842-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 843 Dennis Piotrowski

- 843-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 844 Alan Ariel Carlos

- 844-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 845 Jose Daniel Alabaso

- 845-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 845-2 Metro is designing the terminus station at the Torrance Transit Center to allow the line to continue further south, should funding become available in the future. Potential extensions from the Torrance Transit Center to San Pedro, Long Beach, and the Los Angeles/Orange County line are included in the unfunded portion of the 2009 Metro Long Range Transportation Plan. Metro may consider these projects in the future, if additional funding becomes available.

Submission 846 Ryan Saruwatari

- 846-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 847 Nathan Koller

- 847-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 848 Craig Haller

- 848-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 849 Myles Honda

- 849-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 850 Jean Katow

850-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 851 Ronald Rucker

851-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 852 Molly O'Callahan

852-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 853 George K. Chen

853-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 854 Marifrances Trivelli

854-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 855 Nelsy Jimenez

855-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 856 Diane Ki

856-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

856-2 See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 857 Kirtan Tank

857-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 858 David Lambi

858-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 859 Raihan Fazalbhoj

859-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 860 Adrienne Greenfield

860-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 861 Camille Randolph

861-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 862 Timothy Gould

862-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 863 Lyle Sanders

863-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 864 Kitty Shiao

864-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 865 G Patricia Stewart

865-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 866 Russell Stewart

866-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 867 Peter Spotalis

867-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 868 Julio Ceballos

868-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 869 William Laronal

869-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 870 Toni Wright

870-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

870-2 Visual impacts are addressed in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. Regarding traffic, as explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA fully grade separates light rail from all roadways and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions. Under CEQA economic effects, such as financial effects on businesses, are not considered environmental effects. Metro has created a Business Interruption Fund for major rail projects under construction in Los Angeles County to support the business community.

Submission 871 Ryan Uyehara

871-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 872 Melfern Claro

- 872-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 873 Winston Zhou

- 873-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 874 Brennan Long

- 874-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 874-2 See response to comment 874-1. Metro does not have oversight of Torrance Transit.

Submission 875 Jose Dennis Alabaso

- 875-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 875-2 The commenter's request is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The Metro Aviation/Century C/K Line Station opened in Fall 2024.

Submission 876 Thomas Elder

- 876-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 877 Yundan Liu

- 877-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 877-2 See response to Comment 877-1.

Submission 878 Raymond Peterson

- 878-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 878-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option and support for the Metro ROW Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to Comment 878-1.

Submission 879 Kay Peterson

- 879-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 879-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option and support for the Metro ROW Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to Comment 879-1.

Submission 880 Sunny Zhou

- 880-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 881 Frank Huang

- 881-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 882 Sarah Chiang

- 882-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 883 Caroline Kong

- 883-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 884 Karl Kohl

- 884-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 885 Alexander

- 885-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 886 Mike Palmer

- 886-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 886-2 Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project.

Submission 887 Jose Roldan

- 887-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 888 Maria Pescheryakova

- 888-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 889 Steven Gerhardt

- 889-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 889-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 890 Al Tatro

- 890-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 890-2 See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 891 Miguel Dvid

- 891-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 892 Sheila Fierro

- 892-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 892-2 As noted by the comment, the Metro ROW has long been planned for potential transit expansion, although Metro acknowledges that some residents who live near the ROW may have been unaware of the potential for future transit use. Noise is discussed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Submission 893 Kim Turner

- 893-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 893-2 See response to Comment 893-1.

Submission 894 Dennis Bosch

- 894-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 895 Calin Chiorean

- 895-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 896 Darren Uyematsu

- 896-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 897 Michael Fetaru

- 897-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 898 Nikola Renard

- 898-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 898-2 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 899 Michael Brenk

- 899-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 899-2 See response to comment 899-1. The project schedule will continue to be updated as refinements to the design, project cost estimates, and funding plans are advanced. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 900 Alex Emly

- 900-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 900-2 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to comment 900-2.

Submission 901 Kyle Freitas

- 901-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 901-2 The commenter's support for the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to Comment 901-1.

Submission 902 Alexandra Flores

- 902-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 903 Jamelia Davenport

- 903-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 904 Michael Kosidlak

- 904-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 905 Andrea Retana

- 905-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 906 Kathy Wood

- 906-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 907 Dawn Ng

- 907-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 908 Kevin Griswold

- 908-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 908-2 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 909 Andre Flores

- 909-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 910 Judith Gerber

- 910-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 911 Patti O'Reilly

- 911-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 912 Barbara Kelly

912-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 913 Mauricio De La Torre

913-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 914 Alonso Muñoz

914-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 915 Skyler Reynoso

915-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 916 William Chuh

916-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 917 Lyle Sanders

917-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 918 Nedeem Nasser

918-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 919 Ryan Bada

919-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 920 Raymond Fisher

- 920-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 921 Michelle Hughes

- 921-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 922 Frank Kraus

- 922-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 923 Sawyer

- 923-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 924 Rudy Onate

- 924-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 924-2 Metro is designing the terminus station at the Torrance Transit Center to allow the line to continue further south, should funding become available in the future. Potential extensions from the Torrance Transit Center to San Pedro, Long Beach, and the Los Angeles/Orange County line are included in the unfunded portion of the 2009 Metro Long Range Transportation Plan. Metro may consider these projects in the future, if additional funding becomes available.

Submission 925 Micah Alex

- 925-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 926 Shin Furukawa

- 926-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 927 Chau Yang

- 927-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 928 Jeanne Bala

- 928-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 928-2 Under CEQA, economic effects, such as financial effects on businesses, are not considered environmental effects. Metro has created a Business Interruption Fund for major rail projects under construction in Los Angeles County to support the business community.

Submission 929 Patrice Watanabe

- 929-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 930 Wayne Watanabe

- 930-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 931 Zen Rosenthal

- 931-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 932 Stephen Kawalko

- 932-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 933 Traveion Bell

- 933-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. You can find more about Metro's training programs and career opportunities at www.metro.net/about/careers/students/.

