



**CHAPTER 9
RESPONSES TO
COMMENTS RECEIVED**



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK



9.0 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

9.1 Overview

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (DEIS/DEIR) for the Crenshaw/LAX Corridor Transit Project) was circulated to the public for comment over a 45-day review period that concluded on October 26, 2009. Appendix K of the Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (FEIS/FEIR) contains all comments received on the DEIS/DEIR during the public review period, as well as the responses to these comments. Responses to comments are cross referenced in a table at the beginning of Appendix K to allow commenters to easily locate the response to their comment. Section 15088(c) of the *California Environmental Quality Act* (CEQA) Guidelines describes the evaluation that is required in the response to comments:

The written response shall describe the disposition of significant environmental issues raised (e.g., revisions to the proposed project to mitigate anticipated impacts or objections). In particular, the major environmental issues raised when the lead agency's position is at variance with recommendations and objections raised in the comments must be addressed in detail giving reasons why specific comments and suggestions were not accepted. There must be a good faith, reasoned analysis in response. Conclusory statements unsupported by factual information will not suffice.

In order to comply with Section 15088(c) of CEQA, reasoned, factual responses have been provided to all comments received, with a particular emphasis on significant environmental issues. Generally, the responses to comments provide explanation, clarification, or amplification of information contained in the DEIS/DEIR. All comments and responses to comments are included in the FEIS/FEIR and will be considered by the Metro Board prior to certification and in any approval of the project.

9.2 Organization of Comments and Response

There were 1,234 comments from 533 commenters received during the circulation period for the DEIS/DEIR. Comments were received from federal, state, and local agencies, elected officials, community organizations, transit advocates, and from members of the general public. Additional comments were received and recorded after the circulation period closed. Comments were received via mail, e-mail, phone, and at each meeting. Comments were recorded in a database with the source, date, method of receipt, and issue area identified. There were 56 people that commented on the DEIS/DEIR at four public hearings that were held during the public review and comment period.

A list of commenters and all written and oral comments are provided and responded to Appendix K of the FEIS/FEIR. In order to facilitate review of the responses to comments, the FEIS/FEIR includes Master Responses that respond to issues and questions raised by a number of the comments. Comments and responses to agencies and organizations are then provided, followed by individual members of the public. All of the original correspondence and public hearing transcripts are included, with responses found immediately after the correspondence or transcript. Each correspondence type, individual comments, and individual responses have been assigned

corresponding numbers. Where appropriate, the individual response refers the reader to the applicable Master Response or another individual response. Master Responses also apply to the responses to comments contained in Appendix K.

9.3 Summary of Public Comment from Circulation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report

A brief summary of the public comments that were received, organized by key topic areas, is provided below:

- **Alignments/Routes** - Many of the received comments concerned potential connections to existing transit lines, particularly the Metro Red, Purple, Blue, and Green Lines, as well as the Exposition Light Rail Transit (LRT) Line (under construction). Particular interests focused on regional connectivity, especially active venues and destination centers, such as Hollywood, The Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), South Bay, Downtown Los Angeles, and the Westside. Recommendations were made to design new routes, such as an alignment from La Brea Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard with connections to Venice Boulevard/San Vicente Boulevard then south along Crenshaw Boulevard. Several comments indicated less desire for a connection at Wilshire Boulevard/Crenshaw Boulevard.
- **Mode** -- Most remarks expressed support for LRT, as opposed to bus-based services. Stakeholders urged the consideration of grade separations (either below grade or at grade). Many commenters urged for a fully-grade separated alignment. There was concern that an at-grade alignment would degrade the aesthetics, culture, and history of portions of the Crenshaw/LAX Corridor, particularly in the Leimert Park area. Comments were received pertaining to the safety of LRT at crossings and the interaction of vehicular traffic with LRT. There were several comments from residents who requested the same level of service and amenities that affluent communities receive. Comments relating to bus services varied. Some of the comments were in support of bus services because they were perceived as having less of a negative impact on the aesthetics and culture of the area. Some felt that buses were safer, as opposed to light rail, and would cause less disruption, would cost less, and could be implemented sooner. Some comments were not in support of any additional bus services. Other comments suggested a continued need for local and circulator bus services.
- **Maintenance Facility** - Many comments were received regarding the two preferred maintenance sites that were identified in the DEIS/DEIR, Sites B and D, located in Westchester and El Segundo, respectively.
- **Public Safety** - Stakeholders articulated concern over LRT with regard to its proximity to schools and the safe interaction between LRT and vehicular/pedestrian traffic, particularly at grade-crossings.
- **Traffic and Parking** - Generally, the concerns regarded potential increases in congestion during construction and potentially during LRT/bus rapid transit (BRT) operations. Specifically, Slauson Avenue was cited as a concern for many commenters.



- **Historic and Cultural Resources** - Preservation of the character, culture, and history of the Crenshaw Corridor were paramount. Stakeholders expressed a fear that the community would change, and that minority and small business owners could be impacted. Leimert Park Village and Hyde Park were areas mentioned frequently with regard to preservation.
- **Connectivity** - Participants expressed a desire for regional connectivity and efficiency, with a focused attention on connections to LAX, the Westside, Downtown Los Angeles, the South Bay and the Metro Red, Green, Blue, and Purple Lines.
- **Environmental Justice** - Equity issues were strongly expressed. Community stakeholders wanted the same level of investment and consideration that more affluent communities would receive. Comments expressed that negative impacts should be mitigated to the extent possible and that the quality of life should be protected from degradation.
- **Economic Development** - A few comments referenced the potential for transit to allow for enhanced economic vitality. Others expressed concern for the perceived potential loss of existing businesses along Crenshaw Boulevard.

9.4 Master Responses for the DEIS/DEIR

Common themes emerged from the comments received on the DEIS/DEIR. As such, Master Responses were developed for these frequently asked questions and comments to address broad issue areas where there was extensive public comment and to deal with the various comments in a comprehensive fashion. Specifically, Master Responses are provided to address the following issues:

- Master Response 1: Regarding a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard
- Master Response 2: Comments pertaining to the environmental effects of potential Maintenance Facility Sites B or D
- Master Response 3: A below-grade segment from 48th Street to 60th Street along Crenshaw Boulevard due to children’s safety, traffic, and environmental justice concerns
- Master Response 4: Regarding a fully grade separated light rail transit line along Crenshaw Boulevard with a below-grade station at Vernon Avenue (“the People’s Choice Option”)
- Master Response 5: Traffic Methodology and Analysis
- Master Response 6: Selection of the LRT Alternative as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)
- Master Response 7: Safety Treatments and approach to safety for the project
- Master Response 8: Parking along Park Mesa
- Master Response 9: Grade separations and Environmental Justice
- Master Response 10: Park Mesa Heights

- Master Response 11: Exposition below-grade alignment
- Master Response 12: Crenshaw/Vernon Station

Master Responses

This section provides the detailed responses that are contained in Master Response 1 through 12.

