

ATTACHMENT A

Comments Summary and Responses

The EA was available for public and agency review during a 32-day comment period from October 14, 2022 to November 14, 2022. During the public comment period, the team received 30 comment letters via post and email.

Table A provides a summary of comments received, the commenter, and topic of comment. The corresponding responses immediately follow Table A.

TABLE A - SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS – EA			
No.	Commenter	Comment Topic	Date Received
FEDERAL AGENCIES			
1	Environmental Protection Agency – Connell Dunning	General EA review	November 14, 2022
LOCAL AGENCIES			
2	South Coast Air Quality Management District – Danica Nguyen	Request for additional information; CEQA and NEPA clarification	October 12, 2022
3a	Los Angeles County Fire Department, Forestry Division – Perla Garcia	Request for an electronic submittal to review	October 13, 2022
3b	Los Angeles County Fire Department, Forestry Division – Ronald M. Durban	Department review	November 28, 2022
4	Los Angeles County Sanitation District – Mandy Huffman	Comments pertaining to the technical studies	October 24, 2022
5	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority – Cassie Truong	CEQA and NEPA clarification	November 3, 2022
TRIBAL ENTITIES			
6	Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California – Christina Conley	Request for Tribal coordination	October 18, 2022
ORGANIZATIONS			
7	Toragrafic – Mark Stewart	Project Support	October 24, 2022
8	Fast Signs – Eric Baines	Project Support	October 28, 2022
9	Elevate Culture Corporation – Alfred Torregano	Project Support	November 3, 2022
10	Greening LA – Marcela Oliva	Project Support	November 7, 2022
11	JAD & Associates LLC – Joseph Allan C Dilay, PE	Project Support	November 11, 2022
INDIVIDUALS			
12	Deborah Jennings-Mau	Project Support	October 22, 2022
13	Steve Lampkin	Project Support	October 28, 2022
14	Sunnet Rainer	Project Support	October 28, 2022
15	Lee Denmon	Project Support	October 28, 2022
16	Pauline Diaz	Project Support	October 28, 2022
17	Rene Lydia	Project Support	October 28, 2022
18	Diane Walker	Project Support	October 28, 2022

TABLE A - SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS – EA			
No.	Commenter	Comment Topic	Date Received
19	Bill West	Project Support	October 28, 2022
20	Gwen Goodman	Project Support	October 28, 2022
21	Aletha Metcalf	Project Support	October 28, 2022
22	Joan Richardson	Project Support	October 28, 2022
23	Alicia Smith	Project Support	October 28, 2022
24	Michele Chambers	Project Support	October 28, 2022
25	Doris Obih	Project Support	October 28, 2022
26	Richard Galindo	Project Support	October 28, 2022
27	Jackie Coco	Project Support	October 28, 2022
28	Scott Bedno	Project Support	November 9, 2022
29	Jose Flores	Project Support	November 10, 2022
30	Stacy Howard	Noise/Construction	November 11, 2022

General Response to Comment:

The Build Alternative, which was reaffirmed on November 22, 2022 would construct an approximately 1.6-mile long, elevated, guideway primarily located within the public right-of-way along Market Street, Manchester Boulevard, and Prairie Avenue and include three stations and a maintenance and storage facility. The overall purpose and objective of the proposed Project is to provide a direct and convenient extension of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) regional transit system for local residents and the region to access the City’s new major housing, employment, commercial, and activity centers. The proposed Project is planned to operate from 6:00 AM to 12:00 AM during the week and on weekends, with the possibility of extending operation hours as needed during special events. The proposed Project would open in time to operate for the 2028 Olympics.

Response to Comment 1: Environmental Protection Agency – Connell Dunning

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) submitted a comment letter on November 14, 2022 consistent with their review authority under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. The letter did not identify significant environmental concerns and acknowledged the FTA’s commitment to the Project’s mitigation program detailed in Attachment B. The EPA also requested to be notified upon the release of the FONSI for public review. No other comments or concerns were raised by the EPA and no further action is required at this time.

Response to Comment 2: South Coast Air Quality Management District – Danica Nguyen

The SCAQMD sent an email to the proposed Project email address asking whether the City’s EIR prepared pursuant to the CEQA had been approved and questioned why the EA was prepared and released after the EIR approval. On October 13, 2022, the City contacted the SCAQMD by telephone followed by an email response with the pertinent CEQA clarifications. As indicated to the SCAQMD staff via telephone, the Final EIR was certified by the City of Inglewood on April 12, 2022, thereby concluding the CEQA process. The CEQA compliance is for projects that will use State/regional/local grants or private funding. The EA has been completed per the NEPA, compliance with which is triggered by projects that are seeking federal funds which is the case for the proposed Project. Although the CEQA and the NEPA documents are sometimes joined and publicly circulated in a joint document, they need not be. Consistent with the FTA’s

regulations implementing the NEPA, no final design activities, non-authorized property acquisitions, purchases of construction materials or rolling stock, or construction activities for the proposed Project occurred prior to the issuance of the FONSI. In subsequent emails, the SCAQMD staff also requested an electronic version of the EA which was provided on October 15, 2022. No further correspondence or comment has been received from the SCAQMD and no further action is required at this time.

Response to Comment 3: Los Angeles County Fire Department – Perla Garcia and Ronald M. Durban.