Submission 934 Juan Delgado

934-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 935 Victor Alvarado

935-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 936 Richard Krason

936-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 937 Kevin Chan

937-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 938 Andrea Seo Bauer

938-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 939 Brian Rodriguez

939-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 940 Linda Amato

940-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 941 LeRoy Jackson

941-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 941-2 As described in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, Project Feature PF-T-1 requires contractors to develop a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which would include coordination with local businesses and residents as well as relevant jurisdictions to manage access and the effects of temporary closures and identify reasonable accommodations or alternatives, which could include limiting construction hours, providing alternate routes or temporary easements, or other strategies. PF-T-1 would apply to all of the alignment options studied in the Draft EIR.

Submission 942 Rebecca Poirier

- 942-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 943 L.R. Rowe

- 943-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Guidance on how to ride Metro Rail can be found at <https://www.metro.net/riding/guide/how-ride-rail/>.

Submission 944 Janet Dirks

- 944-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 945 Scott Wood

- 945-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 946 Marian Kravitz

- 946-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 947 Shawn Denny

- 947-1 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. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 948 Joanne Verespej

- 948-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 948-2 Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, includes an updated schedule for the LPA. The project schedule and cost estimates will continue to be updated as the design advances. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 949 W. Hamada

- 949-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 950 Steve Oshiro

- 950-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 951 Robin Fields

- 951-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 952 Paul Matsumoto

- 952-1 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 953 Nicki Noble

- 953-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 954 Craig Kazin

- 954-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 955 Mark Chavez

- 955-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 956 Jahja

- 956-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 957 Reagan Woo

- 957-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 957-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. All options and Alternatives would connect to the Torrance Transit Center, including the Hawthorne Option.

Submission 958 Cliff Weinan

- 958-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 959 Stan Ponegalek

- 959-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 960 David Sakai

- 960-1 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 961 Pamela Dieter

- 961-1 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.
- 961-2 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 962 Freida Wang

962-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 963 Allen Treibull

963-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 964 Charles Dorsey

964-1 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 965 Robert G. Dye

965-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 966 Catherine Clarke

966-1 The commenter's preference for the Trench Option but overall 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-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission 967 Nancy Bridi

967-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 968 Beverly Ricketts

968-1 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 969 Juan Cabeza

969-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. The LPA fully grade separates light rail from

all roadways and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions. As indicated in Section 3.1-4.2.2 of the Draft EIR, each of the alignment options under consideration would have a neutral or beneficial effect on vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Chapter 4, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR has been updated to clarify that the VMT reduction for the LPA is the same as for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Trench Option.

Submission 970 Joyce Henderson

- 970-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 971 Anonymous

- 971-1 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.
- 971-2 See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 972 M. Suarez

- 972-1 The commenter's opposition to the project in general is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 972-2 See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 973 Lynn

- 973-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-9: Light Rail Security; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 974 David H. Lee

- 974-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 975 Judith Crosby

- 975-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 976 Depland

- 976-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 977 Christopher Caunt

- 977-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The project design does not prohibit a future extension that would continue south on the Metro ROW. Potential extensions from the Torrance Transit Center to San Pedro, Long Beach, and the Los Angeles/Orange County line are included in the unfunded portion of the 2009 Metro Long Range Transportation Plan. Metro may consider these projects in the future, if additional funding becomes available. Any future extension would be subject to its own environmental review under CEQA and other applicable requirements before it could be implemented.

Submission 978 Bruce Hamilton

- 978-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 979 Michele Kidman

- 979-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 980 J. Gardinale

- 980-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 981 Robert Allen

- 981-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 982 Steve Marchki

- 982-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 983 Thomas Fukman

983-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 984 Duane Sung

984-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 985 John Whang

985-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 986 Ray Portka

986-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 987 Judith Carter

987-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 988 Vijenera Joseph

988-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

988-2 The Federal Transit Administration Transit Noise and Assessment Manual (2018) defines the area of potential noise impact as within 350 feet of the proposed light rail transit line. Predicted noise levels have been analyzed and reported for all sensitive receptors located within this distance. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Standards.

988-3 The light rail would operate at speeds of between 45 and 65 miles per hour.

988-4 The project is expected to follow the operating patterns of Metro's current rail lines. 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 five minutes. Weekend system headways would be reduced compared to weekdays. For purposes of impact analysis, the Draft EIR assumes that trains would run approximately every five to 10 minutes during peak periods (typical commuting hours) and would run approximately every 10 to 20 minutes during non-peak periods, depending on the time of day. The final operating schedule will be determined closer to project operation.

Submission 989 Offutt

989-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 990 Leroy Kerahen

990-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 991 Pablo Delgado

991-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 992 Janet Wade

992-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 993 Bernadette Kociemba

993-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 994 Carl Willison

994-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 995 John Choy

995-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 996 David Seager

- 996-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 997 Richard Kim

- 997-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 998 Randall Leak

- 998-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 999 Janet Colmerauer

- 999-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1000 Mr. and Mrs. John Hardin

- 1000-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. Metro is designing the terminus station at the Torrance Transit Center to allow the line to continue further south along the Metro ROW, should funding become available in the future. Potential extensions from the Torrance Transit Center to San Pedro, Long Beach, and the Los Angeles/Orange County line are included in the unfunded portion of the 2009 Metro Long Range Transportation Plan. Metro may consider these projects in the future, if additional funding becomes available.

Submission 1001 Elizabeth Evans

- 1001-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. Metro is designing the terminus station at the Torrance Transit Center to allow the line to continue further south, should funding become available in the future. Potential extensions from the Torrance Transit Center to San Pedro, Long Beach, and the Los Angeles/Orange County line are included in the unfunded portion of the 2009 Metro Long Range Transportation Plan. Metro may consider these projects in the future, if additional funding becomes available.