Master Response 1. Comments regarding a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.

The general comment received requests a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.

On December 16, 2009, the Metro Board of Directors selected a locally preferred alternative (LPA) for the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project. The selected LPA includes two underground segments for light rail along Crenshaw Boulevard, between 39th Street and 48th Street and between 60th Street and Victoria Avenue. The inclusion of these two underground segments follows a consistent application of criteria for considering grade separations for light rail transit (LRT). These criteria include availability of right-of-way, environmental impacts (such as traffic impacts, visual impacts, impacts to historic resources, and environmental justice impacts), and Metro's established Grade Crossing Policy. In locations where there is available right-of-way, where there is a lack of unmitigable significant environmental impacts, or where conditions fail to meet the criteria of Metro's Grade Crossing Policy, the LRT alignment is proposed to remain at grade. The Metro Board also authorized continued environmental review of three design options including an extended below grade section between Exposition Boulevard and 39th Street (Exposition/Crenshaw Grade Separation) originally Design Option 6. During advanced conceptual engineering, an at-grade configuration was determined to be technically infeasible and significantly impactful along this segment. The incorporation of Design Option 6 would be required to have a northern terminus at the Exposition Line.

The criteria mentioned above do not require the alignment to be placed underground between 48th Street and 59th Street (in the Park Mesa Heights neighborhood). The cost of constructing a fully grade-separated project along the entire length of Crenshaw Boulevard would be beyond the scope of the approved Metro budget for the project and financially infeasible. Because it is not required by Metro's policies or general criteria, elements such as a grade separation in Park Mesa Heights, are considered betterments. Betterments are typically funded by other parties using funds outside of Metro's program and are over and above expected contributions from the local jurisdictions. At its May 2011 meeting, the Metro Board considered a motion to add a below-grade grade separation between 48th and 59th Streets to the Project Definition. The Board rejected this motion/proposal and, therefore, the project definition retains an at-grade alignment between 48th and 59th Streets.



For additional information, please refer to Chapter 2.0, Alternatives Considered, and Chapter 4.0, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences of the Alignment and Stations of the FEIS/FEIR.

Master Response 2. Comments pertaining to the environmental effects of potential Maintenance Facility Sites B or D.

The general comment received expresses concerns about the two maintenance facility alternatives that were evaluated in the DEIS/DEIR.

The DEIS/DEIR identified four potential maintenance facility sites for initial screening. Two of these sites, Maintenance Facility Site B in the Westchester community and Site D in El Segundo were further analyzed as part of the proposed project. Maintenance Site D was found to have the least adverse affect on the environment in the DEIS/DEIR. The Locally Preferred Alternative selected by the Metro Board of Directors eliminated both Sites B and D from the proposed project and called for an additional evaluation of potential sites during advanced conceptual engineering to identify another preferred site. The new potential maintenance sites identified underwent a supplemental environmental review. All commenters who commented on the maintenance facility sites in the DEIS/DEIR, were notified of the additional site analysis and asked to resubmit comments based on the revised site analysis. The public was solicited to participate in the initial identification process and a public meeting with a hearing was held to receive comments when the revised analysis was circulated. Because both potential maintenance sites identified in the DEIS/DEIR were removed from consideration, no additional response specific to Sites B and D is warranted. For additional information, please refer to Chapter 5.0, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, of the Maintenance Site Alternatives of the FEIS/FEIR.

Master Response 3. Comments requesting a below-grade segment from 48th Street to 60th Street along Crenshaw Boulevard due to children’s safety, traffic, and environmental justice concerns.

The general comment received requests a below-grade alternative along Crenshaw due to concerns with safety, traffic at the Crenshaw/Slauson intersection, and environmental justice. The cost of constructing a fully grade-separated project along the entire length of Crenshaw Boulevard would be beyond the scope of the approved Metro budget for the project and financially infeasible. The FEIS/FEIR determined that no adverse effects to traffic and safety would occur at the Crenshaw/Slauson intersection and that no adverse effects related to environmental justice would occur.

Safety

A number of comments received expressed concern about the safety of pedestrians, specifically school children and the elderly, with a light rail vehicle operating at-grade along Crenshaw Boulevard between 48th and 59th Streets. This segment contains two high schools, Crenshaw High School which is located one block to the east, and View Park Preparatory Charter High School, located on the northwest corner of the Crenshaw Boulevard/Slauson Avenue intersection. There are six at-grade crossings located along this segment, at the intersections of 48th Street, 52nd Street, 54th Street, 57th Street,

Slauson Avenue, and 59th Street. In addition, a station is located to the south of the Crenshaw Boulevard/Slauson Avenue intersection. Appropriate pedestrian crossing control devices for at-grade crossings are critical for rail system safety. In addition to standard cross-walk markings, control devices for pedestrian crossings include flashing light signals, signs, markings along the outside of the rail line, curbside pedestrian barriers, pedestrian automated gates, swing gates, bedstead barriers and crossing channelization. When the light rail transit line is at-grade, it would operate in a semi-exclusive right-of-way separated from automobile traffic by a raised curb. Pedestrians are permitted to cross the street at designated crosswalk locations during protected pedestrian signal phases in which light rail vehicles are not present. Along the Harbor Subdivision, pedestrian safety will involve gated crossings controlled using current Metro standards for crossings. Each crossing will be reviewed during design based on the California Public Utilities Report “Pedestrian – Rail Crossings in California.”

Pedestrians crossing Crenshaw Boulevard across the light rail tracks will be controlled using normal pedestrian traffic signal indications; adequate crossing times will be provided at the traffic signals for pedestrians to cross the street at a normal walking pace. A pedestrian refuge area will be provided in the median at all crossings of the LRT tracks to provide a space for pedestrians to wait out of traffic and off the tracks should they not be able to complete their crossing of Crenshaw Boulevard during one signal phase. Each crossing was evaluated for pedestrian safety based on site visits and engineering design. The evaluation resulted in a list of design modifications and mitigation measures identified in the Safety and Security Section of the FEIS/FEIR to improve the level of safety at crossings. The final determination of safety measures to be implemented near school zones is determined through consultation and approval by the California Public Utilities Commission.

