5.6 RESPONSES TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

Submission PH-1 Armando Vicente

PH-1-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Trench Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for its consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission PH-2 Josh Standifer

PH-2-1 The use of the Metro ROW as recreational space is acknowledged on page 3.15-38 of the Draft EIR. While Metro recognizes that some residents currently use the Metro ROW as informal recreational space, it is important to note that the Metro ROW is not a designated park or public recreational area. Its primary purpose is rail transportation. The project includes two multi-use paths, expanding access to residential neighborhoods and offering additional recreational options. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character and MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

PH-2-2 Metro Homeless Outreach Teams are deployed on Metro buses, trains, and stations to engage with unhoused riders and connect them to resources. See MR-18: Homelessness.

PH-2-3 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-3 Craig St. John

PH-3-1 Property along Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Inglewood Avenue has been identified as potential location for a traction power substation (TPSS), as well as for a sump pump for the Trench Option. The LPA would not require a sump pump or the use of the parcel. The Draft EIR evaluated multiple TPSS locations, which are updated in the Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings – Locally Preferred Alternative, and would be further refined in the next phase of design, pending certification of the Final EIR and approval of the project by the Metro Board.

PH-3-2 The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

PH-3-3 The commenter's preference for an elevated alignment in the Metro ROW alignment is noted. The Metro Board has selected an LPA for purposes of the Final EIR, although it has not yet approved the project, including any of the options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. A final decision will not be made until after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which will include responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

PH-3-4 As described in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, on page 3.1-15, PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), a CTMP would be prepared and implemented to manage disruptions during construction. The plan would include strategies

to manage traffic flow, including phased construction to avoid long-term closures, clearly marked detours, and coordination with local agencies to ensure efficient traffic management. As part of Metro's standard practice, the CTMP would explore scheduling certain construction activities, including deliveries and pick-ups of materials, during non-peak travel periods, and the possibility of conducting some construction work at night. The CTMP would be updated as construction progresses to reflect changes and updates at the work areas.

Submission PH-4 Kevin Mitchell

PH-4-1 Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project, including those related to noise and vibration. Light rail transit operations differ significantly from freight operations in terms of noise and vibration characteristics. Light rail transit systems use lighter, electrically powered vehicles, resulting in lower noise and vibration levels compared to the diesel-powered freight trains currently operating along the Metro ROW. While the project would introduce light rail noise and would require adjustments to the locations of the existing freight tracks, the project would not increase freight operations.

Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, provides a comprehensive analysis of potential noise and vibration impacts associated with construction and operation of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option. In addition, Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, also evaluates the No Project Alternative, and the LPA. Operational noise and vibration impacts of the Trench Option, the Hawthorne Option and the LPA would be reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-10: Changes to Community Character

Regarding construction impacts, Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, discloses that construction activities would cause potentially significant noise and vibration impacts. To address these impacts, Mitigation Measures MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan and MM-VIB-1: Vibration Control Plan would be implemented to reduce these temporary construction impacts to the maximum extent feasible. Additionally, construction-related activities would proceed in phases, meaning that work would not occur in one location for the entire construction period.

PH-4-2 The mitigation measures included in the Draft EIR are designed to eliminate or lessen potentially significant impacts of the project to environmental resources listed in the CEQA Guidelines. The Draft EIR established existing conditions for each resource addressed in the Draft EIR to appropriately study potential impacts to affected neighborhoods.

Submission PH-5 John Schreiber

PH-5-1 The project provides multiple benefits to the City of Lawndale, including improving mobility in the South Bay and providing equitable access to regional destinations through improved connections to the Metro regional rail system. Stations in the City of Lawndale were proposed as part of the 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis, but were removed from consideration at the request of the City of Lawndale. See MR-19: Project Benefits.

PH-5-2 Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project. The use of the Metro ROW as recreational space is acknowledged on page 3.15-38 of the Draft EIR. While Metro recognizes that some residents currently use the Metro ROW as informal recreational space, it is important to note that the Metro ROW is not a designated park or public recreational area. Its primary purpose is rail transportation. The project includes two new multi-use paths, expanding access to residential neighborhoods and offering additional recreational options. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character and MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Section 3.2, Land Use and Planning, Section 3.3, Aesthetics, and 3.7, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR, evaluate potential impacts to natural resources, including trees and green space, along the Metro ROW. Section 3.15-4.5, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR, concludes that the project would not lead to a significant impact or the need for new or physically altered government facilities to meet demand for parks or recreational areas. Existing parks and recreational facilities in the area would continue to serve residents after project implementation.

PH-5-3 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11 Utilities and Service 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: Utilities Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety, MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety, and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks. In addition, the potential for the project to interfere with evacuation plans is addressed on page 3.9-47 of the Draft EIR. The project would not interfere with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. See MR-12: Emergency Access. The Metro Board has selected an LPA for purposes of the Final EIR, which would fully grade separate the light rail within the Metro ROW.

PH-5-4 In order to provide every commenter with an opportunity to express their opinions during the public hearing, a one-minute time limit was allocated. The public has several other avenues to express their comments, including through the project email, letters, and the project phone number.

Submission PH-6 Chelsea Schreiber

PH-6-1 As discussed on page 3.3-71 and several other locations within Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, Metro's Tree Policy requires a minimum tree replacement ratio of 2:1 (or 4:1 if the tree is considered a heritage tree), and the planting of California-native or other drought-tolerant trees. Trees would also be replanted along the corridor to preserve and enhance the aesthetic character of the community.

PH-6-2 Under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

PH-6-3 Metro has constructed nearly 120 miles of light rail throughout Los Angeles County. More information on light rail projects can be found https://www.metro.net/projects/. Comments from stakeholders can be found in the Final EIR of each respective Metro project.

PH-6-4 Approximately 178 residential properties are located immediately adjacent to the Metro ROW, and 22 residential properties are located immediately adjacent to the Hawthorne Option. Metro has designed the project to avoid displacement of residents under either the Metro ROW alignments or the Hawthorne Option. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality. Project operations would not introduce a new substantial permanent source of air pollutant emissions along the alignment. The light rail system would be powered by electricity, meaning there would be no direct emissions associated with rail propulsion. Consequently, operation of the light rail would not contribute to air pollution that could affect long-term health concerns such as asthma or cancer. Regarding potential air quality impacts associated with the relocation of the freight tracks, the distance to which the freight track would be shifted would vary all throughout the alignment, with a maximum shift of approximately 25 feet in the industrial areas north of the Torrance TC Station. This relocation is designed to accommodate the light rail tracks while minimizing potential impacts on adjacent properties. See MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks. Regarding construction impacts, as shown in Table 3.4-21 of the Draft EIR, localized emissions during construction, including those from freight track relocation, would remain below the applicable South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) localized screening thresholds, even with sensitive receptors located near the edge of the Metro ROW. For a comparative evaluation of the alignment options and alternatives, see Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR and Section 4.21, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR.

PH-6-5 Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. Metro has worked diligently to design the project in a manner that avoids impacts to adjacent residential areas and to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address potentially significant environmental impacts. See response to Comment PH-6-4.

Submission PH-7 Lena Pullen

PH-7-1 Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security. Metro Homeless Outreach Teams are deployed on Metro buses, trains, and stations to engage with unhoused riders and connect them to resources. See MR-18: Homelessness.

PH-7-2 The Hawthorne Boulevard Option, the Trench Option, and the LPA would fully grade separate light rail from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with school-age pedestrians and cyclists. As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would have two at-grade light rail crossings at 170th and

182nd Streets. During operations, the potential for delays is dependent on dispatch routing of emergency responders to these particular crossings. Emergency responders are dispatched either from the station or from their current location, which means they may not utilize this crossing to arrive at their response destination. Alternative routes include Grant Avenue, Artesia Boulevard, and 190th Street. Metro would coordinate with involved police departments in addressing security and station areas within their respective jurisdictions. Gate operations for at-grade crossings would be configured per California Public Utility Commission standards. The LPA and Trench Option would grade separate light rail at 170th Street and 182nd Street.

During construction, Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan, as described on page 3.1-15 of the Draft EIR, would require Metro to coordinate with the local jurisdictions to minimize disruptions to public services (e.g., schools). This plan would include details on street closure, detour routes, haul routes and staging areas and would be reviewed by the Cities of Lawndale, Redondo Beach, and Torrance. Consistent with standard Metro practice, the construction traffic management plan would account for peak hours to minimize any disruption to student transportation, including access to Lawndale High School and other schools in the district. Project Feature PF-T-1 also requires Metro to coordinate with emergency service providers, including fire, police and EMTs, to ensure emergency access is provided to the construction zones and neighboring land uses. Emergency access points would be clearly marked in consultation with local fire departments to ensure that emergency vehicles could quickly respond to incidents in the community during construction. See MR-12: Emergency Access.

PH-7-3 The commenter's support for the No Build Alternative and opposition to the Hawthorne Boulevard Option and an alignment through the City of Lawndale are noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-8 Eric Hermelin

PH-8-1 Section 3.6. Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, discloses that each alignment option would result in potentially significant construction-related noise and vibration impacts. To address these impacts, the project would implement Mitigation Measures MM NOI-1: Noise Control Plan, MM-VIB-1: Vibration Control Plan, MM-VIB-2: Construction Equipment Location, and MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post- Construction Surveys. While implementation of these measures would reduce the construction noise and vibration impacts to the maximum extent feasible, some noise and vibration impacts during construction would remain significant and unavoidable. These impacts would be temporary and would cease upon the completion of construction activities.

The potential operational noise impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds and MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

PH-8-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-9 Barry Ogle

PH-9-1 The commenter's experience as a retired BNSF conductor remote control engineer is noted. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

PH-9-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Soil conditions and potential impacts along the Metro ROW are identified in Section 3.8, Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources, of the Draft EIR. Any design using the Metro ROW would account for these conditions in order to construct and operate the project safely. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

PH-9-3 Several routes were examined as part of previous phases and studies of the project, but were eliminated from further consideration, as described in the 2023 Alternatives Considered and Eliminated Report, published alongside the Draft EIR. See Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Submission PH-10 Angelica Vicente

PH-10-1 The commenter's concerns regarding the Metro ROW alignments are noted. Metro has designed the project to fit within the Metro ROW and avoid displacement of people from their homes. Metro has designed the project to avoid displacement of residents. See the 2025 Real Estate Acquisition Report, published concurrently with this Final EIR, for more detailed information on proposed property acquisitions. Metro understands the concern related to property values. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

PH-10-2 Appendix 2-A, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings, of the Draft EIR and Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR show the locations and approximate heights of the retaining walls. The commenter refers to their property near the Metro ROW in the area between 170th Street and Artesia Boulevard. The retaining walls proposed in this area would be approximately the same height as the existing freight track, and would not substantially alter views or affect natural light relative to existing conditions. Figure 3.3-64 in the Draft EIR provides a simulation of a similar scenario, where the retaining wall near Grant Avenue would replace the existing earthen berm. Overall, the impacts related to the retaining walls would be similar to the rest of the project as a whole, as discussed in Section 3.3-4.3.2 of the Draft EIR. They would represent a visual change compared to existing conditions but through application of Metro design policies to ensure a high level of quality in design, they would be consistent with local policies regarding visual character and quality. Soundwalls are designed to withstand all but the most severe earthquakes per the California Building Code.

With respect to potential shading, the creation of shade on private property, such as reduced sunlight in private yards, is generally not considered a significant environmental impact unless it affects public spaces or public resources such as parks, open space, or solar access. In addition, because the position of the sun changes throughout the day and year,

any shading from the project features would be temporary and vary in duration, rather than causing continuous loss of light. Furthermore, the scale of retaining walls and soundwalls would generally be similar to the surrounding environment, and would therefore not introduce substantial new shade. Accordingly, shading of individual residences would not constitute a significant impact.

PH-10-3 Noise and vibration are discussed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The analysis considers both the light rail train and relocated freight tracks. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds, MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design, and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks.

PH-10-4 Metro has extensive experience overseeing the design and construction of light rail projects and has successfully managed utility relocations for similar transit projects throughout the region. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety.

PH-10-5 As discussed in Section 3.2, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, the project would not physically divide a community because residents would still be able to cross the Metro ROW at all existing designated rail crossings located at Inglewood Avenue, Manhattan Beach Boulevard, 159th, 160th, 161st, 162nd, 170th, and 182nd Streets. Land uses would not be altered to isolate any one part of the community from the other. All at-grade crossings for light rail and/or freight would include upgraded safety crossing infrastructure. The LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would fully grade separate light rail from all roadways. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission PH-11 Rhonda Hofmann Gorman

PH-11-1 In order to provide every commenter with an opportunity to express their opinions, a one-minute time limit was allocated. The public has several other avenues to express their comments, including through the project email, letters, and the project phone number.

PH-11-2 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

PH-11-3 Metro Homeless Outreach Teams are deployed on Metro buses, trains, and stations to engage with unhoused riders and connect them to resources. See MR-18: Homelessness.

Submission PH-12 Ted Hofmann

PH-12-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. The chart that the commenter refers to was displayed at the public hearings showing the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Trench and Hawthorne Options analyzed in the Draft EIR, and did not include the alternatives to the project discussed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

PH-12-2 See response to Comment PH12-1. The High-Frequency Bus Alternative is considered and analyzed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. CEQA requires that an EIR identify the Environmentally Superior Alternative and discuss the facts that support that

selection. However, the Lead Agency is not obligated to select the Environmentally Superior Alternative for implementation if it would not accomplish the basic project objectives.

PH-12-3 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option, which may require an overhead easement for the light rail to cross over their property is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission PH-13 Doris Hofmann

PH-13-1 Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

PH-13-2 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). Metro Homeless Outreach Teams are deployed on Metro buses, trains, and stations to engage with unhoused riders and connect them to resources. See MR-18: Homelessness.

PH-13-3 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. The Draft EIR analyzed a High-Frequency Bus Alternative. Light rail offers travel time savings over bus, as demonstrated in the 2023 Ridership Summary Report, which makes light rail transfer to bus rather than a single ride on a bus preferable to many riders. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro has a graffiti program that requires removal of graffiti within 24 hours of being reported. In addition, the Metro Rail Design Criteria requires that a graffiti-resistant coating be applied to furnishings and surfaces to prevent graffiti.

Submission PH-14 Robert Pullen Miles

PH-14-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

PH-14-2 The use of the Metro ROW as recreational space is acknowledged on page 3.15-38 of the Draft EIR. However, access to the Metro ROW is not authorized, as the Metro ROW is part of an active transportation corridor, nor compliant with freight safety standards. The Metro ROW is not a designated park or public recreational area. Its primary purpose is rail transportation. The project would include new multi-use paths, expanding access to residential neighborhoods and offering safe recreational options. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character and MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

PH-14-3 Metro has been coordinating with Westwood Building Supplies since early phases of the project and has refined the design to minimize potential disruptions to the property's operations, as well as their storage area, which they lease from Metro. Although construction activities could result in partial and full road closures along Inglewood Avenue

and Manhattan Beach Boulevard, Metro is committed to minimizing disruption to local businesses. As part of Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan, described in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, the project would include a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which would manage closures, maintain access, and coordinate with businesses. The CTMP requires Metro to coordinate with impacted businesses to limit disruptions.

PH-14-4 The commenter's opposition to the project in Lawndale, support for the No Project Alternative, and preference for more buses is noted. The No Project Alternative and a High-Frequency Bus Alternative were analyzed in Section 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-15 Pat Nichols

PH-15-1 Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project. The Trench Option would reduce noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment by blocking the line-of-site between noise sources and nearby receptors and by eliminating the need for audible light rail warning devices at the 170th Street and 182nd Street crossings.

The Metro Board selected the LPA for the purposes of the Final EIR. Similar to the Trench Option, the LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option avoid the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine light rail train horns and crossing bells. Operational noise impacts of the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would be less than significant with mitigation. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Metro acknowledges that the project would result in light rail noise along the Metro ROW. Per guidance established by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in the Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018), the potential for impacts is based on exterior noise levels. The analysis in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, demonstrates that with mitigation, exterior noise levels impacts would be below the FTA noise thresholds, regardless of whether windows are open or closed.

PH-15-2 The vibration levels from light rail operations would be significantly lower than those generated by freight trains due to the lighter weight. The vibration analysis considered both light rail trains and relocated freight. Operational vibration annoyance impacts would be mitigated to less than significant with mitigation for the Metro ROW alignments and the Hawthorne Option. Mitigation measures include MM-VIB-4: Low Impact Frogs, MM-VIB-5: Resilient Fasteners, and MM-VIB-6: Ballast Mats. Vibration mitigation measures and locations where they would apply are included on pages 3.6-106 through 3.6-108 of the Draft EIR. Because, with mitigation, the operational vibration levels would be below the FTA's thresholds for annoyance, they would also be well below the levels associated with structural damage to adjacent buildings. In addition, as discussed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, the project design process would include thorough site-specific

geotechnical investigations to ensure the stability of nearby structures. Per Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, site-specific geotechnical investigations would be conducted to address foundation and structural safety. The investigation would include engineering and construction recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

Submission PH-16 Denise

PH-16-1 The LPA and the Trench Option would fully grade separate light rail from all roadways, and would not increase traffic congestion, nor affect emergency access along the Metro ROW. For the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the frequency of the railroad crossing gate down time would increase travel times for vehicles relative to existing conditions, but it would not result in the permanent closure of emergency access. All homes and businesses on either side of the Metro ROW are accessible by alternate routes within a half-mile and, therefore, would not be substantially affected by train frequency. See MR-12: Emergency Access for additional information.