Submission 1002 Mary Strenn

- 1002-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1003 Fred Missman

- 1003-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1004 Karen Wheeler

- 1004-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and opposition to the Trench Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. Metro is committed to ensuring that bus access is optimized, regardless of the final station locations. Metro would continue to engage with local transit providers to optimize bus access. Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, includes an updated schedule for the LPA. The project schedule will continue to be updated as refinements to the design, project cost estimates, and funding plans are advanced.

Submission 1005 Jan and Dan Moorehouse

- 1005-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1006 Rogy

- 1006-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.
- 1006-2 Regarding job creation, as discussed in Section 3.15, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR, although construction of the project would create additional jobs in the project area, construction workers would temporarily work in the area and would not likely relocate to the project area on a permanent basis. Additionally, a minimum of 40% of all project work hours would be local hire workers as per Metro's Local Hire Initiative.

Regarding police services, under CEQA, an increase in the need for police services is not considered an environmental impact requiring analysis. However, Section 3.15, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR, does evaluate whether the project would create a demand for public services, such as police, which would necessitate the construction of new or expanded facilities, the construction of which could result in environmental impacts. The analysis concludes that the project would not result in unplanned population growth or other conditions that would generate a demand for new or expanded public service facilities. Therefore, no such impacts were identified.

Regarding project funding, 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, if approved by the Metro Board.

See MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1007 Sandra and Bill Goetz

- 1007-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1007-2 The commenter's opposition to trains is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1008 Robert and Paula Castro

- 1008-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1009 Linda and Thomas Hart

- 1009-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1010 Russ and Trish Stewart

- 1010-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1011 Charles Ford Jr.

- 1011-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1012 James McGee

- 1012-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1013 Barbara Safah

- 1013-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1014 Pauline Acherman

1014-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1015 Edith Reid

1015-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1016 John De Rago

1016-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1017 Judy Douglas

1017-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1018 Daniel McKay

1018-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1019 Anonymous

1019-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1020 Lillian Isobe

1020-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1021 David and Diane Brown

1021-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1022 Ron and Karen Ury

- 1022-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1023 Mr. and Mrs. Mark Hansen

- 1023-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1024 Anonymous

- 1024-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1025 C. Rauser

- 1025-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1025-2 See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology. 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, if approved.

Submission 1026 Donn Plewes

- 1026-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, includes an updated schedule for the LPA. The project schedule will continue to be updated with refinements to the design, project cost estimates, and funding plans. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1027 Jane Kamiya

- 1027-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1028 Frank Mekrut

- 1028-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-9: Light Rail Security; and MR-18: Homelessness. Previous

studies examined routes to Del Amo Mall, but those options were screened out as they did not provide comparable ridership benefits.

Submission 1029 Elizabeth Higgins

- 1029-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1029-2 A map illustrating the LPA and project options can be located on the Metro project website, as well as in different sections of the EIR. The online maps are interactive and can be zoomed in for detailed viewing. <https://www.metro.net/projects/green-line-extension/>

Submission 1030 Michael Maiuri

- 1030-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1031 Camille Henderson Cardenas

- 1031-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1032 Loren Heard

- 1032-1 The comment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The project is being developed and implemented by Metro, not the State of California. Metro's Board of Directors, which is composed of locally elected officials and appointees, provides oversight, and makes decisions about the project's planning, funding, and implementation.

Submission 1033 Anonymous

- 1033-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1033-2 A map illustrating the LPA and project options can be located on the Metro project website, as well as in different sections of the EIR. The online maps are interactive and can be zoomed in for detailed viewing. <https://www.metro.net/projects/green-line-extension/>.

Submission 1034 Robert and Linda Culpeper

- 1034-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1035 William and Claudia Fischer

- 1035-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1036 Martin and Ann Gallagher

- 1036-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1037 Sheldon Katzer

- 1037-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1038 AJ and Richard Ziman

- 1038-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1039 David Frazee

- 1039-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1039-2 Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, identifies mitigation measures to minimize noise levels of construction and operation of the project. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures for information regarding noise project features and mitigation measures. Although operation of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in a significant and unavoidable noise impact, the operational noise impacts of the Trench Option, Hawthorne Option, and LPA would be less than significant with mitigation.

Submission 1040 Joyce Nagel

- 1040-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1041 Linda Howard

- 1041-1 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.

Submission 1042 Henry Yee

- 1042-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1043 Nelson Duenas

- 1043-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 1043-2 See response to comment 1043-1.

Submission 1044 Theo Misaresh

- 1044-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 1044-2 See response to comment 1044-1.

Submission 1045 Resident

- 1045-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1046 William Haffey

- 1046-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1047 Janice Collins

- 1047-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 1047-2 See response to comment 1047-1. 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. As indicated in Section 3.1-4-2.2 of the Draft EIR, each alignment option under consideration would result in a neutral or positive effect on vehicle miles traveled.

Submission 1048 Sherwin Rubin

- 1048-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The project would provide a direct connection to the LAX/Metro Transit Center, which would link to the LAX Automated People Mover. Both the Metro C and K Lines provide a connection to LAX.

Submission 1049 Noema Lorenzo

- 1049-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1049-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW 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. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option fully grade separates light rail from all roadways and would not increase vehicle delay compared to existing conditions.

Submission 1050 Daniel Dalton

- 1050-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1051 Anthony Garcia

- 1051-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1052 Jay Hoffman and Alicia Jacobson

- 1052-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1053 Kyle Freitas

- 1053-1 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.
- 1053-2 The commenter's preference for the Trench Option related to safety and noise concerns is noted. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The LPA, similar to the Trench Option, would fully grade separate light rail from roadways and avoid operational noise impacts with mitigation.

Submission 1054 Terry Masaoka

- 1054-1 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 1055 Eduardo Paiva

- 1055-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1055-2 The proposed stations were selected based on ridership potential, ability to provide through service, physical fit, and community impacts. Previous studies examined routes to Del Amo Mall, but those options were screened out as they did not provide comparable ridership benefits.