Traffic

For a description of the traffic methodology and analysis for the whole Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project, please see Master Response #5. This discussion focuses on traffic impacts at the Crenshaw Boulevard/Slauson Avenue intersection.

There were a number of comments received which specifically identified concerns with the traffic impacts that would occur at the Crenshaw Boulevard/Slauson Avenue intersection should the project be adopted. The comments stated that traffic already backed up at this intersection and that the proposed project operating at-grade would cause the traffic impacts to increase at this intersection. Table F-1 on page F-5 of Appendix F in the DEIS/DIER established that existing traffic volumes at the Crenshaw Avenue/Slauson Avenue intersection are operating beyond capacity. This intersection experiences a delay of 117 seconds during the a.m. peak period and 109 seconds during the p.m. peak period. Table G-2 on page G-4 of Appendix G of the FEIS/FEIR shows that this delay is forecasted to increase to 171 seconds in the a.m. peak period and 118 seconds during the p.m. peak period in 2030, without implementation of the proposed project. This would result in an increase of 54 seconds during the a.m. peak period and 9 seconds in the p.m. peak period for year. With implementation of the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project, Table G-3 on page G-6 in Appendix G of the FEIS/FEIR show that the Crenshaw Boulevard/Slauson Avenue intersection would experience a delay of 102.2 seconds during the a.m. peak period and 109.3 seconds during the p.m. peak



period. The Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project would reduce delay at this intersection by 68.8 seconds during the a.m. peak period and 8.7 seconds in the p.m. peak period for year 2030.

The delay and level of service for the Project was re-analyzed during preparation of the FEIS/FEIR based on new information obtained from the advanced conceptual engineering designs and additional intersection counts. For the differences in traffic methodology please refer to Master Response 5. No significant impacts would result with the Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Line operating at-grade through the Crenshaw Boulevard/Slauson Avenue intersection.

During the refined traffic analysis, additional modeling was completed to characterize the effects of the project along the at-grade segments, which included the Crenshaw Boulevard/Slauson Avenue intersection. This intersection was analyzed with a range of signal cycle lengths ranging from 120 to 150 seconds. The analysis assumes a combination of fixed and adaptive timing to facilitate the appropriate signal progression along Crenshaw Boulevard to accommodate both light rail operations and traffic flow. A 150-second cycle length is used to represent the scenario representing maximum signal timing for intersection analysis. A 120-second cycle length represents the minimum cycle length that can accommodate the signal phasing required for both light rail operations and traffic flow. The range of cycle lengths provides flexibility during subsequent phases of design for the project to provide a foundation to coordinate with LADOT in establishing the appropriate signal operations design that is ultimately applied. The Crenshaw Boulevard/Slauson Avenue intersection would result in decreased delay at all of the signal cycle lengths (150-, 140-, 130-, and 120-seconds) compared to the No-Build Alternative for the year 2030.

In both traffic analyses (DEIS/DEIR and advanced conceptual engineering), no significant traffic impacts were found to occur at the Crenshaw Boulevard/Slauson Avenue intersection.

Environmental Justice

A number of comments received expressed concern over the need to maintain equal standards in the study area, in terms of project development and implementation, especially in relation to other, more affluent communities. These concerns were specifically addressed to implementing a fully- grade-separated project, and being shown the same consideration as communities along the Wilshire Corridor. Grade separation for light rail transit is typically driven by factors related to technical design or environmental criteria, and is not dependent on the type of community where it is to be located. As shown in Table 4-70 on page 4-323 in Section 4.18.2.1 of the FEIS/FEIR, most of the grade separations that occur in the existing Metro Rail system are grade-separated in predominantly minority and low-income communities. The Metro Red and Purple Lines have fifty-five percent of the alignment traveling through minority areas and 74 percent of the lines travel through low-income areas.

The intent of Executive Order 12898 pertaining to Environmental Justice is to disclose any element of the planning, design, and alternative selection process and overall decision-making process, which indicates there has been a systematic bias toward disproportionate focusing adverse environmental impacts on low-income, minority, or

other communities and neighborhoods of concern. The transparency in the decision-making process lies at the heart of this consideration. Transit planning involves both policy choices as well as engineering and environmental impact decisions regarding the modes considered, the level of transit service, frequency of service, route alignments, and station locations. In many instances, minority and low-income communities are highly transit dependent. The planning process is designed in large part to serve the mobility and access of these communities. Serving transit-dependent communities disproportionately less than less transit-dependent communities would be a severe environmental injustice. Nonetheless, the placement of transit infrastructure – while the intent is to provide a beneficial impact to communities, may have unintended adverse effects. The alternatives evaluation and the environmental review process are designed to disclose and resolve any potential unanticipated problems that may affect adjacent communities.

The FEIS/FEIR analyzed the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project to determine if the project would cause disproportionate adverse impacts related to transit service equity, traffic congestion, parking, displacement, community cohesion, visual resources, health issues, historical, archaeological, paleontological, community facilities, economic vitality and employment opportunities, safety and security, and construction. The following considerations were utilized in the environmental justice evaluation of the Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit Alternative (with the first two being required elements of Executive Order 12898):

- Whether the proposed project would have any potential adverse effects that would be disproportionately borne by minority and low-income communities;
- Whether low-income communities have had opportunities to actively participate in the planning of the project; and/or
- Whether the proposed project would provide transit equity.

As described in the FEIS/FEIR, the LPA for the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project would operate at-grade between 48th Street and 59th Street, where it was determined that light rail could operate safely without the need of a grade separation. This determination was based on the width of Crenshaw Boulevard at this point, traffic signal proposed operation modifications, and proposed street geometry changes. No adverse effects related to environmental justice were identified along this segment.

