

Responses to Comments

AR1

Responses to Comments from the South Coast Air Quality Management District, Radlein, Barbara

Response to Comment AR1-1

Metro appreciates your participation and comment.

Response to Comment AR1-2

The LST values in Tables 3-1 through 3-5 of the appendix have been updated using the 1-acre values in the guidance and consistent with the discussion in Section 4.2 of the DSEIS. The updates do not change the impact determination and mitigation measures described would continue to apply.

Response to Comment AR1-3

The maximum daily emissions are shown for each phase in the appendix. However, the maximum daily emissions based on the overlapping construction schedules are shown in Tables 1-5 and 1-6 of the appendix. In addition, Tables 4.2-2 and 4.2-4 in the Air Quality Section indicate the total emissions associated with the overlap of those construction phases. Therefore, these estimates do not need to be updated.

The timing of Phases 1 and 3 would overlap. However, the construction activities would be relatively stationary during daily construction of boring and drilling. These activities would not occur in the same location and would be located approximately 300 feet (94 meters) apart for any given day. Because localized impacts were evaluated based on a receptor distance of 25 meters, construction activities occurring at the same time but at different locations were not evaluated concurrently. Moreover, because EPBM and grouting both involve stationary activities (boring and drilling), the evaluation of emissions from Phase 1 and Phase 3 individually was determined most appropriate for the estimate of potential localized impacts.

Response to Comment AR1-4

Comment noted. Metro will provide Final SEIS.

Responses to Comments

Responses to State Agencies

| Comment Letter/Speaker | Affiliation | Last Name | First Name | Comment Page | Response Page |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------|--------------|---------------|
| State Agencies | | | | | |
| AS1 | State of California – Department of Transportation, District 7 | Watson | Dianna | | |

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 DISTRICT 7-OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
 100 S. MAIN STREET, MS 16
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
 PHONE (213) 897-9140
 FAX (213) 897-1337
 www.dot.ca.gov



*Serious drought.
 Help save water!*

July 28, 2015

Ms. Dolores Roybal Saltareli
 Los Angeles County MTA
 One Gateway Plaza, MS 99-22-2
 Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

RE: Regional Connector Transit Corridor
 Project
 Vic. LA-110 and LA-101
 SCH # 2009031043
 Ref. IGR/CEQA No. 090324CS
 Ref. IGR/CEQA No. 100923CS
 IGR/CEQA No. 150636AL-DSEIS

Dear Ms. Saltareli:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above referenced project. Metro and FTA have prepared a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for the Regional Connector Transit Corridor Project, a proposed underground light rail system that will connect the existing Metro Gold, Blue, and Expo Lines in downtown Los Angeles.

1

Storm water run-off is a sensitive issue for Los Angeles and Ventura counties. Please be mindful that projects should be designed to discharge clean run-off water. Additionally, discharge of storm water run-off is not permitted onto State highway facilities without a storm water management plan.

2

Transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials, which requires the use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways, will require a transportation permit from Caltrans. It is recommended that large size truck trips be limited to off-peak commute periods and idle time not to exceed 10 minutes.

3

In addition, a truck/traffic construction management plan is needed for this project. Traffic Management Plans involving lane closures or street detours, which will impact the circulation system affecting traffic to and from freeway on/off-ramps should be coordinated with Caltrans.

4

Ms. Dolores Roybal Saltareli
July 28, 2015
Page 2

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Alan Lin the project coordinator at (213) 897-8391 and refer to IGR/CEQA No. 150636AL.

Sincerely,



DIANNA WATSON
Branch Chief
Community Planning & LD IGR Review

cc: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse

Responses to Comments

AS1

Responses to Comments from State of California – Department of Transportation, District 7, Watson, Dianna

Response to Comment AS1-1

Comment acknowledged.

Response to Comment AS1-2

As stated in Chapter 1, the Draft SEIS was prepared to address the Order of the United States District Court for the Central District of California in Today's IV, Inc. vs. Federal Transit Administration et al and 515/555 Flower Associates, LLC vs. Federal Transit Administration et al. The Judgment and Order for Partial Injunctive Relief by the Honorable John A. Kronstadt on May 28, 2014 and September 9, 2014, respectively, require that the FTA as the federal lead agency pursuant to NEPA, with Metro, explain why open-face tunneling alternatives were rejected on the Lower Flower Segment in downtown Los Angeles. The Draft SEIS is intended to provide more information on the tunnel construction alternatives on Flower Street that were withdrawn from consideration, specifically Open-Face Shield and Sequential Excavation Method (SEM) tunneling for the Flower Street portion of the Regional Connector project alignment between 4th Street and the 7th Street/Metro Center Station, as required by the Judgment.