Submission 1056 Joe Molloy

- 1056-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1057 Fred Won

- 1057-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1057-2 Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, includes an updated schedule for the LPA. The project schedule will continue to be updated as refinements to the design, project cost estimates, and funding plans are advanced. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1058 James Won

- 1058-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets.

Submission 1059 Jeff O'Brien

- 1059-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1060 Dolores Merendo

- 1060-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1061 Naeim Soliman

- 1061-1 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 1062 Pozos

- 1062-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1063 Ronald Murakami

- 1063-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1064 Mike Marin

- 1064-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1064-2 See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1065 Lisa Chun

- 1065-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1066 Roberta Siegel-Okumura

- 1066-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1067 Sara

- 1067-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

1067-2 See MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1068 Noreen Tsumaki

1068-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

1068-2 The commenter's opposition to the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1069 Gabriel Catalogne

1069-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1070 Bryan Thompson

1070-1 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 1071 Shiv Murti

1071-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

1071-2 The commenter's opinion regarding cost efficiency is noted. Cost efficiency is one of the objectives on which the Metro Board made its LPA selection. Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets.

Submission 1072 Roxanne Morrow

1072-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1073 Tim Knerr

1073-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

1073-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1074 Deborah Comstock

- 1074-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1075 Theresa Barke

- 1075-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1075-2 Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, includes an updated schedule for the LPA. The project schedule and cost estimates will continue to be updated as the design advances. Under CEQA, economic impacts, such as effects on businesses, are not considered environmental impacts. Metro has created a Business Interruption Fund for major rail projects under construction in Los Angeles County to support the business community.

Submission 1076 Dorothy Derricks

- 1076-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1076-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1077 Arthur Oshiro

- 1077-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1078 Scott Bauer

- 1078-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1078-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment and Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would fully grade separate light rail from all roadways.

Submission 1079 Frank R.

- 1079-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1080 Judy Tizon

- 1080-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1080-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. The opposition to the Hawthorne Option due to cost concerns is also noted. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule. Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, includes an updated schedule for the LPA. The project schedule and cost estimates will continue to be updated as the design advances. Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, includes comprehensive mitigation measures to minimize and/or avoid impacts. Although operation of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in a significant and unavoidable noise impact, the operational noise impact of the Trench Option, Hawthorne Option, and LPA would be less than significant with mitigation. Accordingly, no additional mitigation is required for those alignment options. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Submission 1081 Romanelli

- 1081-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1082 Sylvia S.

- 1082-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1083 Claudia Brubaker

- 1083-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1084 Amjadi's

- 1084-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1084-2 Metro acknowledged that comment letter represents one person in support of the project and one person opposed to the project. The commenter's preference for an at-grade option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1085 Nancy Taneka

- 1085-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1086 Mary and Alan Shadbourne

- 1086-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1087 John McGee

- 1087-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1087-2 The commenter's opinion on the benefits of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and cost are noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1088 Fred Wolfe

- 1088-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1088-2 The commenter's opinion on the benefits of the Hawthorne Option and cost and schedule concerns are noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1089 James Bailey

- 1089-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1090 Kelly Hartman

- 1090-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1090-2 Metro published a summary of preliminary cost estimates and schedule in 2023, concurrent with the Draft EIR. The project construction costs range from \$1.96 billion to \$2.96 billion (as estimated in 2022) depending on the route and design configuration. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

- 1090-3 Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR includes an updated schedule for the LPA. The project schedule and cost estimates will continue to be updated as the design advances.

Submission 1091 Georgia Williams

- 1091-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1092 Robert Hernandez

- 1092-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1093 Ray Karimoto

- 1093-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1094 Melody Knerr

- 1094-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1094-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment and opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1095 Karen Currey

- 1095-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1096 Lori Yamasaka

- 1096-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1097 Niparpon Johansen

- 1097-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 1097-2 The commenter's opinion regarding the perceived safety and environmental quality of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option is noted. However, at-grade crossings are generally considered to present a higher risk of collisions with vehicles and pedestrians compared to grade-separated options. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Options would eliminate these conflicts by fully separating light rail from roadways. The Draft EIR evaluates the potential impacts associated with each option in multiple resource areas, including air quality (Section 3.4), pedestrian safety (Section 3.1), and aesthetics (Section 3.3). Dust and air pollution are not expected to accumulate under the elevated guideway in a meaningful or harmful way because the guideway would be open to air on all sides, allowing for natural ventilation. As set forth in Section 3.4-2.5 of the Draft EIR, each alignment option would comply with PF-AQ-2 (SCAQMD Rule 403 Compliance) to control dust and emissions during construction. As set forth in Section 3.4-4 of the Draft EIR, no adverse air quality impacts are expected during operation of the alignment options.

Submission 1098 Marciano Saldana

- 1098-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1099 Hamin

- 1099-1 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 1100 Moien Bigdeli

- 1100-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1101 Allegra DeMott

- 1101-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 1101-2 See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses

Submission 1102 Deb White

- 1102-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1103 Kevin White

- 1103-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1104 Sherry Roberts

- 1104-1 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.
- 1104-2 The Draft EIR evaluates several physical environmental topics related to the concerns implicated in this comment, including pedestrian safety (Section 3.1, Transportation), land use compatibility (Section 3.2, Land Use), visual quality (Section 3.3, Aesthetics), noise and vibration (Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration), and wildlife (Section 3.7, Biological Resources). These sections assess how the project may affect surrounding neighborhoods. Although the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in a significant and unavoidable operational noise impact, none of the other alignments studied – including the LPA – would result in significant and unavoidable operational impacts. Temporary construction-related impacts would be reduced to the maximum extent feasible through implementation of mitigation measures. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 1105 Tyler

- 1105-1 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.
- 1105-2 Metro is not considering a trolley system on Hawthorne Boulevard south to the Pacific Coast Highway as part of the project.