There has been an extensive public outreach process where alternatives have been formulated, evaluated and refined. Through public outreach, information was provided during the evaluation process of the relative impacts among options (alignment routes, vertical and horizontal alignments, station locations, etc.). The Metro Board of Directors, in selecting an LPA, considered the engineering and environmental documentation, as well as public comments and concerns. In instances where issues have arisen, design and alignment decisions have been revisited. In instances where adverse affects have been identified, design options and mitigation measures have been formulated to reduce or eliminate potential impacts on adjacent communities, and on adjacent minority or low-income communities. Because the project would occur within a predominantly minority and low-income area, all the impacts caused by the proposed project would occur to



primarily minority and low-income groups and the impacts of the project would not be disproportionate. Metro, during the public participation process, responded to community concerns regarding the safety of at-grade sections by including grade-separated design options in key sections of the corridor. For additional information, please refer to Chapter 4.0, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, of the Alignment of the FEIS/FEIR.

Master Response 4. Comments regarding a fully grade separated light rail transit line along Crenshaw Boulevard with a below-grade station at Vernon Avenue (“the People’s Choice Option”).

The general comment received requests an entirely below-grade segment along Crenshaw Boulevard.

During the public participation process of the DEIS/DEIR, support for a fully grade-separated light rail transit line along Crenshaw Boulevard with a below-grade station at Vernon Avenue was voiced by several members of the community. This variation of the Crenshaw Transit Project was referred to by these commenters as the “People’s Choice” or “People’s Option.” During the comment period, there were many commenters who asked for incorporation of the People’s Choice variation.

During the preparation of the DEIS/DEIR, six additional design options were considered and evaluated to assess environmental impacts and address community concerns. Those design options specifically related to the “People’s Choice Option” included Design Options 4, 5, and 6, a below-grade segment from 60th Street along Crenshaw Boulevard to Victoria Avenue along the Harbor Subdivision, a below-grade station at Vernon Avenue, and a below-grade segment from Exposition Boulevard along Crenshaw Boulevard to 39th Street, respectively. The Locally Preferred Alternative selected by the Metro Board of Directors, incorporated Design Option 4 and authorized continued environmental review of Design Options 5 and 6 in the advanced conceptual engineering stage during preparation of the FEIS/FEIR.

At its May 2011 Board meeting, the Metro Board considered whether to add the Crenshaw/Vernon Station to the Project Definition and to add project funding. The below-grade station at Vernon was not incorporated into the final project definition but is still under consideration by the Metro Board as a design option. Implementation of this station is dependent upon whether the cost of the station as reflected in bids of potential contractors can fit within designated project funding. The Crenshaw/King station entrance is located 0.4 miles from Leimert Park Village and 0.6 miles from the Optional Crenshaw/Vernon Station entrance and would provide service to the Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza, as well as the Leimert Park Village Community.

During advanced conceptual engineering, an at-grade configuration was determined to be technically infeasible along the section between Exposition Boulevard and 39th Street and the incorporation of Design Option 6 would be required to connect to the Exposition Line. The remaining at-grade segment along Crenshaw Boulevard from 48th Street to 60th Street was determined not to be required based on the criteria that Metro uses to make determinations on grade separations.

The physical conditions and the lack of significant environmental impacts do not require the alignment to be placed underground. The cost of constructing a fully grade-separated project along the entire length of Crenshaw Boulevard would be beyond the scope of Metro policies and the approved Metro budget for the project and financially infeasible. Although the below-grade Vernon Station is not part of the LPA, it is still an option that has been carried into the FEIS/FEIR. The Metro Board of Directors can still choose to incorporate this design option into the LPA, should the board designate funding to pay for the design option. The revised costs for the project are provided in the Chapter 8.0, Financial Analysis and Comparison of Alternatives of the FEIS/FEIR. For additional information, please refer to Chapter 2.0, Alternatives Considered, and Chapter 4.0, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, of the Alignment of the FEIS/FEIR.

Master Response 5. Traffic Methodology and Analysis

The general comment received expresses concern about the traffic analysis done for the project.

Initial Analysis

A total of 46 key intersections were analyzed to characterize the existing traffic operations within the study area. The study intersections are depicted in Figure 3-5, Chapter 3.0 Transportation Impacts, on page 3-16 of the DEIS/DEIR. The operational analysis methodology from the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) (Transportation Research Board, 2000) was used to estimate the delay and corresponding level of service (LOS) at each of the 46 intersections. For comparison purposes, the vehicle/capacity (V/C) ratios using the Critical Movement Analysis method were also presented. The intersection conditions within the study area were based on the average delay, measured in seconds, experienced by drivers. The LOS is a qualitative measure used to describe the conditions of traffic flow ranging from LOS A (free flow) to LOS F (congested conditions), with LOS E representing theoretical capacity. Weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours were selected for analysis because they represent the most critical periods of traffic congestion in the study area.

Methodology

The traffic impact analysis used a Travel Demand Forecasting Model. Using data generated by the travel demand forecasting model, detailed travel pattern information was collected and summarized for future 2030 conditions. Integrated highway and transit forecasts were developed by the Metro model for all project alternatives for 2030 conditions.

Screenline Analysis. The integrated highway and transit forecasts were post-processed to yield screenline-based growth factors for specific portions of the study area for each project alternative. Growth factors were used to account for the increase in future base traffic volumes as a result of areawide or regional growth and development in the project corridor. Considering that topography and land use characteristics vary throughout the project corridor, growth factors were developed for the study corridor by four geographical subareas. Each subarea is bordered by selected screenlines. Screenlines are imaginary lines drawn across the major roadways in the vicinity of the project corridor and are used to assess the traffic volumes arriving and departing the project corridor. Each screenline is analyzed by



direction (north, south, east or west) to ensure that the analysis of traffic volumes (which may be more congested in one direction than the other depending on the time of day) reflects appropriate peak hour conditions rather than an average condition. The subareas and the screenlines bordering those subareas are listed below:

- Subarea 1: Wilshire Boulevard, Jefferson Boulevard, La Brea Avenue, Western Avenue
- Subarea 2: Jefferson Boulevard, Slauson Boulevard, La Brea Avenue, Western Avenue
- Subarea 3: Slauson Boulevard, Florence Avenue, Aviation Boulevard, Western Avenue
- Subarea 4: Manchester Avenue, El Segundo Boulevard, Aviation Boulevard, La Brea Avenue

A comparison of 2005 and forecast 2030 traffic volumes from the Metro model indicates that the overall traffic growth in the vicinity of the project corridor by 2030 is projected to be about 0.2 percent to 2 percent per year depending on the travel direction. These growth factors were then applied to existing 2008 count data to yield future 2030 volumes for the study intersections for all future scenarios.