Submission PH-17 Andrew Wang

PH-17-1 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 PH-18 Jay Gould

PH-18-1 Metro extends its sympathy to the commenter and their family for the experience described. While Metro is not able to comment on individual criminal investigations, safety and security are a top priority for Metro. The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations, as well as construction. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission PH-19 Josh Standifer

PH-19-1 The Draft evaluates potential environmental impacts using established regulatory thresholds and methodologies developed by expert agencies such as the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). These thresholds are not arbitrary; they are designed to protect public health, safety, and quality of life, based on peer-reviewed research and real-world data. Metro understands concerns regarding the introduction of additional rail infrastructure near residential areas, and has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant environmental impacts of the project. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds; MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; MR-5: Vibration Impact types and Impact Thresholds; and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

PH-19-2 Metro Homeless Outreach Teams are deployed on Metro buses, trains, and stations to engage with unhoused riders and connect them to resources. See MR-18: Homelessness.

PH-19-3 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-20 Maria Francis

PH-20-1 The commenter's opposition to the project in Lawndale and support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Operation and construction noise impacts and associated mitigation measures are evaluated in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. Construction impacts are addressed for each relevant environmental topic in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Chapter 4, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, with mitigation measures proposed as necessary to reduce potentially significant impacts. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. It should also be noted that, with mitigation, the LPA would not result in significant operational noise impacts.

Submission PH-21 Marvin Francis

PH-21-1 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.

PH-21-2 Metro understands concerns regarding the introduction of additional train infrastructure near residential areas and has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant environmental impacts of the project. The commenter's concern about construction impacts is noted. Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Impact Analyses, of the Draft EIR, analyzes the impacts that would occur during construction and identifies mitigation measures that would be required to reduce impacts.

PH-21-3 Noise impacts associated with operation of the project are analyzed in detail in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. Relative to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the LPA and Trench Option within the Metro ROW would significantly reduce noise impacts because they eliminate the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option avoid the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine light rail train horns and crossing bells. Operational noise impacts of the LPA, Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option would be less than significant with mitigation. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. The anticipated hours of operation would be 4:00 a.m. one day to 1:00 a.m. the following day. System headways would be reduced during early morning (4:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m.) and late-night hours (7:00 p.m. to 1:00 a.m.) to approximately 15 minutes. This would result in a reduced frequency of trains during these hours and reduced overall noise compared to peak-hour system headways of 5 minutes.

PH-21-4 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. The street improvements on Manhattan Beach Boulevard from Aviation Boulevard to Inglewood Avenue were implemented by the City of Redondo Beach and are unrelated to this project. Those street improvements were completed in early 2025.

Submission PH-22 Tom Wooge

PH-22-1 As discussed in Section 3.2, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, the project would not physically divide a community because residents would still be able to cross the Metro ROW at all existing designated rail crossings: at Inglewood Avenue, Manhattan Beach Boulevard, 159th, 160th, 161st, 162nd, 170th, and 182nd Streets. There are no legal crossings between 162nd Street and 170th Street. Although some individuals trespass across the Metro ROW, such use is unauthorized. Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. The LPA, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option would fully grade separate light rail from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential conflicts with school-age pedestrians and cyclists. The freight track would remain at-grade, but the project would include new pedestrian safety infrastructure, such as gates, which would improve safety compared to existing conditions, where no pedestrian safety infrastructure exists. The presence of a station could also benefit access to schools for residents, parents, and caretakers. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission PH-23 Fred Sadegh

PH-23-1 The commenter's concerns for businesses impacts near the corner of Inglewood Avenue and Manhattan Beach Boulevard are noted. It is unclear which alignment the commenter is supporting. The commenter's preference for the alignment located where there is already a train track may be referring to the Metro ROW alignment. The LPA would require permanent acquisition of three industrial parcels near Inglewood Avenue and Condon Avenue (APN # 4080-025-057- 4080-025-059) to locate operational equipment including traction power substation (TPSS), pump station, and grade-crossing infrastructure. There are a few commercial and industrial properties along Inglewood Avenue near Manhattan Beach Boulevard where Metro has identified the need for a temporary construction easement (TCE) or partial acquisition to locate grade-crossing equipment. See the 2025 Real Estate Acquisitions Report for more information. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Noise and vibration impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. It should also be noted that, with mitigation, the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would not result in significant operational noise impacts.

Submission PH-24 Abby Sahjari

PH-24-1 The commenter's concerns for business impacts near the corner of Inglewood Ave and Manhattan Beach Blvd are noted. It is not clear what parcel the commenter is referring to. Metro published the 2023 Real Estate Acquisition Report concurrent with the Draft EIR to identify potentially affected properties and has updated it for the LPA, which identifies potential temporary construction easements (TCEs), partial acquisitions for grade-crossing

infrastructure, and permanent acquisitions for light rail operational equipment for commercial and industrial properties that may be needed for construction and operations. See the 2025 Real Estate Acquisitions Report for updated information.

Submission PH-25 Kehla Guirguis

PH-25-1 Noise impacts associated with the operation of the project are analyzed in detail in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench Option, and the LPA would include upgrades to existing freight crossings, allowing for the establishment of a Federal Railroad Administration quiet zone. This would eliminate routine freight train horn noise along the Metro ROW in the area. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

The commenter's concerns about the potential impacts to privacy, safety, and the character of the neighborhood are noted. The Metro ROW alignments have been designed to stay within the existing Metro ROW, which has been an active freight corridor for decades. Metro has designed the project to avoid encroachment into the surrounding residential areas and reduce impacts wherever feasible. To address concerns related to proximity, safety and privacy, Metro would install new or upgraded fencing and soundwalls along the light rail guideway. These barriers would enhance safety by preventing unauthorized access, reduce operational noise impacts, and help to preserve privacy for adjacent residents. Soundwall design would also include aesthetic treatments to ensure compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods. Landscaping would also be provided along the Metro ROW. Any remaining views from the light rail into adjacent areas would be brief and transitory. Moreover, Metro's light rail trains are not designed for sightseeing; passengers are typically seated facing inward or are engaged in other activities, further limiting the potential for visual intrusion. As project design advances, Metro would continue to work with local communities to ensure a high level of design. As described in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, the project would include Project Feature PF-AES-1: Local Zoning Ordinances and PF-AES-2: Metro Design Standards to ensure compliance with local ordinances and enhance the visual identity and character of the project within surrounding communities.

Submission PH-26 Safah Guirguis

PH-26-1 Noise is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. Metro has established procedures to maintain the cleanliness and appearance of its transit corridors. Metro's standard operations and maintenance plans address routine landscaping, vegetation management, and litter removal activities. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures; MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

PH-26-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-27 Lena Pullen

PH-27-1 Several routes were examined as part of previous phases and studies of the project, but were eliminated from further consideration, as described in the 2023 Alternatives Considered and Eliminated Report, published alongside the Draft EIR. See Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

PH-27-2 Metro Homeless Outreach Teams are deployed on Metro buses, trains, and stations to engage with unhoused riders and connect them to resources. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

PH-27-3 Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 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 between light rail and with school-age pedestrians and cyclists, and avoid increasing traffic congestion or inhibiting emergency access. The freight track would remain at-grade, but the project would include new pedestrian safety infrastructure, such as gates, which would improve safety compared to existing conditions, where no pedestrian safety infrastructure exists. The presence of a station could also benefit access to schools for residents and parents. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

For the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the frequency of the railroad crossing gate down time would increase relative to existing conditions, but it would not result in the permanent closure of emergency access. All homes and businesses on either side of the Metro ROW are accessible by alternate routes within a half-mile and therefore not affected by train frequency. See MR-12: Emergency Access.

PH-27-4 The commenter's opposition to the project and support for the No Build Alternative is noted.

Noise and vibration are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. Operational noise impacts of 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. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

Submission PH-28 Angelica Vicente

PH-28-1 Metro has designed the project to fit within the Metro ROW and avoid displacement of residents. Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

PH-28-2 As described in Section 3.8, Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources, of the Draft EIR, the project would be designed to accommodate high seismic ground motion and associated consequences in accordance with Metro's geotechnical design standards and thresholds, per Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards. Site-specific geotechnical investigations would be performed in accordance with the Metro Rail Design Criteria Section 5.6 to incorporate seismic demands and provide engineering solutions. The project would comply with the latest versions of local and state building codes and regulations. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

PH-28-3 The potential for vibration impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The vibration levels from light rail operations would be significantly lower than those generated by freight trains, due to the lighter weight. The vibration analysis considered both light rail trains and relocated freight. Operational vibration annoyance impacts would be mitigated to less than significant with mitigation for the Metro ROW alignment and the Hawthorne Option. Mitigation measures include MM-VIB-4: Low Impact Frogs, MM-VIB-5: Resilient Fasteners, and MM-VIB-6: Ballast Mats. Vibration mitigation measures and locations where they would apply are included on pages 3.6-106 through 3.6-108 of the Draft EIR. See MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds.

PH-28-4 Metro has extensive experience overseeing the design and construction of light rail projects and has successfully managed utility relocations for similar transit projects throughout the region. The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11 Utilities and Service System, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, the revisions do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that the impact related to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks.

Submission PH-29 Armando Vicente

PH-29-1 The commenter's opposition to a project along the Metro ROW is noted. 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 5 minutes. Weekend system headways would be reduced compared to weekdays. For purposes of the impact analysis, the Draft EIR assumes that trains would run approximately every 5 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. More sensitive time periods of the day, such as nighttime hours would have a reduced frequency of trains and therefore reduced overall noise compared to peak-hour system headways of 5 minutes.

The potential operational noise impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Like the Trench and Hawthorne Options, the LPA would not result in significant operational noise impact. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds and MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission PH-30 Brandon Vickers

PH-30-1 The commenter's support for the project and an at-grade alignment along the Metro ROW is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-31 Sean Moore

PH-31-1 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.

PH-31-2 The project is evaluated as a standalone project under CEQA because it has a logical terminus and independent utility, serving a specific transit need between Redondo Beach and Torrance without requiring additional phases to function effectively (*Del Mar Terrace Conservancy, Inc. v. City Council* (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 712). The cumulative impact analysis in the Draft EIR incorporates regional projections from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), which accounts for other projects, including Metro rail, and their combined regional effects. In doing so, the Draft EIR evaluates the potential growth effects from past, present, and probable future projects. Each Metro project has specific local objectives, routes, and impacts that must be assessed individually to ensure an accurate and meaningful analysis under CEQA. Evaluating each project independently allows for the consideration of project-specific conditions, resources, and community concerns, while cumulative impacts are addressed within the framework of regional planning documents. Furthermore, consistent with how CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(c) defines a "project," permit approvals facilitated, in part, by the environmental analysis in the Draft EIR, would be limited to only those associated with the Metro ROW alignments and the Hawthorne Option. Future projects proposed by Metro along other alignments not evaluated by the Draft EIR would be required to undergo their own environmental analysis in accordance

with the requirements established by CEQA. Thus, the Draft EIR adequately evaluates the whole of the action and does not piecemeal.

The commenter also expresses general concerns about the adequacy of mitigation measures, but does not specify which mitigation measures they believe to be deferred or inadequately addressed. All mitigation measures proposed in the Draft EIR are based on established standards, methods and guidelines, commonly accepted under CEQA for large-scale transportation projects. In cases where mitigation measures require further refinements and identify feasible compliance options to achieve those standards.

The commenter further states that the Draft EIR does not adequately address multiple CEQA topics. No reason for this belief is provided in the comment. The Draft EIR complies with CEQA and Metro worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project.

Finally, the commenter asserts the ridership study is flawed. The operational parameters in the Draft EIR are based on the travel demand modeling performed for the project. This modeling is included in the 2023 Ridership Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission PH-32 Jonathan Shultz

PH-32-1 Each environmental topic analyzed in the Draft EIR, including noise and vibration, is evaluated for both construction and operational phases. The operational noise impact analysis is presented in Section 3.6-4.1.2, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, beginning on page 3.6-46. As concluded therein, the operational noise impact would only be for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and at one specific location, which is near 170th Street.

Regarding the Trench Option, the Draft EIR recognizes that the alignment transitions out of the trench south of 170th Street, including the areas noted in the comment. The Trench Option is described in Section 2.3-2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 2-21.

The Metro Board selected the LPA for purposes of the Final EIR, which significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-33 George Gale

PH-33-1 The existing freight rail line is located within the Metro ROW, which runs behind residential properties in Lawndale and Redondo Beach. The proposed light rail alignments that follow the Metro ROW would place the new light rail tracks within that same Metro ROW. Metro has extensive experience overseeing the design and construction of light rail projects and has successfully managed utility relocations for similar transit projects throughout the region. The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11 Utilities and Service System, of the Draft EIR. Potential

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

PH-33-2 See response to Comment PH-33-1. Impacts related to soil stability are addressed in Section 3.8, Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources, of the Draft EIR. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

PH-33-3 Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

The potential operational noise impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds and MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. The project under consideration is a light rail transit line to be operated by Metro, not a heavy rail line operated by Metrolink. Light rail vehicles are quieter, electrically powered trains that generate less noise compared to larger, diesel operated Metrolink trains. Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, evaluates the potential for noise impacts and mitigation measures in detail.

PH-33-4 See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission PH-34 Raul Moratto

PH-34-1 The use of the Metro ROW as recreational space is acknowledged on page 3.15-38 of the Draft EIR. While Metro recognizes that some residents currently use the Metro ROW as informal recreational space, it is important to note that the Metro ROW is part of an active transportation corridor and recreational use of the Metro ROW is unauthorized and not compliant with freight safety standards. The Metro ROW alignments, including the LPA, would provide new multi-use paths, expanding access to residential neighborhoods and offering additional recreational options. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character and MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

PH-34-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

PH-34-3 See response to Comment 34-1.

Submission PH-35 Ted Hofmann

PH-35-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The commenter also notes a preference for a bus system should a project be developed within the Metro ROW. A High-Frequency Bus Alternative is analyzed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

PH-35-2 The fundamental purpose of the project is to provide high-capacity transit service in the South Bay. All project objectives could be viewed on page ES-4 of the Draft EIR. The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission PH-36 Amy Lacoe

PH-36-1 The commenter's concern about construction impacts on Hawthorne Boulevard is noted. Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Impact Analyses, of the Draft EIR, analyzes the impacts that would occur during construction, and identifies mitigation measures that would be required to reduce impacts. As detailed in Section 3.1, Transportation, Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan would ensure that access would be maintained, and disruptions reduced during construction.

PH-36-2 The impacts of the Hawthorne Option to nearby residents are described in Section 3.1, Transportation, Section 3.2, Land Use and Planning, Section 3.3, Aesthetics, Section 3.4, Air Quality, and Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration of the Draft EIR. Mitigation measures are proposed to address these impacts, including MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls, MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs and MM-NOI-5: Wheel Squeal Noise Monitoring, as well as design considerations to maintain aesthetic compatibility and minimize disruptions. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

PH-36-3 In 2009, Metro prepared an alternatives analysis that studied the potential for transit service along all or portions of the Metro ROW and identified the segment between the Redondo Beach (Marine) Station and the Torrance Transit Center as the highest priority project. Since then, several alignments and alternatives have been studied. The 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis report recommended two alignments to be carried forward into environmental analysis: the Metro ROW and the Hawthorne Boulevard alignment (both primarily at-grade alignments).

Submission PH-37 Kim

PH-37-1 Urbanized avian species, including resident birds of prey such as red-tailed hawks and great-horned owls, are protected under the Migratory Birds Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code. As discussed in Section 3.7, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR, these species have potential to occur within the Resource Study Area (RSA), which provides suitable breeding and foraging habitat in the form of trees, vegetation, and man-made structures (see page 3.7-22). The Draft EIR acknowledges that construction activities could temporarily

disturb these habitats. To address this, Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-2: Nesting Bird Season Restrictions and Pre-Construction Surveys, establishes seasonal restrictions and pre-construction surveys to identify and protect active nests. Given the existing anthropogenic disturbance (e.g., vehicular traffic, train traffic, human presence) throughout the RSA, these mitigation measures are anticipated to reduce potential impacts on nesting and foraging birds to less than significant. The project does not propose any permanent changes that would preclude birds from returning to the area after construction. Moreover, birds and terrestrial species in the RSA are adapted to living in an urban environment, and operational impacts would be less than significant.

PH-37-2 The commenter's opposition to a project located in residential neighborhoods is noted. Metro has successfully implemented light rail in residential communities across Los Angeles County, including along the Metro E Line in West Los Angeles and the Metro A Line in South Pasadena, where light rail operates adjacent to homes. Metro has worked diligently to design the project in a way that minimizes disruption and to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address potentially significant impacts.