Submission 1106 Charles Osborne

- 1106-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1107 Moss Misiaszek

- 1107-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1107-2 Metro notes the commenter's desire for more transit with less interference at crossings and lights. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option fully grade separate light rail from streets to avoid conflicts with pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles.

Submission 1108 Leo Tsai

- 1108-1 The commenter's opposition to a new transit system located in Torrance is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Traffic signals within Torrance are operated by the City of Torrance and are within the City's jurisdiction to modify or improve.

Submission 1109 John VanderVennet

- 1109-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1110 Tobeylynn Birch

- 1110-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1110-2 Cost efficiency is one of the objectives on which the Metro Board made its LPA selection. Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, includes an updated schedule for the LPA. The project schedule and cost estimates will continue to be updated as the design advances. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1111 Ed De La Cruz

- 1111-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1111-2 This project would provide alternatives to the busy I-405 corridor and also more transit options in this region by connecting to the existing Metro rail lines, as well as two regional bus centers in Redondo Beach and Torrance. 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. Metro published a summary of preliminary cost estimates and schedule in 2023, concurrent with the Draft EIR. The project construction costs range from \$1.96 billion to \$2.96 billion (as estimated in 2022) depending on the route and design configuration. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1112 Hector

- 1112-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1112-2 This commenter's support for public transit and use of existing infrastructure is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1113 Johnson

- 1113-1 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 1114 Victoria Nagano

- 1114-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1115 Travis Wilmer

- 1115-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1116 Bob Kelchner

- 1116-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1116-2 Noise impacts and mitigation measures are described in detail in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. Soundwalls would be installed in areas where noise levels are predicted to exceed Federal Transit Administration (FTA) noise impact criteria for residences, as required by Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls. These soundwalls would block the line-of-sight between the light rail train and sensitive receptors, reducing noise impacts. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Submission 1117 James Knerr

- 1117-1 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.
- 1117-2 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1118 Steph Knerr

- 1118-1 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 1119 Jules River

- 1119-1 The commenter's support for the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1120 Bill and Elaine McMullen

- 1120-1 The commenter’s support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1120-2 The commenter’s support is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1121 Steven Dewberry

- 1121-1 The commenter’s support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1121-2 The commenter’s opposition to the project in Torrance and alternative support for “the lowest cost option” is noted. Metro published a summary of preliminary cost estimates and schedule in 2023, concurrent with the Draft EIR. The project construction costs range from \$1.96 billion to \$2.96 billion (as estimated in 2022) depending on the route and design configuration. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1122 S. Zirkes

- 1122-1 The commenter’s support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1122-2 The project has been designed to provide convenient access to the Redondo Beach Transit Center and Torrance Transit Center, which were selected based on extensive analysis of connectivity and accessibility and community outreach. The stations would serve as key transit hubs, with existing local bus routes providing access to nearby destinations. While Metro assists in identifying improvements during the planning and design phases, the implementation of local access to regional transit facilities falls under the jurisdiction of the local cities. If the project is approved, Metro would coordinate with the local jurisdictions to assist in this planning.

Submission 1123 John Schlosser

- 1123-1 The commenter’s support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1124 David Smith and Guadalupe Vicon

- 1124-1 The commenter’s support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 1124-2 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission 1125 Jiteshkumar Patel

- 1125-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1126 David Placenti

- 1126-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1126-2 The commenter's support for the lowest cost and least intrusive option is noted. Metro published a summary of cost and schedule in 2023. Metro published a summary of preliminary cost estimates and schedule in 2023, concurrent with the Draft EIR. The project construction costs range from \$1.96 billion to \$2.96 billion (as estimated in 2022) depending on the route and design configuration. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule. See Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR for a comparative analysis of the LPA, project options, and alternatives.

Submission 1127 Anonymous

- 1127-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1128 Abir Chakaborty

- 1128-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1129 T.B.

- 1129-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1130 Roxanne Griffin

- 1130-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1131 Linda Brown

- 1131-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1131-2 Noise impacts and mitigation measures are described in detail in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. Soundwalls would be installed in areas where noise levels are predicted to exceed Federal Transit Administration (FTA) noise impact criteria for residences, as required by Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls. These soundwalls would block the line-of-sight between the light rail train and sensitive receptors, reducing noise impacts. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Submission 1132 Mitchell Morgan

- 1132-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1133 Joseph Gualtiere

- 1133-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1134 JoAnn Cope

- 1134-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1134-2 See response to Comment 1134-1.

Submission 1135 Elena Castillo

- 1135-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1135-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. Metro published a summary of preliminary cost estimates and schedule in 2023, concurrent with the Draft EIR. The project construction costs range from \$1.96 billion to \$2.96 billion (as estimated in 2022) depending on the route and design configuration. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1136 John Heins and Yvonne Vanherk

- 1136-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1137 W. Calzadella

- 1137-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1138 Barbara Varou

- 1138-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1139 Marcia and Wilma Noboa

- 1139-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1140 Michael J. Gibson

- 1140-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1141 Patty Nishi

- 1141-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-9: Light Rail Security.
- 1141-2 See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1142 Young Cheng

- 1142-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1143 Anonymous

- 1143-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1144 Mary H. Peters

- 1144-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1145 Eloise and Pat Shea

- 1145-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1146 Michael Streibig

- 1146-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1147 Carter V.

- 1147-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1148 Kent Hori

- 1148-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1149 Janis Berges

- 1149-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1150 Sandra Parvis

- 1150-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1151 Tom Onalfo

- 1151-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro would coordinate with the City of Torrance on rail/bus connections as part of future phases of the project, pending approval.

Submission 1152 Patricia Roderick

1152-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1153 Tom and Eileen Pontius

1153-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1154 Anonymous

1154-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1155 Robert Krauss

1155-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1156 Joseph Palsulich

1156-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1157 Pat and Michael Janson

1157-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

1157-2 Metro published a summary of preliminary cost estimates and schedule in 2023, concurrent with the Draft EIR. The project construction costs range from \$1.96 billion to \$2.96 billion (as estimated in 2022) depending on the route and design configuration. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule. See Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR for a comparative analysis of the LPA, project options, and alternatives.