Intersection Level of Service. Intersection LOS analysis was performed using Synchro (version 7) software. Synchro is a network-based interactive computer program that enables calculation of LOS at signalized intersections. Synchro uses the *Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2000* methodology. The HCM LOS for intersections is determined by measuring delay by seconds per vehicle. The methodology is consistent with the methodology in *HCM 2000*, Chapter 16 for signalized intersections. With this methodology, the average control delay per vehicle is estimated for each lane group and aggregated for each approach and for the intersection as a whole. Synchro also calculates signal timing (green times and cycle lengths) and maximum queue lengths to assist in evaluating signalized intersections. The pedestrian flashing do not walk crossing times at all LRT at-grade intersections were based on the actual planned roadway widths using 4 feet/minute walking speed. Pedestrians crossing Crenshaw Boulevard at lower walking speeds are provided refuge areas in the median of Crenshaw to wait for the next walk indication. The pedestrian walk times were set at a minimum of 7 seconds with 15 seconds used for walk times at LRT at-grade station entrances.

Corridor-Level Traffic Volume Forecasts. The traffic count data collected for the existing conditions analysis data was used in conjunction with the most recent travel model forecast data to estimate 2030 traffic volumes. As a result, the analysis uses a refined methodology that incorporates the most recent travel model forecast data, as well as the most consistent ground count data.

For the LPA, Metro's policy for *Grade Crossing for Light Rail Transit* (December, 2003) was used to assist in the development of 2030 traffic volumes at intersections within 200 feet of proposed at-grade roadway crossings. Initial screening results of LRT operations at the proposed at-grade crossing locations are detailed in a technical memorandum *Implications of Metro Grade Crossing Policy in the Proposed Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project Study Area* (Fehr & Peers, October 2008).

Park-and-Ride Traffic Volume Forecasts. Park-and-ride projections were used to develop trip generation and trip distribution for the LPA. Park-and-ride data was obtained from the Metro model which only provides data for riders that access stations on fixed guideways (LRT and heavy rail transit (HRT)). The park-and-ride trips were added to 2030 traffic volume forecasts to estimate the total traffic volumes.

Significance Criteria

The intersection LOS analysis assumes that an intersection would be adversely affected by traffic volume changes if the Project would cause an increase in average vehicle delay according to the following thresholds that were developed in consultation with local jurisdictions:

- Final LOS C – an adverse impact has occurred if the delay is increased by 5 or more seconds
- Final LOS D - an adverse impact has occurred if the delay is increased by 7.5 or more seconds
- Final LOS E/F - an adverse impact has occurred if the delay is increased by 10 or more seconds

Refined Analysis

The delay and level of service for the Project were re-calculated from the DEIS/DEIR based on new information obtained from the advanced conceptual engineering designs and additional intersection counts. Refined project design information included:

- With the removal of several alignment alternatives, the revised traffic analysis was focused on 26 of the original 46 intersections that would potentially be affected by the LPA. The intersections and detailed traffic analysis can be found in Appendix G of the FEIS/FEIR.
- Pedestrian flashing “do not walk” crossing times were increased at all at-grade intersections based on planned roadway widths using a 4 feet/minute walking speed.
- Pedestrian walk times (initial walking person symbol) were adjusted to a minimum of 7 seconds with 15 seconds used for walk times in at-grade station entrances.
- The prohibition of left turn movements from Crenshaw Boulevard to 54th Street.
- Due to high traffic volumes, pedestrians, and long crossing times, the use of transit priority is not expected to be effective along Crenshaw Boulevard. To provide station to station travel for the LRT with minimum stops, progression timings were determined. The coordination plans provided bi-directional through bands along Crenshaw Boulevard for the LRT and arterial traffic. To provide the best progression for the LRT, longer than typical cycle lengths were explored. Longer cycle lengths provide larger progressive windows for the LRT and are required to provide protected left turn phasing whenever traffic turns left across the LRT tracks. The maximum LADOT allowable cycle length of 150 seconds provides the best LRT flows. A range of cycle lengths from 120 to 150 seconds was applied to the entire section of Crenshaw Boulevard, including areas without on-street running, for consistent



progression along the arterial. By using longer cycle lengths, levels of service for the on-street running portions were mostly unaffected, while operations were significantly improved at King Boulevard, Stocker Street, and Vernon Avenue.

- All red time was changed at several locations to provide a consistent one second of all red time.
- Lane widths were changed from 12 feet to 10 feet on Crenshaw Boulevard in at-grade crossing intersections to better reflect proposed lane widths and to accommodate a bicycle lane section.
- Northbound and southbound left turns were removed at 54th Street/Crenshaw Boulevard.
- The southbound left turn at Exposition Boulevard/Crenshaw Boulevard was removed.
- Double left-turn lanes (150 feet) were added to Slauson Avenue/Crenshaw Boulevard on the east and westbound approaches. Dedicated right-turn lanes were allowed between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m. on the north and southbound approaches. It will remain a shared through right turn lane on the north and southbound approaches between 6:30 a.m and 4 p.m. due to school drop offs.
- The Westbound direction of movement at Centinela Ave/Florence Avenue now allows double right-turns and two through lanes.
- Protected left turns were added at the intersections of Florence Avenue with Cedar, Eucalyptus, and Ivy to provide railroad clearance operations at these locations, and address delays caused by railroad pre-emption.

Modeling Results

In general, the results support the findings contained in the environmental analysis while providing additional information on impacts to pedestrians and LRT vehicles. Microsimulation was performed using VISSIM 5.10 by PTV Vision to better assess impacts on traffic and LRT operations and to compensate for instability in traffic delay calculations generated by the Synchro traffic model for intersections that are projected to be at or above capacity. The simulation analysis calculated the delay at each intersection approach, queues, and corridor travel time results. The VISSIM model was based on the new advanced conceptual designs for the Crenshaw LRT, the corridor intersection lane configurations, and the updated DEIR corridor signal timing assumptions included in the *Intersection Delay & Lane Configuration Report* in the Traffic Appendix of the FEIS/FEIR. For a more detailed description of the microsimulation methodology and results, refer to the *Traffic Microsimulation Report* in the Traffic Appendix of the FEIS/FEIR.

The evaluation of intersection impacts is discussed in two parts based on whether or not the LPA operates at-grade in the same right-of-way with automobile traffic. Impacts are evaluated against existing conditions and against 2030 conditions. With traffic congestion is greater in year 2030 than opening day (2018) and existing conditions, the worst case scenario for evaluating the traffic impacts of the project would also occur in year 2030. The intersections where the LPA operates at-grade in the same right-of-way with automobile traffic are discussed separately to establish the appropriate combination

of light rail transit and traffic signal operations and optimize the effectiveness of the local transportation network.