PH-37-3 As described in Section 3.8, Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources, of the Draft EIR, the project would be designed to accommodate high seismic ground motion and associated consequences in accordance with Metro's geotechnical design standards and thresholds, per Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards. Site-specific geotechnical investigations would be performed in accordance with the Metro Rail Design Criteria Section 5.6 to incorporate seismic demands and provide engineering solutions. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission PH-38 Marianna Carlton

PH-38-1 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

PH-38-2 An additional station along the Hawthorne Option within the City of Lawndale was studied as part of the 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis, but was removed from further consideration at the request of the City of Lawndale. Over the course of several planning studies, 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 PH-39 Mike Gallin

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

PH-39-2 Approximately 178 residential properties are located immediately adjacent to the Metro ROW, and 22 residential properties are located immediately adjacent to the Hawthorne Option. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project, including air quality and noise effects to residences.

PH-39-3 The commenter's reiteration of support for the Hawthorne Option is noted.

Submission PH-40 Ray Hollar

PH-40-1 Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, evaluates baseline conditions of the existing Metro ROW as an active railroad corridor. This includes not only the current freight train operations, but also the visual characteristics inherent to a railroad corridor, such as railroad tracks and associated infrastructure. In addition, as stated on page 3.3-54 of the Draft EIR, views of the mountains and other landmarks the commenter mentioned are located relatively long distances from the Metro ROW in Lawndale, which makes any possible views of them quite distant. For example, the Hollywood Sign is located approximately 17 miles north/northeast of the Metro ROW in Lawndale. Nonetheless, those distant views would remain available from public streets and sidewalks, even with the addition of project elements such as soundwalls and elevated structure. The implementation of the project would not fundamentally change the use of the Metro ROW as a transportation corridor. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

PH-40-2 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission PH-41 Ted Hoffmann

PH-41-1 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.

PH-41-2 It is unclear what problems the commenter is referring to at the Galleria. The Hawthorne Option would be located within Hawthorne Boulevard and would not require any acquisitions of private property as part of the South Bay Galleria.

PH-41-3 The commenter's support for the No Project Alternative or buses is noted. Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, assesses a No Project Alternative and a High-Frequency Bus Alternative.

Submission PH-42 Lama Barikhan

PH-42-1 The commenter's opposition to the project in Lawndale is noted. Noise and vibration impacts and associated mitigation measures are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. Moreover, the LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the

Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

PH-42-2 The commenter's support for the No Project Alternative or buses is noted. Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, assessed a No Project Alternative and a High-Frequency Bus Alternative. The Metro Board reviewed and considered these alternatives when they selected the Hybrid Alternative as the LPA in May 2024.

Submission PH-43 Samsung

PH-43-1 The use of the Metro ROW as recreational space is acknowledged on page 3.15-38 of the Draft EIR. While Metro recognizes that some residents currently use the Metro ROW as informal recreational space, it is important to note that the Metro ROW is not a designated park or public recreational area. Its primary purpose is rail transportation. The project would include two new multi-use paths, expanding access to residential neighborhoods and offering additional recreational options. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character and MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Submission PH-44 Lama Barikhan

PH-44-1 The commenter's question appears to refer to a future proposal in 2024 and its potential effect on the housing market. It is unclear what specific proposal the commenter is referencing. If the comment is referring to the proposed C Line Extension Project and its potential impacts on the real estate market, note that economic effects such as changes in property values are not considered physical environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. Metro acknowledges community concerns related to property values. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

Submission PH-45 Kim

PH-45-1 The project would not pass by 192nd Street. If the commenter intended to say 182nd Street, the project would pass through that area. The project under consideration is a light rail transit line to be operated by Metro, not a heavy rail line operated by Metrolink or freight rail. Light rail vehicles are quieter, electrically powered trains that generate less noise compared to larger, diesel operated Metrolink trains and freight operators. Mitigation Measure MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys requires contractors to document damage resulting from vibration impacts during construction, and repair them. In addition, as discussed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, the project design process would include thorough site geotechnical investigations to ensure the stability of nearby structures. Per Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, site-specific geotechnical investigations would be conducted to address foundation and structural safety. The investigation would include engineering and construction recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged. Regarding operational vibration damage, see MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds.

PH-45-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-46 Mike Gallin

PH-46-1 Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, evaluates potential noise impacts, including those from wheel squeal. According to the Federal Transit Administration's Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018), curves with a radius greater than 1,000 feet do not generate wheel squeal. As a result, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) recommends designing transit projects to avoid tight curves with radii of less than 1,000 feet to mitigate potential noise impacts. The Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, Trench Option, and the LPA do not include curves with radii less than 1,000 feet, which are the primary cause of wheel squeal. Consequently, wheel squeal is not anticipated under these design conditions.

The Hawthorne Option includes two curves which could potentially produce wheel squeal. Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-5: Wheel Squeal Noise Monitoring would require noise monitoring to identify wheel squeal at two curves with a radius less than 1,000 feet for the Hawthorne Option:

> Curve between Santa Fe Avenue and Inglewood Avenue

> Curve between 161st Street and 163rd Street

If wheel squeal is identified, Metro shall install wayside rail lubrication to ensure wheel squeal does not occur. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Submission PH-47 Becky Sitton

PH-47-1 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 PH-48 Nancy Cline

PH-48-1 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

PH-48-2 The commenter reiterates opposition to the Hawthorne Option. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR and is noted for the record. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission PH-49 Kim

PH-49-1 Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, evaluates potential noise impacts, including those from wheel squeal. According to the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018), curves with a radius greater than 1,000 feet do not generate wheel squeal. As a result, the FTA recommends designing transit projects to avoid tight curves with radii of less than 1,000 feet to mitigate potential noise impacts. The Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, Trench Option, and the LPA do not include

curves with radii less than 1,000 feet, which are the primary cause of wheel squeal. Consequently, wheel squeal is not anticipated under these design conditions.

The Hawthorne Option includes two curves which could potentially produce wheel squeal. Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-5: Wheel Squeal Noise Monitoring would require noise monitoring to identify wheel squeal at two curves with a radius less than 1,000 feet for the Hawthorne Option:

> Curve between Santa Fe Avenue and Inglewood Avenue

> Curve between 161st Street and 163rd Street

If wheel squeal is identified, Metro shall install wayside rail lubrication to ensure wheel squeal does not occur. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

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

Submission PH-50 Rupesh

PH-50-1 Light rail transit vehicles are much quieter than freight trains because they are electrically powered and propelled by propulsion motors in the wheels of the transit vehicles. Freight locomotives are significantly louder as a result of the large diesel engines needed to propel the train and the freight horn which is sounded on approach to at-grade crossings. For example, a freight locomotive has a reference sound exposure level of 97 A-weighted decibels (dBA) and the freight horn has a reference sound exposure level of 110 dBA. In comparison, a light rail transit vehicle has a reference sound exposure level of 78 dBA, approximately 19 dBA quieter than a freight locomotive. The light rail transit vehicles use a "quacker" horn which produces a relatively low-volume sound (78 dBA at 50 feet in front of the lead vehicle) and has a marginal effect on community noise exposure at train speeds greater than 35 miles per hour. The "quacker" horn is approximately 32 dBA quieter than the freight horn. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Submission PH-51 Ted Hofmann

PH-51-1 Regarding existing horn noise from freight trains, for the Metro ROW alignments, the project would enable local cities to establish a Quiet Zone in coordination with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). More specifically, as part of Project Feature PF-NV-1: Quiet Zone Equipment Installation, Metro would install all necessary safety equipment to meet FRA standards for the establishment of a freight quiet zone. Additionally, Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment would require Metro to provide support and guidance to the City of Lawndale, City of Redondo Beach, and City of Torrance to establish a quiet zone(s) from north of Inglewood Avenue to south of 182nd Street. The establishment of a quiet zone would reduce freight noise overall along the Metro ROW by eliminating one of the primary sources of noise from freight trains, the horn, which produces a noise level of 110 decibels. In most cases, with implementation of the quiet zone, freight noise would be

quieter than existing conditions even though the tracks would be in closer proximity to some sensitive receptors.

Light rail transit vehicles are much quieter than freight trains because they are electrically powered and propelled by propulsion motors in the wheels of the transit vehicles. Freight locomotives are significantly louder as a result of the large diesel engines needed to propel the train and the freight horn which is sounded on approach to at-grade crossings. For example, a freight locomotive has a reference sound exposure level of 97 A-weighted decibels (dBA) and the freight horn has a reference sound exposure level of 110 dBA. In comparison, a light rail transit vehicle has a reference sound exposure level of 78 dBA, approximately 19 dBA quieter than a freight locomotive. The light rail transit vehicles use a "quacker" horn which produces a relatively low-volume sound (78 dBA at 50 feet in front of the lead vehicle) and has a marginal effect on community noise exposure at train speeds greater than 35 miles per hour. The "quacker" horn is approximately 32 dBA quieter than the freight horn. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Submission PH-52 Kim

PH-52-1 The commenter's opposition to a light rail project in the Metro ROW is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-53 Rupesh

PH-53-1 Metro worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project, including those related to construction. The Metro Board has selected an LPA for the purposes of the Final EIR, although it has not yet made a final decision on the project, including whether to approve of the options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR or reject the project for approval. A final decision will not be made until after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which includes responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter.

Submission PH-54 Ted Hofmann

PH-54-1 The commenter's opposition to a light rail project in the City of Lawndale is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. During construction, Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan, as described on page 3.1-15 of the Draft EIR, requires Metro to coordinate with emergency service providers, including fire, police, and EMTs, to ensure emergency access is provided to the construction zones and neighboring land uses. Emergency access points would be clearly marked in consultation with local fire departments to ensure that emergency vehicles could quickly respond to incidents in the community during construction. See MR-12: Emergency Access.

Submission PH-55 Kevin McKenzie

PH-55-1 The commenter's support for the project is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The C Line Extension would operate as the K Line and connect to the LAX/Metro Transit Station, which serves LAX. The K Lines operate as a north-south line between the South Bay and the

Metro E Line and the C Line now operates east-west between LAX and Norwalk. Both lines would provide a direct connection to LAX.

Submission PH-56 Ray Hollar

PH-56-1 Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project, including those related to construction. The potential operational noise impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Along the Metro ROW, the LPA and Trench Option would significantly reduce noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because they eliminate the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA, Trench Option and Hawthorne Option avoid the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells. Operational noise impacts of the LPA would be less than significant with mitigation. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds and MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, evaluates potential noise impacts in detail for both construction and operation. The analysis identifies mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to the extent feasible.

PH-56-2 The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology. A Metro ride is 75 cents for seniors during peak periods and 35 cents during non-peak periods, with fare capping of $2.50 per day. See Metro website for fare information at www.metro.net/riding/fares/seniors/#how-much-does-it-cost.

Submission PH-57 Amy Lacoe

PH-57-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Approximately 178 residential properties are located immediately adjacent to the Metro ROW, and 22 residential properties are located immediately adjacent to the Hawthorne Option. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project, including air quality and noise effects to residences. The Draft EIR considers and analyzes noise and vibration impacts in Section 3.6. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. Moreover, the LPA significantly reduces noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because it eliminates the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA removes the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine train horns and crossing bells.

Submission PH-58 Traber Schroeder

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

PH-58-2 The commenter's support for more extensive transit lines, sidewalks, bike lanes and bike parking, is noted. As described in Chapter 2, Description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR, the project would feature multi-use paths along the Metro ROW, where space permits along Condon Avenue in Lawndale and between Grant Avenue and 182nd Street in Redondo Beach. The new paths would improve neighborhood walking/cycling spaces within neighborhoods where sidewalks do not exist and access to proposed stations. 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 PH-59 Pam Combar

PH-59-1 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.

PH-59-2 The project's potential impacts related to soil and ground conditions are evaluated in Section 3.8, Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources, of the Draft EIR, with additional information regarding soil stability provided in Section 4.12, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR. Regarding the sinkhole cited by the commenter and potential for collapsible soil more generally, see MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

Submission PH-60 Nathan Koller

PH-60-1 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-61 Bill Lingar

PH-61-1 CEQA does not require an analysis of safety in terms of crime, as it is not an environmental issue, and therefore the Draft EIR does not make any conclusions regarding this topic. Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

Submission PH-62 Kimberly Gillen

PH-62-1 Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, evaluates potential noise and vibration impacts, including noise impacts from wheel squeal. According to the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018), curves with a radius greater than 1,000 feet do not generate wheel squeal. As a result, the FTA recommends designing transit projects to avoid curves with radii of less than 1,000 feet to mitigate potential noise impacts. The Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, Trench Option, and the LPA do not include tight curves with radii less than 1,000 feet, which are the primary

cause of wheel squeal. Consequently, wheel squeal is not anticipated under these design conditions.

The Hawthorne Option includes two curves which could potentially produce wheel squeal. Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-5: Wheel Squeal Noise Monitoring would require noise monitoring to identify wheel squeal at two curves with a radius less than 1,000 feet for the Hawthorne Option:

> Curve between Santa Fe Avenue and Inglewood Avenue

> Curve between 161st Street and 163rd Street

If wheel squeal is identified, Metro shall install wayside rail lubrication to ensure wheel squeal does not occur.

PH-62-2 The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

PH-62-3 The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11 Utilities and Service System, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, the revisions do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that the impact related to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

In addition, as discussed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, the project design process would include thorough site geotechnical investigations to ensure the stability of nearby structures. Per Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, site-specific geotechnical investigations would be conducted to address foundation and structural safety. The investigation would include engineering and construction recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

Submission PH-63 Aram Chaparyam

PH-63-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignments is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

PH-63-2 Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project.

Submission PH-64 Robin Willinis

PH-64-1 The Metro Board has not committed to approving the project. The Metro Board has selected an LPA for purposes of the Final EIR, although it has not yet approved the project,

including any of the options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. A final decision will not be made until after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which includes responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter. The Metro Board may select the No Build Alternative. The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission PH-65 Michael Kim

PH-65-1 Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

PH-65-2 The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. The LPA, Trench Option and Hawthorne Option would fully grade separate the light rail from all roadways, thereby avoiding potential light rail conflicts with school-age pedestrians and cyclists. The freight track would remain at-grade, but the project would include new pedestrian safety infrastructure, such as gates, which would improve safety compared to existing conditions, where no pedestrian safety infrastructure exists. The presence of a station could also benefit access to schools for residents, parents, and caretakers. Both the LPA and Trench Option would grade separate light rail at 170th Street, which could eliminate conflicts between light rail trains, vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists and eliminate the need for audible warning sounds to reduce noise to less than significant with mitigation.

PH-65-3 As described in Section 3.8, Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources, of the Draft EIR, the project would be designed to accommodate high seismic ground motion and associated consequences in accordance with Metro's geotechnical design standards and thresholds, per Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards. Site-specific geotechnical investigations would be performed in accordance with the Metro Rail Design Criteria Section 5.6 to incorporate seismic demands and provide engineering solutions. The project would comply with the latest versions of local and state building codes and regulations. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission PH-66 Ted Hofmann

PH-66-1 The comment does not raise significant environmental issues or otherwise address the adequacy of the Draft EIR and is noted for the record. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

PH-66-2 The properties mentioned by the commenter relate to the Hawthorne Option, where an overhead (aerial) easement would be needed for the elevated light rail structure to cross over the owner's property. Metro has designed the project to avoid displacement of residents. The maps referenced are from the 2023 Real Estate Acquisitions Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR.

PH-66-3 As indicated by the commenter, Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR assesses a No Project Alternative and a High-Frequency Bus Alternative.

PH-66-4 CEQA requires that an EIR identify the Environmentally Superior Alternative and discuss the facts that support that selection. However, the Lead Agency is not obligated to select the Environmentally Superior Alternative for implementation if it would not accomplish the basic project objectives.

Submission PH-67 James Eckland

PH-67-1 As shown in Appendix 2-A, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings, of the Draft EIR, there would be walkways along the elevated guideway for maintenance of the Hawthorne Option.

PH-67-2 Metro's projects are all designed to National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) and California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) requirements that cover fire/life safety. Metro has emergency response plans and safety policies and procedures to address incidents that may occur during operation. In the event of an emergency, passengers would be able to exit the train and leave the light rail guideway via walkways. Additionally, communication systems would be integrated into the project equipment to communicate with emergency providers during incidents.

PH-67-3 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignments is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-68 George Gillen

PH-68-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignments is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. All light rail and freight tracks are designed according to Metro's design criteria with appropriate clearances, which includes space for maintenance. See Appendix 2-A, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings of the Draft EIR and Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative, for more details on the relocated freight and light rail tracks. Potential hazard impacts were analyzed in Section 3.9-4, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR, and Section 4.13 of this Final EIR and determined to be less than significant. Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

PH-68-2 The commenter's support for a bus system is noted. Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR includes an analysis of a High-Frequency Bus Alternative. For more information regarding the concerns raised in the comment, see MR-1: Selection of Alternatives, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety, MR-12: Emergency Access, and MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

Submission PH-69 Patti Giglio

PH-69-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignments is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro has not conducted an economic impact study for the project. Under CEQA, potential economic effects such as reductions in property values or loss of property tax revenues would not constitute an effect to the physical environment. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses. Additionally, Metro's goal is to help businesses continue to thrive throughout and following construction. Metro has developed programs to provide financial assistance to small businesses along transit corridor construction project through the Business Interruption Fund and marketing support through the Eat Shop Play program. More information about these programs is available on the Metro website at https://www.metro.net/about/business-interruption-fund/ and https://eat-shop-play-lametro.hub.arcgis.com/.

Submission PH-70 Bettina Osten

PH-70-1 Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. Vibration is discussed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The analysis considers both the light rail train and relocated freight tracks. See MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds.

Submission PH-71 Milan Matsumoto

PH-71-1 The commenter's support for the project and preference for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-72 Robert Acherman

PH-72-1 The C Line Extension would operate as the K Line and connect to the LAX/Metro Transit Station, which serves LAX. The K Line operates as a north-south line between the South Bay and the Metro E Line and the C Line operates east-west between LAX and Norwalk. Both lines provide a direct connection to LAX.

PH-72-2 The commenter's concerns are noted. Cost effectiveness is one of the project objectives and has been and will continue to be taken into consideration by the Metro Board with respect to this project. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

PH-72-3 Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR evaluates the potential noise and vibration impacts of the project and identifies mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to the extent feasible. The Metro Board selected the LPA for the purposes of the Final EIR. The LPA and Trench Option significantly reduce noise impacts along the Metro ROW compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because they eliminate the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA, Trench Option and Hawthorne Option avoid the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine light rail train horns and crossing bells. Operational noise impacts of the LPA,

Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would be less than significant with mitigation. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-10: Changes to Community Character. Metro's general contact information is included at this website: https://www.metro.net/about/contacts/. Metro Customer relations handles complaints and feedback.

Submission PH-73 Thomas Dorsey

PH-73-1 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 PH-74 Kyle Brubaker

PH-74-1 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

Submission PH-75 Massima Darom

PH-75-1 Metro has considered multiple alignment options, starting with the 2009 Alternatives Analysis, which identified the C Line extension to Torrance within the Metro ROW as a priority project. Alignments to other destinations were considered and eliminated in past studies because they did not provide ridership benefits or achieve the project objectives. The project would connect the two new city transit centers in Redondo Beach and Torrance to the Metro rail network. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

PH-75-2 The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

PH-75-3 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Noise is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. It should also be noted that, with mitigation, the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would not result in significant operational noise impacts.

Submission PH-76 Paul Miller

PH-76-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignments and opposition to the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Air quality is addressed in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. Traffic congestion and delays (often measured by Level of Service) are not considered significant environmental impacts under CEQA, but Metro prepared a 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, providing additional information on potential changes in traffic patterns and impacts not required by CEQA, but for the public's information. See also MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service.

Submission PH-77 Michelle Bonnee

PH-77-1 The commenter's opposition to the Hawthorne Option and concerns for cost are 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 PH-78 Monica Sweet

PH-78-1 The commenter's support for the Trench Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

PH-78-2 The Metro Board has selected an LPA for purposes of the Final EIR, although it has not yet approved the project, including any of the options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. A final decision will not be made until after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which will include responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter.

Submission PH-79 Kim Turner

PH-79-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignments is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

PH-79-2 The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR, or otherwise raise significant environmental issues, and is noted for the record. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

PH-79-3 See response to PH-79-1.

Submission PH-80 Holly Osborne

PH-80-1 Cost estimates are not part of the Draft EIR but were prepared in 2022 and published in 2023 alongside the Draft EIR for public information and Metro Board consideration. The costs estimates for all light rail alternatives considered in the Draft EIR as estimated in 2022 are as follows: Elevated/At-Grade Alignment ($1.96B), Trench Option ($2.84B), Hawthorne Option ($2.96B), and the LPA ($2.23B). These costs were considered by the Metro Board in the May 2024 Board meeting prior to selecting the LPA, and would continue to be a major consideration. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule. Metro has published refined cost estimates concurrent with the release of the Final EIR.

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

Submission PH-81 Ray Hollar

PH-81-1 CEQA does not require funding to be demonstrated in a Draft EIR. However, the May 2024 Board Report, available to the public prior to the Metro Board meeting and reviewed by the Metro Board prior to selecting an LPA, included estimates of how much funding could be expected from identified funding sources, shortfalls, and potential additional sources. 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, 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.

PH-81-2 The commenter's statement about rental businesses is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

PH-81-3 It is unclear how the commenter derived their cost per rider figure. The May 2024 Board Report, available to the public prior to the Metro Board meeting and reviewed by the Metro Board prior to selecting an LPA, included cost/benefit information on cost per annual new rider, cost per all annual trips, and cost per reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). In all instances the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment performed the best on this metric of the light rail alignments. The LPA performed second best on cost per annual new rider and cost per reduction in VMT. The Hawthorne Option performed second best in cost per annual trips and worse than the Trench Option in cost per reduction in VMT.

After the close of the Draft EIR comment period, Metro continued to coordinate with the commenter on questions related to cost, including an email sent on April 22, 2024. In the additional correspondence, Metro provided more information regarding cost estimate assumptions.

Submission PH-82 Ted Hofmann

PH-82-1 The commenter's support for the No Project Alternative or the High Frequency Bus Alternative is noted. CEQA requires that an EIR identify the Environmentally Superior Alternative. However, the Lead Agency is not obligated to select the Environmentally Superior Alternative for implementation if it is infeasible. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The Metro Board has selected an LPA for the purposes of the Final EIR. A final decision will not be made until after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which will include responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter.

Submission PH-83 John Schreiber

PH-83-1 Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, evaluates baseline conditions of the existing Metro ROW as an active railroad corridor. This includes not only the current freight train operations, but also the visual characteristics inherent to a railroad corridor, such as railroad tracks and associated infrastructure. In addition, as stated on page 3.3-54 of the Draft EIR, views of the mountains and other landmarks the commenter mentioned are located relatively long distances from the Metro ROW in Lawndale, which makes any possible views of them quite distant. For example, the Hollywood Sign is located approximately 17 miles north/northeast of the Metro ROW in Lawndale. Nonetheless, those distant views would remain available from public streets and sidewalks, even with the addition of project elements such as soundwalls and elevated structure. The implementation of the project would not fundamentally change the use of the Metro ROW as a transportation corridor. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission PH-84 Don Szerlip

PH-84-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment to directly connect to the Redondo Beach Transit Center is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-85 Jennifer Dodge

PH-85-1 Metro has been exploring options for transit service along the Metro ROW for several decades. Metro purchased the Harbor Subdivision from the precursor to the BNSF in the early 1990s with plans to provide passenger rail service to the South Bay. In 2009, Metro prepared an alternatives analysis that studied the potential for transit service along all, or portions of the Metro ROW and identified the segment between the Redondo Beach (Marine) Station and the Torrance Transit Center as the highest priority project. Since then, several alignments and alternatives have been studied. The project is designed to fit within the Metro ROW. Metro completed a property boundary survey in 2025, the results of which are reflected in the Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative. Chapter 3, Environmental Impact Analyses, of the Draft EIR, analyzes not only the potential impacts of light rail, but impacts associated with modifications to freight tracks as well as their simultaneous operation. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission PH-86 Kimberly Gillen

PH-86-1 The project is designed to fit within the Metro ROW. See Appendix 2-A, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings, of the Draft EIR, Select Advance Conceptual Engineering Drawings, and Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

The Draft EIR, Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials and Section 3.11, Utilities and Service Systems, account for the presence of underground utilities. As described in Project Feature PF-US-1: Utility Identification and Coordination, Metro and its contractors would coordinate with utility providers to implement required safety measures during design and construction. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety. Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration of the Draft EIR analyze impacts related to noise and vibration.

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

PH-86-2 See response to Comment 86-1. See also MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks.

Submission PH-87 Erik Ore

PH-87-1 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 PH-88 Kimberly Gillen

PH-88-1 The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

PH-88-2 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

PH-88-3 Urbanized avian species, including resident birds of prey such as red-tailed hawks, great-horned owls, and barn owls, are protected under the Migratory Birds Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code. As discussed in Section 3.7, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR, these species have potential to occur within the RSA, which provides suitable breeding and foraging habitat in the form of trees, vegetation, and man-made structures (see page 3.7-22 of the Draft EIR). The Draft EIR acknowledges that construction activities could temporarily disturb these habitats. To address this, Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-2: Nesting Bird Season Restrictions and Pre-Construction Surveys establishes protections for nesting birds, including seasonal restrictions and pre-construction surveys to identify active nests. Given the existing anthropogenic disturbance (e.g., vehicular traffic, train traffic, human presence) throughout the RSA, these measures are anticipated to mitigate potential impacts on local avian species to less than significant. The project does not propose any permanent changes that would preclude birds from returning to the area after construction is completed. Moreover, birds and terrestrial species in the RSA are adapted to living in an urban environment, and operational impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

PH-88-4 Regarding potential for derailments, see MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. Metro is aware of the Friendship Campus, which is currently under construction. The property fronts Inglewood Avenue and is approximately 550 feet from the Metro ROW at the nearest boundary. The presence of the under-construction Friendship Campus within a quarter-mile of the Metro ROW is acknowledged in Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR. As discussed in Section 3.9-4.3 of the Draft EIR, although proposed construction activities would occur within a quarter-mile of several existing schools, the project includes Project Feature PF-HHM-2: Demolition Plans, which requires demolition plans detailing the procedures for handling ACMs, LBP, PCB, TWW, and universal waste in accordance with federal and state regulations. The project feature also includes provisions for the handling and transport of contaminated soil in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 116. Additionally, the project includes Project Feature PF-AQ-1: Metro Green Construction Policy Compliance, which would require construction activities to comply with the provisions of the Metro Green Construction Policy related to emissions and fugitive dust control. Furthermore, the project includes Project Feature PF-HHM-1: Handling, Storage, and Transport of Hazardous Materials and Wastes, which requires preparation of plans detailing BMPs for hazardous

materials transport, storage, and use, as well as BMPs for cleanup should releases occur. The Friendship Campus does not alter this conclusion.

Submission PH-89 David Zappacosta

PH-89-1 Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR evaluates vibration impacts to sensitive uses along the proposed alignments, including both vibration annoyance and potential for structural damage during construction. The Draft EIR concludes that construction of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in one significant and unavoidable vibration damage impact near Grant Avenue, where reconstruction of the freight bridge would require equipment such as an impact pile driver. For all other areas of the corridor, construction methods would generate lower vibration levels, and with implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-VIB-1: Vibration Control Plan and MM-VIB-2: Construction Equipment Location, damage-related vibration impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

The Trench Option, Hawthorne Option, and LPA would not require reconstruction of the Grant Avenue freight bridge and therefore would not result in significant construction vibration damage impacts with mitigation. For more information on vibration damage and annoyance, see MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Thresholds.

The LPA would also avoid relocating the freight track closer to the Breakwater Village Condominiums; this is one of the reasons it was selected as the LPA.

For additional information on structural concerns, see MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

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

The Metro Board selected an LPA for the purposes of the Final EIR, but has not approved the project. The Board will make that decision after reviewing the Final EIR, which includes analysis of potential impacts and public input.

PH-89-2 Noise and vibration are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of Draft EIR. The analysis follows the Federal Transit Administration Transit Noise and Vibration Assessment Manual to evaluate both construction and operational noise impacts, including potential impacts on nearby residences.

The Draft EIR discloses that construction activities may cause temporary noise impacts in exceedance of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) noise criteria. To address these impacts, Mitigation Measures such as MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan and MM-VIB-1: Vibration Control Plan would be implemented to minimize construction noise and vibration to the extent feasible. These plans include measures such as the use of quieter equipment, noise barriers, and monitoring to ensure compliance with the FTA construction noise and vibration criteria to the maximum extent feasible.

The comment references noise levels of 76 and 94 decibels as "punitive" to those living along the Metro ROW. However, it is unclear to which specific noise levels the commenter is referring. Construction noise levels would not be continuous. Regarding operational noise impacts, the Draft EIR assesses those impacts by calculating the total noise exposure at sensitive receptors, which combines the existing noise exposure with the incremental noise caused by the project. The FTA criteria, as shown in Table 3.6-3 and Figure 3.6-2 of the Draft EIR, determine the thresholds for moderate and severe impacts based on existing conditions at each cluster of properties. For example, if the existing noise level at a residence is 50 a-weighted decibels (dBA (L_{dn})), the severe impact threshold would be noise levels above 59 dBA (L_{dn}). These thresholds ensure that noise impacts remain within acceptable levels relative to the existing conditions of the area.

It should also be noted that the frequency of trains has been factored into the analysis, consistent with the FTA guidance. The operational noise impacts for the Metro ROW alignments would be less than significant with mitigation.

See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds, and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

PH-89-3 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignments is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-90 Kevin Mitchell

PH-90-1 See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety; MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety; and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

PH-90-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-91 Niki Negrete-Mitchell

PH-91-1 As discussed in Section 3.8-2.3 of the Draft EIR, the Resource Study Areas (RSAs) for geology, soils, and paleontological resources are the footprints of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option. The footprints are defined as the areas necessary to construct, operate, and maintain the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Options. The footprints evaluated by the Draft EIR are consistent in soil composition and geologic characteristics with those found throughout Los Angeles County.

According to the utility owner, the sinkhole referenced by the commenter was the result of a broken irrigation line in a residential flower bed and was a localized issue that has since been repaired. Although Metro cannot independently confirm the exact cause, available information suggests it was unrelated to underlying geologic conditions, which differ significantly from the construction methods planned for the project. Drilling operations, especially those involving extraction, could alter subsurface pressure and create voids, increasing the risk of subsidence and sinkholes. In contrast, Metro's construction, including the proposed trenching, would involve controlled excavation with no substantial extraction

of subsurface materials that could destabilize soil layers. In Section 4.3 of Chapter 4, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, the following language has been added to the Project Description regarding construction: "Any existing sinkholes shall be examined by the geotechnical engineer of record prior to construction to inform specific steps needed for unique site conditions." The addition provides further clarity that sinkholes, as well as immediately adjacent features such as existing retaining walls, would be examined as part of site-specific soil investigations, but does not change the conclusions of the Draft EIR. See also MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

With respect to underground utilities, including the high-pressure gas lines, see MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety.

With respect to the risk of freight derailment, see MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

With respect to the relocation of the existing freight, see MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks.

PH-91-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to using the Metro ROW alignments is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-92 Candice Nafissi

PH-92-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to using the Metro ROW is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. The Metro Board selected the Hybrid Alternative as the LPA. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

The Draft EIR analyzes noise impacts and air quality impacts in Sections 3.6, Noise and Vibration, and 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, respectively. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality. It should also be noted that, with mitigation, the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option would not result in significant operational noise impacts. With respect to the commenter's assertion that the project would generate noise that "exacerbates Redondo Beach's noise ordinance," see responses to Comments 130-5 and 130-15.

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

Submission PH-93 Michelle Lopez

PH-93-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. Metro understands the commenter's concerns regarding property values and crime. However, social and economic impacts are not considered environmental impacts under CEQA. The Draft EIR focuses on physical

environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses. Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security. Metro Homeless Outreach Teams are deployed on Metro buses, trains, and stations to engage with unhoused riders and connect them to resources. See MR-18: Homelessness.

PH-93-2 See response to Comment 93-1. Metro has not conducted an economic impact study for the project at this time.

Submission PH-94 Cindy Lederman

PH-94-1 Metro has undertaken extensive community outreach for potential transit service along all or portions of the Metro ROW for well over a decade. Metro's outreach program also accommodates the needs of residents with limited English proficiency. Most recently, in advance of the Metro Board of Director's selection of the LPA in May 2024, Metro distributed 32,000 postcards to residents, property owners, and businesses within a one-mile radius of all alignments under study. Additionally, at the request of the City of Lawndale, Metro sent flyers to every resident within Lawndale. All outreach notifications are provided in both English and Spanish. Documentation on the outreach conducted during the environmental review process is available on the Metro project Dropbox, by visiting metro.net/clineext/#documents.

Metro prepared cost estimates for the alignments in 2022, which included the cost of the length of the tracks as well as excavation. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule. While CEQA does not require an EIR to include project cost information, Metro provided this information to support public understanding of the project alternatives and to inform the Metro Board's selection of the LPA. The costs as estimated in 2022 are as follows: Elevated/At-Grade Alignment ($1.96B), Trench Option ($2.84B), Hawthorne Option ($2.96B), and the LPA ($2.23B). Metro has released refined cost estimates in 2025 dollars, concurrent with the Final EIR.

PH-94-2 The Draft EIR identifies all significant and unavoidable impacts in Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Impact Analyses, of the Draft EIR. The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission PH-95 Lucas Love

PH-95-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to the Metro ROW alignments is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

The Draft EIR analyzed the project's noise impacts in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. It should also be noted that, with mitigation, the LPA would not result in significant operational noise impacts.

Potential impacts related to hazardous materials were analyzed in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR, and determined to be less than significant. MR-7:

Utilities Relocation and Hazardous Materials. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses, for additional information.