Submission 1158 Wayne A. Holman

1158-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1159 F. Momohara

1159-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1160 Simeon Smith

1160-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1161 Pete and Mary Eliopoulos

1161-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1162 Allison Fuentesvilla

1162-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1163 Anonymous

1163-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1164 Katsuaki Matsuda

1164-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1165 Anthony Galante

1165-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1166 C.A. Turner

1166-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1167 Winnie C. Stanfield

- 1167-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1167-2 The commenter's opposition to the Trench Option and Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to comment 1167-1.

Submission 1168 Nely Go

- 1168-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1169 Lorette Muchmore

- 1169-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1170 Virginia Nelson

- 1170-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1170-2 Light rail cannot run on the existing freight tracks, due to different operating requirements and safety. Light rail and freight would be physically separated. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission 1171 Mark Dunn

- 1171-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Metro ROW is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1172 Wayne Mityoshi

- 1172-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1173 Linda J. Muir

- 1173-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1174 Suwannee Adomien

- 1174-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-9: Light Rail Security.
- 1174-2 See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission 1175 Jon M. Ziegler

- 1175-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1176 Michael Dillenback

- 1176-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1177 Patricia Miyoshi

- 1177-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1178 Rajeswari Gounder

- 1178-1 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 1179 Julie Snakenborg

- 1179-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1180 C. Bedrossian

- 1180-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1181 Dario M. Chavez

- 1181-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 1181-2 This commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to comment 1181-1.

Submission 1182 Gloria Londono

- 1182-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1183 Alvaro Lopez

- 1183-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1184 Vincent Deneux

- 1184-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1185 Tony Yang

- 1185-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1186 Charles Delio

- 1186-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1187 Tim

- 1187-1 The commenter's opposition to transit is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1188 Sarah Winfrey

- 1188-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1189 Young-Joon Mok

- 1189-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1190 Isabel Douvan

- 1190-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1190-2 See response to comment 1190-1.

Submission 1191 Melanie White

- 1191-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1192 Timothy Ma

- 1192-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1193 Irene Ma

- 1193-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1194 Matteo Interlandi

- 1194-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and the Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1195 Mohamed Fassy Jayah

- 1195-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1196 Abdulvahob Nabiev

- 1196-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1197 Alan Kita

- 1197-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

- 1197-2 See response to Comment 1197-1. Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets.

Submission 1198 Charles Wilson

- 1198-1 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 1199 Dawn Kita

- 1199-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1200 Xianming Liu

- 1200-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1201 Donna

- 1201-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1202 Kevin Hetrick

- 1202-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1202-2 The project schedule and cost estimates will continue to be updated as the design advances. While offering financial incentives to construction contractors for early completion is worth considering, accelerating the project would present significant challenges. These include securing additional funds, expediting the procurement process, coordinating condensed review and permit approvals from public and private entities, and managing an intensive, compressed construction period. Each of these elements requires careful planning to ensure that safety, environmental regulations, and community impacts are appropriately addressed. Metro remains committed to delivering the project as efficiently as possible while balancing the need to control costs and ensure compliance with all necessary approvals.

Submission 1203 Avelina Daum

- 1203-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1204 Mark Nakano

- 1204-1 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.
- 1204-2 The commenter's support for an elevated project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would fully grade separate light rail from all roadways, which would help avoid service delays.

Submission 1205 Nelson Wong

- 1205-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1206 Catrice Nakamura

- 1206-1 See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.
- 1206-2 The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), Transit Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) Grant from the California State Transportation Agency (CALSTA) Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, and 3% match contributions from local jurisdictions. These funds are specifically allocated for transportation infrastructure and cannot be redirected for unrelated purposes such as homelessness programs or other local services. The commenter's concerns about community character and public priorities are noted. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 1207 Jack L.

- 1207-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1207-2 This commenter's preference for an at-grade alignment over the Trench Option and support for a quiet zone is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The project would provide all the upgrades to the crossings needed to establish the quiet zone. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.
- 1207-3 The commenter's concern regarding parking deterring ridership is noted. The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). Ridership projections show that riders from the greater South Bay and Palos Verdes Peninsula would use the system to connect to the regional rail network.
- 1207-4 The commenter's opinion that the Hawthorne Option would be best for South Bay businesses is noted. An additional station along the Hawthorne Option was studied in the 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis, and removed from further study at the request of

the City of Lawndale. Previous studies also examined routes to Del Amo Mall, but those options were screened out as they did not provide comparable ridership benefits.

- 1207-5 All alignments proposed on the Metro ROW include infrastructure improvements that would make all freight at-grade crossings alongside the light rail tracks eligible for quiet zone applications.

Submission 1208 Alkistis Tsitouri

- 1208-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1209 Kelly Lowe

- 1209-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1210 Laura Harder

- 1210-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1211 Kandi Hsin

- 1211-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1212 Jeff Patton

- 1212-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1213 Lin Van Gelder

- 1213-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1214 James Van Gelder

- 1214-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1215 Jan-Michael Sanchez

- 1215-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1215-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, includes an updated schedule for the LPA. The project schedule and cost estimates will continue to be updated as the design advances. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule

Submission 1216 Emilie Hunter

- 1216-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1217 Pat Leighton

- 1217-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1218 Abraham Que

- 1218-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1219 Paul Yamada

- 1219-1 This project would provide alternatives to the busy I-405 corridor and also more transit options in this region by connecting to existing Metro rail lines, as well as two regional bus transit centers in Redondo Beach and Torrance. 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. Metro published a summary of preliminary cost estimates and schedule in 2023, concurrent with the Draft EIR. The project construction costs range from \$1.96 billion to \$2.96 billion (as estimated in 2022) depending on the route and design configuration. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1220 Celia Lee

- 1220-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1220-2 This comment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to comment 1220-1.