Metro understands the sensitivity of the run-off issue for Los Angeles and Ventura Counties. The unchanged analysis for impacts of water run-off and discharge of the locally preferred alternative may be found in the Final EIS/EIR, Chapter 4.10 Water Resources, Section 4.10.3.5 Locally Preferred Alternative. Additionally, Chapter 8 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program identifies the mitigation measures to be implemented as the Project relates to construction and water impacts.

As shown in Appendix L of the Draft SEIS the mitigation measure for the Locally Preferred Alternative would apply for Alternatives A and B.

Response to Comment AS1-3

Please see response to Comment AS1-2 above. The analysis for impacts of transportation during construction activities can be found in the Final EIS/EIR, Chapter 3 Transportation, Section 3.3.5 Locally Preferred Alternative. Additionally, Chapter 8 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program identifies the mitigation measures to be implemented as the Project relates to construction impacts to traffic, transportation permits, and transport of construction equipment.

Response to Comment AS1-4

Please see response to Comment AS1-2 above. As indicated in Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, of the Final EIS/EIR, a traffic management and construction mitigation

has been developed for the Project to minimize impacts to traffic flow to street traffic and from freeway on/off ramps. TR-1, from the MMRP, would apply to Alternatives A and B.

Responses to Comments

Responses to Public Comment

| Comment Letter/Speaker | Affiliation | Last Name | First Name | Comment Page | Response Page |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| Public Comment | | | | | |
| PC1 | | Chang | Ike | | |
| PC2 | | Meinert | Robert | | |
| PC3 | | Sutton | Christopher | | |
| PC4 | | Watson | Robert | | |
| PC5 | | Sutton | Christopher | | |



Comment Card

Name: IKE I. CHANG

Affiliation (i.e. organization, resident, business): _____

Address: 223 S. CENTRAL AVE APT. #503

Phone: 213-617-8927 L.A., CA 90012

Email: _____

Comment Type: Written Comment Verbal and Written Comment

Comment: _____

보다 넓은 차원의 의견.
PURPLE LINE 이 SANTA MONICA 까지 연결
PLAN 들과 있습니다. 이 기회에 허락 보시면

Please use the reverse side for additional comments. Comments may also be mailed to: Ms. Dolores Roybal Saltarelli, Project Manager, Metro, One Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90012 or emailed to roybald@metro.net

계속 뒷등



Ike Chang

Comment Card

Name: IKE I. Chang

Affiliation (i.e. organization, resident, business): 223 S. Central Ave., Apt. #503

Address: L.A., CA 90012

Phone: (213) 617-8927

Email: _____

Comment Type: Written Comment Verbal and Written Comment

Comment: _____

A more wider scope of opinion.
I am listening to the plan describing how the Purple line is getting connected
to Santa Monica. Is there more plans in the works for more metro lines?

1

Please use the reverse side for additional comments. Comments may also be mailed to: Ms. Dolores Roybal Saltarelli, Project Manager, Metro, One Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90012 or emailed to roybald@metro.net

보다 더 많은 지하철의 건설 계획이 있으신지요.
 있으시다면 보다 널리 일반 시민에게 그 plan
 들은 신중해 주실것을 양망합니다.
 한국, 1973년에 미국와서 43년동안 살고
 있는 KORA KOREAN AMERICAN 으로서 느끼는 것!!
 보다 더 많은 지하철의 필요하다고 느낍니다.
 METROLINK 는 METRO RAIL 과 별개임을 압니다.
 METRO RAIL 을 보다 많이 계획화 해서
 한국에서처럼, 일반 시민이 보다 많은 도움이
 될것을 기대합니다.
 IKE CHANG
 6/30/2015

Public Comments Continued:

Public Comments Continued:

If so, I hope and wish that you ~~could~~ advertise those plans to
 the general public. This is what I am feeling as a Korean American
 of 43 years, who came to U.S. in 1973. I feel that we need a
 lot more metro lines. I know that Metrolink is separate from
 Metro Rail. I hope that there will be more plans for metro rail
 and help the general public more like in Korea.

2

(signature - Ike Chang)
 6/30/2015

Responses to Comments

PC1

Responses to Comments from Chang, Ike

Response to Comment PC1-1

Metro appreciates your comment. Metro is studying various transportation corridors as a way to expand its regional transit system. Metro's 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) serves as the long-term master plan for the transit system.

Response to Comment PC1-2

Thank you for your comment. It is noted that you support a more expanded Metro rail system and will continue to inform the public of the public participation process for the input on the environmental and planning process. In addition, Metro will continue to coordinate with other agencies, such as Metrolink.