Under the LPA, 11 of the 26 intersections would operate at acceptable levels of service. Twenty-three of the 26 study intersections are not in locations where the LPA operates at-grade in the same right-of-way with automobile traffic. The remaining three of the 26 study intersections are located along the at-grade portion of the alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard from 60th to 48th Streets:

- Crenshaw Boulevard/Slauson Avenue
- Crenshaw Boulevard/54th Street
- Crenshaw Boulevard/48th Street

These three intersections are representative of the intersections along Crenshaw Boulevard where the LPA operates at-grade. Additional intersection analysis was completed during advanced conceptual engineering to characterize the full range of effects of the project along these at-grade segments. These three intersections were analyzed with a range of signal cycle lengths ranging from 120 to 150 seconds. The analysis assumes a combination of fixed and adaptive timing to facilitate the appropriate signal progression along Crenshaw Boulevard to accommodate both light rail operations and traffic flow. The analysis also assumes the prohibition of left turns from Crenshaw Boulevard to 54th Street. A 150-second cycle length is used to represent the scenario representing maximum signal timing for intersection analysis. A 120-second cycle length represents the minimum cycle length that can accommodate the signal phasing required for both light rail operations and traffic flow. The range of cycle lengths provides flexibility during subsequent phases of design for the project to provide a foundation to coordinate with LADOT in establishing the appropriate signal operations design that is ultimately applied.

The intersection analysis for the remaining 23 intersections does not alter signal cycle lengths and the 2030 intersection LOS, delay, and V/C ratio calculations are provided for the LPA in comparison to 2030 No-Build condition.

Intersections with Ranges of Signal Cycle Lengths for At-Grade Operation. The LPA would not result in adverse traffic impacts at any of the three at-grade intersections along Crenshaw Boulevard based on a 150-second cycle length for the year 2030. The LPA would result in adverse effects at the Crenshaw Boulevard/54th Street intersection for the 140-, 130-, 120-second signal cycle lengths (using the LADOT criteria). The project would cause the LOS to degrade from C to D with an increase in delay of over 7.5 seconds. The two other study intersections (Crenshaw Boulevard/48th Street and Crenshaw Boulevard/Slauson Avenue) along the at-grade segment of Crenshaw Boulevard would not result in adverse effects at the 150-, 140-, 130-, 120-second signal cycle lengths. The longer signal cycle lengths would result in Crenshaw Boulevard getting more of the signal phase which would cause east and west-bound traffic to wait longer and some queues would build up on these streets. The LOS and delay for the range of signal cycle lengths compared to the No-Build Alternative are provided in Appendix G.



There is one location (Crenshaw Boulevard and 54th Street) that is impacted at signal cycle lengths at or less than 140 seconds. There are no changes in street geometry that would reduce impacts. Increasing the signal cycle length to 150 seconds would eliminate the impact. The determination of the signal cycle length, however, is an issue broader than the effects at a single intersection and has system implications for the grid of intersections north and south as well as east and west of this location. Within this system constraint, the intersection operations will be optimized to the extent feasible through a cooperative effort between Metro and LADOT as the project progresses toward implementation. Because there is no absolute certainty that the 150 cycle length can be achieved, the impacts at this intersection are considered significant and adverse.

Parking loss for the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project would primarily occur on the inner portion of the frontage road bordering both sides of Crenshaw Boulevard between 48th and 60th Street. There is a total loss of 308 on-street parking spaces along Crenshaw Boulevard with a loss of 142 northbound and 166 southbound on-street parking spaces. A parking utilization survey conducted during the Advanced Conceptual Engineering Process determined that the loss of on-street parking would not result in a parking shortage for the area. The location and size of the park and ride facilities was refined during the Advance Conceptual Engineering Process. The Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project will have park and ride sites at the La Brea, West, and Exposition Stations. The West Station park and ride lot will contain up to 120 spaces, the La Brea Station park and ride lot will contain up to 100 spaces, and the Exposition Station park and ride lot will contain up to 110 spaces. Together, these facilities would serve the transit corridor's parking demands. For additional information, please refer to Chapter 3 .0, Transportation Impacts, of the FEIS/FEIR.

Master Response 6. Selection of the LRT Alternative as the Locally Preferred Alternative.

The general comment received requests the LRT Alternative over the BRT Alternative.

An Alternatives Analysis was completed during the preparation of the DEIS/DEIR to identify the transit alternatives to be evaluated in the DEIS/DEIR. The results of the Alternatives Analysis is presented in Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of the DEIS/DEIR. This analysis used criteria including but not limited to regional connectivity, ridership, and cost-effectiveness to compare the different modes of transit and alignment options and determine which alternatives would be carried forward for further analysis into the DEIS/DEIR. The Alternatives Analysis identified that a light rail transit and a bus rapid transit alternative be studied for further consideration based on the evaluation criteria. The two alternatives identified for further study in the Alternatives Analysis, along with a No Build Alternative and a Transportation Systems Management Alternative underwent a comprehensive environmental review in the DEIS/DEIR. Based on the results of this evaluation and public input received, the Metro Board of Directors selected the Light Rail Alternative as the Locally Preferred Alternative. The Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit Alternative proved to generate the greatest travel time savings and reliability, higher ridership for comparable segments, a stronger support of community goals for economic development, and a connectivity with other elements of Metro's regional transit system (specifically, the Metro Green Line). The BRT Alternative did not yield strong travel time benefits due to mixed-flow operation and

the slow speeds required of BRT vehicles at un-gated crossings along the Harbor Subdivision railroad right-of-way. Additional traffic impacts would occur from the conversion of mixed flow lanes in narrow sections of Crenshaw Boulevard. For additional information, please refer to Chapter 2.0, Alternatives Considered, of the Alignment of the FEIS/FEIR.

Master Response 7. Safety Treatments and approach to safety for the project.

The general comment received requests a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard to ensure the safety of vehicles and pedestrians.