Submission 1221 Kaiulani Lie

- 1221-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1221-2 Chapter 3.0, Environmental Impacts, of the Draft EIR, analyzes the project's environmental impacts. Section 4.20, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, includes revisions to the Draft EIR analysis. The revisions do not result in significant new information or changes to the impact conclusions.

Submission 1222 Ernie Roberts

- 1222-1 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.
- 1222-2 The potential for noise impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. Similar to the Trench Option, the LPA, and Hawthorne Option would fully grade separate light rail and, with mitigation, would result in less than significant noise impacts during operations. Regarding potential disruptions to businesses, under CEQA, economic impacts, such as financial effects on businesses, are not considered environmental impacts. Metro has created a Business Interruption Fund for major rail projects under construction in Los Angeles County to support the business community.

Submission 1223 Daniel Will

- 1223-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1224 Brian Quinn

- 1224-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1224-2 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. Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1225 Gregg DeNeui

- 1225-1 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.
- 1225-2 The potential for noise impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission 1226 Jimmy Gow

- 1226-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1226-2 As described in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan requires contractors to develop a construction traffic management 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.

Submission 1227 Rhonda McNeil

- 1227-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1227-2 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. Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security. Regarding job creation, as discussed in Section 3.15, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR, although construction of the project would create additional jobs in the project area, construction workers would temporarily work in the area and would not likely relocate to the project area on a permanent basis. Additionally, a minimum of 40% of all project work hours would be local hire workers as per Metro's Local Hire Initiative.

Submission 1228 Kimberlee Ann James

- 1228-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1229 Jackson N. Henry

- 1229-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1229-2 This commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment and opposition to the Trench Option and Hawthorne Options is noted. Metro published a summary of preliminary cost estimates and schedule in 2023, concurrent with the Draft EIR. The project construction costs range from \$1.96 billion to \$2.96 billion (as estimated in 2022) depending on the route and design configuration. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1230 Brian Getchius

- 1230-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1230-2 As described on Page 3.15-17 of the Draft EIR, the Los Angeles County Sheriff 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 Sheriff 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-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service. See also the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for discussion on traffic conditions. It includes intersections along Crenshaw Boulevard.

Submission 1231 Eric Chen

- 1231-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1231-2 Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, includes an updated schedule for the LPA. The project schedule and cost estimates will continue to be updated as the design advances. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1232 Mike Selfridge

- 1232-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1232-2 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), Transit Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) Grant from the California State Transportation Agency (CALSTA) Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, and 3% match contributions from local jurisdictions. Metro would continue to identify additional funding to support the project and close the funding gap, pending project approval.

Submission 1233 HL

- 1233-1 The commenter's support for the No Build Alternative is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1233-2 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. Metro

- takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.
- 1233-3 See response to Comment 1233-2.
- 1233-4 The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology. The commenter asserts the household incomes of residents in Redondo Beach, Torrance, and Lawndale are not similar to those of users on the Metro system, based on results of a survey. As described in the 2023 Project Need and Purpose Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, the project area contains communities that meet Metro's Equity Focus Communities (EFC) criteria, which include income, vehicle ownership, and ethnicity. For all three of these criteria, the greatest percentages of equity-related criteria within the project area are located in Lawndale, east of the Redondo Beach (Marine) Station; centrally, surrounding the South Bay Galleria; and in Torrance, to the west of the Torrance Transit Center. In addition to serving these communities, the project would also provide a regional benefit for all riders, by improving an alternative mode of access to the South Bay.
- 1233-5 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, and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would fully grade separate light rail from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with school-age pedestrians and cyclists. The presence of a station could also improve access to schools for residents and parents.
- 1233-6 See response to Comment 133-4.

Submission 1234 Michael Dillenback

- 1234-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1235 Patricia Miyoshi

- 1235-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1236 Christopher Rutte

- 1236-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1236-2 The C Line Extension to Torrance Ridership Summary Report (2023a), available on the project's website, includes ridership forecasts. The project is estimated to serve between

11,500 and 15,600 daily project trips by 2045. The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), Transit 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.

Submission 1237 Richard Long

1237-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Both the Metro C and K Lines now connect to LAX.

Submission 1238 Enrique Garcia

1238-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1239 Louis Quaglietta

1239-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1240 Catherine Emmerson

1240-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1241 Jerri Holmgren

1241-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The potential for noise impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR.

Submission 1242 Charles A. Pinos

1242-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

1242-2 The Mary K. Giordano Regional Transit Center is located at 465 Crenshaw Boulevard, Torrance, CA.

Submission 1243 Ruth Ann Gray

- 1243-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and the Trench Option and is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1244 Harder Munro

- 1244-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1245 Terry Engle

- 1245-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1246 D.J. Ponder

- 1246-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1247 Marilyn Deborah Maxwell

- 1247-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1248 Russell Tsuji

- 1248-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1249 Earl Nolan

- 1249-1 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 1250 Alfred Jung

- 1250-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1251 Mariana Amezcua

1251-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1252 Se Hyun Sung

1252-1 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 1253 Bonnie Inskeep

1253-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1254 Michael J. Gibson

1254-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1255 Jerry Armstrong

1255-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1256 Micheal Hart

1256-1 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 1257 Y. Mcleod

1257-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1258 Jessie Lee

1258-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1259 Jungok

- 1259-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1260 Keith Herbers

- 1260-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1261 Charles Diehl

- 1261-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1262 Cuna Chona

- 1262-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1263 Mark Williams

- 1263-1 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 1264 Shankar Pachari

- 1264-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1265 Ron Sapp

- 1265-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1266 Jim Childers

- 1266-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1267 Rebecca Tubbs

- 1267-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1268 Gabriel Ponciano

- 1268-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1269 Steven Lindsey

- 1269-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1270 Albert Castro

- 1270-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1271 Josh Standifer

- 1271-1 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.
- 1271-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. The project is designed to fit 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. Impacts related to wildlife were analyzed in Section 3.7, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety; and MR-10: Changes in Community Character.