The LACoFD responded to the EA circulation by requesting that the EA document be submitted to the Los Angeles County's EPIC-LA website for LACoFD environmental review. The City registered and submitted the EA on the EPIC-LA site on October 26, 2022. A comment letter was received on November 28, 2022, after the close of the EA circulation. The comment letter included review comments from the LACoFD Planning Division, Land Development Unit, Forestry Division, and Health Hazardous Materials Division. Both the Planning and Health Hazardous Materials Divisions had no comments and provided contact information for representatives of each division. The Land Development Unit stated that the Project must comply with County code and ordinance requirements for construction, access, water main, fire flows and fire hydrants and that any changes to water/fire hydrant locations require Fire Department review and approval. The Forestry Division noted their statutory responsibilities including oversight of erosion control, watershed management, rare and endangered species, brush clearance, vegetation management, fuel modification for Fire Hazard Severity Zones, archaeological and cultural resources, and the County Oak Tree Ordinance. The Build Alternative will comply with applicable County code and ordinance requirements as well as any County-required plan review or approvals.

Response to Comment 4: Los Angeles County Sanitation District – Mandy Huffman

The Los Angeles County Sanitation District provided clarifying comments on the Utilities Study provided in Appendix G of the EA. The comments stated that several sewer lines and storm drains identified in the study were incorrectly identified as Los Angeles County-owned facilities and asked that these items be corrected. In addition, the comment also noted that sewer line relocation and abandonment identified in the Utilities Study conflict matrix were being coordinated directly with the Districts' Sewer Design section. The Utilities Study has been updated with these clarifications and has been saved to the City and the FTA project files.

Response to Comment 5: Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority – Cassie Truong

The LACMTA sent an email following receipt of the NOA and asked for clarification and confirmation that the proposed Project had not changed substantially since LACMTA's review of the CEQA document. The City responded via email to explain that the Project description provided in the EA is the same as that provided in the CEQA EIR. No further correspondence or comment has been received from the LACMTA and no further action is required at this time.

Response to Comment 6: Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California – Christina Conley

The Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California responded to the EA circulation requesting to be notified on the proposed Project. Although, the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California were previously invited to participate in the NEPA Section 106 process for tribal consultation, as well as part of the CEQA and Assembly Bill 52 process, they did not respond to initial requests and the NEPA Section 106 process proceeded without their input. On December 12, 2022 the City contacted Ms. Conley via telephone to determine the Gabrielino Tongva Indians' interest in participating in formal tribal consultation under NEPA and the National Historic Preservation Act. Through this correspondence, Ms. Conley requested copies of

the original consultation invitation provided them in January 2022. The City provided the previous correspondences to Ms. Conley via email and Ms. Conley responded on December 12, 2022 stating that the tribe's mitigation monitoring concerns and cultural sensitivity of the Area of Potential Effect had been covered by the City's environmental review. Ms. Conley also noted that the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California will participate in the monitoring of the Project's ground disturbing activities on a rotation with other interested tribes. The Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California expressed no other concerns and no further action is required at this time. The Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California are included in the stakeholder database and mailing list and will continue to receive notifications in future phases of the proposed Project's development.

Response to Comment 30: Stacy Howard

The proposed construction hours are not 6:00 AM-12:00 AM. As described in Section 3.3.14, Construction Schedule and Activities, construction activity associated with the proposed Project would occur 24-hours a day, seven days a week with primarily heavy construction activities (those involving large equipment use on site) occurring over a 16 hour/day schedule with two shifts: either a morning shift from approximately 7:00 AM to 3:00 PM and an evening shift from approximately 3:00 PM to 11:00 PM; or a morning shift from approximately 7:00 AM to 3:00 PM and a night shift from approximately 11:00 PM to 7:00 AM. The night shift would be used typically for material deliveries, export of soil and debris and other light construction activities. However, certain heavy construction activities that necessitate temporary road closures could occur at night-time to minimize traffic disruptions. It is important to note that 24-hour construction is proposed to shorten the overall construction schedule. Pursuant to the Inglewood Municipal Code, any construction between the hours of 8:00 PM and 7:00 AM would require approval of a permit from the Permits and License Committee of the City.

A detailed noise analysis is provided in the EA, Section 4.18 under Effect CON-18: Noise and Vibration. Construction noise levels would not exceed the FTA's impact criteria. During daytime construction activities, noise levels at sensitive receptors would range from 50.1 to 79.6 dBA L_{eq} . The highest daytime noise levels would be at the residential uses along Manchester Drive to the northeast of the MSF, although the highest noise level would be less than the daytime L_{eq} of 90 dBA for residential land uses. Certain heavy construction activities that necessitate temporary road closures could occur at night-time to minimize traffic impacts. For example, construction of the elevated guideway, columns and station components that could impact Prairie Avenue and Manchester Boulevard would be primarily constructed during the off-peak hours and night hours to minimize impacts to daily commuter traffic and potential event traffic. During nighttime construction activities, noise levels at sensitive receptors would range from 47.1 to 76.5 dBA L_{eq} . The highest nighttime noise levels would be at the residential uses along Manchester Drive to the northeast of the MSF, although the highest noise level would be less than the nighttime L_{eq} of 80 dBA for residential land uses.

The EA identifies several mitigation measures intended to address construction noise effects for residents, including Mitigation Measure **NV-3**, which requires a Construction Noise Control Plan that would proactively minimize potential adverse effects by requiring a monitoring plan during demolition and construction activities to ensure noise levels are below the specified noise limits. Similarly, to address potential construction-related vibration effects, Mitigation Measure **NV-4** would minimize potential adverse effects by requiring a Construction Vibration Reduction Plan to minimize construction vibration at nearby sensitive receptors from vibration created by construction activities. Finally, the Construction Commitments Program adopted for the proposed Project would require a Community Affairs Liaison be identified who would be responsible for responding within 24 hours to any local complaints about construction activities related to noise and vibration.