Achieving vehicular and pedestrian safety near the operation of a light rail transit line is the result of several conditions, including safety oriented design, light rail operator training, and public education. When the light rail transit line is at-grade, it would operate in a semi-exclusive right-of-way separated from automobile traffic by a raised curb. The evaluations were conducted using the Metro Grade Crossing Policy for Light Rail Transit. The evaluation resulted in a list of design modifications and mitigation measures identified in the Safety and Security Section of the FEIS/FEIR to improve the level of safety at crossings. The exact safety measures to be implemented is determined through consultation and approval by the California Public Utilities Commission. For additional information, please refer to Chapter 4.0, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, of the Alignment of the FEIS/FEIR.

Master Response 8. Parking along Park Mesa.

The general comment received states concerns about the reconfiguration of the frontage roads in Park Mesa and the loss of parking that would occur.

Metro acknowledges that the construction of the light rail line would change traffic patterns, reduce on street parking and change access to local businesses during construction. Metro will work with and coordinate with local businesses to minimize adverse effects to the extent feasible. During operation of the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project, access to surrounding businesses and residences would be improved and vehicle trips within the Corridor would be reduced. With removal of the frontage road that parallels Crenshaw Boulevard from 48th to 60th Streets, the existing bus stops would be relocated. Relocating the existing bus stops results in the removal of additional on-street parking spaces on Crenshaw Boulevard. Based on the advanced conceptual engineering designs and relocation of the existing bus stops, there is a permanent loss of 142 northbound and 166 southbound on-street parking spaces between 48th and 60th Streets. A parking inventory of on-street parking along Crenshaw Boulevard found that the existing parking was underutilized and the remaining parking after implementation of the project would be sufficient to accommodate the demand and would not be detrimental to the existing businesses along Crenshaw Boulevard. For additional information, please refer to Chapter 3 .0, Transportation Impacts, of the FEIS/FEIR.

Master Response 9. Grade separations and Environmental Justice.

The general comment received suggests that if a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard is not implemented it would be an environmental justice concern.



Metro, similar to other transit planning agencies throughout the U.S., operates on the premise that LRT is primarily an at-grade or surface-running transit technology and incorporates grade separations. This transit technology can operate in at-grade environments ranging from mixed traffic, to an exclusive right-of-way or guideway. Metro considers grade separations associated with LRT projects on a case-by-case basis primarily for severe traffic or other environmental impacts and not on the socio-economic profile of an area. Traffic operations at intersections must be maintained at an acceptable level of service (LOS) in conjunction with adequate LRT train frequencies and overall travel times. As described in the FEIS/FEIR, the LPA for the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Project would operate at-grade between 48th Street and 60th Street, where it was determined that light rail could operate safely without the need of a grade separation. This determination was based on the width of Crenshaw Boulevard at this point, proposed operation modifications to traffic signals, and proposed street geometry changes. No adverse effects related to environmental justice were identified along this segment.

There has been an extensive public outreach process where alternatives have been formulated, evaluated and refined. The evaluation process has informed the affected residents of the relative impacts among options (alignment routes, vertical and horizontal alignments, station locations, etc.). The Metro Board of Directors, in selecting an LPA, considered the engineering and environmental documentation, as well as public comments and concerns. In instances where issues have arisen, design and alignment decisions have been revisited. In instances where adverse effects have been identified, design options and mitigation measures have been formulated to reduce or eliminate potential impacts on adjacent communities, and on adjacent minority or low-income communities.

Metro, during the public participation process, responded to community concerns regarding the safety of at-grade sections by including grade-separated design options in key sections of the corridor with the exception of the segment on Crenshaw Boulevard from 48th Street to 60th Street, where it was determined that light rail could operate safely without the need of a grade separation. This determination was based on the availability of right-of-way within Crenshaw Boulevard along this section, traffic signal proposed operation modifications, and proposed street geometry changes. No adverse effects related to environmental justice were identified along this segment.

CEQA/NEPA requires the analysis of the physical impacts of the environment. The Environmental Justice analysis found that no disproportionate environmental impacts would occur to any of the groups referred to by the commenter.

Under the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project, the northern terminus of the line is at the Exposition Station. The Wilshire/La Brea station area and associated affluent, non-minority Park Mile community to the north that the commenters refers to would not receive transit service under the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project. A future northern extension of the line to Wilshire is not part of the Locally Preferred Alternative selected by the Metro Board of Directors. A Feasibility study has been conducted by Metro that indicated that a future northern extension of light rail transit to Wilshire Boulevard is feasible. A grade separation at Exposition facilitates a future northern extension toward Wilshire Boulevard. Otherwise the at-grade segment from King to

Exposition would have to be demolished and re-constructed below grade if a future northern connection is implemented. Such a connection is included in the Strategic Element of Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan adopted in October 2009. A separate planning process could explore a transit investment in the corridor if a future update to Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan identifies this as a funded project. However, no disproportionate impacts could occur since this prospective extension is not a funded transit project. For additional information, please refer to Chapter 2.0, Alternatives Considered, and Chapter 4.0, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, of the Alignment of the FEIS/FEIR.

Master Response 10. Park Mesa Heights.

The general comment received requests a below-grade alternative from 48th Street to 60th Street.

A below-grade alternative from 48th Street to 60th Street was studied during the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project. This investigation documented the characteristics of such a below-grade alignment. Under the Base LRT Alternative, where the alignment is at-grade between 48th Street to 60th Street, no adverse impacts to traffic, safety, noise and vibration, aesthetic resources, environmental justice, or communities and neighborhoods would occur with implementation of mitigation measures. The physical conditions and the lack of significant environmental impacts would not require the alignment to be placed underground between 48th Street and 60th Street. In addition, the cost of constructing a fully grade-separated project along the entire length of Crenshaw Boulevard would be beyond the scope of Metro policies and the approved Metro budget for the project and financially infeasible. The revised costs for the project are provided in the Chapter 8.0, Financial Analysis and Comparison of Alternatives of the FEIS/FEIR. For additional information, please refer to Chapter 2.0, Alternatives Considered, and Chapter 4.0, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, of the Alignment of the FEIS/FEIR.

Master Response 11. Exposition below-grade alignment.

The general comment received requests a below-grade segment from the Crenshaw/King Station to the Crenshaw/Exposition Station.