Submission PH-96 Mike Garlan

PH-96-1 Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, provides a thorough analysis of the project's potential noise and vibration impacts and identifies mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts to the maximum extent feasible. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

PH-96-2 The potential for aesthetics impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and the Trench Option are addressed in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. The potential for aesthetics impacts for the LPA is addressed Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. None of the Metro ROW alignments would result in temporary or permanent significant aesthetic impacts. The analysis in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, does not assign value judgments to neighborhoods or communities. Instead, every effort was made to be objective in the descriptions of the existing visual conditions. The analysis considers the characteristics of the area, including existing infrastructure, land use, and visual features, to determine whether the project would result in a significant aesthetic impact. The descriptions in the Draft EIR are intended to provide factual context for the analysis and do not reflect Metro's value or perception of the community. Metro values the input of residents and works to ensure that projects enhance neighborhoods and meet the needs of local communities.

See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

PH-96-3 The commenter's support for the No Project Alternative and secondary preference for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-97 Colleen Villegas

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

PH-97-2 Vibration is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. With mitigation, the project would not result in significant operational vibration impacts. See MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds.

PH-97-3 Metro is not aware of any study linking noise from Metro transit to increased health effects. See response to Comment PH-97-1 and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

Submission PH-98 Michael Kim

PH-98-1 The Draft EIR analyzes the potential impacts of each project option in Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Impact Analyses, of the Draft EIR. The impacts of each option are summarized in the Executive Summary of the Draft EIR.

This comment does not identify any specific impacts that lack detail. The conclusions of the Draft EIR are based on technical studies, modeling, and data prepared by qualified experts. Its assumptions and analyses are documented in the report and its technical appendices for public review. If there are specific aspects of the analysis that the commenter believes require clarification or revision, the commenter is encouraged to provide further details so that Metro may address them.

PH-98-2 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 and the California Public Utilities Code) 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.

PH-98-3 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission PH-99 Paige Kaluderovic

PH-99-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

PH-99-2 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

PH-99-3 As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, soundwalls would be implemented to mitigate noise generated by the light rail and to some extent, noise generated by the freight trains as required by Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls. However, two of the primary sources of freight noise are the diesel engines and the horn; soundwalls are less effective at mitigating these due to the height of the engines and horn as well as the decibel level of the horn. Other measures would be implemented to reduce freight noise.

Project Feature PF-NV-1: Quiet Zone Equipment Installation ensures that the project would be quiet zone ready and freight noise is anticipated to be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment. Per Project Feature PF-NV-1: Quiet Zone Equipment Installation, the eight at-grade freight crossings between Inglewood Ave and 182nd Street have been designed and would be constructed to include all Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) required Supplemental Safety Measures and associated improvements and equipment that are needed to qualify for Automatic FRA Approval to establish a quiet zone. Crossing signal bells would also be set to the minimum noise level of

75 a-weighted decibel (dBA) at 10 feet per American Railway and Engineering and Maintenance of Way requirements.

Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment would require Metro to cooperate with the City of Lawndale, City of Redondo Beach, and City of Torrance to establish a quiet zone(s) from north of Inglewood Avenue to south of 182nd Street. The quiet zone is anticipated to reduce freight noise overall along the Metro ROW by eliminating one of the primary sources of noise from freight trains, the horn, which produces a noise level of 110 dBA. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

PH-99-4 While Metro is not responsible for freight operations, the EIR includes mitigation measures to address potential impacts from the freight relocation that occur as part of this project. See response to Comment PH-99-3.

Submission PH-100 Jill Love

PH-100-1 Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 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 pedestrians and cyclists. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

PH-100-2 See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for detailed discussions of how construction and operation in the corridor would be managed in the consideration of local soils conditions, including preventing potential impacts to underground utilities, including with respect to groundborne-vibration during construction and operations of the project.

With respect to potential impacts associated with views of the retaining walls, the Draft EIR includes a detailed evaluation of potential visual changes. This assessment uses the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) methodology for evaluating visual quality, based on three criteria: vividness (the memorability of the landscape), intactness (the extent to which the landscape is free from visual intrusions), and unity (the coherence and harmony of the landscape). As described in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, the project area is already highly urbanized, with a mix of residential, industrial, and commercial land uses, as well as the existing freight rail corridor. There are no designated scenic vistas or notable natural landscapes within the project's vicinity. As required by Project Feature PF-AES-1: Local Zoning Ordinances, the proposed retaining walls would be developed consistently with Metro's Design Criteria. The addition of these retaining walls would not substantially degrade the visual character of the environment, which, as noted is generally low under all three of FHWA criteria. In many cases, the retaining walls would be screened by fencing, landscaping, or adjacent structures. The addition of retaining walls and other project elements would be considered neutral and would not result in significant aesthetic impacts.

Regarding potential impacts related to flooding as a result of the retaining walls, the project would include a Low-Impact Development (LID) drainage system designed to retain most

stormwater runoff within the project footprint. This system would meet the stormwater quality design volume requirements under the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit established by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB), thereby minimizing flooding on-site and off-site, including in sumps, per Project Feature PF-HWQ-6: Low Impact Development (LID) BMPs per Regional Requirements. Additional runoff from the project would continue to be collected by storm drain facilities. Discharge locations of underdrains installed along the alignment would be the same as existing discharge locations. The retainment of the majority of stormwater runoff within the project footprint and preservation of existing discharge locations reduces the potential for erosion and sedimentation to occur on or off site. Thus, the addition of impervious surfaces would not result in substantial erosion or siltation, and this impact would be less than significant. For the Trench Option, storm water management would be addressed through Project Feature PF-HWQ-7: Trench Operation Runoff Collection and Treatment, which provides for proper collection, treatment, and rerouting of excess runoff, which would prevent flooding, reduce strain on sump pumps and help maintain natural water absorption.

None of the alignment options have potential to cause vibration-related structural damage during operations (see Draft EIR page 3.6-92). During construction, with mitigation, only the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment would result in a potentially significant and unavoidable vibration-related damage impact (see Draft EIR, Sections 3.6-4.3, 4.5-3.6.3, and 4.5-3.6.4). See MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds, and MR-6: Vibration Analysis During Final Design for additional information.

PH-100-3 The potential for noise impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds, MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures, and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

PH-100-4 As explained on page 3.1-3 of the Draft EIR, traffic delay (often measured by level of service) is no longer permissible as a CEQA impact criterion and therefore this analysis and related topics are not addressed in the Draft EIR. See MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service and the 2023 Transportation Detail Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, for a discussion of traffic conditions. As described in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan requires contractors to develop a construction management traffic plan. Metro and its contractors would coordinate with emergency providers, schools, local businesses, residents and 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. See MR-12: Emergency Access. The Metro Board has selected an LPA for the purpose of the Final EIR, which, like the Trench Option, would fully grade separate the light rail at 182nd Street and therefore have no effect on emergency vehicles along 182nd Street.

PH-100-5 While change in community character does not constitute a significant impact under CEQA, Section 3.2, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, analyzes the project's consistency or support with the many goals and policies of the jurisdictions along the corridor and finds less than significant impacts. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission PH-101 Jerome Chang

PH 101-1 Washington Elementary School and Adams Middle school are both located approximately 1,200 feet from the Metro ROW. Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, analyzes air quality impacts to sensitive receptors, including schools within the study area. As described in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, the Metro ROW alignments and the LPA would not generate localized emissions that exceed regional air quality standards; therefore, localized air quality impacts to schools would be less than significant.

Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, analyzes construction-related noise impacts to sensitive uses using a screening distance of 500 feet. Because the schools are located approximately 1,200 feet from the ROW, they are outside of this screening distance. At this distance, typical construction noise would be less than 65 a-weighted decibels (dBA), not accounting for additional noise reduction provided by intervening structures. For the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, pile driving activity at the Grant Avenue freight bridge would result in an hourly equivalent sound level (Leq) of approximately 67 dBA at the schools. The LPA, Trench Option and Hawthorne Option would not involve constructing a new freight bridge at Grant Avenue.

These estimated noise levels would not exceed the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) daytime construction noise impact criteria of 90 dBA 1-hour Leq. Noise contours for typical construction activities and for pile driving near Washington Elementary School and Adams Middle School are shown in Figure 3.6-13 (page 3.6-27) and Figure 3.6-19 (page 3.6-45) of the Draft EIR, respectively. As shown, neither school is located within the construction noise contours. Mitigation Measure NOI-1 (Noise Control Plan) would be implemented to control noise during construction. The Noise Control Plan would include noise reducing measures to reduce construction noise and noise monitoring to ensure compliance with the FTA noise criteria to the maximum extent feasible.

PH-101-2 See response to Comment PH-101-1. Regarding the potential for concurrent construction activities with other nearby construction projects, Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail construction activities. As described in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan, Metro would require contractors to develop a detailed construction traffic management plan (CTMP) prior to the start of localized construction activities. The CTMP would require Metro and its contractors to coordinate with emergency providers, schools, and relevant jurisdictions. Among other things, the plan would address how to maintain access to schools, ensure pedestrian and cyclist safety, and coordinate with emergency service providers to preserve emergency access. The CTMP may also include measures such as limiting construction hours, scheduling material deliveries during off-peak hours, providing off-site truck staging. The plan would also be updated as needed to reflect changing conditions, such as the presence of other active construction in the area, to minimize disruptions and ensure effectiveness. Metro would work closely with the local jurisdictions to reduce impacts and maintain safe, navigable conditions for pedestrians, vehicles, and school operations throughout the construction period.

PH-101-3 The commenter's support for a rapid bus line on Hawthorne Boulevard is noted. A High-Frequency Bus Alternative is analyzed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-102 Ted Hoffmann

PH-102-1 The freight train estimates included in the Draft EIR are based on actual operations data collected through field monitoring and coordination with the BNSF.

PH-102-2 As currently designed, the Hawthorne Option would include an elevated structure that would span over a portion of the property identified by the commenter. However, based on the current engineering plans, the project would not require permanent acquisition of the home, but rather an overhead (aerial) easement to cross over a portion of the property. If the Metro Board selects the Hawthorne Option for implementation, Metro would coordinate with potentially affected property owners as needed.

Submission PH-103 Bob Pinzlon

PH-103-1 Several routes were examined as part of previous phases and studies of the project, but were eliminated from further consideration, as described in the 2023 Alternatives Considered and Eliminated Report, published alongside the Draft EIR See Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

The commenter's support for Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. While change in community character does not constitute a significant impact under CEQA, Section 3.2, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, analyzes the project's consistency or support with the many goals and policies of the jurisdictions along the corridor and finds less than significant impacts. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission PH-104 Julie Iffland

PH-104-1 Metro has been exploring options for transit service along the Metro ROW for several decades. Metro purchased the Harbor Subdivision from the precursor to the BNSF in the early 1990s. In 2009, Metro prepared an alternatives analysis that studied the potential for transit service along all or portions of the Metro ROW and identified the segment between the Redondo Beach (Marine) Station and the Torrance Transit Center as the highest priority project. Since then, several alignments and alternatives have been studied. The 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis report recommended two alignments to be carried forward into environmental analysis: the Metro ROW and the Hawthorne Boulevard alignment (both primarily at-grade alignments).

PH-104-2 Metro is committed to integrating safety into all Metro rail operations. The project would comply with relevant safety standards, including the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and Metro's Grade Crossing Safety Policy. 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

freight track would remain at-grade, but the project would include new pedestrian safety infrastructure, such as gates, which would improve safety compared to existing conditions, where no pedestrian safety infrastructure exists. The presence of a station could also benefit access to schools for residents and parents. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

PH-104-3 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment, and at-grade options in particular, is noted. The only alignment option with at-grade light rail under consideration is the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. As a point of clarification, light rail transit has not been studied by Metro within the City of Manhattan Beach.

Submission PH-105 John Hough

PH-105-1 This comment is noted. The Los Angeles County Transportation Commission, Metro's predecessor, purchased the Harbor Subdivision in the early 1990s from the predecessor of the BNSF Railway, prior to the opening of the Alameda Corridor. The 2009 Harbor Subdivision Alternatives Analysis Study analyzed existing and future transportation conditions and studied many transit alternatives along the 26-mile Metro ROW between Downtown Los Angeles, and the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. The Alternatives Analysis Study recommended a Phased Implementation Strategy that identified a Metro Light Rail extension from Redondo Beach to Torrance as the highest priority for implementation. This 2009 study considered Hawthorne Boulevard as a potential route for this extension. Based on community input, the Trench Option was studied through Lawndale in the Draft EIR.

Submission PH-106 G.P. Sudduth

PH-106-1 Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses. Also see MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

PH-106-2 Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, evaluates potential noise impacts, including those from wheel squeal. According to the Federal Transit Administration's Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018), curves with a radius greater than 1,000 feet do not generate wheel squeal. As a result, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) recommends designing transit projects to avoid tight curves with radii of less than 1,000 feet to mitigate potential noise impacts. The Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, Trench Option, and the LPA do not include curves with radii less than 1,000 feet, which are the primary cause of wheel squeal. Consequently, wheel squeal is not anticipated under these design conditions.

The Hawthorne Option includes two curves which could potentially produce wheel squeal. Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-5: Wheel Squeal Noise Monitoring would require noise

monitoring to identify wheel squeal at two curves with a radius less than 1,000 feet for the Hawthorne Option:

> Curve between Santa Fe Avenue and Inglewood Avenue

> Curve between 161st Street and 163rd Street

If wheel squeal is identified, Metro shall install wayside rail lubrication to ensure wheel squeal does not occur. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Submission PH-107 Niki Negrete-Mitchell

PH-107-1 The commenter's concern about construction impacts is noted. As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration of the Draft EIR, a Noise Control Plan (Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan) would be implemented to minimize noise levels to below the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) construction noise criteria to the maximum extent feasible. Construction-related activities would proceed in phases, limiting the duration of any impacts at a given location. With respect to construction vibration impacts, Mitigation Measures MM-VIB-1: Vibration Control Plan; MM-VIB-2: Construction Equipment Location; and MM-VIB-3: Pre- and Post-Construction Surveys would be implemented to minimize vibration near sensitive receptors. Metro closely engages with neighborhoods during construction, there would be a designated construction manager that could be contacted to report any construction related concerns. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

PH-107-2 Urbanized avian species, including resident birds of prey such as red-tailed hawks and great-horned owls, are protected under the Migratory Birds Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code (CFGC). As discussed in Section 3.7, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR, species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code (CFGC) have potential to occur within the Resource Study Area (RSA). This includes resident birds of prey, such as red-tailed hawks and great-horned owls. As stated on page 3.7-22 of the Draft EIR, portions of the RSA, such as El Nido Park, provide urbanized avian species with both suitable breeding and foraging habitat in the form of trees, vegetation, and man-made structures. The Draft EIR acknowledges that construction activities could temporarily disturb these habitats. To address this, Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-2: Nesting Bird Season Restrictions and Pre-Construction Surveys establishes protections for nesting birds, including seasonal restrictions and pre-construction surveys to identify active nests. Given the existing anthropogenic disturbance (e.g., vehicular traffic, train traffic, human presence) throughout the RSA, these measures are anticipated to mitigate potential impacts on local avian species to less than significant. The project does not propose any permanent changes that would preclude birds from returning to the area after construction is completed.

See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission PH-108 Holly Osborne

PH-108-1 The noise analysis in the Draft EIR follows the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018), which specifies the use of 24-hour time-averaged noise levels to assess the ambient noise environment. These levels capture all sound sources, including the occasional freight train pass-by, as part of the existing baseline. The analysis also incorporates a 10-dBA (a-weighted decibel) penalty for all sound occurring during the nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) to account for increased sensitivity to noise during these hours. The effect of the penalty is that in the calculation of 24-hour noise, any event that occurs during the nighttime hours, is equivalent to 10 of the same events during the daytime hours. This ensures the assessment reflects the potential for greater disturbance from nighttime noise events. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds.

Although noise from freight trains is loud and increases the 24-hour average noise levels, its infrequent occurrence during the day means that it does not dominate or skew the overall noise profile. Excluding the freight noise from the existing ambient noise conditions would not comply with FTA methodology and would misrepresent the true ambient noise environment. The 24-hour noise measurements include both periods when the freight is not operating and periods when freight is operating.

Submission PH-109 Lara Duke

PH-109-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The Draft EIR analyzed biological impacts in Section 3.7, Biological Resources, and concluded that impacts would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

PH-109-2 Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, includes a comprehensive analysis of the potential noise and vibration impacts of the proposed light rail and freight train operations. Mitigation measures, including MM-NOI-2: Soundwalls, MM-NOI-3: Low Impact Frogs, and MM-NOI-4: Quiet Zone Establishment are designed to reduce noise levels to less than significant for most sensitive receptors. Additionally, the Metro Board selected the LPA for purposes of the Final EIR. The LPA and Trench Option significantly reduce noise impacts compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment because they eliminate the at-grade crossings at 170th and 182nd Streets. By grade separating the light rail from all roadways, the LPA, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option remove the need for audible warning at light rail crossings, such as routine light rail train horns and crossing bells.

PH-109-3 Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

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 PH-110 Jan Kurth

PH-110-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. See Section 2.4-1 of the Draft EIR for more information on methods anticipated for retaining wall construction. Also see MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

PH-110-2 The commenter's support for the No Project Alternative, the High-Frequency Bus Alternative, or high-speed buses is noted. The commenter also reiterates support for the Hawthorne Option and opposition to Metro ROW alignment. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission PH-111 Shelby Michael

PH-111-1 The commenter's support for the project with a preference for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. 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 PH-112 Kimberly

PH-112-1 CEQA does not require an analysis of safety in terms of crime, as it is not an environmental issue, and therefore the Draft EIR does not make any conclusions regarding this topic. Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

PH-112-2 The commenter's concern about construction impacts is noted. As part of Metro's standard construction management practices, contractors are required to maintain clean and safe work zones, including regular site inspections and debris removal to minimize impacts to the surrounding community. Metro closely engages with neighborhoods during construction, there would be a designated construction manager that could be contacted to report any construction related concerns.

PH-112-3 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety and MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission PH-113 Holly Osborne

PH-113-1 Project-related noise was estimated using methodologies provided in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018). The FTA Manual includes screening guidance for distances at which rail transit noise would not

significantly impact land uses. The screening distance for sensitive land uses is 175 feet for obstructed uses and 350 feet for unobstructed uses. The park facilities of William Green Park in Lawndale are approximately 350 feet from the Metro ROW and classrooms are located approximately 0.13 mile (686 feet) from the Metro ROW. William Green Elementary School would not be exposed to excessive noise.

PH-113-2 Metro has undertaken extensive community outreach for potential transit service along all or portions of the Metro ROW for well over a decade. Metro's outreach program also accommodates the needs of residents with limited English proficiency. Most recently, in advance of the Metro Board of Director's selection of the LPA in May 2024, Metro distributed 32,000 postcards to residents, property owners, and businesses within a one-mile radius of all alignments under study. Additionally, at the request of the City of Lawndale, Metro sent flyers to every resident within Lawndale. All outreach notifications are provided in both English and Spanish. Documentation on the outreach conducted during the environmental review process is available on the Metro project Dropbox, by visiting metro.net/clineext/#documents.

Submission PH-114 Chelsea Schreiber

PH-114-1 There are approximately 178 residential properties located immediately adjacent to the Metro ROW, from the Redondo Beach (Marine) Station to the Torrance Transit Center.

PH-114-2 Metro has undertaken extensive community outreach for potential transit service along all or portions of the Metro ROW for well over a decade. Metro's outreach program also accommodates the needs of residents with limited English proficiency. Most recently, in advance of the Metro Board of Director's selection of the LPA in May 2024, Metro distributed 32,000 postcards to residents, property owners, and businesses within a one-mile radius of all alignments under study. Additionally, at the request of the City of Lawndale, Metro sent flyers to every resident within Lawndale. All outreach notifications are provided in both English and Spanish. Documentation on the outreach conducted during the environmental review process is available on the Metro project Dropbox, by visiting metro.net/clineext/#documents.

Submission PH-115 Zein Obagi

PH-115-1 The Executive Summary is intended to provide a high-level overview of the project and its impacts, consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15123. More detailed information is provided in the body of the Draft EIR, including in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, which explains that freight track relocation would vary along the Metro ROW. The Draft EIR accurately describes the freight track relocation, which would vary along the Metro ROW, and remain at-grade. The Final EIR will be presented to the Metro Board who, prior to approving the project must certify that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR. Throughout the entire corridor, the width of the Metro ROW is more than sufficient to meet design requirements to safely incorporate the project elements, including for tracks, retaining walls, soundwalls or other barriers, and maintenance access areas. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. The Draft EIR evaluates the potential impacts of the freight relocation on adjacent residences. See MR-20: Proximity Impacts of Relocated Freight Tracks.

PH-115-2 Project Feature PF-NV-1: Quiet Zone Equipment Installation ensures that equipment would be installed at the eight at-grade freight crossings to ensure seamless implementation of a quiet zone by the cities of Lawndale, Redondo Beach, and Torrance. It does not require discretionary action from the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) or other agencies. Project Features PF-NV-2: Crossing Signal Bell Shrouds and PF-NV-3: Gate-Down-Bell-Stop Variance would require CPUC coordination and approval, but based on Metro's past experience with CPUC on similar light rail transit projects, it is fully anticipated that these project features would receive CPUC approval. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

PH-115-3 The route for the High-Frequency Bus was chosen to maximize the use of existing bus infrastructure on existing arterials and minimize travel time by not deviating off the main roadways. Light rail with dedicated tracks and stations does not face that same constraint as bus. Ridership is discussed in the 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission PH-116 Kim Binegar

PH-116-1 Metro has published two alternatives analyses related to a light rail extension to Torrance and the South Bay: the 2009 Harbor Subdivision Alternatives Analysis Report and the 2018 Green Line Extension to Torrance Supplemental Alternatives Analysis Report. These reports can be found on the project website project filing cabinet and include an explanation of their methodology. The Metro Board has selected an LPA for the purposes of the Final EIR, although it has not yet approved the project, including any of the options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. A final decision will not be made until after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which will include responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The EIR does not weigh factors such as cost and community preferences, as those are outside the scope of CEQA. However, those broader considerations are part of the Metro Board's policy decision-making process. These factors were summarized in Board reports available on the project website and presented in September 2023 and April 2024, prior to the selection of the LPA in May 2024. The Metro Board will consider the findings of the Final EIR, along with all public comments and community input received throughout the process, and take into account other policy considerations, before making any final decision on the project.

Submission PH-117 Mark Cole

PH-117-1 The commenter's support for the project is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

PH-117-2 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 PH-118 Kimberly

PH-118-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes. Metro is aware of the Friendship Campus, which is currently under construction and located approximately 550 feet from the Metro ROW at its closest point. The Draft EIR includes analysis of potential noise, vibration, air quality, and other impacts to receptors located within the vicinity of the Metro ROW, including at this distance. Based on that analysis, the project would not result in significant noise, vibration, pollutant or other impacts to this property. Metro acknowledges that project construction is not anticipated to be complete before the 2028 Olympics.

PH-118-2 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. The project has been studied by Metro well before Los Angeles was awarded as the host city for the 2028 Olympic Games in 2017. Metro has been exploring options for transit service along the Metro ROW for several decades. Metro purchased the Harbor Subdivision from the precursor to the BNSF in the early 1990s. In 2009, Metro prepared an alternatives analysis that studied the potential for transit service along all or portions of the Metro ROW and identified the segment between the Redondo Beach (Marine) Station and the Torrance Transit Center as the highest priority project. Since then, several alignments and alternatives have been studied. The 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis report recommended two alignments to be carried forward into environmental analysis: the Metro ROW and the Hawthorne Boulevard alignment (both primarily at-grade alignments). The project is estimated to serve between 11,500 and 15,600 daily project trips in 2042. Ridership projections are discussed in the 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission PH-119 Kim Turner

PH-119-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

PH-119-2 See response to Comment PH-119-1.

Submission PH-120 Massimi Darou

PH-120-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro has undertaken extensive community outreach for potential transit service along all or portions of the Metro ROW for well over a decade. Metro's outreach program also takes into consideration limited English proficiency within the communities. Most recently, in connection with the Draft EIR open houses, Metro mailed nearly 32,000 postcards to residents, property owners, and businesses within a one-mile radius of all the alignments under study. Additionally, at the request of the City of Lawndale, Metro sent flyers to every resident within Lawndale. All outreach notifications are provided in both English and Spanish. Documentation on the outreach conducted during the environmental review process is available on the Metro project Dropbox, by visiting metro.net/clineext/#documents.

PH-120-2 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignments, and support for the Hawthorne Option, High-Frequency Bus Alternative, or No Project Alternative, are noted. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission PH-121 Doug Boswell

PH-121-1 Metro has worked diligently to design the project in a manner that minimizes property acquisitions, and disruptions to adjacent residential areas and to develop feasible, and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project, including noise and safety effects. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures and MR-9: Light Rail Security. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

The Metro Board will not select the project based only on cost. Instead, the Board considers a range of factors, including technical analysis, environmental impacts, and community input. The Metro Board has selected an LPA for the purposes of the Final EIR, although it has not yet approved the project, including any of the options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. A final decision will not be made until after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which will include responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter.

The width of the Metro ROW varies across the project area. Most segments measure 100 feet, but some are narrower (75 feet) or wider (over 150 feet). Metro conducted a property survey in Spring 2025 to verify Metro's property boundaries, the results of which are reflected in the Final EIR Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative. Throughout the entire corridor, the width of the Metro ROW is more than sufficient to meet design requirements for the project elements, including for tracks, retaining walls, soundwalls or other barriers, maintenance access areas, and sufficient clearance from freight. Metro has designed the project to avoid displacement of residents.

PH-121-2 Section 3.8-4.6 of the Draft EIR evaluates the potential for the project to be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project. As described in 3.8-2.5 of the Draft EIR, the project includes Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, which requires preparation of site-specific geotechnical investigations, consistent with Metro's established design criteria. Based on the project as defined, including PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Standards, the Draft EIR concludes that this impact would be less than significant. Similarly, Section 3.8-4.7 of the Draft EIR evaluates whether the project to be located on expansive soil, as defined in California Building Code Section 1803.5.3, and whether it would create a substantial risk to life or property. The Draft EIR concludes that this impact would also be less than significant based on the full project description, which incorporates Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards. Compliance with established engineering and safety criteria, as required by Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, would

ensure long-term structural stability and safety. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information.

As discussed in Section 3.8-4.2 of the Draft EIR, using construction techniques like sloping or benching of excavation and shoring of trench walls with support would prevent any construction impacts like caving or soil instability. The following text has been added to Section 4.12, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR: "Shoring would be monitored for lateral and vertical movement during construction."

PH-121-3 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.

PH-121-4 See response to Comment 121-2.

PH-121-5 As shown on page 3.6-53 of the Draft EIR, soundwalls are proposed along both the west and east sides of the Metro ROW. The soundwalls would begin immediately south of 182nd Street and continue to Hawthorne Boulevard for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and from 186th Street to Hawthorne Boulevard for the LPA and Trench Option. The noise analysis follows the Detailed Noise Analysis Procedure per the 2018 Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual. Consistent with this methodology, the assessment of soundwall effectiveness takes into consideration the height of the receptors, height of the soundwalls, and the distance of the receptor from the source and soundwall. Regarding reflective noise, the FTA methodology includes assumptions about sound reflections from barriers, such as soundwaves bouncing off non-absorptive (reflective) surfaces. Where the assessment determined that additional noise reduction was necessary to reduce noise levels to below the FTA noise impact criteria, absorptive noise barriers have been recommended.

PH-121-6 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Ridership is discussed in the 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology. Riders at the Redondo Beach Transit Center would also be able to access the South Bay Galleria and planned future development via a short walk or transit connection, and Metro would continue to assess opportunities for further enhancing connections as the design progresses.

Submission PH-122 Ray Hollar

PH-122-1 Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, carefully considered potential noise and vibration impacts on sensitive receptors, including Pacific Crest Cemetery, which is included as Cluster F1. As discussed in Section 3.6, the light rail transit vehicles would be slower at this location due to the approach and departure from the Redondo Beach Transit Center Station. The existing ambient noise level at Cluster F1 is approximately 60 a-weighted decibels (dBA), L_{eq}. The predicted noise level at Cluster F1 after implementation of mitigation would be approximately 55 dBA, L_{eq} during a typical hour, as shown on page 3.6-60 of the Draft EIR. While the maximum instantaneous noise level as the train passes at a speed of 35 miles per hour would be approximately 70 to 75 dBA, this temporary noise is

similar to existing conditions of the cemetery, which fronts Grant Avenue and Inglewood Avenue. To provide context, normal human speech at 3 feet is approximately 65 dBA, as shown in Figure 3.6-1 on page 3.6-2 of the Draft EIR. With mitigation measures implemented, noise levels would not exceed the Federal Transit Administration noise impact criteria, and the Draft EIR concluded that noise impacts to Cluster F1 would be less than significant with mitigation. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

It should also be noted that the LPA would reduce all operational noise impacts to less than significant with mitigation. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-123 Niki Negrete-Mitchell

PH-123-1 There is sufficient space for the proposed light rail, freight track, and soundwalls within the Metro ROW. See Appendix 2-A, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings, of the Draft EIR and Appendix B, Select Advanced Conceptual Engineering Drawings - Locally Preferred Alternative, of the Final EIR for more details on the relocated freight and light rail tracks. See also MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. Regarding reflective noise, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) methodology includes assumptions about sound reflections from barriers, such as soundwaves bouncing off non-absorptive (reflective) surfaces. Where the assessment determined that additional noise reduction was necessary to reduce noise levels to below the FTA noise impact criteria, absorptive noise barriers have been recommended.

PH-123-2 Vibration is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The vibration levels from light rail operations would be significantly lower than those generated by freight trains, due to the lighter weight. The vibration analysis considered both light rail trains and relocated freight. Operational vibration annoyance impacts would be mitigated to less than significant with mitigation for the Metro ROW alignments and the Hawthorne Option. Mitigation measures include MM-VIB-4: Low Impact Frogs, MM-VIB-5: Resilient Fasteners, and MM-VIB-6: Ballast Mats. Vibration mitigation measures and locations where they would apply are included on pages 3.6-106 through 3.6-108 of the Draft EIR.

Submission PH-124 Jennifer Dodge

PH-124-1 As discussed on page ES-1 of the Draft EIR, the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment is referred to as the “Proposed Project” in the Draft EIR, because it is the alignment that has been historically studied and advanced for the extension of the C Line (Green) to the South Bay Region. In addition, for the purposes of CEQA, Metro must define one of the three evaluated alignments as the “proposed project;” however, this term does not convey any preference or recommendation. The Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option were evaluated in the Draft EIR at equal levels of detail. Pursuant to Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines, the Draft EIR also considered a reasonable range of CEQA alternatives: the No Project Alternative, the High-Frequency Bus Alternative, and the 170th/182nd Grade-Separated Light Rail Transit Alternative (also referred to as the “Hybrid Alternative”). In May 2024, based on a range of factors, the Metro Board selected the Hybrid Alternative as LPA for the purposes of the Final EIR. The Metro Board has not yet approved the project and may approve any of the options or alternatives evaluated in the

Draft EIR, including the No Project Alternative. A final decision will not be made until after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which includes responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-125 Zein Obagi

PH-125-1 The Executive Summary is intended to provide a high-level summary of the CEQA impact determinations and does not include detailed information about specific design elements or specific aspects of the existing setting with respect to individual environmental issue areas (e.g., geology and soils).

Section 3.8-2.3 of the Draft EIR defines the Resource Study Areas (RSAs) for geology, soils, and paleontological resources as the footprints of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, Trench Option, and Hawthorne Option. These footprints encompass the areas necessary to construct, operate, and maintain each alignment. Additional information about existing soil conditions is provided in Draft EIR section 3.8-3.

See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes for additional information.

PH-125-2 Metro staff recommended that the Metro Board select the LPA based on multiple factors, including the contents of the Draft EIR and public engagement. In May 2024, the Metro Board selected the Hybrid Alternative as the LPA. It has not yet approved the project, including any of the options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. A final decision will not be made until after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR which includes responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-126 Doug Boswell

PH-126-1 The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

PH-126-2 Noise and vibration are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, and air quality is addressed in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR considers the effects of both light-rail and the relocated freight tracks. 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.

PH-126-3 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. The Metro Board has selected an LPA for the purposes of the Final EIR. It has not yet approved the project, including any of the options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. A final decision will not be made until after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which includes responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-127 Mary Smiley

PH-127-1 The commenter's support for the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro strives to complete projects on time and within estimated budgets. Contingency is considered in the development of cost and schedule. See MR-21: Cost Estimates and Schedule.

Submission PH-128 Ray Hollar

PH-128-1 The May 2024 Board Report, available to the public prior to the Metro Board meeting and reviewed by the Metro Board prior to selecting an LPA, included information on cost effectiveness and included cost/benefit information, including cost per annual new rider, cost per annual project trip, and cost per reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). In all instances the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment performed the best of the light rail alignments on all metrics. The LPA performed second best on cost per annual new rider and cost per reduction in VMT and third best on cost per annual project trip. The Trench Option performed third best in cost per VMT reduction and the worst in cost per annual new rider and cost per annual project trip. The Hawthorne Option performed second best in cost per annual project trip, third best in cost per annual new rider, and the worst in cost per reduction in VMT.

The commenter refers to metrics in the 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Report, which included two methods to calculate cost per rider. One method was to calculate the total capital cost over projected new riders. The other was to use the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA's) formula for annualized cost per rider, which divides annualized capital costs and annual operating and maintenance costs by the total anticipated annual riders and consists of only the total ridership on the project alignment (including riders who may already use Metro Rail and other public transit). The results of the first method are included in the May 2024 Metro Board Report. Although the Hawthorne Option is anticipated to have the highest annual new ridership (based on the FTA's formula), it would have significantly higher capital costs, which results in a lower cost effectiveness ratio.

All alignment options would provide greenhouse gas emissions reductions as shown in Table 3.5-16 Proposed Project and Options GHG Emissions (2042) in Section 3.5, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of the Draft EIR. Although the Hawthorne Option would provide a marginal benefit in greenhouse gas emissions reductions compared to the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Trench Option, this is not the only consideration in selection of the LPA, as noted above.

Regarding noise, with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the EIR, operational noise and vibration impacts of the Trench Option, the Hawthorne Option and

the LPA would be reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

Submission PH-129 Corey Cardinal

PH-129-1 Potential air quality impacts are addressed in Section 3.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, including dust control during construction. Compliance with Project Features PF-AQ-1: Tier 4 Engine Standards and PF-AQ-2: Dust Control Best Practices would ensure that construction activities comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and Metro standards controlling emissions and dust. Operationally, the light rail vehicles would be powered by electricity and would not produce localized emissions. The air quality analysis disclosed in the Draft EIR includes an assessment of localized emissions that would be generated from construction sites, which accounted for dust that would be generated. The localized air quality impacts were found to be less than significant when compared to the applicable SCAQMD thresholds, which were set at levels to prevent the occurrence of substantial dust concentrations reaching sensitive receptors that could cause adverse health effects. The localized impacts analysis used the most conservative receptor distance to be as protective as possible of the health of nearby residents. Thus, the analysis of dust emissions in the Draft EIR is adequate. Regional air quality would improve with implementation of the project due to a shift from passenger vehicles to light rail in the corridor. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-4: Potential Negative Health Effects Related to Noise, Vibration, and Air Quality.

PH-129-2 Impacts related to drainage patterns alterations are addressed in Section 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR. As discussed in Section 3.10-4.3 of the Draft EIR, each of the alignment options studied in the Draft EIR, would increase impervious surfaces compared to existing conditions. However, most of the stormwater runoff would be retained within the project footprint, through an integrated low-impact development (LID) drainage system. This system would be designed to accommodate the stormwater quality design in volume, consistent with the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit requirements established by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB). This system would minimize the potential for flooding both on-site and off-site, including in sumps. Maintenance of drainage infrastructure would also comply with applicable regulatory requirements to ensure long-term functionality.

As discussed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, in the Draft EIR, Section 4.5-3.10, the hydrology and water quality impacts of the LPA would be less than those analyzed in the Draft EIR for the Trench Option based on requiring less excavation. The potential impacts would be less than significant because the LPA would also include stormwater retention systems consistent with regional LID requirements.

PH-129-3 CEQA does not require an analysis of safety in terms of crime, as it is not an environmental issue, and therefore the Draft EIR does not make any conclusions regarding this topic. However, safety is a top priority for Metro. Metro Homeless Outreach Teams are deployed on Metro buses, trains, and stations to engage with unhoused riders and connect them to resources. See MR-9: Light Rail Security and MR-18: Homelessness.

PH-129-4 Ballast mats are proposed to reduce noise and vibration and consist of a rubber or other type of elastomer pad that is placed under the ballast. In general, the mat must be placed on a concrete pad to be effective. Installation of the ballast mats would not have any secondary detrimental effects to the environment. The materials are engineered for durability and have been extensively used in transit systems, including throughout the Metro system, without adverse environmental effects. Based on their track record of use and compliance with regulatory requirements, no significant impact to the environment is anticipated from the installation or use of ballast mats.

PH-129-5 As discussed in Section 3.8, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, per Project Feature PF-GEO-1: Metro Geotechnical Design Standards, the project design process would include thorough site-specific geotechnical investigations to address foundation and ensure the stability of nearby structures. The investigation would identify soil conditions and include engineering and construction recommendations to ensure surrounding structures are not damaged and remain safe and structurally sound. See MR-13: Soil Stability and Sinkholes.

The comment is not clear regarding the concern related to airports. As stated on page 3.9-47 of the Draft EIR, the project is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of any airport. Therefore, the project would have no impact related to safety hazards associated with a public airport or public use airport during construction or operation. See response to Comment PH-129-1 related to air quality concerns.

Submission PH-130 Lisa Francis

PH-130-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, provides a comprehensive analysis of potential noise impacts associated with construction and operation of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option. In addition, Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, also evaluates the No Project Alternative, and the LPA. Operational noise and vibration impacts of the Trench Option, the Hawthorne Option and the LPA would be reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

PH-130-2 Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses. Also see MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission PH-131 Ted Hofmann

PH-131-1 In order to provide every commenter with an opportunity to express their opinions, a one-minute time limit was allocated at public hearings. The public has several other avenues to express their comments, including through the project email, letters, and the project phone number.

CEQA requires analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives to the project that would have the potential to meet most project objectives while avoiding or substantially reducing any of the significant impacts of the project. Public outreach events and materials focused on the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment and Options under study, although, details on all the CEQA alternatives can be found in the Draft EIR and were presented to the Metro Board for consideration.

CEQA requires that an EIR identify the Environmentally Superior Alternative, which is the alternative that would be expected to generate the fewest adverse impacts. However, the Lead Agency is not obligated to select the Environmentally Superior Alternative. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The Metro Board has selected an LPA for the purposes of the Final EIR, although it has not approved the project, including any of the options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. A final decision will not be made until after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which includes responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter.

Submission PH-132 Doris Hofmann

PH-132-1 The commenter's opposition to a Metro rail project, and support for the High-Frequency Bus Alternative, is noted. The High-Frequency Bus Alternative is analyzed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives and See MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Ridership projections are discussed in the 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, provides a comprehensive analysis of potential noise impacts associated with construction and operation of the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option. In addition, Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, evaluates the No Project Alternative, High Frequency Bus Alternative, and the LPA. Operational noise and vibration impacts of the Trench Option, the Hawthorne Option and the LPA would be reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures.

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 also be fully grade-separated.

Submission PH-133 Michael Kim

PH-133-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignments is noted. 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.

Submission PH-134 Glen Brackenridge

PH-134-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Ridership is discussed in the 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology. The project would connect the two new city transit centers in Redondo Beach and Torrance to the Metro rail network.

PH-134-2 Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

PH-134-3 Existing noise levels both along the Metro ROW and Hawthorne Boulevard are shown beginning on page 3.6-22 of the Draft EIR. These monitored noise levels reflect full 24-hour monitoring and accurately portray the existing conditions for the alignments, including rush hour, non-rush hour, and freight rail activities. The analysis follows Federal Transit Administration (FTA) methodology, which uses day-night average noise levels to capture overall ambient conditions, including quiet periods when the freight trains are not present. Monitored noise levels along Hawthorne Boulevard typically had a higher ambient noise level due to roadway traffic. However, residential neighborhoods set back from Hawthorne Boulevard had similar noise levels as to those recorded in neighborhoods along the Metro ROW, which accounted for freight rail noise. See page 3.6-23 for noise measured ambient noise levels at each noise monitoring location.

Submission PH-135 Sirley Cuevas

PH-135-1 Metro shared all comments made on the Draft EIR, as well as records of previous engagement, with the Metro Board to help inform their decision-making process. In May 2024, the Metro Board selected an LPA for the purposes of the Final EIR. However, it has not yet approved the project, including any of the options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. A final decision will not be made until after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which includes responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter. The decision will also consider comments from the community and environmental impacts, including those to air quality. As disclosed in the Draft EIR, only the Trench Option would result in a significant and unavoidable air quality impact, which would occur during

construction; none of the other alignment options or alternatives would result in significant impacts to air quality.

Submission PH-136 Laura Thomas

PH-136-1 CEQA does not require an analysis of safety in terms of crime, as it is not an environmental issue, and therefore the Draft EIR does not make any conclusions regarding this topic. Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. See MR-9: Light Rail Security.

PH-136-2 The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). The project would connect the City of Lawndale to two new city transit centers in Redondo Beach and Torrance, providing expanded access to Los Angeles County through the Metro rail network. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission PH-137 John Richards

PH-137-1 The commenter's opposition to a rail project and preference for buses is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, in Draft EIR analyzes a High-Frequency Bus Alternative. Ridership projections are discussed in the 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR. 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, and 3% match contributions from local jurisdictions. Metro would continue to explore funding opportunities for the project.

The project would travel through three cities: Lawndale, Redondo Beach and Torrance. Metro has been exploring options for transit service along the Metro ROW for several decades. Metro purchased the Harbor Subdivision from the precursor to the BNSF in the early 1990s. In 2009, Metro prepared an alternatives analysis that studied the potential for transit service along all or portions of the Metro ROW that identified the segment between the Redondo Beach (Marine) Station and the Torrance Transit Center as a high-priority corridor. Since then, several alignments and alternatives have been studied. The 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis report recommended two alignments to be carried forward into environmental analysis: the Metro ROW and the Hawthorne Boulevard alignment (both primarily at-grade alignments). Since then, Metro has considered grade-separated light rail, including the Trench Option, Hawthorne Option, and LPA. See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

The underground subway being constructed on Wilshire Boulevard, referenced by the commenter, is the Metro D Line Subway Extension. The Wilshire corridor is among the busiest in the country, with extremely high transit and traffic demand and limited surface right-of-way. By contrast, the Metro ROW is an existing rail corridor and does not meet the same thresholds that would necessitate a fully underground subway.

Submission PH-138 Holly Osborne

PH-138-1 The Draft EIR, using aerial imagery, identified seven structures along the west side of the Metro ROW between Grant Avenue and Artesia Boulevard that could be subject to groundborne vibration damage during construction of the Elevated/At Grade Alignment. Breakwater Village, a senior living community adjacent to the Metro ROW, appears to have one structure that is immediately adjacent to the rail corridor. The other buildings in the development front Ruxton Lane and are set back farther from the Metro ROW. It is important to note that only the structure physically adjacent to the Metro ROW was identified as potentially affected in the analysis. For that structure, there is approximately 400-feet of frontage along the corridor. Two points along the building frontage were analyzed to ensure that vibration levels were adequately evaluated along its length. Regardless of the number of dwelling units with a structure, the vibration analysis in the Draft EIR focused on the potential for structural damage to the building, consistent with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (FTA, 2018). The analysis evaluates vibration levels at representative building facades and applies thresholds based on structural criteria, not on individual unit count. Therefore, the conclusions of the Draft EIR remain valid. This approach was applied consistently throughout the corridor.

Submission PH-139 Ted Hofmann

PH-139-1 The property mentioned by the commenter is located along the Hawthorne Option, which would require an aerial (overhead) easement for the elevated light rail structure to cross a portion of the property. Metro has designed the project to avoid displacement of residents. The maps referenced are from the 2023 Real Estate Acquisitions Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR.

In May 2024, the Metro Board selected the Hybrid Alternative as the LPA, which travels along the Metro ROW and would not affect the property mentioned. However, if the Metro Board approved the Hawthorne Option as the final project as part of the certification of the Final EIR, Metro would follow the standard property appraisal and compensation procedures to determine fair market value and just compensation for the overhead easement area. The easement process would comply with the California Relocation Act, as applicable. Affected property owners would be contacted in advance and provided with information regarding the easement and their rights.

PH-139-2 The Measure M Expenditure Plan, passed in 2016 by over 70% of Los Angeles County voters, includes a variety of transportation projects, one of which was this light rail project extending the C Line (Green) to Torrance.

Submission PH-140 G.P. Sudduth

PH-140-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. As part of the 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis, Metro studied stations in the City of Lawndale between Inglewood Avenue and Manhattan Beach Boulevard along

the Metro ROW and at Hawthorne Boulevard/166th Street. At the request of the City of Lawndale, Metro removed these proposed stations from further study.

Submission PH-141 John Schreiber

PH-141-1 While change in community character does not constitute a significant impact under CEQA, Section 3.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, analyzes the project's potential to physically divide communities and concludes that impacts would result in less than significant. Pedestrians would still be able cross the Metro ROW at all existing designated rail crossings: Inglewood Avenue, Manhattan Beach Boulevard, 159th, 160th, 161st, 162nd, 170th, and 182nd Streets. Land uses would not be altered so as to isolate any one part of the community from the other. Retaining walls would be required to transition the light rail guideway from elevated to at-grade, but they would not block any crossings. The LPA and Trench Option would fully grade separate light rail from all roadways along the Metro ROW. The Hawthorne Option would likewise be fully grade-separated. MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

PH-141-2 As discussed in Section 3.2, Land Use and Planning, and Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, while the Metro ROW alignments would cause visual changes in the community, the same access across the Metro ROW as designated today would be maintained, and structures would not completely block views to the other side of the community (see Figures 3.3-62 and 3.3-63 of the Draft EIR, where the opposite side of the Metro ROW is both visible and accessible).

PH-141-3 Light rail noise was assessed based on the anticipated frequency of trips during the different hours of operation. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds.

Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, evaluates potential noise impacts, including those from wheel squeal. According to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018), curves with a radius greater than 1,000 feet do not generate wheel squeal. As a result, the FTA recommends designing transit projects to avoid tight curves with radii of less than 1,000 feet to mitigate potential noise impacts. The Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, Trench Option, and the LPA do not include curves with radii less than 1,000 feet, which are the primary cause of wheel squeal. Consequently, wheel squeal is not anticipated under these design conditions.

The Hawthorne Option includes two curves which could potentially produce wheel squeal. Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-5: Wheel Squeal Noise Monitoring would require noise monitoring to identify wheel squeal at two curves with a radius less than 1,000 feet for the Hawthorne Option:

> Curve between Santa Fe Avenue and Inglewood Avenue

> Curve between 161st Street and 163rd Street

If wheel squeal is identified, Metro shall install wayside rail lubrication to ensure wheel squeal does not occur. Rail lubrication is discussed in the FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018) as a valid method for mitigating noise.

Submission PH-142 Catherine Boll

PH-142-1 The commenter's support for the Hawthorne Option is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project.

Light rail vehicles are quieter, electrically powered trains that generate less noise compared to larger, diesel operated Metrolink trains. Noise and vibration impacts are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. The Metro ROW alignment, the Trench Option, and the LPA would include upgrades to existing freight crossings, allowing for the establishment of a Federal Railroad Administration quiet zone. This would eliminate routine freight train horn noise along the Metro ROW in the area.

PH-142-2 As described in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, a Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan would be implemented as mitigation for construction noise impacts, which would require Metro's contractor to prepare and implement a detailed, site-specific Noise Control Plan that demonstrates compliance with the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA's) construction noise thresholds. To ensure impacts are reduced to the maximum extent feasible, MM-NOI-1: Noise Control Plan would require the contractor to conduct continuous noise monitoring and to implement corrective actions if thresholds are exceeded. As described in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR, debris and waste generated during construction would be properly transported away and disposed of in accordance with federal and State regulations.

PH-142-3 See response to Comment 142-1.

Submission PH-143 John Richards

PH-143-1 The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

PH-143-2 The commenter's opposition to a train in Lawndale and support for buses is noted. A High-Frequency Bus Alternative is analyzed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-144 Joanne Doram

PH-144-1 Metro has undertaken extensive community outreach for potential transit service along all or portions of the Metro ROW for well over a decade. Metro's outreach program also accommodates the needs of residents with limited English proficiency. Most recently, in advance of the Metro Board of Director's selection of the LPA in May 2024, Metro distributed 32,000 postcards to residents, property owners, and businesses within a one-mile radius of all alignments under study. Additionally, at the request of the City of Lawndale, Metro sent flyers to every resident within Lawndale. All outreach notifications are provided in both English and Spanish. Documentation on the outreach conducted during the

environmental review process is available on the Metro project Dropbox, by visiting metro.net/clineext/#documents.

The Metro Board of Directors, not the public, votes on the approval of regional transit projects. The Measure M Expenditure Plan, passed in 2016 by over 70% of Los Angeles County voters, includes a variety of transportation projects, one of which was this light rail project extending the C Line (Green) to Torrance. The Metro Board has selected an LPA for purposes of the Final EIR, although it has not yet approved the project, including any of the options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. A final decision will not be made until after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which includes responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-145 Corey Cardinal

PH-145-1 The commenter's concerns are noted. Metro has undertaken extensive community outreach for the project, see response PH-144-1. The estimated capital cost would be to construct the project. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

Submission PH-146 Massima Daroui

PH-146-1 The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

PH-146-2 The Measure M Expenditure Plan, passed in 2016 by over 70% of Los Angeles County voters includes funding for a variety of transportation projects, one of which was this light rail project extending the C Line (Green) to Torrance. Although Metro owns the Metro ROW, BNSF operates and maintains the freight tracks in the City of Lawndale. As part of this project, Metro would relocate and rebuild the freight tracks as needed, to accommodate the light rail extension.

PH-146-3 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignments, and support for the Hawthorne Option and High-Frequency Bus Alternative, is noted. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-147 Terri Thomas

PH-147-1 The commenter's opposition to a rail project and support for an effective bus station on Hawthorne Boulevard is noted. A High-Frequency Bus Alternative is evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. The 2023 Ridership Report, published concurrently with the Draft EIR, shows that the project would generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology. In 2022, Metro adopted a Metro Tree Policy which outlines Metro's commitment to protecting trees, when possible, and replacing those that must be removed as a result of Metro construction and maintenance. For non-heritage trees, the policy specifies a replacement ratio of two trees for every tree removed. For the alignments along the Metro ROW, the project would include two new multi-use paths

along the Metro ROW (between 159th Street and Condon and 170th 182nd Streets). See MR-10: Changes to Community Character.

Submission PH-148 Craig St. John

PH-148-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. All project options and alternatives were planned to minimize conflicts with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). However, Metro does not have authority over Caltrans or its potential future projects. Metro would continue to coordinate with Caltrans as this project progresses. The Metro Board selected as the LPA for the purposes of the Final EIR, is located within the Metro ROW and would avoid potential conflict on Hawthorne Boulevard. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

PH-148-2 Section 3.6. Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, discloses that each alignment option would result in a potentially significant construction-related noise impact. To address this impact, the project would implement Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1: Noise Control Plan. While implementation of this measure requires compliance with the FTA's 1-hour equivalent noise level (Leq) noise thresholds and includes continuous noise monitoring and corrective actions, the Draft EIR acknowledges that temporary exceedances may still occur. For this reason, construction noise impacts are identified as significant and unavoidable. Such impacts would be temporary and would cease upon the completion of construction activities.

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

PH-148-3 Metro has not conducted an economic impact study for the project. Potential economic effects, such as reductions in property values and loss of property tax revenues, do not in and of themselves constitute effects on the physical environment, and therefore the Draft EIR does not reach conclusions on those issues. Rather, the Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. However, Metro's goal is to help businesses continue to thrive throughout construction and post construction. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses for more information on the resources for businesses impacted by Metro's project due to construction and post construction.

Submission PH-149 Holly Osborne

PH-149-1 The noise analysis in the Draft EIR follows the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018), which specifies the use of 24-hour time-averaged noise levels to assess the ambient noise environment. These levels capture all sound sources, including the occasional freight train pass-by, as part of the existing baseline. The analysis also incorporates a 10-dBA (a-weighted decibel) penalty for all sound occurring during the nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) to account for increased

sensitivity to noise during these hours. The effect of the penalty is that in the calculation of 24-hour noise, any event that occurs during the nighttime hours, is equivalent to 10 of the same events during the daytime hours. This ensures the assessment reflects the potential for greater disturbance from nighttime noise events. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds.

Although noise from freight trains is loud and increases the 24-hour average noise levels, its infrequent occurrence during the day means that it does not dominate or skew the overall noise profile. Excluding the freight noise from the existing ambient noise conditions would not comply with FTA methodology and would misrepresent the true ambient noise environment. The 24-hour noise measurements include both periods when the freight is not operating and periods when freight is operating.

Metro follows Federal Transit Administration guidance which is a United States agency. It is unclear what the referenced Canadian methodology is, which may not be appropriate for a project being implemented in the United States.

Submission PH-150 Rose Rodriguez

PH-150-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignments is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives; and MR-10: Changes to Community Character; and MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

PH-150-2 The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11 Utilities and Service System, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, the revisions do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that the impact related to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety. The commenter's opposition to light rail train pass-bys is noted.

PH-150-3 As discussed in Section 3.2, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, the project would not physically divide a community because residents would still be able cross the Metro ROW at all existing designated rail crossings: Inglewood Avenue, Manhattan Beach Boulevard, 159th, 160th, 161st, 162nd, 170th, and 182nd Streets. Land uses would not be altered so as to isolate any one part of the community from the other. The use of the Metro ROW as recreational space is acknowledged on page 3.15-38 of the Draft EIR. While Metro recognizes that some residents currently use the Metro ROW as informal recreational space, it is important to note that the Metro ROW is not a designated park or public recreational area. Its primary purpose is rail transportation, and access is not authorized. The LPA includes two new multiuse paths, expanding access to residential neighborhoods and offering additional recreational options. See MR-10: Changes to Community Character and MR-16: Response to Lawndale and Redondo Beach Community Letter.

Per CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, Metro is conducting environmental analysis to disclose the potential impacts of the project and identify feasible mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce significant impacts. The EIR and associated approval process is not a waiver. An EIR is the most detailed level of environmental approval under CEQA. The Metro Board has selected an LPA for the purposes of the Final EIR. It has not yet approved the project, including any of the options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. A final decision will not be made until after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which includes responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter.

PH-150-4 Metro is the CEQA lead agency for this project. This requires Metro to take responsibility for preparing the appropriate CEQA document for the project.

Submission PH-151 Ray Hollar

PH-151-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment and support for the No Build Alternative is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. CEQA does not require funding to be demonstrated in a Draft EIR. However, the May 2024 Board Report, which was made available to the public prior to the Metro Board meeting and reviewed by the Board prior to selecting an LPA, included estimates of anticipated funding from identified sources, projected shortfalls, and potential additional sources. It also included cost-benefit analysis information, including cost per annual new rider, cost per all annual trips, and cost per reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Report described similar methods for calculating cost per rider. It is unclear how the commenter derived their cost per rider figure.

Submission PH-152 G.P. Sudduth

PH-152-1 Metro understands concerns regarding property values. However, under CEQA, economic impacts such as changes in property values are not considered environmental impacts. The Draft EIR focuses on physical environmental impacts and measures to mitigate them, as required by CEQA. To address questions and concerns on property values, Metro has prepared more information. See MR-14: Property Values and Impacts to Businesses.

PH-152-2 Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, provides a detailed analysis of noise and vibration impacts based on the Federal Transit Administration Transit Noise and Vibration Assessment Manual. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds.

PH-152-3 A High-Frequency Bus Alternative is analyzed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Proposed bus stops for the High-Frequency Bus Alternative are located at existing on-road stops, such as the one at Artesia Boulevard and Hawthorne Boulevard to maximize travel time savings by avoiding deviations from arterials. This strategy is intended to improve efficiency for bus riders by maintaining a direct route. Light rail does not have the same constraints as bus. The proposed light rail stations are strategically placed to optimize connectivity and serve key transit hubs, including the Torrance Transit Center, to provide greater access for riders.

Submission PH-153 Michael Kim

PH-153-1 Metro plans, operates, and coordinates funding for most of the public transportation system in Los Angeles County. It does not operate or profit from freight rail operations. The project would not add new freight rail capacity to the Metro ROW. 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 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.

PH-153-2 As described in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, on page 3.1-15, Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), a CTMP would be prepared and implemented to manage disruptions during construction. The plan would include strategies to manage traffic flow, including phased construction to avoid long-term closures, clearly marked detours, and coordination with local agencies to ensure efficient traffic management. As part of Metro's standard practice, the CTMP would explore scheduling certain construction activities, including deliveries and pick-ups of materials, during non-peak travel periods, and the possibility of conducting some construction work at night. The CTMP would be updated as construction progresses to reflect changes and updates at the work areas.

PH-153-3 The project would not add new freight rail capacity to the Metro ROW, as discussed in response to Comment PH-153-1. All at-grade crossings for light rail and/or freight would include upgraded safety crossing infrastructure. The LPA, Trench Option and Hawthorne Option would fully grade separate light rail from roadways. Metro takes the safety and well-being of nearby communities very seriously. See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission PH-154 Doris Hofmann

PH-154-1 The commenter's opposition to the project is noted. This project is partially funded by Measure R, as well as Measure M, another ballot measure passed by over 70% of voters in Los Angeles County to fund mobility projects. Additional funding includes a Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) Grant from the California State Transportation Agency (CALSTA) and 3% match contributions from local jurisdictions. Metro would continue to explore funding opportunities for the project. The project would provide multiple benefits to the City of Lawndale, including improving mobility in the South Bay and providing equitable access to regional destinations through improved connections to the Metro regional rail system. Stations in the City of Lawndale were proposed as part of the 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis, but were removed from consideration at the request of the City of Lawndale.

PH-154-2 The project would provide multiple benefits to the City of Lawndale, including improving mobility in the South Bay and providing equitable access to regional destinations through improved connections to the Metro regional rail system. Metro has undertaken extensive community outreach for potential transit service along all or portions of the Metro ROW for well over a decade. Metro's outreach program also accommodates the needs of residents with limited English proficiency. In advance of the Metro Board of Director's selection of the LPA in May 2024, Metro distributed 32,000 postcards to residents, property owners, and businesses within a one-mile radius of all alignments under study. Additionally, at the request of the City of Lawndale, Metro sent flyers to every resident within Lawndale. All public meeting materials and outreach notification have been provided in English and Spanish. Documentation on the outreach conducted during the environmental review process is available on the Metro project Dropbox, by visiting metro.net/clineext/#documents.

Submission PH-155 Rose Rodriguez

PH-155-1 The commenter's support for buses instead of rail is noted. A High-Frequency Bus Alternative is analyzed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Proposed bus stops for the High-Frequency Bus Alternative are located at existing bus stops, such as the one at Artesia Boulevard and Hawthorne Boulevard to maximize travel time savings by avoiding deviations from arterials. This strategy is intended to improve efficiency for bus riders by maintaining a direct route. Light rail does not have the same constraint as bus. The proposed light rail stations are strategically placed to optimize connectivity and serve key transit hubs, including the Torrance Transit Center, to provide greater access for riders. The proposed 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.

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

PH-155-2 The potential operational noise impacts for the Elevated/At-Grade Alignment, the Trench Option, and the Hawthorne Option are addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The potential for LPA impacts is addressed Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. See MR-2: Operational Noise Analysis Methodology and Impact Thresholds and MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. Also see MR-19: Project Benefits, which details how the project is consistent with Metro's Equity Platform.

PH-155-3 The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR and is noted for the record. All comments have been shared with the Metro Board for their consideration.

Submission PH-156 Mary Smiley

PH-156-1 Metro plans, operates, and coordinates funding for most of the public transportation system in Los Angeles County. The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, as a governing body, does not vote to approve or reject regional transit projects. However, all five County Supervisors sit on the Metro Board of Directors as individual members representing their supervisorial district. In May 2024, the Metro Board selected an LPA for the purposes of the Final EIR, although it has not taken final action on the project, including approval of any of the options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. A final decision on whether to certify the EIR and approve the project will not be made until after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which includes responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

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

Submission PH-157 Lisa Francis

PH-157-1 The commenter's preference for buses is noted. A High-Frequency Bus Alternative is analyzed in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Caltrans has a planned Express Lanes project, which expands the I-405 through this area; Metro has considered this future expansion in the design of the Hawthorne Option, as described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR.

In the City of Lawndale, Metro owns the railroad corridor, while BNSF has operating rights through it. BNSF is not obligated to address freight noise mitigation, but Metro is committed to enhancing the community's well-being. The project includes many features to reduce noise and vibration from freight trains. As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the project would include new pedestrian safety infrastructure at all at-grade freight crossings, which would allow for future conversion of the corridor into a quiet zone. See MR-3: Operational Noise Project Features and Mitigation Measures. Special trackwork is also proposed for the new relocated freight tracks to reduce noise and vibration. Mitigation measures include MM-VIB-5: Resilient Fasteners and MM-VIB-6: Ballast Mats.

Submission PH-158 Bernadette Suarez

PH-158-1 The project would provide multiple benefits to the City of Lawndale, including improving mobility in the South Bay and providing equitable access to regional destinations through improved connections to the Metro regional rail system. Stations in the City of Lawndale were proposed as part of the 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis, but were removed from consideration at the request of the City of Lawndale. Metro adopted an Equity Platform to help ensure system changes prioritize those most in need of improved access to opportunity. Metro identifies Equity Focuses Communities as communities where there are higher concentrations of resident and household demographics associated with mobility barriers (low-income households; Black, Indigenous, or People of Color populations; and households that do not have access to a car). The southern neighborhoods of Lawndale

would be within walking distance to proposed stations in Redondo Beach. Metro is committed to equity to improve access to jobs, housing, and economic opportunities through mobility projects and would continue to prepare inclusive outreach and engagement strategies as Metro advances the project. See MR-19: Project Benefits.

Submission PH-159 Sean Moore

PH-159-1 The commenter's opposition to the project within the City of Lawndale is noted. The Draft EIR analyzes transportation impacts in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Aesthetics is addressed in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. Land use impacts, including those related to open space, are addressed Section 3.2, Land Use, of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR concluded that the project would not result in significant and unavoidable impacts to transportation, aesthetics, land use, or open space.

PH-159-2 The commenter's support for the No Project Alternative, High-Frequency Bus Alternative, or any alternative that is not located within the Metro ROW is noted. The Metro Board has selected the Hybrid Alternative as the LPA for the purposes of the Final EIR, although it has not approved the project, including any of the options and alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. A final decision on whether to certify the EIR and approve the project will not be made until after the Metro Board reviews the Final EIR, which includes responses to all public comments, including those of the commenter. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives.

Submission PH-160 Pat Kearney

PH-160-1 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.

PH-160-2 The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology.

Submission PH-161 John Richards

PH-161-1 The Draft EIR was published in 2023 using the most currently available information to conduct the environmental impact analysis, including for transportation and vibration.

The Draft EIR analyzed transportation impacts in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. As described in Section 3.1, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, on page 3.1-15, Project Feature PF-T-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), a CTMP would be prepared to manage disruptions during construction. The plan would include strategies to manage traffic flow, including phased construction to avoid long-term closures, clearly marked detours, and coordination with local agencies to ensure efficient traffic management. As part of Metro's standard practice, the CTMP would explore scheduling certain construction activities, including deliveries and pick-ups of materials, during non-peak travel periods, and the possibility of conducting some construction work at night. The CTMP would be updated as construction progresses to reflect changes and updates at the work areas. Traffic congestion and delays (often measured by Level of Service) are not considered significant environmental impacts under CEQA. Metro prepared a 2023 Transportation Detail Report,

published alongside the Draft EIR, providing additional information on potential changes in traffic patterns and impacts not required by CEQA, but for the public's information. See also MR-11: Traffic Delay and Level-of-Service.

The potential for vibration impacts is addressed in Section 3.6, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR. The vibration levels from light rail operations, would be significantly lower than those generated by freight trains, due to the lighter weight. The vibration analysis considered both light rail trains and relocated freight. Operational vibration annoyance impacts would be mitigated to less than significant with mitigation for all alignments. Mitigation measures include MM-VIB-4: Low Impact Frogs, MM-VIB-5: Resilient Fasteners, and MM-VIB-6: Ballast Mats. Vibration mitigation measures and locations where they would apply are included on pages 3.6-106 through 3.6-108 of the Draft EIR. See MR-5: Vibration Impact Types and Impact Thresholds.

PH-161-2 The 2023 Ridership Summary Report, published alongside the Draft EIR, shows that the project is expected to generate between 11,500 to 15,600 daily transit trips (boardings). See MR-15: Metro Ridership Forecasting Methodology. The project provides multiple benefits to the City of Lawndale, including improving mobility in the South Bay and providing equitable access to regional destinations through improved connections to the Metro regional rail system. Stations in the City of Lawndale were proposed as part of the 2018 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis, but were removed from consideration at the request of the City of Lawndale.

PH-161-3 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. CEQA does not require an analysis of safety in terms of crime, as it is not an environmental issue, and therefore the Draft EIR does not make any conclusions regarding this topic.

Submission PH-162 Rose Rodriguez

PH-162-1 The presence of natural gas lines and petroleum pipelines, their potential impacts, and applicable regulatory requirements are addressed in Sections 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and 3.11 Utilities and Service System, of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts of the LPA in this context are evaluated in Chapter 4, Evaluation of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 4.13, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR expands on the analysis in Section 3.9-4.2.1 of the Draft EIR by clarifying the protocols, construction techniques, regulations, and standards with which the project would comply. As detailed therein, the revisions do not change the Draft EIR's conclusion that the impact related to oil and gas pipelines would be less than significant.

The 1951 explosion mentioned in the comment occurred decades before Metro's establishment and was unrelated to Metro, its operations, or light rail transit, in general. Since that time, safety protocols, construction methods, and regulatory standards for managing pipelines and hazardous materials have significantly advanced. Additionally, light rail and relocated freight operations would not increase the likelihood of pipeline-related incidents, such as explosions. See MR-7: Utility Relocation and Hazardous Materials Safety andMR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety for more details on how light rail would be safely constructed and operated in the Metro ROW.

PH-162-2 See MR-8: Light Rail and Freight Train Safety.

Submission PH-163 Ted Hofmann

PH-163-1 The commenter's opposition to the Metro ROW alignment is noted. See MR-1: Selection of Alternatives. Metro has worked diligently to develop feasible and effective mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts of the project.

PH-163-2 The Hawthorne Option would include a station in the center median of Hawthorne Boulevard south of Artesia Boulevard. Transit parking is included in the Redondo Beach Transit Center, which is operated by the City of Redondo Beach. Metro would provide transit parking at the terminus station in Torrance. Metro does not provide long-term parking for airports. The C Line Extension would operate as the southern part of the K Line and connect to the LAX/Metro Transit Station, which would serve LAX. The K Line now operates as a north-south line between the South Bay and the Metro E Line and the C Line operates east-west between LAX and Norwalk. Both lines provide a direct connection to LAX.

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.