Submission 1272 Owen

- 1272-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and rail in general is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1273 Josh Stanton

- 1273-1 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.
- 1273-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. The project is designed to fit 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. As part of this project, multi-use recreational paths would be added in several parts of the corridor, which would provide safe paths for recreational users. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission 1274 Brendon Reyell

- 1274-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1275 Dale Case

- 1275-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1276 Kathy

- 1276-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1277 E. Atkins

- 1277-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1278 Jason T. Tam

- 1278-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1279 Marc Lawrence

- 1279-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1279-2 The noise impacts of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option are evaluated in detail in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The LPA is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. The noise impacts of a light rail system depend on many factors, including track technology, mitigation measures, and whether the alignment crosses streets at-grade. For this project, the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment includes at-grade light rail crossings that require warning bells and light rail train horns, which increase noise exposure in the surrounding neighborhoods. By contrast, the

LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would fully separate the light rail from the street grid, eliminating the need for these audible warnings and significantly reducing operational noise impacts. With implementation of mitigation measures, including MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls, noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation for LPA, Trench Option and Hawthorne Option.

Submission 1280 Michael Wermers

1280-1 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 1281 Alexandros S. Martinez

1281-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

1281-2 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. The LPA, along with all alignments along the Metro ROW, directly connects to the Redondo Beach Transit Center.

Submission 1282 Diana Davis

1282-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1283 Bryan

1283-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. See the Executive Summary in the Draft EIR for a summary of the potential impacts on pages ES-1 through ES-50.

Submission 1284 Perry Shields

1284-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1285 Daniel

1285-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1286 Virginia Darnell

1286-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1287 Tejas Parmar

- 1287-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1288 L. Nakashima

- 1288-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1289 Dave and Rena Hayami

- 1289-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1290 Swee Woo

- 1290-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1291 Robert Boiles

- 1291-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1291-2 This commenter's preference for the least expensive option is noted. Cost efficiency is one of the objectives on which the Metro Board made its LPA selection. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1292 Jeff Wong

- 1292-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1293 Larry Turgeon

- 1293-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1293-2 The project is designed to provide convenient access to the Redondo Beach Transit Center and Torrance Transit Center, which were selected based on extensive analysis of

connectivity and accessibility and community outreach. The stations would serve as key transit hubs, with existing local bus routes providing access to nearby destinations.

Submission 1294 Jose Dennis Alabaso

- 1294-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1294-2 The commenter's support for the project and desire for an accelerated schedule is noted.

Submission 1295 Anonymous

- 1295-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1296 Sean Murphy

- 1296-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1297 Ton-Ming Chieh

- 1297-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1298 Benito Miranda

- 1298-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1298-2 The project would provide a direct connection to the LAX Automated People Mover via the K Line.

Submission 1299 Anonymous

- 1299-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1300 Steve Chamberlain

- 1300-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1301 Bonnie Van Alphen

- 1301-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1301-2 This commenter's preference for the least expensive option is noted. Cost efficiency is one of the objectives on which the Metro Board made its LPA selection. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1302 Anonymous

- 1302-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1303 Noriko Fujita

- 1303-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1304 Harry & JoAnn Ross

- 1304-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1305 Susan LaMotte

- 1305-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. 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). Ridership projections show that riders from the greater South Bay and Palos Verdes will use the system to connect to the regional rail network. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission 1306 Joseph A Spilka

- 1306-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. See also the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for discussion on traffic conditions.

Submission 1307 Michael Stull

- 1307-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1308 Ron Botelho

- 1308-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1308-2 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). Ridership projections show that riders from the greater South Bay and Palos Verdes Peninsula would use the system to connect to the regional rail network. The project has secured funding from Measure R (2008), Measure M (2016), Transit Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) Grant from the California State Transportation Agency (CALSTA) Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, and 3% match contributions from local jurisdictions. Metro would continue to identify additional funding to support the project and close the funding gap, pending approval.

Submission 1309 Mr. & Mrs. Aguiar

- 1309-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1309-2 See response to Comment 1309-1. Cost efficiency is one of the objectives on which the Metro Board made its LPA selection. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1310 D. Fisher

- 1310-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1311 Chih Chang

- 1311-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1312 Anonymous

- 1312-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1312-2 As described in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan requires contractors to develop a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). 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 CTMP.

Submission 1313 Everett Kirsch

- 1313-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1314 Kikuchi Family

- 1314-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1315 Donald Nakamoto

- 1315-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1316 Beverly Findley

- 1316-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1316-2 The Metro Board considered cost efficiency in selecting the LPA and will continue to consider that factor, among others, prior to reaching a final decision on the project. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission 1317 Edmund & Kerry Cababa

- 1317-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1318 Mrs. Deborah DeLoud

- 1318-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1319 Craig Scdoris

- 1319-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and desire for an accelerated schedule is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1320 Lynn Shirvandehi

- 1320-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1320-2 This commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See response to Comment 1320-1.

Submission 1321 Bernas

- 1321-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.
- 1321-2 This commenter's preference to reduce disruptions is noted. The Draft EIR analyzes the environmental impacts of all project options and alternatives. See the Draft EIR Executive Summary for a summary of all impacts, and the Final EIR Executive Summary for a summary of the LPA impacts.

Submission 1322 Dianne & Jerry Baltz

- 1322-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1323 Jenny Sakamoto

- 1323-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission 1324 Timothy McAkee

- 1324-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Should the project be approved and advanced into construction, a minimum of 40% of all project work hours would be local hire workers as per Metro's Local Hire Initiative.

Submission 1325 Anonymous

- 1325-1 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 1326 Janet Sieffert

- 1326-1 The commenter's support for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.