The selected LPA included two underground segments for light rail along Crenshaw Boulevard, between 39th Street and 48th Street and between 60th Street and Victoria Avenue. The inclusion of these two underground segments follows a consistent application of criteria for considering grade separations for light rail transit (LRT). These criteria include availability of right-of-way, environmental impacts (such as traffic impacts, visual impacts, impacts to historic resources, and environmental justice impacts), and Metro's established Grade Crossing Policy. In locations where there is available right-of-way, where there is a lack of significant environmental impacts, or where conditions fail to meet the criteria of Metro's Grade Crossing Policy, the LRT alignment is proposed to remain at grade. The Metro Board also authorized continued environmental review of three design options including an extended below grade section between Exposition Boulevard and 39th Street (Exposition/Crenshaw Grade Separation)



originally Design Option 6. During advanced conceptual engineering, an at-grade configuration was determined to be technically infeasible along this segment due to potential conflicts with a development project approved by the City of Los Angeles, traffic impacts, and safety concerns. The incorporation of Design Option 6 would be required to have a northern terminus at the Exposition Line. Implementation of this segment is subject to financial feasibility. The revised costs for the project are provided in the Chapter 8.0, Financial Evaluation and Comparison of Alternatives of the FEIS/FEIR. For additional information, please refer to Chapter 2.0, Alternatives Considered, and Chapter 4.0, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, of the Alignment of the FEIS/FEIR.

Master Response 12. Crenshaw/Vernon Station.

The locations of transit stations are determined on a case by case basis and are based on a combination of factors, which include, but are not limited to cost, potential ridership, displacement, engineering feasibility, and impacts on travel times. A design option for a below-grade station at Vernon Avenue adjacent to Leimert Park was carried forward into the design process for further consideration. The optional Vernon Station was not included into the project definition because of the proximity to the King Station (0.6 miles) and cost to construct an underground station.

The exact locations of the stations were determined during the station area planning workshops and final design process. The optional Crenshaw/Vernon Station is an open cut trench station located in the Leimert Triangle, west of Vernon Avenue. The Crenshaw/King Station would be located in the median of the Crenshaw Boulevard with a portal on the southwest corner of the Crenshaw/King Boulevards intersection. An optional below-grade station at Vernon Avenue was carried forward through advanced conceptual engineering for further consideration. As suggested by the commenter, the station was designed to be a trench station within the Vernon triangle, which would also contain construction staging areas and a TPSS for the purposes of environmental review and clearance. At its May 2011 Board meeting, the Metro Board considered whether to add the Crenshaw/Vernon Station to the Project Definition and to add project funding. The below-grade station at Vernon was not incorporated into the final project definition but is still under consideration by the Metro Board as a design option. Implementation of this station is dependent upon whether the cost of the station as reflected in bids of potential contractors can fit within designated project funding. The King station is located 0.4 miles from Leimert Park Village and would provide service to the Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza, as well as the Leimert Park Village Community. Depending on costs reflected in contractor bids, the tunnels may be designed to accommodate a station in the future should the station be supported by funding.

The costs for construction of the at-grade station at Vernon stated in the DEIS/DIER were preliminary projections which have since been refined during the final design process. These revised costs are provided in the Chapter 8.0, Financial Evaluation and Comparison of the Alternatives of the FEIS/FEIR. Although the below-grade Vernon Station is not part of the LPA, it is still an option that has been carried into the FEIS/FEIR. The Metro Board of Directors can incorporate this design option into the LPA at the certification hearing, should the Board designate additional funding to pay for

the design option. For additional information, please refer to Chapter 2.0, Alternatives Considered, and Chapter 4.0, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, of the Alignment of the FEIS/FEIR.

9.5 Summary of Public Comment from Circulation of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report

There were 198 written comments from 42 commenters and oral comments made by 53 speakers received during the circulation period for the SDEIS/RDEIR. Comments were received from federal, state, and local agencies, elected officials, community organizations, transit advocates, and from members of the general public. Comments were received via mail, e-mail, phone, and the public hearings. Comments were recorded in a database with the source, date, method of receipt, and issue area identified.

A brief summary of the public comments that were received, organized by key topic areas, is provided below:

- **Maintenance Facilities** – 197 written comments were received related to maintenance facilities, primarily related to noise, economics, displacement, construction, traffic and air quality. Primarily these comments were related to the Site #17 – Marine/Redondo Beach and Division 22 Northern Expansion Alternatives.
- **Parklands and Historic and Cultural Resources** – One comment was received related to parklands and historic and cultural resources concerning Edward Vincent Jr. Park.

Agency Coordination

Multiple federal, state, local agencies provided comment during the circulation period. Additionally, communications were received from elected officials.

Comments were received from the following agencies and organizations:

- United States Department of the Interior
- Department of Transportation
- State Clearinghouse
- City of Hawthorne
- City of Inglewood
- City of Lawndale
- City of Redondo Beach
- County of Los Angeles
- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- Southern California Edison
- Fusion Homeowners Association



- Aviation Center Owners Association
- Neighborhood Council of Westchester
- Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition

9.6 Master Responses for the SDEIS/RDEIR

Although alternatives to project components are not required under NEPA or CEQA, the DEIS/DEIR and SDEIS/RDEIR considered alternatives to the proposed maintenance facility for the proposed project. Many comments received on the SDEIS/RDEIR were not related to the Site #14 – Arbor Vitae/Bellanca Alternative, the preferred maintenance site alternative selected by the Metro Board on April 28, 2011. A Master Response was developed for questions and comments issue areas pertaining specifically to the other three sites.

Supplemental Master Response 1. Regarding Comments Received regarding the potential selection of the Site #17 – Marine/Redondo Beach, Site #15 – Aviation/Manchester, and Division 22 Northern Expansion Alternatives.

Metro appreciates the ideas of the commenter and public input is an important part of the planning process. Based on the evaluation of impacts of the four maintenance site alternatives and public comment received on the evaluation, on April 28, 2011 the Metro Board of Directors selected the Site #14 – Arbor Vitae/Bellanca Alternative as the preferred site for the maintenance facility for the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project. Based on the Metro Board action, the Site #15 – Arbor Vitae/Bellanca, Site #17 – Marine/Redondo Beach, and the Division 22 Northern Expansion Alternatives are no longer under consideration and will not undergo further environmental review. No CEQA findings will be made for the Site #15 – Arbor Vitae/Bellanca, Site #17 – Marine/Redondo Beach, and the Division 22 Northern Expansion Alternatives and they will not be included in the FTA Record of Decision. Further future consideration of these sites would require a new environmental review process with additional opportunity for public comment. No additional response regarding the potential selection of the remaining three maintenance alternative sites is required, since they are no longer under consideration as potential sites for the maintenance facility.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK