

Appendix A2

Responses to Public Comments on the DEIS/DEIR

A2.1 Introduction

The East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIS/DEIR) was made available to stakeholders, agencies, and the general public for review and comment for a 60-day review period from September 1, 2017 through October 30, 2017. During the public review period, approximately 2,600 public comments were received, including verbal and written comments received via US mail, email, and the project website (<https://www.metro.ent/projects/east-sfv/>, by clicking “Contact Us”), and at the five public meetings. The comments covered a variety of topics that generally concerned build alternative/maintenance and storage facility (MSF) site locations, parking impacts, safety impacts, connections to other transit projects, property acquisitions, traffic impacts, and air quality impacts. Comments were submitted by various stakeholders, including public agencies, elected officials, organizations, and individuals. Chapter 7 of this Final Environmental Impact Statement/Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIS/FEIR) describes the public outreach process and comments received during public review of the DEIS/DEIR.

The Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR 1503.4) requires that an agency preparing an FEIS under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) assess and consider comments both individually and collectively, and respond by one or more of the means listed below, stating its response in the final statement. Possible responses are to:

- Modify alternatives, including the proposed action.
- Develop and evaluate alternatives not previously given serious consideration by the agency.
- Supplement, improve, or modify its analyses.
- Make factual corrections.
- Explain why the comments do not warrant further agency response, citing the sources, authorities, or reasons that support the agency's position.
- If appropriate, indicate those circumstances that would trigger agency reappraisal or further response.

An Initial Operating Segment (IOS) has been included in this FEIS/FEIR to enable the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) to realize potential cost savings, which would not otherwise occur under the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA), from phasing the project and beginning work earlier on an initial segment. It should be noted that Metro is proceeding with IOSs on other Metro projects for that reason and to specifically provide the decision-making body of Metro (the Metro Board) with flexibility in determining the most efficient and cost-effective manner to implement those projects. Proceeding with an IOS for the proposed project would also allow further coordination to occur with the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) and Metrolink, which will be necessary to accommodate double tracking of the Antelope Valley Line, and with the City of San Fernando regarding traffic impacts at intersections in the City prior to development of the remaining northern segment of the LPA.

Although the IOS for the proposed project would run along the same alignment and have the same design features and operating characteristics as those described above for the LPA, it would occupy a smaller project footprint than the LPA because it would extend from the Metro Orange Line on the south to the proposed the Van Nuys/San Fernando station on the north. It remains Metro's intent, however, to build the remaining northern 2.5 miles of the LPA within the existing railroad right-of-way, from the Van Nuys/San Fernando station to the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink station. Impacts associated with the IOS are discussed below.

In response to comments received on the DEIS/DEIR and further analysis and study, the following updates were made to the FEIS/FEIR.

- **Executive Summary:** The Executive Summary was updated to reflect the revisions identified in the following chapters, including identification of a Locally Preferred Alternative and the addition of the IOS.
- **Chapter 2, Project Description/Alternatives Considered:** This chapter was revised to reflect identification of an LPA, Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade Light-Rail Transit (LRT), and MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site and the addition of the IOS. This chapter also identifies the reasons why Alternative 4 Modified, was selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative and describes other refinements to the alternative that have occurred subsequent to publication of the DEIS/DEIR.
- **Chapter 3, Transportation, Transit, Circulation, and Parking:** The analysis of transportation impacts in this chapter has been updated to reflect the changes to the Locally Preferred Alternative, Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT and the addition of the IOS.
- **Chapter 4, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences:** The impact discussions in this chapter have been revised and updated as necessary to reflect the modifications to the Locally Preferred Alternative, Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT, which has been identified by the Metro Board of Directors as the Locally Preferred Alternative, and in response to public comments. Discussion of the impacts of the IOS have also been added to this chapter.
- **Chapter 5, Section 4(f) Evaluation:** This chapter has been updated to reflect identification of the Locally Preferred Alternative, Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT with MSF Option B. A discussion of the IOS impacts has also been included in this chapter.
- **Chapter 6, Evaluation of Alternatives:** This chapter has been revised to include updated information regarding the costs (capital, operating, and maintenance) and capital funding sources for the proposed project.
- **Chapter 7, Public and Agency Outreach:** Revisions have been made to this chapter to include public outreach efforts conducted during public circulation of the DEIS/DEIR.

Appendix A1 contains copies of all written comments received on the DEIS/DEIR—mailed comment letters, comment cards from the public hearings, and court transcripts—and this appendix contains responses to those comments. Each comment letter, comment card, and hearing transcript has been bracketed into separate, numbered comments, and the responses to each comment correspond to the same organization and numbering. The comments and responses are organized and grouped into the categories shown in Table A2-1 based on the affiliation of the commenter.

Table A2-1: Commenter Categories

Letter/Speaker ID Prefix	Description
AF	Federal Agency
AS	State Agency
AL	Local Agency
PC	Individual Public Comment
PHC	Public Hearing Comment Card
PHT	Public Hearing Transcript

To assist the reader's review and use of the responses to comments, two indices that provide the commenter name, affiliation, and comment letter/speaker identification designator (e.g., PC1) for each comment letter are provided below. The first index lists all the comment letters by comment letter/speaker identification designator, and the second lists all of the comment letters alphabetically by commenter's last name.

Table A2-2: Index by Comment Letter/Speaker Identification Designator

Comment Letter/Speaker	Affiliation	Last Name	First Name	Comment Page	Response Page
Federal Agencies					
AF1	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Connell	Dunning	A1-9	A2-12
State Agencies					
AS1	California Public Utilities Commission	Bond	Matthew	A1-15	A2-13
Local Agencies and Elected Officials					
AL1	Atwater Village Neighborhood Council	Morrissey	Edward	A1-21	A2-14
AL2	Los Angeles 7th District Councilwoman	Rodriguez	Monica	A1-22	A2-14
AL3	City of Los Angeles, Info Tech Agency Department	Moore	Anthony	A1-24	A2-15

Comment Letter/ Speaker	Affiliation	Last Name	First Name	Comment Page	Response Page
AL4	Wastewater Engineering Services Division	Poosti	Ali	A1-40	A2-15
AL5	Mayor, City of San Fernando	Ballin	Sylvia	A1-41	A2-15
AL6	Mayor, City of San Fernando	Ballin	Sylvia	A1-47	A2-18
AL7	City of Los Angeles 6th District Councilwoman	Martinez	Nury	A1-50	A2-19
AL8	California State University of Northridge	Vega	Francesca	A1-52	A2-20
AL9	LA County Fire Department	Takeshita	Michael Y.	A1-53	A2-20
AL10	Los Angeles Unified School District	Meade	Will	A1-55	A2-20
AL11	Metropolitan Water District	Harriger	Jennifer	A1-58	A2-24
AL12	Panorama City Neighborhood Council	Wilkinson	Gregory L.	A1-81	A2-24
AL13	San Fernando Valley Council Governments	Talamantes	Jess	A1-82	A2-24
AL14	Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council	Babian	Avo	A1-83	A2-25
AL15	Van Nuys Neighborhood Council (VNNC) Board	Lynn	Jeffrey	A1-86	A2-26

A2.2 Master Comments and Responses

Most of public comments received by Metro in response to public circulation of the DEIS/DEIR generally concerned the following topics:

- Opposition to or support of a particular build alternative or MSF site.
- Parking impacts and effects on businesses from removal of on-street parking.
- Safety concerns, including the potential for increased conflicts between LRT vehicles and pedestrians.
- The relationship of the proposed project to the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project, including how and where the two projects might connect.
- Right-of-way acquisition and business displacement impacts.
- Traffic impacts from removal of travel lanes to accommodate the LRT alignment.
- Air quality impacts during construction.

To facilitate reader review of this section of the FEIS/FEIR, master responses have been prepared to address these comments and are provided below. Each master comment has been assigned a unique identifier, e.g., MC-1. Responses to individual public comments follow the master comments and responses below. Where an individual comment is made on one of the topics above, the reader is referred back to the master comments and responses, as appropriate.

MC-1: Preference for or Opposition to Build Alternatives

Summary of Comments

Numerous commenters expressed opinions for or against individual build alternatives.

Response

The DEIS/DEIR for the proposed project analyzed a No-Build Alternative, a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative, and the following four build alternatives: Alternative 1: Curb-Running Bus Rapid Transit (BRT); Alternative 2: Median-Running BRT; Alternative 3: Low-Floor LRT/Tram; and Alternative 4: LRT (with subway portion).

Alternative 4, modified to be at-grade LRT only, has been identified by the Metro Board of Directors as the LPA for the reasons discussed below.

The operating efficiencies that would be realized through Alternative 4, along with the number of corridor boardings that the alternative is projected to generate, best matched the project's purposes/project objectives to:

1. Improve mobility in the eastern San Fernando Valley by introducing an improved north-south transit connection between key transit hubs/routes;
2. Provide new service and/or infrastructure that improves passenger mobility and enhances transit accessibility/connectivity for residents within the project study area to local and regional destinations and activity centers;
3. Provide more reliable transit service within the eastern San Fernando Valley;
4. Increase transit service efficiency (speeds and passenger throughput) in the project study area;
5. Provide additional transit options in an area with a large transit-dependent population, including the disabled, and high transit ridership;
6. Encourage modal shift to transit in the eastern San Fernando Valley, thereby improving air quality; and
7. Make transit service more environmentally beneficial through reductions in greenhouse gas emissions in the project study area.

In addition, the identification of Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT as the LPA is consistent with Metro's Measure M commitment to San Fernando Valley voters to construct a "high-capacity" transit project that extends from the Metro Orange Line (Orange Line) to the Sylmar/ San Fernando Metrolink station. A three-car train set can accommodate up to 400 riders, which is far greater capacity than can be achieved with the BRT alternatives evaluated in the DEIS/DEIR. Because of its higher capacity, the LPA would also reduce overcrowding, which is a common issue for the articulated buses that currently operate on Van Nuys Boulevard. This corridor has some of the highest bus boardings in Metro's system, because of, in part, the high number of transit-dependent riders.

The LPA is also in line with comments received during the DEIS/DEIR 60-day public review period. Among those who submitted public comments on the DEIS/DEIR and indicated a preferred transit mode, more than two-thirds expressed a preference for LRT; 30 percent preferred BRT (see Public Comment Summary Report in Appendix JJ to this FEIS/FEIR) Although public comments were submitted in support of the 2.5-mile subway, the majority of commenters stated that they would prefer to have an at-grade LRT system now rather than wait for additional funds to be identified for a subway (see Appendix JJ). In addition, some voiced concern over the construction impacts (including additional right-of-way acquisitions) that would occur if a subway were built.

The other alternatives evaluated in the DEIS/DEIR are identified below, along with reasoning for why each alternative was not selected:

- **Alternatives 1 and 2: Curb-Running and Median-Running BRT.** Both of the BRT alternatives had capacity concerns because an articulated BRT has a maximum capacity of 69 riders, which is far less than the 400-person capacity of a three-car LRT train set. Overcrowding is a frequent problem for articulated buses that currently operate on Van Nuys Boulevard and these alternatives would not resolve those issues due to the more limited capacity of BRT compared to LRT trains. In addition, the operational efficiencies that would be realized by the BRT alternatives would not be significantly superior to those enjoyed by existing bus service. Although the BRT alternatives would not result in the following unavoidable significant adverse impacts that could occur due to the LRT alternatives (i.e., construction traffic and transit impacts, community and neighborhood impacts due to property acquisitions and business displacements, and operational visual impacts), they would not provide the regional mobility, transit, and operational air quality benefits of the LRT alternatives and would not fulfill the project objectives (specifically objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7) to the extent that the LRT alternatives would. In addition, the community voiced strong support for LRT as the preferred mode of travel.
- **Alternative 3: Low-Floor LRT.** This alternative includes 28 stations (approximate 1/3-mile intervals), which resulted in operating efficiencies that were less than those of the BRT alternatives. The low-floor stations would help efficiencies, but the unique configuration would prevent trains from seamlessly connecting with other LRT lines if extended in the future. The community was very receptive to LRT but strongly preferred a 14-station design that could operate at greater speeds and reduce travel time.
- **Alternative 4 (unmodified): At-Grade and Subway.** This alternative without the proposed modification to eliminate the subway segment is double the project cost estimated in Measure M, has far greater property and construction impacts, and would substantially delay the timeline for delivery of the project; therefore, it was not recommended.

MC-2: Opposition to MSF Option A

Summary of Comments

Numerous comments were received in opposition to construction of an MSF at the Option A site.

Response

As described in the DEIS/DEIR, the construction of a new MSF site would only be required to serve the two rail build alternatives (Alternative 3 and Alternative 4). Because a modified version of Alternative 4 (Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT) has been selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative, an MSF site would be constructed as part of the proposed project.

The DEIS/DEIR considered the following three locations for the MSF:

- MSF Option A – Van Nuys Boulevard/Metro Orange Line
- MSF Option B – Van Nuys Boulevard/Keswick Street
- MSF Option C – Van Nuys Boulevard/Armintha Street

Based on a technical analysis of all three and public input, Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site. MSF Option B is strategically located at the mid-point of the alignment. Significant opposition to Option A (adjacent to the Metro Orange Line) was expressed by the community, while Option B received significant support, including letters from a local Los Angeles City Councilmember and the Panorama City Neighborhood Council.

The other alternative MSF locations are identified below along with reasoning for why each option was not selected:

- MSF Option A: This MSF option, which would be located to the west of the Van Nuys Metro Orange Line Station, resulted in significant opposition from the community because of the large number of businesses that would be displaced as a result of right-of-way impacts and other community concerns. This option would also result in the displacement of four residential units.
- MSF Option C: This MSF option would be located to the west of Van Nuys Boulevard and immediately north of the Metrolink tracks in Panorama City. The option proved to be more difficult to access because of the dip in Van Nuys Boulevard where Metrolink passes. There are also several multi-unit residential properties north of the option that would be affected by train yard noise and vibration.

MC-3: Parking Impacts

Summary of Comments

A number of commenters expressed concerns about the loss of existing on-street parking spaces due to the proposed project.

Response

Under Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT, which has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors, all curbside parking would be prohibited along surface-running segments of the LPA on Van Nuys Boulevard in order to accommodate the LRT right-of-way and maintain two travel lanes in each direction (Note: The existing two southbound lanes and one northbound lane along Van Nuys Boulevard between Laurel Canyon Boulevard and San Fernando Road would be maintained under the LPA). Where the LRT alignment would operate within the Metro-owned railroad right-of-way, on-street parking would be maintained along San Fernando Road and Truman Street adjacent to the railroad right-of-way.

Although parking impacts are not considered to be significant impacts to the environment under CEQA, this FEIS/FEIR acknowledges that 1,111 parking spaces along Van Nuys Boulevard and approximately 528 off-street spaces would be removed to accommodate the LRT median guideway, LRT stations, and traction power substation (TPSS) facilities. The actual number of spaces that will need to be removed will be determined during the Preliminary Engineering (PE) phase of the project. As described in Chapter 3 of the DEIS/DEIR and in this FEIS/FEIR, it is anticipated, based on parking surveys of the cross-streets within 1 or 2 blocks of Van Nuys Boulevard, that adjacent streets,

although not as convenient, and off-street parking lots would be able to accommodate the displaced weekday and weekend parking demand. However, it was also acknowledged in the DEIS/DEIR and in this FEIS/FEIR that there may be access issues for delivery trucks for smaller businesses (those without truck loading bays or other on-site loading/delivery facilities) since they would not be able to stop within the roadway during LRT operations. Consequently, they would have to use off-street parking facilities, parking on adjacent streets, or alleyways behind the businesses.

MC-4: Safety Concerns

Summary of Comments

Commenters stated concerns about hazards to public safety that could occur due to the proposed project, including conflicts between transit vehicles and pedestrians.

Response

Under the LPA, Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT, multiple safety features are built into the design of the alternative. Under the LPA, all current crosswalks at signal-controlled intersections would be maintained. Between the signalized intersections, a fence would be installed to prevent mid-block pedestrian crossings, which is Metro's current practice for its median-running LRT lines. Pedestrians would be required to walk to a signalized location to cross Van Nuys Boulevard, and LRT passengers would reach the median high-floor station platforms (39 inches) from crosswalks at signalized intersections. These components of the LPA would help reduce opportunities for persons to cross the LRT alignment in a dangerous manner. Additionally, Mitigation Measures MM-TRA-1 through MM-TRA-7 in Section 3.3.4.2 of Chapter 3 and MM-SS-1 through MM-SS-23 in Section 4.14.3.11 are proposed to further minimize potential impacts on pedestrian and bicycle facilities and hazards to users of those facilities. Also, see the supporting Transportation and Safety and Security technical studies in Appendices G and W, respectively, to this FEIS/FEIR. Furthermore, LRT stations would incorporate features to enhance safety. Canopies at the LRT stations would be approximately 13 feet high and would incorporate station lighting. In addition, signage and safety and security equipment—such as closed-circuit televisions, public announcement systems, passenger assistance telephones, and variable message signs (providing real-time information)—would be part of the amenities of each station. For stations with only one public access point, an emergency exit and stairs would be provided. The Los Angeles Police Department and Metro Police would also patrol the proposed LRT stations to ensure the safety of transit users and employees.

MC-5: Proposed Project's Relationship to the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project

Summary of Comments

Commenters wanted to know whether planning for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project would be coordinated with development of the proposed project, and how and where those two projects might connect.

Response

Along with planning for the proposed project, Metro is also studying how best to provide improved transit service through the Sepulveda Pass connecting the San Fernando Valley and the Westside (e.g., Westwood, Brentwood, West LA, and Culver City). Specifically, a feasibility study for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project has been completed by a separate Metro planning team, and Metro has issued Requests for Proposals to select consultant teams to further develop alternatives and to prepare the environmental documentation for the project. The teams working for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor, Metro Orange Line Improvements, and the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor meet regularly and will continue to do so to ensure projects are coordinated to the greatest extent possible and to determine how best to connect the three transit lines to serve Metro's transit riders and local communities.

MC-6: Right-of-way Acquisition and Business Displacement Impacts

Summary of Comments

Commenters expressed concerns about the impact on their businesses as a result of having to relocate due to acquisition of properties for right-of-way for the proposed project.

Response

The proposed LPA and MSF Option B could result in the acquisition of 100 properties, including full acquisition of 68 properties, partial acquisition of 30 properties, acquisition of one Metro-owned property, and acquisition of one vacant alley, as discussed in Section 4.2.3.2 of this FEIS/FEIR. As required by law, Metro would comply with the provisions of the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Uniform Act) and the California Relocation Act. The Uniform Act mandates that certain relocation services and payments be made available to eligible residents, businesses, and nonprofit organizations displaced as a direct result of projects undertaken by a federal agency or with federal financial assistance (Note: Although Metro is proposing to fund the project with state and local sources and is not pursuing federal funds, Metro will comply with Uniform Act provisions). The Uniform Act provides for uniform and equitable treatment for persons displaced from their homes or businesses and establishes uniform and equitable land acquisition policies.

Where acquisition and relocation are unavoidable, owners of private property have federal constitutional guarantees that their property would not be taken or damaged for public use unless they first receive just compensation. Just compensation is measured by the "fair market value" of the property taken, where "fair market value" is considered to be the:

Highest price on the date of valuation that would be agreed to by a seller, being willing to sell, but under no particular or urgent necessity for so doing, nor obliged to sell; and a buyer, being ready, willing and able to buy, but under no particular necessity for so doing, each dealing with the other with the full knowledge of all the uses and purposes for which the property is reasonably adaptable and available (Code of Civil Procedure Section 1263.320a).

As outlined in Section 4622(a) of the Uniform Act, whenever a program or project to be undertaken by a displacing agency will result in the displacement of any person, the head of the displacing agency shall provide for the payment to the displaced person all of the following:

- Actual reasonable expenses in moving himself and his family as well as his business, farm operation, or other personal property.
- Actual direct losses of tangible personal property as a result of moving or discontinuing a business or farm operation, but not to exceed an amount equal to the reasonable expenses that would have been required to relocate such property, as determined by the head of the agency.
- Actual reasonable expenses in searching for a replacement business or farm.
- Actual reasonable expenses necessary to reestablish a displaced farm, nonprofit organization, or small business at its new site, but not to exceed \$25,000, as adjusted by regulation, in accordance with Section 4633(d) of the Uniform Act.

The provisions of the California Relocation Act (California Act) California Code of Regulations, Chapter 6, Subchapter 1 (California Code) apply if a public entity undertakes a project for which federal funds are not present. In this case, the public entity must provide relocation assistance and benefits. The California Code, which is generally consistent with the intent and guidelines of the Uniform Act, seeks to:

- Ensure the consistent and fair treatment of owners and occupants of real property.
- Encourage and expedite acquisition by agreement to avoid litigation and relieve congestion in the courts.
- Promote confidence in the public land acquisitions.

As stated above, under federal regulations, owners of private property have similar state constitutional guarantees regarding property acquisitions, damages, and just compensation.

Also, please note that this FEIS/FEIR acknowledges that economic impacts could occur to other businesses that depend on the revenue generated by transactions with businesses that would be displaced by the proposed project. However, under the regulations of the Uniform Act, since the businesses that experience those economic impacts would not be displaced by the proposed project, they would not be eligible for financial assistance under the Uniform Act.

MC-7: Traffic Impacts

Summary of Comments

A number of commenters expressed concerns about the impacts on traffic and resulting increase in congestion due to removal of travel lanes to accommodate the proposed project.

Response

The traffic study was updated to address the LPA, which eliminated the subway segment. The revisions included a reassessment of the level of service at all study intersections. The analysis is consistent with the methodology applied in the traffic study that was prepared for the DEIS/DEIR. The analysis included an assessment of traffic operations and corresponding levels of service at all study intersections.

The traffic impacts of the LPA are discussed in detail in Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR. According to the traffic analysis in Chapter 3, significant localized impacts are projected to occur at 20 of the 73 study intersections (in the year 2040) along the corridor, which is primarily a result of the increased congestion that could occur as a result of proposed traffic lane reductions required to accommodate a median LRT

alignment and the resulting increases in traffic congestion. Significant impacts could also occur at an additional six of the 51 study intersections along the parallel Woodman Avenue and Sepulveda Boulevard corridors. Under the Existing-with-Project scenario, significant impacts would occur at 16 of the 73 study intersections along the project corridor. No feasible measures have been identified to mitigate these localized significant impacts to a less-than-significant level. However, it should also be noted that the passage of California Senate Bill (SB) 743 in 2013 (implemented in 2018) created a shift in transportation impact analysis under CEQA from a focus on automobile delay, as measured by level of service and similar metrics, toward a focus on reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Although intersection level-of-service impacts are no longer considered significant impacts under CEQA as a result of SB 743, for informational purposes for the benefit of the reader and decision makers and for consistency with the analyses in the DEIS/DEIR, an analysis of the LPA's intersection impacts and the significance of those impacts has been included in this FEIS/FEIR.

It should also be noted that the increase in transit capacity that would be provided by the LPA (e.g., a three-car LRT train set with 5- to 6-minute headways can carry far more people than a traffic lane in each direction) and projected increases in ridership are expected to result in significant reductions in daily VMT and vehicle hours traveled (VHT) within the study area. Reductions in VMT are beneficial since they mean that fewer cumulative vehicle miles traveled are being generated on a daily basis and, as a consequence, there would be an overall reduction in congestion levels within the study area.

MC-8: Air Quality Impacts

Summary of Comments

Commenters expressed concerns about the air quality impacts of the proposed project, including air quality impacts during construction.

Response

Construction of the LPA would result in the short-term generation of criteria pollutant emissions. Emissions would include the following:

- Fugitive dust generated from curb/pavement demolition, site work, and other construction activities.
- Hydrocarbon (ROG) emissions related to the application of architectural coatings and asphalt pavement.
- Exhaust emissions from powered construction equipment.
- Motor vehicle emissions associated with construction equipment, worker commute, and debris-hauling activities.

Projected pollutant emissions from construction activities could exceed the regional construction significance thresholds for ROG and NO_x and localized significance thresholds for nitrogen oxide (NO_x), particulate matter (PM) less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀), and PM less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM_{2.5}). Although the proposed project would minimize impacts on air quality to the maximum extent feasible through implementation of mitigation measures (see MM-AQ-1 through MM-AQ-9 in Section 4.6.3.2 of this FEIS/FEIR), impacts would remain significant under CEQA and adverse impacts could occur on sensitive populations (e.g., children, the elderly, and chronically ill persons, especially those with cardio-pulmonary diseases) in the immediate vicinity of construction activities. For a detailed discussion of the proposed project's air quality impacts, see Section 4.6.3 of this FEIS/FEIR.

Once completed and operational, the LPA would result in beneficial net reductions in regional criteria pollutant emissions (see Section 4.6.3.2 of this FEIS/FEIR).

A2.3 Responses to Federal Agency Comments

Responses to AF1 – Dunning Connell, US Environmental Protection Agency

Comment #	Response
AF1-1	The EPA’s support of the goals of the project is appreciated and has been noted by Metro.
AF1-2	<p>The air quality mitigation measures (MM-AQ-1 through MM-AQ-7) included in the DEIS/DEIR are also included in this FEIS/FEIR and will be included in the Record of Decision and the CEQA-required Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Additionally, the following mitigation measure has been added to Section 4.6-Air Quality, in response to the recommendation regarding staggering construction activities:</p> <p>MM-AQ-9: The Design-Builder shall consider means and methods that would minimize cumulative air quality impacts during the construction period, including, but not limited to, the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Timing project-related construction activities associated with the maintenance and storage facility, stations, and track installation such that overlapping schedules are minimized. 2. Timing project-related construction activities so that overlapping schedules with other projects in the area are avoided. 3. Reducing the number of pieces of diesel-fueled equipment used at a given time when construction activities occur in the vicinity of sensitive receptors, such as residences, schools, parks, hospitals, and nursing homes.
AF1-3	<p>As noted in Chapter 2, the existing bike lanes extending approximately 2 miles north on Van Nuys Boulevard from Parthenia Street to Beachy Avenue and from Laurel Canyon Boulevard to San Fernando Road would be removed in order to accommodate the LRT guideway. Two parallel corridors have been identified for consideration and approval by the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) as bike friendly corridors. These include Filmore Street to the west and Pierce Street to the east. Both of these streets can be developed as Class III Bike Friendly streets by striping sharrows and providing signage. Metro will also continue to work with LADOT to identify, to the extent feasible, replacement locations for Class II bike lanes that meet the goals and policies in the City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan (see Mitigation Measure MM-TRA-7 in Section 3.3.4.2).</p> <p>The segment of the existing Class I bike path in the City of San Fernando that is located northeast of the existing Metrolink/UPRR railroad track would be relocated further to the northeast in order to accommodate the construction of the two LRT tracks and relocated single Metrolink/UPRR track. If and when the second Metrolink/UPRR track is constructed, the existing bike path in the City of San Fernando would be relocated to an on-street location. The relocation of the Class I bike path has been discussed by representatives of the City of San Fernando and Metro, and the two agencies have agreed to coordinate the relocation of the bike path to an on-street location, possibly San Fernando Road or another suitable route that may be determined at a later date by the City. In addition, in compliance with Metro’s new First/Last Mile directive, new bicycle and pedestrian improvements will be identified at all 14 stations, which includes those in the City of Los Angeles and the City of San Fernando.</p>
AF1-4	One hard copy and one CD of the FEIS/FEIR will be provided to the EPA as requested.

A2.4 Responses to State Agency Comments

Responses to AS1 – Matthew Bond, California Public Utilities Commission

Comment #	Response
AS1-1	The information on the requirements and responsibilities of the California Public Utilities Commission has been noted by Metro for the record.
AS1-2	Metro will comply with all applicable state rules and regulations including those noted by the Commission in the comment.
AS1-3	The design phase for the Locally Preferred Alternative, Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT, began in late 2019. The Metro Program Management Team is leading the design phase. The design will follow the Metro Rail Design Criteria (MRDC) when feasible, which recognizes all applicable Commission General Orders.
AS1-4	Metro will comply with 49 CRF part 659, Rail Fixed Guideway System Safety Oversight, dated April 29, 2005. The guideline notes the primary responsibility of the state remains designating an entity—other than the rail transit agency, in this case Metro, to oversee the safety and security of a rail fixed guideway system.
AS1-5	<p>As noted in the traffic study forty-three intersections would have left-turn prohibitions. At these intersections, only right turns from Van Nuys Boulevard or right turns onto Van Nuys Boulevard would be permitted. Similarly, left-turns across the LRT guideway to and from driveways would not be permitted. Left-turns and other movements across the guideway would be permitted only at signalized intersections. At left-turn pockets, Metro will install additional safety features to prevent motorists from initiating a turn movement across the tracks unless they have a permissive left-turn indication.</p> <p>In June 2018, the Metro Board adopted a Locally Preferred Alternative, which includes LRT running at-grade for the entire 9.2 miles of the project. The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated from consideration due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and because it would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, and right-of-way and traffic impacts. Furthermore, additional subway segments along the corridor are not likely due to the additional time an underground station would take to construct.</p> <p>Also, please see the responses to Master Comments MC-1 and MC-4.</p>

A2.5 Responses to Local Agency and Elected Official Comments

Response to AL1 - Edward Morrissey, Atwater Village Neighborhood Council

Comment #	Response
AL1-1	Metro will continue to engage with and solicit input from community organizations, including local neighborhood councils, on the proposed project as it proceeds, contingent upon approval of the project by the Metro Board and FTA, through preliminary engineering, final design, and construction. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Responses to AL2 - Monica Rodriguez, Los Angeles 7th District Councilwoman

Comment #	Response
AL2-1	When Metro’s staff presents the proposed project to the Metro Board of Directors for approval in 2020, it’s anticipated that the Metro Board will approve programs similar to what has been approved for other Metro projects that are designed to assist area small businesses during construction. These programs include a Metro Business Interruption Fund, a Metro Business Solution Center, as well as an Eat/Shop/Play program.
AL2-2	A shared park-and-ride facility would be located at the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station. Metro passengers would jointly use the parking lot with Metrolink customers. Metro is not planning to construct any new park-and-ride facilities for this project. The travel forecast model assumed unconstrained parking at the northern terminus parking lot. Should parking demand exceed the available parking supply at this facility, spillover customer parking would be required to use on-street parking. Additional parking controls at the parking lot in terms of parking fees could also be applied to control demand. Cumulative development impacts in the study area are included in the traffic analysis via the traffic forecast model for all future year scenarios.
AL2-3	The growth inducing impacts discussion in this FEIS/FEIR (see Section 4.18) acknowledges that new development that could be induced by the proposed project could result in the displacement of existing commercial, industrial, and residential uses. Also, please see Sections 4.2, 4.4, and 4.17 in this FEIS/FEIR for a discussion of the Locally Preferred Alternative’s acquisition, community, and environmental justice impacts, respectively, and measures to mitigate or minimize potential impacts.

Response to AL3 – Anthony Moore, City of Los Angeles, Info Tech Agency Department

Comment #	Response
AL3-1	Metro has noted for the record and thanks the City of Los Angeles for providing detailed information regarding the city’s emergency communication systems and radio sites.

Response to AL4 - Ali Poosti, City of Los Angeles, Wastewater Engineering Services Division

Comment #	Response
AL4-1	The comment that the proposed project is unrelated to sewers and does not require any hydraulic analysis is noted for the record.

Responses to AL5 – Sylvia Ballin, Mayor, City of San Fernando

Comment #	Response
AL5-1	<p>The City’s support for the project is appreciated and has been noted by Metro.</p> <p>An evaluation has been conducted of these at-grade crossings in conformance with Metro’s Grade Crossing Safety Policy. Additional enhancements to the existing crossing operations and infrastructure will be determined during the PE phase of the project and in cooperation with the City of San Fernando, which began in late 2019. Specifically, spillback queues are expected to extend to the nearest upstream crossing. The crossings would feature traffic signal preemption, intended to clear influence zone queues, which also provides the additional benefit of preventing movements toward the grade crossing when the gates are down. As a result, the adjacent intersections would be unlikely to suffer blocking by queues.</p> <p>Spillback queues have the potential to become very lengthy, particularly after the consecutive arrival of two or three trains or after a longer, slower freight train traverses the crossing. Although spillback queues could impose travel delays to motorists, they would not result in a safety concerns at the crossing. Railroad grade crossing protection will be designed to prevent spillback queues from feeding influence zone queues or interfering with track clearance phases.</p> <p>At the Hubbard crossing, the traffic signals and crossing controls would be upgraded to address concerns of the CPUC by modifying the traffic signals at Truman Street and First Street/Frank Modugno Drive and conform to preemption needs, per CPUC and responsible agencies.</p> <p>At the Maclay crossing, the traffic signals and crossing controls would be upgraded to address concerns of the CPUC by modifying the traffic signals at Truman Street and First Street to conform to preemption needs, per CPUC and responsible agencies. To avoid bottlenecks downstream of crossings, the source of congestion can be reduced by creating lane drops upstream of the crossing. This includes closing the Maclay Avenue driveway serving the existing shopping center on the northeast corner of Truman Street and removing the curbside trolley bus stop that could impede eastbound traffic departing from the track area.</p>

Comment #	Response
	<p>At the Brand crossing, a new preempted traffic signal at the intersection of Brand Boulevard and 1st Street would be installed, and upgraded traffic signals and crossing controls to address concerns of the CPUC, the three train operators, and the city would be provided.</p> <p>At the Wolfskill and Jesse Street crossing, a new preempted traffic signal at the intersection of Brand Boulevard and First Street would be installed. Upgraded traffic signals and crossing controls at Truman Street that conform to preemption needs, per CPUC and responsible agencies, would be provided. The intersection of Jessie Street and First Street (Robert F. Kennedy Drive) would be signalized and preempted to control pedestrian activity at that intersection.</p>
AL5-2	<p>Metro has identified Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT as the Locally Preferred Alternative. The LRT alignment, as it passes through the City of San Fernando, would be located within the Metro-owned railroad right-of-way, thereby avoiding the business disruption impacts noted in the City’s letter that would occur under DEIS/DEIR Alternative 3. Nonetheless, Metro will continue to work with the City of San Fernando during preliminary engineering and final design, contingent upon approval of the proposed project by the Metro Board and FTA, to ensure business disruption and traffic impacts are minimized to the extent feasible and practicable.</p>
AL5-3	<p>The SR-118 westbound (WB) off-ramp at San Fernando Road is projected to operate at Level of Service (LOS) A during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Based on the traffic model, vehicle queuing at the off-ramp would not pass the gore point of the freeway (note: the gore point is the triangular area formed where one lane merges into another, such as a freeway on-ramp, or diverges from the freeway at an off-ramp). The longest queue length would be approximately 227 feet (EBL) during the a.m. peak hour. The distance from the intersections to the gore point is approximately 1,400 feet.</p> <p>The SR-118 eastbound (EB) off-ramp at San Fernando Road would operate at LOS B during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Based on the traffic model, vehicle queuing at the off-ramp would not pass the gore point from the freeway. The longest queue length would be approximately 351 feet (EBL) during the a.m. peak hour. The distance from the intersection to the gore is approximately 1,500 feet.</p>
AL5-4	<p>Traffic operations improvements such as signal coordination will be taken into consideration during the PE design phase of the project and will be prepared in coordination with the City Traffic Engineer. Also, please see Mitigation Measure MM-TRA-4 in Section 3.3.4.2 of Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR.</p> <p>During the design phase, improvements such as dual left turn lanes and/or other roadway and intersection restriping changes will be considered as appropriate. These types of improvements will also take into account traffic operations at nearby at-grade crossings. Changes in roadway striping and intersection striping configurations will be coordinated with the City Traffic Engineer. Also, please see Mitigation Measure MM-TRA-4 in Section 3.3.4.2 of Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR.</p> <p>The segment of the existing bike path that is located north of Wolfskill Street and northeast of the existing railroad track would be relocated further to the east/northeast under the LPA. Relocation of this segment of the bike path would not result in any significant impacts on the environment. Therefore, although the City’s recommendation to relocate the bike path to the south of the proposed LPA tracks to create a continuous path with the segment south of the City of San Fernando city limits is not required under CEQA, Metro will continue to explore and develop bicycle infrastructure in consultation with the City. Also, please see the response to comment AF1-3 and mitigation measures in Chapter 3 that will be implemented to address impacts on pedestrian/bike pathways including measures MM-TRA-1 through MM-TRA-3 and MM-TRA-5 through MM-TRA-7.</p>

Comment #	Response
AL5-5	<p>During the PE phase of the study, the PE consultant will take into consideration the design standards of the San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan, where applicable. Also, see Section 4.1.3.2 of this FEIS/FEIR for a discussion of the LPA’s consistency or conflicts with local land use plans, including the San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan.</p>
AL5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metro is not planning to construct any parking infrastructure as a part of the LPA. • Metro has conducted extensive community outreach in the City of San Fernando and will continue to do so during the PE and construction phases of the project. • Metro will work with the City to develop station designs that reflect the City’s rich cultural and historic attributes and the Specific Plan’s recommendations. • One half of one percent of the overall project construction costs will be set aside for the integration of site-specific public art. The aesthetic design of stations and related transit facilities will aim to promote a sense of place and minimize adverse visual effects on surrounding neighborhoods. Metro project precedents are featured here: metro.net/art. • Metro has completed a First/Last Mile planning study as a part of the planning of the project. Outreach efforts, which included walk audits with members of the community, City staff, and elected officials, were conducted to obtain their input regarding the location and need for pedestrian and landscape improvements. During the PE design phase of the project, the Metro team will work with the City to develop the types of specific treatments that will be implemented during the construction phase of the project. For more information on potential improvements, please see the First/Last Mile study.
AL5-7	<p>Metro is not planning to construct any new parking infrastructure as part of the proposed project. Metro, however, will continue to consult and coordinate with the City to determine ways to minimize the loss of existing parking spaces and develop replacement parking as needed.</p>
AL5-8	<p>The comment is not a comment on the environmental analyses in the FEIS/FEIR but instead provides recommendations regarding the City’s financial contributions to the project.</p> <p>The Measure M Ordinance requires a 3% local contribution toward major rail construction projects, which reflects the local benefits gained by communities with direct access to the region’s expanding rail network. The total 3% local contribution will be calculated based on Metro’s Life of Project (LOP) cost estimate at the completion of 30% design/engineering. Once the total 3% contribution is calculated, the distribution of responsibility across benefiting jurisdictions will be determined using a formula that accounts for both track mileage and station area within a jurisdiction’s boundaries. The provisions in Measure M will allow Metro to apply this requirement equitably across all affected jurisdictions. In addition, Measure M provides flexibility in how jurisdictions meet their contribution requirements, including: locally controlled funds, in-kind contributions, and qualified first/last mile improvement projects. Metro is committed to working with the City of San Fernando, including discussing the City’s proposed recommendations, to arrive at a solution that meets the near-term capital needs of the project and the City.</p>

Responses to AL6 – Sylvia Ballin, Mayor, City of San Fernando

Comment #	Response
AL6-1	<p>Metro acknowledges that the Locally Preferred Alternative (Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT) could result in business displacement in the City, which would result in the loss of tax revenue to the City and create other indirect adverse socioeconomic effects (see Section 4.3.3.2 of this FEIS/FEIR). However, based on current project plans, only one business within the City, which is located at 1753 Truman Street, would be displaced by a full take (note: A full take of a vacant parcel located north of Hubbard Street in the City of San Fernando would also be required [see Table 4.2-2 in Section 4.2.3.2 of this FEIS/FEIR] That property is required to accommodate the relocated bike path and a proposed TPSS. Partial takes of property would also be required from the properties bordering the northeast side of the railroad right-of-way, from just north of Maclay Avenue to approximately 350 feet south of Brand Boulevard; however, those partial property takes are not expected to result in the displacement of any businesses (please see Section 4.2.3.2 of this FEIS/FEIR and the Advanced Conceptual Engineering Plans in Appendix HH). Nonetheless, Metro will continue to work with the City to minimize impacts.</p>
AL6-2	<p>Although Metro has the authority to acquire properties through eminent domain, every effort will be made to reach an agreeable settlement through voluntary negotiations. However, if agreement cannot be reached after a reasonable time, Metro will follow State of California eminent domain laws and initiate a formal condemnation process to acquire the necessary property. This process is meant to protect property owners by allowing a court to determine the fair market value of the property. It's important to note that, even after a condemnation action has been initiated, Metro may continue to negotiate with property owners in an attempt to reach agreement in lieu of continuing the condemnation action. Also, as noted in the response to comment AL6-1, based on current plans, the LPA would result in only two full takes of property (and one business) within the City of San Fernando.</p> <p>With regards to the City's comments in the "original letter related to economic and social justice," please see comment letter AL-5, above, and the responses to the comments in that letter.</p>
AL6-3	<p>Metro will continue to work with and consult the City of San Fernando and recognizes the City's openness and willingness to consider removing the bike path from the railroad right-of-way and re-routing it along Truman Avenue, pending community input and review by the full City Council, to reduce right-of-way acquisitions and provide alternative bike facility opportunities in the corridor area. Pursuant to Metro's discussions with the City and the ad-hoc committee, relocation of the bike path is being taken into account as a part of the next stage of the project's design process.</p>
AL6-4	<p>Metro would construct two LRT tracks in the railroad right-of-way as a part of the proposed ESFVTC Project. The existing single track along the right-of-way used by Metrolink and UPRR freight trains and the existing bike path would be shifted to the east/northeast to accommodate the two LRT tracks, which would result in partial takes of property along First Street. The Advanced Conceptual Engineering Plans in Appendix JJ depict the extent of the right-of-way impacts required to accommodate the two LRT tracks and the relocated Metrolink/UPRR track and bike path. A second track for Metrolink, which would result in a four-track alignment, is a separate project that has gone through the engineering process and is under environmental review. If that project, which is currently not funded, is approved by Metro, it's anticipated that the bike path would be relocated to the street right-of-way to avoid further right-of-way impacts on the properties along First Street. If this occurs, this would not be a significant impact as a result of the ESFVTC Project. Also, as noted in the response to comment AL6-3, above, consultation with the City of San Fernando regarding the future location of the bike path to minimize right-of-way impacts will continue.</p>
AL6-5	<p>Please see the response to comment AL6-2, above.</p>

Comment #	Response
AL6-6	The City’s letters dated 10/25/2017 and 2/12/2018 (comment letters AL5 and A6L [see Appendix A1]) are included in the record and hereby made available to the public, including individuals and agencies that may have been previously informed of the City’s support for the project.

Responses to AL7 – Nury Martinez, City of Los Angeles 6th District Councilwoman

Comment #	Response
AL7-1	Councilwoman Martinez’s support for Alternative 4 – LRT is acknowledged for the record. Also, please note the Metro Board has identified Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT as the LPA. The LPA would be constructed entirely at grade along its 9.2-mile length. Please see the response to Master Comment MC-1 for additional information on the reasons why Alternative 4 Modified was selected by Metro as the LPA.
AL7-2	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Option B would result in fewer property acquisitions (34 full acquisitions) and business displacements than the other options. With regards to nuisance impacts (e.g., air quality and noise impacts during construction and operation), MSF Option C is likely to result in the greatest impacts because of the proximity of multi-family residences immediately to the north of the Option C site, The Option A site is adjacent to single-family residences on the south side of Calvert Street and east of Cedros Avenue. The Option B site is generally surrounded by industrial and commercial uses, except at the southwest corner of the site where single-family residences are on the opposite side of Pacoima Wash from the MSF Option B site. Thus, MSF Option B, which has been selected as the LPA’s MSF, is likely to result in the fewest nuisance impacts. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
AL7-3	Based on current plans (see Appendix HH of this FEIS/FEIR), a partial take of property would not be required from the property at 9540 Van Nuys Boulevard.
AL7-4	Metro will implement all feasible mitigation measures to reduce or avoid the significant construction impacts of the project including traffic, air quality, and noise impacts (please see Section 3.3.4.2 of this FEIS/FEIR for the proposed traffic mitigation measure, Section 4.6.3.2 for air quality mitigation measures, and Section 4.8.3.2 for proposed noise mitigation measures). Metro and its construction management team will also continue to work and consult with Councilwoman Martinez’s office and other stakeholders during PE, final design, and construction to ensure impacts, including impacts from truck haul traffic, are reduced to the extent practicable.

Response to AL8 – Francesca Vega, California State University of Northridge

Comment #	Response
AL8-1	California State University, Northridge’s support for an at-grade light rail system, which is the Locally Preferred Alternative identified by Metro, is acknowledged for the record. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Responses to AL9 – Michael Y. Takeshita, LA County Fire Department

Comment #	Response
AL9-1	The County of Los Angeles Fire Department Planning Division’s comment that the proposed project does not appear to have any impact on the emergency responsibilities of the department is acknowledged by Metro for the record.
AL9-2	The County of Los Angeles Fire Department’s Land Use Development comment, which states that the proposed project is unlikely to have an impact and provides the name and phone number of the contact person at the department should questions arise, is noted for the record by Metro.
AL9-3	The department’s Forestry Division comment stating it has no further comments at this time is noted for the record.
AL9-4	The department’s Health Hazardous Materials Division comment that it has no comments or requirements at this time is noted for the record.

Responses to AL10 – Will Meade, Los Angeles Unified School District

Comment #	Response
AL10-1	<p>Construction of the LPA could result in significant construction noise impacts on nearby noise-sensitive uses as described in Section 4.8 of the DEIS/DEIR and this FEIS/FEIR. Mitigation measures are proposed to reduce potential construction noise impacts, but the DEIS/DEIR and this FEIS/FEIR acknowledge that noise impacts would still remain significant after mitigation. Metro will continue to consult and coordinate with Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) to ensure construction noise at LAUSD schools is minimized to the extent feasible. Also, see the responses to other LAUSD comments below.</p> <p>Operation of the LPA is not expected to result in any significant noise impacts on LAUSD schools. Under CEQA, the lead agency has the discretion to establish the appropriate threshold for the analysis of impacts. The comment provides LAUSD’s noise standards, which are “...based on the California High Performance Schools (CHPS) noise standard.” Those limits are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An exterior noise standard of 67 dBA L_{eq},

Comment #	Response																																							
	<p>2. An interior noise standard of 45 dBA L_{eq}.</p> <p>3. A noise level increase of 3 dBA or greater over ambient noise levels is considered significant for existing schools and would require mitigation to achieve levels within 2 dBA of pre-project ambient level.</p> <p>As noted in the comment, there are three high schools where the tracks will be within 100 feet of some portion of the school.</p> <p>As seen in the table below, at Arleta High School, the proposed project is expected to generate an hourly L_{eq} of 61 dBA, which is 9 decibels lower than the existing hourly L_{eq} of 70 dBA. The new noise generated by operation of the LRT trains is predicted to cause less than a 1-decibel increase above existing noise levels.</p> <p>At San Fernando Middle School, the existing noise is 62 dBA L_{eq}. New noise from the LRT project is predicted to be 60 dBA L_{eq}. The combination of the existing noise (62 dBA) and the predicted new noise from LRT operations (60 dBA) would be 64 dBA. This is a 2-decibel increase over the existing noise.</p> <p>The third school is Panorama High School. The proposed project is expected to generate an hourly L_{eq} of 64 dBA, which is 7 decibels lower than the existing hourly L_{eq} of 71 dBA. The new noise generated by operation of the LRT trains is predicted to cause a 1-decibel increase in noise levels.</p> <p>Even applying the LAUSD noise thresholds, the ESFVTC Project would not cause noise impacts at LAUSD schools because it would not increase existing noise 3dBA or greater over existing ambient levels. Following either the FTA impact criteria or the LAUSD impact criteria, therefore, operational noise from the project would be a less than significant impact.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="3">Cluster ID</th> <th rowspan="3">Cluster Description</th> <th rowspan="3">Existing Noise Level (L_{eq} in dBA)</th> <th colspan="3">FTA Impact Assessment (L_{eq} in dBA)</th> <th colspan="2">CEQA Impact Assessment</th> </tr> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Predicted Project Noise</th> <th colspan="2">FTA Impact Threshold, Project Noise</th> <th rowspan="2">Predicted Future Noise Level (L_{eq} in dBA)</th> <th rowspan="2">Predicted Increase (future minus existing, in dB)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Moderate</th> <th>Severe</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NB-I</td> <td>Arleta HS</td> <td>70</td> <td>61</td> <td>69</td> <td>75</td> <td>71</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NB-N</td> <td>San Fernando MS</td> <td>62</td> <td>60</td> <td>64</td> <td>69</td> <td>64</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SB-E</td> <td>Panorama HS</td> <td>71</td> <td>64</td> <td>70</td> <td>75</td> <td>72</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Cluster ID	Cluster Description	Existing Noise Level (L_{eq} in dBA)	FTA Impact Assessment (L_{eq} in dBA)			CEQA Impact Assessment		Predicted Project Noise	FTA Impact Threshold, Project Noise		Predicted Future Noise Level (L_{eq} in dBA)	Predicted Increase (future minus existing, in dB)	Moderate	Severe	NB-I	Arleta HS	70	61	69	75	71	1	NB-N	San Fernando MS	62	60	64	69	64	2	SB-E	Panorama HS	71	64	70	75	72	1
Cluster ID	Cluster Description				Existing Noise Level (L_{eq} in dBA)	FTA Impact Assessment (L_{eq} in dBA)			CEQA Impact Assessment																															
						Predicted Project Noise	FTA Impact Threshold, Project Noise		Predicted Future Noise Level (L_{eq} in dBA)	Predicted Increase (future minus existing, in dB)																														
		Moderate	Severe																																					
NB-I	Arleta HS	70	61	69	75	71	1																																	
NB-N	San Fernando MS	62	60	64	69	64	2																																	
SB-E	Panorama HS	71	64	70	75	72	1																																	
AL10-2	<p>Section 4.8 of this FEIS/FEIR identifies feasible construction noise mitigation measures (see MM-NOI-1a through MM-NOI-1d) that would be implemented to reduce construction noise. If the proposed mitigation measures identified in that section do not reduce any identified significant construction noise impacts to Los Angeles Unified School District schools to a less-than-significant level, Metro will continue to consult with the District to determine if there are any additional feasible and practicable measures that would effectively reduce construction or operation related noise at District schools. Provisions will be made to allow the affected school or designated representative(s) to notify Metro when such measures are warranted.</p>																																							

Comment #	Response
AL10-3	The proposed construction mitigation measures in Section 3.11 have been revised to incorporate the District’s recommended measures. Also, please note that a construction management plan, which is prepared for all Metro construction projects, would be prepared by the Design Build Contractor. That plan will incorporate the applicable mitigation measures in this FEIS/FEIR as well as other measures the Contractor determines are necessary to ensure the minimization of construction impacts on pedestrians in general, and in the vicinity of school sites.
AL10-4	The LPA, would have a safety barrier/fencing along the right-of-way to keep pedestrians from crossing the LRT guideway at mid-block locations. Pedestrian crossings would be limited to signalized intersections.
AL10-5	The LPA, would be at grade along its entire alignment. No grade separations are proposed. Pedestrian and vehicle gates with audible and visual warning devices would be installed at all at-grade pedestrian and vehicle crossings. Additionally, the project team would apply best practices and lessons learned from the construction of prior LRT projects to the design of ESFVTC grade crossings to ensure they are as safe and efficient as possible for pedestrians, motorists, and transit riders.
AL10-6	The LRT would operate at the same speed limit as posted for motor vehicle traffic along Van Nuys Boulevard, which is 35 miles per hour. The operating plan for the LRT is that it would operate at 35 MPH along Van Nuys Boulevard albeit with slower speeds approaching and departing stations. Additional speed restrictions are not a part of the operating plan.
AL10-7	Metro or its contractors will contact and coordinate with local school districts, including LAUSD’s Transportation Branch, regarding construction activities that could affect school bus routes, as described in Mitigation Measure MM-TRA-2 in Section 3.3.3.4 of Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR.
AL10-8	<p>Provided below are specific responses to each of the recommendations in Comment AL10-8.</p> <p>LAUSD Comment: School buses must have unrestricted access to District schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response: A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will be prepared for the proposed project as described in Mitigation Measure MM-TRA-2 (see Section 3.3.4.2 of this FEIS/FEIR). The TMP will include the following measures: • Maintain access to adjacent businesses and schools (including passenger loading areas for parents dropping off students) via existing or temporary driveways or loading zones throughout the construction period. <p>LAUSD Comment: During the construction phase, truck traffic and construction vehicles may not cause traffic delays for our transported students.</p> <p>Response: Given the extent of construction activities that would occur along Van Nuys Boulevard and the fact that lane closures would be required to construct the LPA, it’s not possible to avoid all traffic delays. However, please note that the following measures will be included in the Traffic Management Plan that would be prepared for the proposed project (please see Mitigation Measure MM-TRA-2 in Section 3.3.4.2 of this FEIS/FEIR):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where feasible, temporarily restripe roadways including turning lanes, through lanes, and parking lanes at the affected intersections to maximize the vehicular capacity at those locations affected by construction closures; • Place station traffic control officers at major intersections during peak hours to minimize delays related to construction activities;

Comment #	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To the extent practical, maintain traffic lanes in both directions, particularly during the morning and afternoon peak hours; • Coordinate potential road closures and detour routes and other construction activities that could adversely affect vehicle routes in the immediate vicinity of local schools with local school districts. <p>LAUSD Comment: During and after construction, changed traffic patterns, lane adjustment, traffic light patterns, and altered bus stops may not affect school buses' on-time performance and passenger safety.</p> <p>Response: As noted in the response above, given the extent of construction and potential lane closures, traffic delays will be unavoidable during the construction period. Additionally, implementation of the LPA would reduce the number of travel lanes from three lanes to two lanes in each direction along Van Nuys Boulevard. The reduction in roadway capacity would result in additional delay and significant traffic impacts at a number of study intersections, as described in Section 3.3.3.2 in Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR. Although the following mitigation measure is proposed to reduce potential operational traffic impacts, the impacts would not be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>MM-TRA-4: During the Preliminary Engineering phase of the project, Metro will work with the cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando to synchronize and coordinate signal timing and to optimize changes in roadway striping to minimize potential operational traffic impacts and hazards to the extent feasible.</p> <p>LAUSD Comment: Construction trucks and other vehicles are required to stop when encountering school buses using red-flashing lights must-stop-indicators per the California Vehicle Code.</p> <p>Response: Construction contractors will comply with all existing California Vehicle Codes. Accordingly, no changes to the mitigation measures in the FEIS/FEIR are required.</p> <p>LAUSD Comment: Contractors must install and maintain appropriate traffic controls (signs and signals) to ensure vehicular safety.</p> <p>Response: This recommendation has been added to Mitigation Measure MM-TRA-2 in Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR.</p> <p>LAUSD Comment: Contractors must maintain ongoing communication with LAUSD school administrators, providing sufficient notice to forewarn children and parents when existing vehicle routes to schools may be impacted.</p> <p>Response: Mitigation measure MM-TRA-2 has been revised to include the following text.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate potential road closures and detour routes and other construction activities that could adversely affect vehicle routes in the immediate vicinity of local schools with local school districts. <p>LAUSD Comment: Parents dropping off their children must have access to the passenger loading areas.</p> <p>Response: Please see the first response above for proposed measures that would be included in the Transportation Management Plan.</p>
AL10-9	Please see the responses to the comments above.

Responses to AL11 – Jennifer Harriger, Metropolitan Water District

Comment #	Response
AL11-1	<p>As requested by the commenter representing the Metropolitan Water District, Metro will submit to Metropolitan design plans for proposed facilities in the vicinity of Metropolitan’s pipelines and will coordinate with Metropolitan staff to avoid impacts that would disrupt service or restrict access that could interfere with Metropolitan’s ongoing operation, maintenance, and repair of its pipelines or facilities.</p> <p>The LPA design commenced in the fall of 2019 and is expected to be completed in 2021. Final Design will begin in 2021–2022 and will take about one year. Construction will take about 3 to 4 years. Testing will follow and last for one year.</p>
AL11-2	<p>Metro acknowledges receipt of Metropolitan’s “Guidelines for Developments in the Area of Facilities, Fee Properties, and/or Easement of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.” Additionally, as requested, all project plans or designs submitted to Metropolitan will clearly identify Metropolitan’s facilities and rights-of-way.</p>
AL11-3	<p>The proposed MSF buildings would be designed and constructed in compliance with mandatory Title 24 and CALGreen Building Code requirements and would achieve a minimum LEED rating of Silver, as specified in the Metro Sustainability Implementation Plan. Compliance with these requirements and guidelines would minimize energy use, as well as water consumption. Metro will also consider using recycled water for its facilities where possible.</p>

Response to AL12 – Gregory L. Wilkinson, Panorama City Neighborhood Council

Comment #	Response
AL12-1	<p>The Metro Board of Directors has identified Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT with MSF Option B as the Locally Preferred Alternative. The Panorama City Neighborhood Council’s support of the LRT alternative and MSF Option B are noted for the record by Metro. Please see the responses to Master Comments MC-1 and MC-2 for a discussion of the reasons for selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative and MSF Option B.</p>

Response to AL13 – Jess Talamantes, San Fernando Valley Council Governments

Comment #	Response
AL13-1	<p>The San Fernando Valley Council of Governments’ support of light rail is acknowledged for the record by Metro. Also please see the response to Master Comment MC-1 for a discussion of the reasons why the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT as the Locally Preferred Alternative.</p>

Responses to AL14 – Avo Babian, Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council

Comment #	Response
AL14-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p> <p>Metro will investigate all practicable funding options for the proposed project, including public private partnership options.</p> <p>With regards to the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project, Metro has completed a Feasibility Study that identifies alternatives that would connect to the proposed ESFVTC Project. Metro has also issued Requests for Proposals to further develop the Sepulveda Transit Corridor alternatives and prepare the environmental documentation for the proposed project. As part of those efforts, Metro will continue to study how best to provide improved transit service through the Sepulveda Pass connecting the San Fernando Valley and the Westside (e.g., Westwood, Brentwood, West LA, and Culver City). The teams working for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor, Metro Orange Line Improvements, and the ESFVTC Projects meet regularly and will continue to do so to ensure projects are coordinated to the greatest extent possible and to determine how best to connect the three transit lines to serve Metro’s transit riders and local communities.</p>
AL14-2	<p>The proposed project’s impacts on emergency services are described in Sections 4.14 and 4.15 of the DEIS/DEIR and this FEIS/FEIR. The analysis presented in those sections determined that the median alignment alternatives, Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 (Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified by the Metro Board of Directors as the Locally Preferred Alternative) could potentially result in significant impacts on emergency services as a result of: (1) limitations on turning movements across the median alignment, which could cause emergency vehicles, in some instances, to take a slightly more circuitous route, and (2) increased congestion resulting from the reduction in the number of travel lanes along Van Nuys Boulevard, which could result in additional delay for emergency responders. Metro will continue to coordinate and consult with the emergency services providers during preliminary engineering, final design, and construction to ensure public safety impacts are minimized to the extent possible, as described in Mitigation Measure MM-SS-11 in Section 4.14 of this FEIS/FEIR.</p>
AL14-3	<p>Along the Van Nuys Boulevard corridor, left-turns and cross-traffic would be maintained at all signalized intersections. As feasible, U-turns may also be maintained. There are additional north-south street facilities that run to the east and west of Van Nuys Boulevard that can and do provide access to the neighborhoods adjacent to the corridor including Hazeltine Avenue, Woodman Avenue, Kester Avenue, Sepulveda Boulevard, and other local streets. Please see Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR for additional details regarding the Locally Preferred Alternative’s traffic impacts.</p>
AL14-4	<p>The train platforms would be designed and constructed with amenities consistent with Metro’s station design criteria, subject to allowable space. Stations would not include restrooms or water fountains.</p>

Responses to AL15 – Jeffrey Lynn, Van Nuys Neighborhood Council VNNC Board

Comment #	Response
AL15-1	The Van Nuys Neighborhood Council General Board’s (VNNC) support of Alternative 4 – LRT is noted for the record by Metro.
AL15-2	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative by the Metro Board of Directors. The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated from consideration due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and because it would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, and right-of-way and traffic impacts. Additional subway or aerial segments along the corridor are not likely for the same reasons. Furthermore, additional grade-separated segments along the corridor are not being considered because of the time and cost that would be added to the construction schedule, which would delay the opening of the project.
AL15-3	Metro operates three-car LRT trains throughout its system, and three-car trains are the design standard in Metro’s <i>Metro Rail Design Criteria</i> . The institution of six-car trains would necessitate longer station platforms. This could result in additional cross-street closures and right-of-way acquisition in order to accommodate the larger station footprint, as well as additional capital and operating expenses. For those reasons, three-car trains are proposed for the ESFVTC Project.
AL15-4	Although the Van Nuys Metro Orange Line is assumed to be a logical location for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project to connect with the proposed ESFVTC Project, the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project is still in an early planning stage and the mode and alignment for the Sepulveda project have not yet been determined, nor has that project’s northern terminus.
AL15-5	MSF Option B has been identified by Metro as the preferred MSF site.
AL15-6	Metro considered the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) property to the east of the Van Nuys Metrolink station as a possible location for a maintenance and storage facility. However, the site was deemed difficult to access for light rail and the LADWP informed Metro that it planned to begin construction on the site soon for the “Mid Valley Water Facility” project.

A2.6 Responses to Individual Public Comments

Response to Comment PC1 - Advantage Vending Solutions

Comment #	Response
PC1-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC2 - Nancy Alderman

Comment #	Response
PC2-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on the identification of the LPA, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC3 - Adrienne Altman

Comment #	Response
PC3-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on the identification of the LPA, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC4 - Joseph P. Anczewicz

Comment #	Response
PC4-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on the identification of the LPA, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC5 - Bob Anderson

Comment #	Response
PC5-1	<p>Metro is independently studying a future connection/service over the Sepulveda Pass that would connect to the ESFVTC. The study is evaluating rail transit concepts between the San Fernando Valley and LAX including heavy rail transit, light rail transit, monorail, and rubber tire transit. The study corridor extends approximately 22 miles and generally follows Interstate 405 (San Diego Freeway). In addition to connecting with the ESFVTC, it could connect with the Purple Line and the Expo Line. Analysis of travel boardings on buses along Van Nuys Boulevard shows very heavy transfer activity between the buses on Van Nuys Boulevard and the Metro Orange Line). Ridership south of the Metro Orange Line is approximately half of the ridership north of the Metro Orange Line and it is therefore not warranted to extend exclusive guideways south of the Orange Line until sometime in the future when there is a connection through the Sepulveda Pass to the Westside. In order to provide for this future connection, Metro is now identifying the Metro Orange Line Van Nuys Station as the initial southern terminus of the ESFVTC for exclusive bus and rail guideways.</p> <p>Although the Sepulveda Transit Corridor line could connect to the ESFVTC Project, it should be noted the Sepulveda project is a separate project and its planning, design, and construction are not dependent upon approval and construction of the ESFVTC Project. Both the ESFVTC Project and Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project have independent utility and logical termini, and will be considered separately by the Metro Board for approval.</p> <p>Metro is also planning to construct grade separations along the Metro Orange Line alignment, over Van Nuys Boulevard. As a result of the proposed grade separation, Metro evaluated alternate locations for the ESFVTC station at the Metro Orange Line. The ESFVTC project description (see Chapter 2 of this FEIS/FEIR) has been updated to include plans showing the preferred station location and footprint. A below-grade station at this location, however, is not being considered due to the cost to construct a subway station, it does not result in substantially faster travel times, as well as the additional time an underground station would take to construct. A below-grade station would also result in greater construction impacts including noise, air quality, and traffic impacts than the proposed at-grade station.</p>
PC5-2	Please see the response to comment PC5-1.
PC5-3	<p>Please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p> <p>Also, constructing the entire segment 9.2-mile alignment, or the segment of the alignment along Van-Nuys Boulevard, as a subway would be substantially more expensive, would take substantially more time to construct, and could result in substantially greater construction impacts in the vicinity of the subway portal and station locations than the proposed LPA. For those reasons, that alternative was not considered for detailed analysis in the DEIS/DEIR or this FEIS/FEIR.</p>
PC5-4	Please see the response to comment PC5-1.

Response to Comment PC6 - Arman Antekelyan

Comment #	Response
PC6-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC7 - C. L. Antokal

Comment #	Response
PC7-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by Metro. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC8 - John Arnstein

Comment #	Response
PC8-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1, which provides information on why Alternative 4 was selected as the LPA.

Response to Comment PC9 - Michelle Aucoin

Comment #	Response
PC9-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC10 - Azure Lotus Trust - 1

Comment #	Response
PC10-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC11 - Azure Lotus Trust - 2

Comment #	Response
PC11-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC12 - Azure Lotus Trust – 3

Comment #	Response
PC12-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC13 - Azure Lotus Trust - 4

Comment #	Response
PC13-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC14 - Brad Balduff

Comment #	Response
PC14-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC15 - Marilyn Balduff

Comment #	Response
PC15-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC15-2	As noted in the response to Public Comment PC15-1, MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors.

Response to Comment PC16 - Raffi Bandarian

Comment #	Response
PC16-1	<p>The commenter’s request that Metro choose another option for the proposed project due to their concerns about noise and traffic impacts is noted by Metro for the record.</p> <p>The commenter is also referred to Section 4.8 and Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR, which discuss in detail the noise and traffic impacts, respectively, of the proposed project and measures to mitigate any significant impacts.</p> <p>Also, please see the responses to Master Comments MC-1 and MC-2, which explain the reasons that the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 4 – LRT (at grade) and MSF Option B as the LPA.</p>

Response to Comment PC17 - Raffi & Lorna Peer Bandarian

Comment #	Response
PC17-1	The commenter’s request that Metro “pick another site for this project” is noted for the record. Also, please note that the Metro Board of Directors has identified Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT with MSF Option B as the LPA. For further information on the reasons the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 4 and MSF Option B as the preferred alternative, please see the responses to Master Comments MC-1 and MC-2.

Response to Comment PC18 - Alexander Barber

Comment #	Response
PC18-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT with MSF Option B has been identified by the Metro Board of Directors as the LPA. For further information on the reasons the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 4 with MSF Option B as the preferred alternative, please see the responses to Master Comments MC-1 and MC-2.

Response to Comment PC19 - BarItalia Classics

Comment #	Response
PC19-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC20 - Maria Barreto

Comment #	Response
PC20-1	The comment suggesting Metro provide faster and more prompt buses is noted for the record by Metro and will be taken into consideration in future planning efforts. Also, please note that Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT with MSF Option B has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors.

Response to Comment PC21 - Adam Becker - 1

Comment #	Response
PC21-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC22 - Adam Becker - 2

Comment #	Response
PC22-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site. Also, please note that Metro conducted an extensive outreach effort including hosting more than 100 meetings, direct mail notification, email notifications, press releases, newspaper and online ads, a project website, as well as a number of other outreach methods (see Chapter 7 for additional details). Additionally, the commenter has been added to the mailing list for all future public notices regarding the project.

Response to Comment PC23 - Gerard Belliveau

Comment #	Response
PC23-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC24 - Jody Belliveau

Comment #	Response
PC24-1	The comment that the proposed project would “destroy a vital part of our neighborhood” and the request that Metro find other alternatives are noted for the record. Also, please note that Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT with MSF Option B has been identified by the Metro Board of Directors as the LPA. For further information on the reasons the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 4 with MSF Option B as the preferred alternative, please see the responses to Master Comments MC-1 and MC-2.

Response to Comment PC25 - Diana Berrones

Comment #	Response
PC25-1	The commenter’s opposition to the proposed project and their concerns about the proposed project’s impacts on traffic and property values have been noted for the record by Metro. Also, please note that Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT with MSF Option B has been identified by the Metro Board of Directors as the LPA. For a discussion of the reasons why Alternative 4 was selected as the preferred alternative, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2. Also, please see Chapter 3, Section 3.3 for a discussion of the LPA’s traffic impacts.

Response to Comment PC26 - Bruce Blumenthal

Comment #	Response
PC26-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC26-2	As noted above, MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. With regard to the LADWP property, Metro considered that property in developing the three potential MSF sites identified in the DEIS/DEIR. However, the site was deemed difficult to access for light rail and LADWP informed Metro that it planned to soon begin construction on the site for its Mid Valley Water Facility Project.
PC26-3	Please see the responses to comments PC26-1 and PC26-2 above.

Response to Comment PC27 - Richard Bourne

Comment #	Response
PC27-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC27-2	Please see the response above to comment PC27-1.
PC27-3	Please see the response above to comment PC27-1.
PC27-4	The commenter’s concern about the impacts of a subway are noted for the record. With regards to the commenter’s recommendation to elevate the alignment, an elevated guideway was eliminated from consideration early in the alternatives analysis due to public opposition to aerial structures and the resulting visual impacts they would have on the community. In addition, an elevated BRT would make this mode cost ineffective due to the additional infrastructure and right-of-way costs, in comparison to the at-grade alternatives.
PC27-5	Please see the response to comment PC27-4.
PC27-6	The project would begin at the Van Nuys Metro Orange Line Station and proceed north through the communities of Van Nuys, Panorama City, and Pacoima and the City of San Fernando. The Van Nuys Metro Orange Line is assumed to be a logical location for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project to connect with the ESFVTC Project. However, the mode and alignment for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project has not been determined, nor has its northern terminus.

Response to Comment PC28 - Nathan Bousfield

Comment #	Response
PC28-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified by the Metro Board of Directors as the LPA for the reasons described in the response to Master Comment MC-1, which include that it has a much greater capacity than the BRT alternatives. With regard to the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project, it should be noted that the mode for that project and its northern terminus have not yet been determined. However, compatibility with and connection to the ESFVTC Project are factors that will be considered by Metro as planning for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project proceeds.
PC28-2	Please see the response above to comment PC28-1.

Response to Comment PC29 - Kaja Bowman

Comment #	Response
PC29-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC29-2	Metro will evaluate bus operations in the project study area during the construction phases of the project and will make service and schedule adjustments as warranted. Potential service changes to Line 158 are unknown at this time.
PC29-3	The commenter’s support for light rail with 14 stations is noted for the record. Also, see the response to comment PC29-1 above.

Response to Comment PC30 - BravoCustoms

Comment #	Response
PC30-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC31 - Steve Brecht - 1

Comment #	Response
PC31-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC32 - Steve Brecht - 2

Comment #	Response
PC32-1	<p>The comment that rail is an outdated, inflexible, unreliable, and expensive system is noted for the record. Additionally, please note that Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on the identification of the LPA, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p> <p>With regard to the comment that rail is a huge terrorist target, it should be noted that any project that provides facilities with public gathering places is a potential terrorist target. Furthermore, although the LPA would facilitate access to other transit lines improving regional connectivity and mobility, it would be served by its own maintenance and storage facility and could operate independently and continue to provide service in the event of service interruptions on other lines in the system, and those other lines could also continue to operate in the event of service interruptions on the ESFVTC line. It is also not expected that implementation of the LPA would increase the incidence of terrorist attacks. If such events were to occur, Metro, which has contracts for dedicated transit community policing services with three law enforcement agencies—the Los Angeles Police Department, the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, and the Long Beach Police Department—has programs, policies, and procedures in place to prevent and respond to such events. There are myriad resources available to Metro within the three contracted law enforcement agencies, including uniformed patrol, undercover teams, investigative units, bomb squad, canine patrols, anti-terrorism and intelligence units, narcotics teams, detectives, risk management specialists, and helicopter support, among others.</p> <p>Metro also maintains a dedicated in-house security unit that is utilized for the more sensitive Metro areas of operation such as facilities protection, revenue collection, board meeting security (Sergeant-at-Arms), rail tunnel inspection team, K-9 operations, training, planning and policy development, and security of the Headquarters Building. Metro contracts with a private security firm for additional security services. This firm provides security services for park-and-ride lots, adjacent rail lines, and Metro properties throughout the service area. Construction contractors are required to provide adequate security for projects to include security guards, as appropriate. Metro Security provides oversight for the contractor security programs. The agency also includes effective security planning and numerous security hardware systems as a major component of the Security System Plan.</p>

Response to Comment PC33 - Kevin Brogan

Comment #	Response
PC33-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. MSF Option A is no longer under consideration.

Response to Comment PC34 – Jan Brown

Comment #	Response
PC34-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 2 of the DEIS/DEIR and this FEIS/FEIR, the proposed LRT alternative would be designed to accommodate three-car trains.</p> <p>With regard to the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project, it should be noted that the mode for that project and its northern terminus have not been determined. However, compatibility with and connection to the ESFVTC Project are factors that will be considered by Metro as planning for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project proceeds. Also, please see the response to comment PC5-1.</p>
PC34-2	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC34-3	The subway portion of Alternative 4 – LRT, is no longer under consideration. Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC35 - Mark Brown

Comment #	Response
PC35-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC35-2	<p>The subway segment for the project was eliminated by the Metro Board of Directors due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, right of way acquisitions, and traffic impacts. Consideration of additional subway segments along the corridor is not likely for the same reasons.</p> <p>Van Nuys Boulevard would not be closed off entirely to pedestrian crossings. Pedestrians would be able to cross Van Nuys Boulevard at signalized intersections to maintain a high level of safety.</p>
PC35-3	The Vanowen station serves the northern section of the Van Nuys Civic Center and accounts for approximately 9 percent of the boardings on the ESFVTC line. The Metro Board elected to eliminate the subway segment on the line due to its construction costs and it does not result in substantially faster travel times. As noted in the response to comment PC35-2, a subway segment on the southern end of the corridor is not under consideration.

Comment #	Response
PC35-4	Stations are spaced, for the most part, at approximate ¼ -mile intervals. The station spacing is designed to maximize transfers between the ESFVTC and intersecting bus lines affording greater connectivity to off-corridor communities, as well as to maximize premium transit service along the corridor to as many neighborhoods as possible. The corridor also has a fairly high number of disabled patrons that would be inconvenienced with farther station spacing.
PC35-5	The type of signal treatment will be determined during the preliminary engineering phase of the ESFVTC Project. It is envisioned that possible timing changes could be implemented by one of four means: an LRT priority system, Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control (ATSAC) Critical Intersection Control (CIC), ATSAC Critical Arterial Control (CAC), or LADOT's Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS). Bus priority, which already exists on several corridors within the San Fernando Valley, provides additional green time to approaching buses when identified as late per the schedule. Similar priority treatment could be afforded to LRT operations. CIC adjusts the relative phase splits on a cycle-by-cycle basis. CAC adjusts offsets to provide progression in the peak direction. ATCS constantly adjusts the green time as needed based on the competing demands of approaching traffic.
PC35-6	<p>A parking study was completed as a part of the DEIS/DEIR process to provide a comprehensive and detailed understanding of the actual use of parking, within a more refined parking survey area defined by Metro and the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT). The parking study area included on-street and off-street parking within a primarily one- to two-block radius from Van Nuys Boulevard from Ventura Boulevard to San Fernando Road (Van Nuys parking study area) and Sepulveda Boulevard from Ventura Boulevard to Victory Boulevard (Sepulveda parking study area). The parking survey days and time periods were coordinated and selected through consultation with the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Parking Technical Advisory Committee, which was comprised of Metro and LADOT staff. The survey timeframes for this analysis were chosen to ensure they overlapped with the peak times of commercial activity in the study area and included on and off-street public parking.</p> <p>Section 3.2.3 of the DEIS/DEIR and this FEIS/FEIR discusses the findings of the parking study. Parking, as well as loading/unloading, along Van Nuys Boulevard would be affected due to the reduction in travel lanes on Van Nuys Boulevard from three to two, which is necessary to accommodate an LRT median guideway. It should be noted that with implementation of the LPA, some additional parking would be affected because the 2.5-mile segment that would have traveled underground under DEIS/DEIR Alternative 4 would now travel at grade. As a consequence, additional parking spaces along Van Nuys Boulevard would be eliminated under the LPA compared to the number that would be removed under Alternative 4. In total, 1,111 on-street parking spaces and approximately 528 off-street parking spaces along Van Nuys Boulevard would be removed to accommodate the infrastructure associated with the LPA.</p> <p>Parking for land uses along Van Nuys Boulevard, including the Pacoima area, would be required to shift from on-street to off-street lots and garages conjoined to the property or on the side streets in the vicinity of the land use in question. Deliveries to businesses and residences would not be able to rely on curbside parking and would either have to use off-street parking facilities or park on an adjacent street or alleyway behind commercial properties. However, it is anticipated that the remaining available on-street and/or off-street parking supply would be able to accommodate the weekday and weekend parking demand. Therefore, no significant parking impacts from removal of the on- and off-street parking supply would occur.</p> <p>In the City of San Fernando, no parking along San Fernando Road would be affected under the LPA because the rail service would be operating in an exclusive right-of-way within that corridor.</p> <p>Also, please note that loss of parking, though an inconvenience to some parkers and a potential adverse economic impact on local businesses, does not constitute a significant impact under CEQA.</p>

Comment #	Response
PC35-7	The illustration referenced in and attached to the letter are included in the record and will be reviewed by Metro staff and considered by the Metro Board of Directors.

Response to Comment PC36 - Michelle Brunnick

Comment #	Response
PC36-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC37 - Magnolo Bugarin

Comment #	Response
PC37-1	The commenter's support of Alternative 4 – LRT, which a modified version has been identified as the LPA (at-grade version) by the Metro Board of Directors, has been noted for the record. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC37-2	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors.
PC37-3	Please see the response to comment PC37-1 above.

Response to Comment PC38 - Chris Streuly, Bill's Burgers

Comment #	Response
PC38-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC39 - Jon Burk - 1

Comment #	Response
PC39-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC40 - Jon Burk - 2

Comment #	Response
PC40-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC41 - Marilee Burton

Comment #	Response
PC41-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC42 - California Auto Crafters

Comment #	Response
PC42-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC43 - Calvet Cosmetics

Comment #	Response
PC43-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC44 - Rosemary Campbell

Comment #	Response
PC44-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated from consideration due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, property acquisitions, and traffic impacts. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC45 - Chris Carrera, - 7

Comment #	Response
PC45-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC45-2	The proposed ESFVTC operating plan and station designs assumes three-car train operations.
PC45-3	The Sylmar/San Fernando LRT station would be located adjacent to the Metrolink station. Passenger connections would be further developed in the preliminary engineering phase of the project. The LRT station at the Van Nuys Metrolink/Amtrak station would be located on Van Nuys Boulevard near Keswick Street, in the immediate vicinity of the Metrolink station.
PC45-4	Metro is independently studying the feasibility of alternative transit modes over the Sepulveda Pass that would connect to the ESFVTC. Options in that corridor range from BRT in high-occupancy vehicle/Express Lanes on Interstate 405 to a full transit/highway tunnel extending under the pass from the Metro Orange Line to the future Metro Purple Line and/or Metro Expo Line Stations in West Los Angeles.
PC45-5	The DEIS/DEIR evaluated numerous MSF sites. The site adjacent to the Metro Orange Line (MSF Site A) was under consideration but was not selected as part of the LPA due to community opposition. The type of trainset/vehicle that would be used in a future rail corridor project over the Sepulveda Pass would be determined by the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Study, which is currently underway by a separate Metro planning team. That study will evaluate the feasibility of multiple technologies.
PC45-6	As discussed in Section 3.3.1.1 of the DEIS/DEIR and this FEIS/FEIR, cross-traffic would be limited to major/secondary roadway signalized intersections. Cross-traffic from minor streets and driveways would be prohibited.
PC45-7	Metro aims to achieve maximum efficiency in planning and constructing the proposed project.

Response to Comment PC46 - Terence Cason

Comment #	Response
PC46-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC47 - John Casselberry, Jr.

Comment #	Response
PC47-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. The tunnel has been removed from further consideration.

Response to Comment PC48 - Roberta Castillo

Comment #	Response
PC48-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC48-2	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC48-3	The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated and is no longer under consideration due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, and traffic impacts.
PC48-4	The comment in support of the LRT alternative with 14 stations is noted for the record. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC48-5	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC49 - Anna Catalano

Comment #	Response
PC49-1	The proposed project would result in the short-term generation of criteria pollutant emissions. Emissions would include: (1) fugitive dust generated from curb/pavement demolition, site work, and other construction activities; (2) hydrocarbon (reactive organic gas) emissions related to the application of architectural coatings and asphalt pavement; (3) exhaust emissions from powered construction equipment; and (4) motor vehicle emissions associated with construction equipment, worker commute, and debris-hauling activities. The proposed project would minimize impacts on air quality to the maximum extent feasible through implementation of mitigation measures MM-AQ-1 through MM-AQ-9. However, with implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would remain significant under CEQA. Please see Section 4.6.3 of this FEIS/FEIR for additional details regarding the LPA's air quality impacts and measures to mitigate those impacts.

Response to Comment PC50 - Gregory Charlton

Comment #	Response
PC50-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. The subway has been eliminated from further consideration due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, and traffic impacts.

Response to Comment PC51 - Rob Chatlin

Comment #	Response
PC51-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC52 - Sherri Chiasson

Comment #	Response
PC52-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC53 - Karen S. Cini

Comment #	Response
PC53-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC54 - Michael Cini

Comment #	Response
PC54-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC55 - Darrell Clarke, Sierra Club

Comment #	Response
PC55-1	<p>The Sierra Club's support of Alternative 4 – LRT, is noted for the record. Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p> <p>Metro operates three-car LRT trains throughout its system and the proposed ESFVTC operating plan and station designs assume three-car train operations. Three-car trains are the design standard in Metro's <i>Metro Rail Design Criteria</i>. Four-car trains would necessitate longer station platforms, which could result in additional cross-street closures and right-of-way acquisitions in order to accommodate the larger station footprint, as well as increased capital and operating expenses.</p>

Comment #	Response
PC55-2	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site. Metro considered the LADWP property to the east of the Van Nuys Metrolink station for a maintenance and storage facility. However, the site was deemed too distant and too difficult to access for light rail. In addition, LADWP informed Metro that it planned to soon begin construction on the site for its Mid Valley Water Facility Project.
PC55-3	The subway portion of Alternative 4 is no longer under consideration. Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. The entire 9.2-mile length of the LPA alignment would be at grade.
PC55-4	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC56 - James Clark

Comment #	Response
PC56-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC57 - Maria Cobian

Comment #	Response
PC57-1	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-4 for a description of the safety features that would be built into the design of the LPA (Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT) line and stations to ensure pedestrian and vehicle safety. Also, please see the response to comment AL10-5 from Los Angeles Unified School District.

Response to Comment PC58 - Eilene G. Collins - Bright

Comment #	Response
PC58-1	As a result of community opposition, site location and right-of-way needs, MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2.

Response to Comment PC59 - Cara Colwell

Comment #	Response
PC59-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC59-2	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC59-3	The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, and traffic impacts.
PC59-4	The comment in support of the LRT alternative with 14 stations is noted for the record. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC59-5	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC60 - Maria Contreras

Comment #	Response
PC60-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC60-2	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-4 for a description of the safety features that would be built into the design of Alternative 4's LRT line and stations.

Response to Comment PC61 - Jane Creighton

Comment #	Response
PC61-1	The commenter's opposition to the proposed project is noted for the record.

Response to Comment PC62 - Joanne D'Antonio

Comment #	Response
PC62-1	<p>With regards to the suggestion to construct the project as BRT now and convert to rail later when the Sepulveda Transit Corridor design is determined, it should be noted that an extensive community engagement process and technical analysis was conducted and after those efforts, the Metro Board chose to construct an at-grade LRT as the Locally Preferred Alternative. The community indicated a preference for at-grade LRT over the BRT alternatives. Additionally, it would not be cost effective to construct BRT infrastructure along the corridor and then construct another technology a few years later along the same corridor. And, it would subject the community to multiple periods of construction, which would likely be disruptive to residents and businesses. Metro is currently completing an alternatives analysis for the Sepulveda corridor, which takes into consideration connections to the ESFVTC project.</p> <p>Also, please see the responses to Master Comment MC-5 and comment PC5-1.</p>

Response to Comment PC63 - Debra K. Davis

Comment #	Response
PC63-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC64 - Shimal Dhanjee

Comment #	Response
PC64-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC65 - Lorraine Diaz

Comment #	Response
PC65-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC66 - Zarek Dietz

Comment #	Response
PC66-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC67 - Renee Disisto

Comment #	Response
PC67-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC68 - Soraya Dosaj

Comment #	Response
PC68-1	The Los Angeles Department of City Planning, which is responsible for determining the amount of parking that shall be provided for new development, has released Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) guidelines that identify parking requirements for residential projects along transit corridors. Parking requirements for residential and/or commercial development is outside the purview of Metro. Also, please see the responses to Master Comment MC-3 and comment PC35-6.

Response to Comment PC69 - Eleanor Dullas

Comment #	Response
PC69-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC70 - DuraGlo Collision Center Inc.

Comment #	Response
PC70-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC71 - David Eisenberg

Comment #	Response
PC71-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC72 - Ahmed Elhawary

Comment #	Response
PC72-1	As requested, the commenter has been added to Metro's email list for public correspondence regarding the proposed project.

Response to Comment PC73 - Elhawary, Ahmed and Abdel

Comment #	Response
PC73-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC74 - Jerry Ellingson

Comment #	Response
PC74-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC75 - Tracy Elliot

Comment #	Response
PC75-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC75-2	Due to the limited right-of-way and roadway cross-section, the alignment would only be able to accommodate the LRT guideway and two travel lanes in each direction. On-street parking and a Class II bike lane cannot be accommodated. As noted in Chapter 2 of this FEIS/FEIR, the existing bike lanes extending approximately 2 miles north on Van Nuys Boulevard from Parthenia Street to Beachy Avenue and from Laurel Canyon Boulevard to San Fernando Road would be removed in order to accommodate the LRT guideway. In response to the proposed removal of the bike lanes on Van Nuys Boulevard, two parallel corridors have been identified for consideration and approval by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) as bike friendly corridors. These include Filmore Street to the west and Pierce Street to the east. Both of these streets could be designated and designed as Class III Bike Friendly streets through use of sharrows (markings indicating the lane is to be shared by bikes and cars) and signage. Metro will also continue to work with LADOT to identify, to the extent feasible, replacement locations for Class II bike lanes that meet the goals and policies in the City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan (also, please see mitigation measure MM-TRA-7 in Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR). Additionally, it should be noted that Metro has prepared a First/Last Mile Plan that evaluates and identifies first/last mile opportunities at the 14 stations including pedestrian and bike infrastructure improvements.

Response to Comment PC76 - Christopher Ellis

Comment #	Response
PC76-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC77 – Emilios Finishing Studio

Comment #	Response
PC77-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC78 - Erin

Comment #	Response
PC78-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC79 - Felipe Escobar

Comment #	Response
PC79-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC80 - Natalie Estrada

Comment #	Response																																																																																														
PC80-1	<p>The LPA includes 14 stations as described in Chapter 2 of this FEIS/FEIR. Boardings (or ridership) by station for the LPA are provided below and in Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR. DEIS/DEIR Alternative 4 and the LPA would result in similar transit boardings. Boardings by station are also provided below for DEIS/DEIR Alternative 3.</p> <p>LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE - RIDERSHIP BY STATION</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Station</th> <th colspan="3">Ridership</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Peak Period</th> <th>Off-peak Period</th> <th>Daily</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Metrolink Sylmar Station</td> <td>1,740</td> <td>1,293</td> <td>3,033</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maclay</td> <td>954</td> <td>420</td> <td>1,374</td> </tr> <tr> <td>San Fernando Road/Paxton Street</td> <td>502</td> <td>258</td> <td>759</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Van Nuys Boulevard/San Fernando Road</td> <td>647</td> <td>330</td> <td>977</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Van Nuys Boulevard/Laurel Canyon</td> <td>653</td> <td>201</td> <td>854</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Van Nuys Boulevard/Arleta Avenue</td> <td>396</td> <td>204</td> <td>600</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Van Nuys Boulevard/Woodman Avenue</td> <td>640</td> <td>310</td> <td>950</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Van Nuys Boulevard/Nordoff Street</td> <td>1,269</td> <td>529</td> <td>1,798</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Van Nuys Boulevard/Roscoe Boulevard</td> <td>1,426</td> <td>638</td> <td>2,064</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Metrolink Van Nuys Station</td> <td>2,081</td> <td>864</td> <td>2,945</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Van Nuys Boulevard/Sherman Way</td> <td>1,559</td> <td>715</td> <td>2,274</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Van Nuys Boulevard/Vanowen Street</td> <td>2,333</td> <td>600</td> <td>2,933</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Van Nuys Boulevard/Victory Boulevard</td> <td>2,060</td> <td>817</td> <td>2,876</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Van Nuys Boulevard/Oxnard Street</td> <td>7,181</td> <td>2,324</td> <td>9,505</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>23,439</td> <td>9,499</td> <td>32,938</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Source: KOA, 2018.</p> <p>ALTERNATIVE 3 – RIDERSHIP BY STATION</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Station</th> <th colspan="3">Ridership</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Peak Period</th> <th>Off-peak Period</th> <th>Daily</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ESFV-SYLMAR</td> <td>1,016</td> <td>1,161</td> <td>2,177</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESFV-MACLAY</td> <td>799</td> <td>542.5</td> <td>1,342</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESFV-SAN FERNANDO/PAXTON</td> <td>410.5</td> <td>193</td> <td>603.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESFV-VAN NUYS/SAN FERNANDO</td> <td>475</td> <td>195.5</td> <td>670.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESFV-VAN NUYS/TELFAI</td> <td>310</td> <td>189.5</td> <td>499.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Station	Ridership			Peak Period	Off-peak Period	Daily	Metrolink Sylmar Station	1,740	1,293	3,033	Maclay	954	420	1,374	San Fernando Road/Paxton Street	502	258	759	Van Nuys Boulevard/San Fernando Road	647	330	977	Van Nuys Boulevard/Laurel Canyon	653	201	854	Van Nuys Boulevard/Arleta Avenue	396	204	600	Van Nuys Boulevard/Woodman Avenue	640	310	950	Van Nuys Boulevard/Nordoff Street	1,269	529	1,798	Van Nuys Boulevard/Roscoe Boulevard	1,426	638	2,064	Metrolink Van Nuys Station	2,081	864	2,945	Van Nuys Boulevard/Sherman Way	1,559	715	2,274	Van Nuys Boulevard/Vanowen Street	2,333	600	2,933	Van Nuys Boulevard/Victory Boulevard	2,060	817	2,876	Van Nuys Boulevard/Oxnard Street	7,181	2,324	9,505	Total	23,439	9,499	32,938	Station	Ridership			Peak Period	Off-peak Period	Daily	ESFV-SYLMAR	1,016	1,161	2,177	ESFV-MACLAY	799	542.5	1,342	ESFV-SAN FERNANDO/PAXTON	410.5	193	603.5	ESFV-VAN NUYS/SAN FERNANDO	475	195.5	670.5	ESFV-VAN NUYS/TELFAI	310	189.5	499.5
	Station		Ridership																																																																																												
		Peak Period	Off-peak Period	Daily																																																																																											
	Metrolink Sylmar Station	1,740	1,293	3,033																																																																																											
	Maclay	954	420	1,374																																																																																											
	San Fernando Road/Paxton Street	502	258	759																																																																																											
	Van Nuys Boulevard/San Fernando Road	647	330	977																																																																																											
	Van Nuys Boulevard/Laurel Canyon	653	201	854																																																																																											
	Van Nuys Boulevard/Arleta Avenue	396	204	600																																																																																											
	Van Nuys Boulevard/Woodman Avenue	640	310	950																																																																																											
	Van Nuys Boulevard/Nordoff Street	1,269	529	1,798																																																																																											
	Van Nuys Boulevard/Roscoe Boulevard	1,426	638	2,064																																																																																											
	Metrolink Van Nuys Station	2,081	864	2,945																																																																																											
	Van Nuys Boulevard/Sherman Way	1,559	715	2,274																																																																																											
	Van Nuys Boulevard/Vanowen Street	2,333	600	2,933																																																																																											
	Van Nuys Boulevard/Victory Boulevard	2,060	817	2,876																																																																																											
	Van Nuys Boulevard/Oxnard Street	7,181	2,324	9,505																																																																																											
	Total	23,439	9,499	32,938																																																																																											
	Station	Ridership																																																																																													
		Peak Period	Off-peak Period	Daily																																																																																											
ESFV-SYLMAR	1,016	1,161	2,177																																																																																												
ESFV-MACLAY	799	542.5	1,342																																																																																												
ESFV-SAN FERNANDO/PAXTON	410.5	193	603.5																																																																																												
ESFV-VAN NUYS/SAN FERNANDO	475	195.5	670.5																																																																																												
ESFV-VAN NUYS/TELFAI	310	189.5	499.5																																																																																												

Comment #	Response			
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/HADDON	282	145.5	427.5
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/LAUREL CYN	486	164.5	650.5
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/ARLETA	132.5	83.5	216
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/BEACHY	157.5	74	231.5
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/WOODMAN	150	107	257
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/PLUMMER	211	101	312
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/TUPPER	295.5	126	421.5
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/NORDOFF	719.5	339.5	1059
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/PATHENIA N.	405.5	164	569.5
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/PATHENIA S.	593.5	263.5	857
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/CHASE	449.5	192.5	642
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/ROSCOE	632	287.5	919.5
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/LANARK	422.5	183.5	606
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/ BLYTHE	208	97	305
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/METROLINKVN	524.5	332	856.5
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/VALERIO	349	173	522
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/SHERMAN	894	471.5	1,366
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/HART	560	228	788
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/VANOWEN	1,308	270	1,578
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/KITTRIDGE	667	271.5	938
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/VICTORY	1,385	561	1,946
	ESFV-VAN NUYS/ERWIN	1,284	524	1,808
ESFV-VAN NUYS/OXNARD	5,848	2,103	7,951	
	Total	20,973	9,544	30,517
	Source: KOA, 2018.			
PC80-2	“Daily Transit Boardings” are defined as the forecasted total ridership on the transit service for a typical weekday (see Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR)			
PC80-3	The ridership numbers are provided within Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR.			
PC80-4	The boardings tables in the DEIS/DEIR have been corrected in this FEIS/FEIR. Also, please see the response to comment PC80-1 above and Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR. Additionally, please note that the ridership estimated for each alternative was forecasted by the LA Metro Travel Demand Model. Metro has developed and maintained this model in the last two decades and the model was approved by Federal Transit Administration. The project team has calibrated/validated the model for the eastern San Fernando Valley area against the observed bus ridership, street congested speeds, roadway attributes, and traffic volumes, before using the model to forecast boardings for the alternatives studied in the DEIS/DEIR. The performance of a light rail alternative is typically superior to a bus alternative due to its higher capacity, shorter headways, higher speeds, and overall service reliability.			
PC80-5	Both total daily boardings for the proposed transit service and new transit trips (shift from auto trips) attracted by each alternative are provided in Chapter 3 of the DEIS/DEIR and this FEIS/FEIR.			
PC80-6	Please see the response to comment PC80-1 above.			

Response to Comment PC81 - John Fahe

Comment #	Response
PC81-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC82 - Fred Farzan - 1

Comment #	Response
PC82-1	The commenter has been added to the mailing list for the proposed project and will be sent all future public correspondence on the project.

Response to Comment PC83 - Fred Farzan - 2

Comment #	Response
PC83-1	Please see the response to comment PC82-1.

Response to Comment PC84 - Michelle Feiner

Comment #	Response
PC84-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC85 - Jamie Fishman

Comment #	Response
PC85-1	The commenter's opposition to the proposed project is noted for the record. Also, please note that Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT with MSF Option B has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on why Alternative 4 with MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred alternative, please see the responses to Master Comments MC-1 and MC-2.

Response to Comment PC86 - Marc Fishman

Comment #	Response
PC86-1	The commenter's opposition to the proposed project is noted for the record. Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC87 - Sara Fletcher

Comment #	Response
PC87-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC88 - Judith Forman

Comment #	Response
PC88-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC89 - Andrew Fox

Comment #	Response
PC89-1	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-5 for a discussion of how Metro would continue to coordinate planning for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor, Orange Line Improvements, and ESFVTC.

Response to Comment PC90 - Gary Fox

Comment #	Response
PC90-1	The commenter's support for Alternative 4 – LRT is noted for the record. Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. Also please see the response to Master Comment MC-5 regarding the proposed project's relationship to the Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor Project.
PC90-2	Please see the response to comment PC90-1 above.

Response to Comment PC91 - Ken Frederick

Comment #	Response
PC91-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC91-2	Metro is currently studying a future connection/service over the Sepulveda Pass that would connect to the ESFVTC. The study is evaluating rail transit concepts between the San Fernando Valley and LAX including heavy rail transit, light rail transit, monorail, and rubber tire transit. The study corridor extends approximately 22 miles and generally follows Interstate 405 (San Diego Freeway). In addition to potentially connecting with the ESFVTC, it could also connect with the Metro Purple Line and the Metro Expo Line.

Response to Comment PC92 - Alexander Friedman - 1

Comment #	Response
PC92-1	The commenter’s support for the proposed project is noted for the record.
PC92-2	The commenter’s support for the LRT alternative is also noted for the record. Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC92-3	The project originally considered alternatives that extended south to Ventura Boulevard. However, during the project’s scoping period, the option resulted in considerable community opposition and Metro’s technical analysis found that buses experience little congestion and travel at relatively high speeds south of the Metro Orange Line. Therefore, Local and Metro Rapid buses would provide service for patrons that wish to travel south from the ESFVTC Project’s southern terminus, which would be located at the Van Nuys Metro Orange Line Station.
PC92-4	The teams working on the Sepulveda Transit Corridor, Metro Orange Line Improvements, and ESFVTC meet regularly to coordinate to the greatest extent possible.
PC92-5	Due to the limited right-of-way and roadway cross-section, the alignment would only be able to accommodate the LRT guideway and two travel lanes in each direction. On-street parking and a class II bike lane cannot be accommodated. As noted in Chapter 2 of this FEIS/FEIR, the existing bike lanes extending approximately 2 miles north on Van Nuys Boulevard from Parthenia Street to Beachy Avenue and from Laurel Canyon Boulevard to San Fernando Road would be removed in order to accommodate the LRT guideway. In response to the proposed removal of the bike lanes on Van Nuys Boulevard, two parallel corridors have been identified for consideration and approval by LADOT as bike friendly corridors. These include Filmore Street to the west and Pierce Street to the east. Both of these streets could be designated and designed as Class III Bike Friendly streets through use of sharrows (markings indicating the lane is to be shared by bikes and cars) and signage. Metro will also continue to work with LADOT to identify, to the extent feasible, replacement locations for Class II bike lanes that meet the goals and policies in the City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan (also, please see mitigation measure MM-TRA-7 in Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR).
PC92-6	The commenter’s support for light rail along Van Nuys Boulevard is noted for the record.
PC92-7	Conversion of the Metro Orange Line to light rail is not within the scope of the ESFVTC Project. However, Measure M funds have been identified for the Metro Orange Line’s conversion to light rail for 2057.

Response to Comment PC93 - Alexander Friedman - 2

Comment #	Response
PC93-1	The map referenced in the comment and attached to the email submitted to Metro has been included in the record.
PC93-2	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC93-3	Please see the response to comment PC93-2 above.

Comment #	Response
PC93-4	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT, which includes 14 stations, has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS/FEIR for a detailed description of this alternative.
PC93-5	Please see response to comment PC92-3.
PC93-6	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-5.
PC93-7	Please see the response to comment PC92-5.

Response to Comment PC94 - Nancy Friedman

Comment #	Response
PC94-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC95 - Robert Friedman

Comment #	Response
PC95-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC96 - Wendy Furth

Comment #	Response
PC96-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC97 - Evelyn and Spike Steingasser Gabai

Comment #	Response
PC97-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC98 - Michael Gans

Comment #	Response
PC98-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC99 - Adan Garcia

Comment #	Response
PC99-1	The commenter's support for Alternative 4 – LRT has been noted for the record. Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC100 - Elizabeth Garcia

Comment #	Response
PC100-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC100-2	Metro has initiated and continues to lead a comprehensive outreach program for the proposed project. Through the use of traditional and innovative methods, the outreach activities have yielded hundreds of comments; Metro has hosted and presented at over 100 meetings, sharing project information with over 2,900 participants. In addition, through the use of public open houses, focus groups, workshops, tours, participation in community events, social media outlets, and webinars, project stakeholders have been involved in each of the major technical milestones of the project development process that has occurred to date.
PC100-3	Please see the response to comment PC100-1 above.

Response to Comment PC101 - Evangelina Garcia

Comment #	Response
PC101-1	The commenter's concern about the cost of the proposed project is noted for the record.
PC101-2	The commenter's concern that the proposed project would attract homeless individuals to the project area is noted for the record. The potential to attract homeless individuals to a project area is not a CEQA impact. The proposed project would integrate measures to maximize safety for all passengers. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-4 for a description of the safety features that would be built into the design of Alternative 4's LRT line and stations.
PC101-3	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-7 regarding the proposed project's impacts on traffic.

Comment #	Response
PC101-4	Please see the response to comment PC101-2 above.
PC101-5	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-1 for a discussion of the reasons why MSF Option B has been selected as the preferred location for the maintenance and storage facility.
PC101-6	The commenter has been added to the email list for the proposed project.

Response to Comment PC102 - Jana Gaudette

Comment #	Response
PC102-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC103 - Catherine Gish-Persi

Comment #	Response
PC103-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC104 - Themis Glatman

Comment #	Response
PC104-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC105 - Margaret Glynn

Comment #	Response
PC105-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC106 - Greg Golden

Comment #	Response
PC106-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC107 - David Goldstein - 1

Comment #	Response
PC107-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC107-2	Please see the response to comment PC107-1 above.

Response to Comment PC108 - David Goldstein - 2

Comment #	Response
PC108-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC109 - Leila and Maani Goleosrkhi

Comment #	Response
PC109-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC110 - Ellen Golla

Comment #	Response
PC110-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC111 - Ivan Gomez

Comment #	Response
PC111-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC111-2	With regard to the LADWP property, Metro considered that property in developing the three potential MSF sites identified in the DEIS/DEIR. However, the site was deemed too distant and too difficult to access for light rail and LADWP informed Metro that it planned to soon begin construction on the site for its Mid Valley Water Facility Project.

Comment #	Response
PC111-3	Metro will review each of the 14 stations for opportunities to increase the attractiveness of walking or biking to and from the stations. This effort will be completed within the next year and will look within 0.5 mile of the stations for walkability and within 3 miles for cycling. This will be a component of the Metro Board–approved “First/Last Mile” directive for all Metro rail projects.
PC111-4	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC111-5	Please see the response to comment PC111-2 above.
PC111-6	Please see the responses to comments PC111-1 and PC111-2 above.

Response to Comment PC112 - Ivan Gomez

Comment #	Response
PC112-1	The commenter’s concern about the loss of valuable, high-skilled industrial jobs is noted for the record. Also, please note that MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC112-2	Please see the response to comment PC112-1 above.
PC112-3	In June 2018, the Metro Board adopted an LPA, which includes MSF Site B. All other MSF sites were eliminated from consideration due to either community opposition or the feasibility of a site from a property acquisition or operations perspective. Also, please see the response to comment PC111-2 above.
PC112-4	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors.
PC112-5	The DEIS/DEIR and this FEIS/FEIR did not weigh the potential impacts the proposed project might have on autonomous driving, nor did it assess the potential impact autonomous driving may have on the project. Those analyses are beyond the scope of this FEIS/FEIR and the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.

Response to Comment PC113 - William Graca - 1

Comment #	Response
PC113-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC114 - William Graca

Comment #	Response
PC114-1	Conversion of the Metro Orange Line to light rail is not within the scope of the ESFVTC Project. However, Measure M funds have been identified for the Orange Line’s conversion to light rail for 2057.

Response to Comment PC115 - Cheryl Grant

Comment #	Response
PC115-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC116 - Max Greene

Comment #	Response
PC116-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC117 - William Griffith

Comment #	Response
PC117-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC117-2	Please see the response to comment PC117-1 above and Master Comment MC-6.

Response to Comment PC118 - Lynne Gullo

Comment #	Response
PC118-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC119 - Angelica Guzman

Comment #	Response
PC119-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC119-2	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC119-3	The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated and is no longer under consideration due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, and traffic impacts.
PC119-4	The comment in support of the LRT alternative with 14 stations is noted for the record. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC119-5	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC120 - Jack Haddox

Comment #	Response
PC120-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC121 - Ira Hart

Comment #	Response
PC121-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC122 - Omar Hegazy

Comment #	Response
PC122-1	The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated in favor of an at-grade segment and Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC122-2	Please see the response to comment PC122-1 above.

Response to Comment PC123 - Silvia Hernandez

Comment #	Response
PC123-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC124 - Bradley Hertz

Comment #	Response
PC124-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC125 - Heath Hewitt

Comment #	Response
PC125-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC126 - Merritt Hicks

Comment #	Response
PC126-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC127 - Andrew Hurvitz

Comment #	Response
PC127-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC128 - David Iblings

Comment #	Response
PC128-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC129 - Sasha Itzikman

Comment #	Response
PC129-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC130 – JM Performance Automotive

Comment #	Response
PC130-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC131 - Kevin Johnson

Comment #	Response
PC131-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC132 - Mark Johnston

Comment #	Response
PC132-1	The commenter’s input regarding the operation of the public hearing has been noted for the record by Metro and will be taken into consideration for future public meetings. Also, please note that for the particular meeting in question, security at the venue locked the entrance before their departure after the start of the meeting. Once staff were notified, a staff member was stationed outside to assist and redirect attendees to the next available entrance.
PC132-2	The ESFVTC Project team met with high-speed rail representatives and learned that the high-speed rail project team has removed the San Fernando rail right-of-way between Van Nuys Boulevard and the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink station from consideration.
PC132-3	The subway portion between Sherman Way and Roscoe was not chosen as the preferred alternative; rather, light rail would be at grade along this segment of the alignment. Metro is working to make the connection between the Van Nuys Metrolink Station and the ESFVTC Project as convenient as feasible.
PC132-4	The comment regarding the design of the proposed project in relation to the Sepulveda/Interstate 405 line has been noted by Metro for the record. At this time, however, the mode and alignment for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor project has not been determined, nor has its northern terminus. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-5.
PC132-5	Conversion of the Metro Orange Line to light rail is not within the scope of the ESFVTC Project. However, Measure M funds have been identified for the Metro Orange Line’s conversion to light rail for 2057.
PC132-6	The comment is noted for the record but the Burbank airport is outside the project study area and scope for the ESFVTC Project. The commenter’s recommendations, however, will be forwarded to appropriate Metro staff.

Comment #	Response
PC132-7	The Metro Red Line is outside the project study area and, as such, was not reviewed as a part of this project. However, the comment will be forwarded to the appropriate Metro department.
PC132-8	The commenter’s recommendations have been noted for the record. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-5.

Response to Comment PC133 - Judy Jordan

Comment #	Response
PC133-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC134 - Alexander Kasendorf

Comment #	Response
PC134-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC135 - Laurie Kelson

Comment #	Response
PC135-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site. Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC136 - Carlyn Kessler

Comment #	Response
PC136-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC137 - Carlyn Kessler

Comment #	Response
PC137-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC138 - Jan Kidwell

Comment #	Response
PC138-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC139 - Gina Konwiser

Comment #	Response
PC139-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC140 - Gary Kosman

Comment #	Response
PC140-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC141 - Kati Koster

Comment #	Response
PC141-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC142 - Roger B. Krost

Comment #	Response
PC142-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC143 - Karen Kutzin

Comment #	Response
PC143-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC144 - Janes Lamb

Comment #	Response
PC144-1	The LPA selected by the Metro Board of Directors is an at-grade LRT system with 14 stations. The project team would apply best practices and lessons learned from the construction of prior LRT projects into the design of ESFVTC grade crossings. In short, the project team is working to ensure intersections are as safe and efficient as possible.
PC144-2	Please see the response to comment PC144-1 above.
PC144-3	The ESFVTC Project would connect with the Metro Orange Line at Van Nuys Boulevard. However, the Metro Orange Line conversion is a separate effort, which, under Measure M, is scheduled for LRT conversion in 2057.

Response to Comment PC145 - Hadyn Lazarow

Comment #	Response
PC145-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC146 - Melinda Liberatore

Comment #	Response
PC146-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC147 - Tony and Melinda Liberatore

Comment #	Response
PC147-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC148 - Vivi Lin

Comment #	Response
PC148-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC149 - Tina Lol

Comment #	Response
PC149-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC150 - Jonathan Lopez

Comment #	Response
PC150-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. The selection of this site minimizes the acquisition of small businesses. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2.

Response to Comment PC151 - Todd Lorber - 1

Comment #	Response
PC151-1	An elevated guideway was eliminated from consideration based on community opposition to aerial structures due to the visual impacts they would have on the community. In addition, an elevated BRT would make this mode cost ineffective due to the additional infrastructure and right-of-way costs, in comparison to the at-grade BRT alternatives. Nonetheless, the commenter's recommended alternative to the BRT and LRT alternatives identified in the DEIS/DEIR is noted for the record by Metro. Also please note that, Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC152 - Todd Lorber - 2

Comment #	Response
PC152-1	The commenter's concern about the acquisition of diminishing industrial space in the San Fernando Valley is noted for the record, and Section 4.2, <i>Real Estate and Acquisitions</i> , of this FEIS/FEIR has been updated with recent additional information on the lack of available industrial space in the project area. Also, please note that MSF Option B, which would result in the acquisition of 34 parcels, has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. The commenter is also referred to Section 4.3 for a discussion of the economic impacts of those acquisitions, including the adverse impacts on businesses who receive revenue from transactions with businesses that would be displaced by the proposed project.

Comment #	Response
PC152-2	<p>Although buses take less distance and time to stop than much larger and heavier LRT trains, there are other factors to consider when evaluating the relative operational safety of an LRT line. For example, the LRT guideway will have curbs along the outer edge and fencing down the center. The curbs will prevent casual intrusion by motorists onto the LRT tracks. The fencing will prevent pedestrians from running across the tracks as well as motorists from attempting to drive across the guideway. These same design and safety features are employed on other Metro LRT lines operating in similar environments. It is unlikely obstacles in the form of a motor vehicle will be laying across the tracks. The LRT trains will operate along Van Nuys Boulevard at the same speed as motor vehicles, which is 35mph. The LRT guideway is generally straight with generous sight distances, which should afford the train operator with a clear view of the tracks should they become obstructed. All intersections that cross Van Nuys Boulevard will be signalized. Vehicular traffic and LRT trains will be controlled by these traffic signals. Left turns/U-turns will be controlled by traffic signals, which will have their own dedicated signal phase, ensuring these movements can be done safely. All of these design and operational factors will contribute to ensure safe operation of the LRT trains.</p> <p>Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-4 for a discussion of the proposed project's safety impacts.</p>
PC152-3	<p>Please see Section 4.11 for a discussion of the energy consumption of the project alternatives, including Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT, which has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors.</p>
PC152-4	<p>Please see the response to Master Comment MC-7 regarding the proposed project's impacts on traffic and Chapter 3, <i>Transportation, Transit, Circulation, and Parking</i>, for a detailed discussion of the proposed project's impacts on the transportation system in the project study area.</p>
PC152-5	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. An elevated BRT would result in additional visual impacts, greater right-of-way impacts because the elevated guideway columns would require deep columns with footers occupying a wide footprint to meet seismic and structural codes, and significantly greater utility relocation impacts because of the depth of the support columns. Because this alternative would result in greater impacts than the LPA (Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT), would not avoid or minimize the significant impacts of the LPA (Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT), and because it did not have the support of the community, it was eliminated from consideration. In addition, an elevated guideway would be more expensive than an at-grade alternative as a result of the additional infrastructure and right-of-way costs. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1 and why Metro eliminated the subway segment and is instead proposing to construct the entire 9.2-mile LRT alignment at grade.</p>

Response to Comment PC153 - Christopher Luna

Comment #	Response
PC153-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PC154 - Susan Lisa Lynch

Comment #	Response
PC154-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC155 - Jessica Maillard

Comment #	Response
PC155-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC156 - Jessica Maillard

Comment #	Response
PC156-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC157 - Mariadp84

Comment #	Response
PC157-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC158 - Jerry Martin

Comment #	Response
PC158-1	The Sylmar San Fernando Metrolink Station Site was chosen as the terminus location of the ESFVTC LRT line because of its availability, to maximize use of the Metrolink park-and-ride lot and its use by Metro customers, and to take advantage of its proximity to downtown San Fernando, as well as its proximity to the Metrolink and local buses for regional connectivity. An extension to Roxford Street would require relocation of the existing Metrolink tracks and additional right-of-way acquisition for the LRT.
PC158-2	Stations would be spaced at approximately 3/4-mile intervals. Station locations were chosen to maximize transfers between the LRT project and other Metro Bus Lines or Metrolink and Amtrak services. Additional factors taken into consideration in determining the location of stations were proximity to activity centers and minimizing as much as possible the acquisition of right-of-way and property.

Response to Comment PC159 - Patrick Marti

Comment #	Response
PC159-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC160 - Eric Mazer

Comment #	Response
PC160-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. The Option B site is located in an industrial area south of Raymer Street and west of Van Nuys Boulevard. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC161 - McCalla Company

Comment #	Response
PC161-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC162 - Rebecca McDonald

Comment #	Response
PC162-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC163 - Penelope McMillan

Comment #	Response
PC163-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC163-2	The LPA would include 14 stations rather than the 28 stations preferred by the commenter that would be provided under Alternative 3. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC163-3	Passenger safety is paramount in all of Metro's design considerations. Access/egress to station platforms are ADA compliant, well lit, and have wayfinding signage and control features such as pedestrian gates or pedestrian signals where appropriate. At the Sylmar/ San Fernando station, a grade-separated pedestrian crossing would be provided between the LRT platform and existing station parking lot.

Comment #	Response
PC163-4	It is assumed LRT passengers will arrive by multiple modes of transportation. Also, please note that Metro is not constructing or expanding the existing off-street parking lot at the Sylmar/ San Fernando Station.

Response to Comment PC164 - Kevin Morales

Comment #	Response
PC164-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC164-2	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC164-3	The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated and is no longer under consideration due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, and traffic impacts.
PC164-4	The comment in support of the LRT alternative with 14 stations is noted for the record. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC164-5	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC165 - Dauoud Mourad

Comment #	Response
PC165-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC166 - Terri Mouton

Comment #	Response
PC166-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC167 - Kristine Muscara

Comment #	Response
PC167-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC168 - Mustangs Etc.

Comment #	Response
PC168-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC169 - Lorenzo Mutia - 1

Comment #	Response
PC169-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC169-2	Please see the response to comment PC169-1 above.
PC169-3	An elevated BRT would result in additional visual impacts, greater right-of-way impacts because the elevated guideway columns would require deep columns with footers occupying a wide footprint to meet seismic and structural codes, and significantly greater utility relocation impacts because of the depth of the support columns. Because this alternative would result in greater impacts than the LPA (Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT), would not avoid or minimize the significant impacts of the LPA (Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT), and because it did not have the support of the community, it was eliminated from consideration. In addition, an elevated guideway would be more expensive than an at-grade alternative as a result of the additional infrastructure and right-of-way costs.

Response to Comment PC170 - Lorenzo Mutia - 2

Comment #	Response
PC170-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC170-2	Due to the limited right-of-way and roadway cross-section, the alignment would only be able to accommodate the LRT guideway and two travel lanes in each direction. On-street parking and a class II bike lane cannot be accommodated. Metro is working with LADOT to identify potential measures to mitigate the removal of class II bike lanes that are currently on Van Nuys Boulevard. Also, please note that Metro has completed a First/Last Mile Plan for the ESFVTC Project. The plan includes a robust program of projects for pedestrians and projects for wheels. These projects will enhance the walking and bike riding experience and environment between for Metro passengers and in many instances the community at large in the vicinity of the 14 proposed LRT stations.
PC170-3	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT, which has been selected as the LPA, would result in the acquisition of up to four single-family residences. Please see Section 4.2, <i>Real Estate and Acquisitions</i> , for more information on these potential acquisition impacts and Section 4.4, <i>Communities and Neighborhoods</i> , for a discussion of community impacts and disruptions. Also, please see the response to comment PC188-1.

Response to Comment PC171 - Nancy

Comment #	Response
PC171-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC172 - Paula Newsome - 1

Comment #	Response
PC172-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC173 - Paula Newsome - 2

Comment #	Response
PC173-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC174 - Jessica Niven - Kohring

Comment #	Response
PC174-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC175 - Glenys Norwood

Comment #	Response
PC175-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC176 - Lisa Nunez

Comment #	Response
PC176-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC177 - Michael O'Brien

Comment #	Response
PC177-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC177-2	Please see the response to comment PC177-1 above. Also, please note Metro has initiated and continues to lead a comprehensive outreach program for the proposed project. Through the use of traditional and innovative methods, the outreach activities have yielded hundreds of comments; Metro has hosted and presented at over 100 meetings, sharing project information with over 2,900 participants. In addition, through the use of public open houses, focus groups, workshops, tours, participation in community events, social media outlets, and webinars, project stakeholders have been involved in each of the major technical milestones of the project development process that has occurred to date.

Response to Comment PC178 - Anita O'Connell

Comment #	Response
PC178-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC179 - Michael O'Connor

Comment #	Response
PC179-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC180 - Mike and Gary Aggas O'Gara

Comment #	Response
PC180-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC181 - Dennis Orellana

Comment #	Response
PC181-1	A preliminary list of parcels to be acquired, based on the advanced conceptual plans developed by the project team for the Locally Preferred Alternative, is included in Tables 4.2-2 and 4.2-3 in Section 4.2 of this FEIS/FEIR. However, please note that Metro is continuing to review and refine project plans and will work with the local community city officials to minimize right-of-way impacts on property and business owners, including those identified in the comment. Final determinations on the parcels to be acquired will be made as the project progresses into the final engineering phase of the selected alternative.

Response to Comment PC182 - David Orr

Comment #	Response
PC182-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC183 - Dominic Ortiz

Comment #	Response
PC183-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC183-2	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC183-3	The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated and is no longer under consideration due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, and traffic impacts.
PC183-4	The comment in support of the LRT alternative with 14 stations is noted for the record. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC183-5	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC184 - Michael Ortiz

Comment #	Response
PC184-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC184-2	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Comment #	Response
PC184-3	The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated and is no longer under consideration due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, and traffic impacts.
PC184-4	The comment in support of the LRT alternative with 14 stations is noted for the record. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC184-5	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC185 - Francine Oschin

Comment #	Response
PC185-1	The LPA identified by the Metro Board of Directors is Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT, which eliminates the subway segment. Instead, the LPA would be at grade for the entire 9.2-mile length of the alignment. For further information on the selection of the LPA, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC186 - Hunter Owens

Comment #	Response
PC186-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC187 – Pablo Sash and Door

Comment #	Response
PC187-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC188 - Veronica Padilla

Comment #	Response
PC188-1	The comment recommending that Metro institute a Transit-Oriented Communities policy, in consultation with the City of Los Angeles, in order to protect neighborhoods vulnerable to displacement, including low-income and communities of color, will be taken into consideration during Metro’s planning efforts.
PC188-2	Evaluating the transit connectivity within the larger Los Angeles County area is beyond the scope of the ESFVTC Project. Metro is, however, currently evaluating a number of other projects in the Valley, such as the Sepulveda Corridor Study, that would one day connect with the ESFVTC Project.

Comment #	Response
PC188-3	Metrolink has a station on Van Nuys Boulevard to near the Saticoy intersection. Metrolink stations are owned and maintained by the city in which they are located. With that noted, the City of Los Angeles does have plans to upgrade the station in the very near future. The ESFVTC Project includes a station within a short walking distance of the Van Nuys Metrolink station.
PC188-4	The ESFVTC Project would pass over the Pacoima Wash as it travels north on the San Fernando Rail right-of-way, just south of the City of San Fernando. Although access to the Pacoima Wash greenway and integration with the ESFVTC Project are outside the scope of this project and were not considered during planning efforts to date, Metro is willing to consult with stakeholders, including Pacoima Beautiful and the City of Los Angeles, to determine if there are ways to avoid obstructing or diminishing access to the greenway.
PC188-5	Metro will continue to engage members of the community and local businesses during final design and construction to identify, develop, and implement reasonable and feasible measures to minimize impacts on the corridor-adjacent communities during the construction phases of the project. Also, please see the relevant construction impact discussions and proposed mitigation measures listed in Table ES-3 in the Executive Summary (see mitigation measures MM-TRA-1, MM-TRA-2, MM-CN-1, and MM-SS-1 through MM-SS-23) and in Chapters 3 and 4 of this FEIS/FEIR. It should also be noted that none of the historic properties identified in the DEIS/DEIR that are located in the immediate vicinity of the alignment would be acquired or significantly affected by the LPA (Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT).
PC188-6	A First/Last Mile Plan has been developed as a part of this project that incorporates community input.

Response to Comment PC189 - Rocco Palumbo

Comment #	Response
PC189-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC190 - Tommy Paul

Comment #	Response
PC190-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC191 - Salvador Pelaez

Comment #	Response
PC191-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Comment #	Response
PC191-2	Alternative 4 includes 14 stations. Metro will review each of the 14 stations for opportunities to increase the attractiveness of walking or biking to and from the stations. This effort will be completed within the next year and will look within 0.5 mile of the stations for walkability and within 3 miles for cycling. This will be a component of the Metro Board–approved “First/Last Mile” directive for all Metro rail projects.
PC191-3	Please see the response to comment PC191-2 above.

Response to Comment PC192 - Ganon Karen Perea

Comment #	Response
PC192-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC193 –Mont Perez

Comment #	Response
PC193-1	The commenter’s support of the proposed project is noted for the record by Metro.
PC193-2	The ridership projections during the Alternatives Analysis phase of the project indicated that an extension of the LRT north toward Mission College did not warrant further consideration. It was also determined that the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink station on the north and the Metro Orange Line on the south are logical termini for the transit corridor and a transit line along the corridor terminating at those locations would provide the most cost-effective solution to improving mobility and transit accessibility for the highly transit-dependent populations in the corridor, and would thus best fulfill the project’s purpose and need (see Chapter 1, <i>Purpose and Need</i>). Nonetheless, Metro appreciates Los Angeles Mission College’s interest in and support of the project. Metro will also continue to consult with the college as part of future Metro planning efforts to improve transit service in the area, which may include consideration of a shuttle from the Sylmar/San Fernando station to the college.

Response to Comment PC194 - Bradley D. Pierce, Pierce Law Firm

Comment #	Response
PC194-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site. The commenter is also referred to Section 4.2, <i>Real Estate and Acquisitions</i> , of this FEIS/FEIR, which has been updated to more accurately describe current conditions in the corridor.

Response to Comment PC195 - Colin Piethe

Comment #	Response
PC195-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC196 - Anna Plumley

Comment #	Response
PC196-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC197 - Tim Plumley

Comment #	Response
PC197-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC198 - Eric Polin

Comment #	Response
PC198-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC199 - Quality Auto Clinic

Comment #	Response
PC199-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC200 - Quality Dry Wall Inc.

Comment #	Response
PC200-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC201 – Radioactive Autobody

Comment #	Response
PC201-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC202 - Jesus Ramos

Comment #	Response
PC202-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC202-2	<p>Metro, as part of Metro’s outreach program during the DEIS/DEIR phase, contacted the following churches by phone, and follow-up emails were sent with information about the DEIS/DEIR public hearings, along with an electronic copy of the fact sheet in English and Spanish (hard copies were delivered when requested):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Saint Elizabeth’s Church; • Victory House; • Bible Baptist Church; • St. Mark’s Episcopal Church; • Church on the Way; • Church of the Valley; • Mary Immaculate Catholic Church; and • Our Lady of Peace Catholic Church. <p>The last of the public hearings on the DEIS/DEIR was held on Saturday, September 23, 2017, subsequent to receipt of the 9/21/17 email from the commenter, from 9 a.m. to noon at St. Mark’s Episcopal Church, 14646 Sherman Way, Van Nuys, CA 91405. It should be noted that a Spanish interpreter, in addition to bilingual staff, was available at this and the other public hearings.</p> <p>In addition to the public hearings, on October 10, 2017, Metro hosted an informational meeting for businesses and property owners who had been notified that the property they own/lease is under consideration by the Federal Transit Administration and Metro for possible acquisition. Metro staff members from Planning, Real Estate, and Community Relations were present to respond to questions. The meeting took place at the Van Nuys State Building auditorium. Approximately 120 people attended, including staff members from local elected officials, business advocacy organizations, and the media. To allow for more public input, Metro extended the comment period from 45 to 60 days. The public outreach team conducted door-to-door visits to business and property owners located within right-of-way acquisition areas to provide flyers, explaining the project, and invite their attendance at the meeting.</p> <p>Metro continues to lead a comprehensive outreach program for the proposed project. Through the use of traditional and innovative methods, the outreach activities have yielded hundreds of comments; Metro has hosted and presented at over 100 meetings sharing, project information with over 2,900 participants. Metro will continue to hold meetings with the community at venues accessible to the public, which may include city facilities as well as private churches.</p>

Comment #	Response
	In addition, through the use of public open houses, focus groups, workshops, tours, participation in community events, social media outlets, and webinars, project stakeholders have been involved in each of the major technical milestones of the project development process that has occurred to date.
PC202-3	Please see the response to comment PC202-2 for a description of Metro’s efforts to inform and engage all members of the community. Because of the large Hispanic population in the project effort, Metro has made a concerted outreach effort to non-English speakers employing a wide range of innovative outreach strategies to include and solicit feedback from those who may speak Spanish and/or have limited English proficiency. All noticing communications for the scoping meetings were conducted in English and Spanish. Collateral materials (brochures, flyers, emails, advertisements, and posters) were made available in both languages. For each set of meetings, Metro created bilingual (English/Spanish) materials. Post-scoping activities included targeted outreach to Latino-owned and small-business owners along Van Nuys Boulevard to ensure their feedback was included in the project plans. Bilingual team members visited businesses along the corridor to speak with store owners/managers/employees and share information about the Project. Metro has built relationships with trusted community leaders, organizations, and schools to disseminate project information and collect feedback through small-group presentations and tabling at “pop-up events” like community health fairs, arts festivals, and school events. Bilingual team members staffed tables at these all-day events, sharing the new project materials and answering questions from hundreds of community members who spoke only Spanish.

Response to Comment PC203 - Tracey Ramos

Comment #	Response
PC203-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC204 – Regent Inc.

Comment #	Response
PC204-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC205 - Bill Reider

Comment #	Response
PC205-1	The commenter’s opposition to the proposed project is noted for the record by Metro.

Response to Comment PC206 - Noli Reyes

Comment #	Response
PC206-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC206-2	In response to the comment, the commenter has been added to the email list for the proposed project.

Response to Comment PC207 - Robert Rieth

Comment #	Response
PC207-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. Also, please see the response to comment AL14-2, which addresses emergency vehicle access.
PC207-2	The commenter's support of the BRT alternatives and suggestion to connect the ESFVTC to the Metro Orange Line via an underground tunnel to provide a single ride from the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink station to the North Hollywood station are noted for the record by Metro. It is also acknowledged that implementation of the LPA (Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT), would require LRT transit riders traveling from the Sylmar/San Fernando station to the North Hollywood Orange Line station to transfer at the Van Nuys station. Although this transfer would increase travel times for transit riders, Metro's project team will continue to review and refine the pedestrian connections between the two station to improve access to the two transit lines, while ensuring pedestrian safety.
PC207-3	The comment is noted for the record; however, use of the Antelope Valley corridor was outside of the limits and scope of the project study area.
PC207-4	In June 2018, Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT was identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. The TSM Alternative was eliminated because it did not provide the level of mobility benefits Metro was looking to achieve, as it consisted of service frequency increases (i.e., reduced headways) on Metro Bus Lines 233/761. Furthermore, during the community outreach/engagement process, residents, stakeholders, and Metro's customers expressed strong support for an LRT alternative, which would, it was expressed, best meet their travel needs along the corridor.

Response to Comment PC208 - Monica Roldan

Comment #	Response
PC208-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC208-2	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC208-3	The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated and is no longer under consideration due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, and traffic impacts.

Comment #	Response
PC208-4	The comment in support of the LRT alternative with 14 stations is noted for the record. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC208-5	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC209 - Phyllis Rosenberg

Comment #	Response
PC209-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC210 - Diane Rowland

Comment #	Response
PC210-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC211 - David J. Ruckman

Comment #	Response
PC211-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC211-2	Please see the response to comment PC211-1 above.
PC211-3	Please see the response to comment PC211-1 above.

Response to Comment PC212 - Rupert

Comment #	Response
PC212-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC213 - Zachary Rynew

Comment #	Response
PC213-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC213-2	Due to the limited right-of-way and roadway cross-section, the alignment would only be able to accommodate the LRT guideway and two travel lanes in each direction. On-street parking and a class II bike lane cannot be accommodated. Metro is working with LADOT to identify potential measures to mitigate the proposed removal of the class II bike lanes that are currently on Van Nuys Boulevard. Additionally, Metro will review each of the 14 stations for opportunities to increase the attractiveness of walking or biking to and from the stations. This effort will be completed within the next year and will look within 0.5 mile of the stations for walkability and within 3 miles for cycling. This will be a component of the Metro Board-approved “First/Last Mile” directive for all Metro rail projects.

Response to Comment PC214 - Diana Saikali

Comment #	Response
PC214-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC215 - Robert Saikali

Comment #	Response
PC215-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC216 - Kristin Sales

Comment #	Response
PC216-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC216-2	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC217 - David Sals, Jr.

Comment #	Response
PC217-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC217-2	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC217-3	The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated and is no longer under consideration due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, and traffic impacts.
PC217-4	The comment in support of the LRT alternative with 14 stations is noted for the record. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC217-5	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC218 - Ed Saltzberg

Comment #	Response
PC218-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC218-2	Please see the response to PC218-1 above.

Response to Comment PC219 - Sarah

Comment #	Response
PC219-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC220 - Tracy Saritzky

Comment #	Response
PC220-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC221 - Stephen G. Schwartz

Comment #	Response
PC221-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC222 - Ann Sciuto

Comment #	Response
PC222-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC223 - Robert Scott

Comment #	Response
PC223-1	<p>MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.</p> <p>With regard to the alternate MSF site identified by the commenter, i.e., the Pacoima Spreading Grounds, the County of Los Angeles Flood Control District recently issued (on November 14, 2018) a Recirculated Mitigated Negative Declaration for a project to improve the spreading grounds to double the storage capacity, significantly increase the percolation rate, and increase the stormwater capture capacity. The project would also include a new bike path. Given that the planning for this project is underway, and that the site is too far from Van Nuys Boulevard (approximately 0.25 mile) and is immediately adjacent to single-family residential neighborhoods, this site is unlikely to be a viable alternative to MSF Option B.</p>
PC223-2	The comment is noted for the record. Also, please see the response to comment PC223-1 above.
PC223-3	Please see the response to comment PC223-1 above.

Response to Comment PC224 - Kathryn Serviss

Comment #	Response
PC224-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC225 - John Shamoun

Comment #	Response
PC225-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC226 - Nadine Shelton

Comment #	Response
PC226-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC227 - Kendra Silverstein

Comment #	Response
PC227-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC228 - Audrey Simons

Comment #	Response
PC228-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. Also, please note that the LPA includes a station at Maclay Avenue.

Response to Comment PC229 - Amelia Soohoo

Comment #	Response
PC229-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC230 - Bethany Stafford-Paul

Comment #	Response
PC230-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC231 - N Stein

Comment #	Response
PC231-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC232 - Brad Stephenson

Comment #	Response
PC232-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC233 - Michael Stevenson

Comment #	Response
PC233-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC234 - James Stewart

Comment #	Response
PC234-1	The commenter's opposition to the proposed project is noted for the record. Also please note that Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC235 - Michael Stone

Comment #	Response
PC235-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC236 - Emily Streetz

Comment #	Response
PC236-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Comment #	Response
PC236-2	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-5.

Response to Comment PC237 - Carrie Sutkin (with attachments)

Comment #	Response
PC237-1 through PC237-26	<p>MSF Option A is no longer under consideration due to community opposition. MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p> <p>Also, please note that the cost estimates do not reflect relocation assistance and benefits. Those costs are handled on a case-by-case basis by Metro and affected business owners. Since the amount of assistance is variable, a cost estimate cannot be determined at this time.</p>
PC237-27	The commenter’s support for light rail transit is noted for the record.
PC237-28	<p>The southern terminus of the project is Van Nuys Boulevard where it crosses the Metro Orange Line. This location would enable patrons to transfer to Metro east/west service with connections to the Metro Red Line.</p> <p>Also, please see the response to comment PC5-1.</p>
PC237-29 through PC237-32	<p>The DEIS/DEIR acknowledged that development of an MSF at any of the three sites identified would result in socio-economic and other impacts (see Sections 4.2, Real Estate and Acquisitions and Section 4.3, Economic and Fiscal impacts, for more details). Also, please see the responses to comments PC237-1 through PC237-26 above.</p> <p>With regard to the LADWP property, Metro considered that property in developing the three potential MSF sites identified in the DEIS/DEIR. However, the site was deemed difficult to access for light rail and LADWP informed Metro that it planned to soon begin construction on the site for its Mid Valley Water Facility Project.</p> <p>With regards to the commenter’s recommendation to elevate the alignment, an elevated guideway was eliminated from consideration early in the alternatives analysis due to public opposition to aerial structures and the resulting visual impacts they would have on the community. In addition, an elevated BRT would make this mode cost ineffective due to the additional infrastructure and right-of-way costs (the elevated guideway columns would require deep columns with footers occupying a wide footprint to meet seismic and structural codes, and significantly greater utility relocation impacts because of the depth of the support columns), in comparison to the at-grade alternatives.</p>
PC237-33	Metro has initiated and continues to lead a comprehensive outreach program for the proposed project. Through the use of traditional and innovative methods, the outreach activities have yielded hundreds of comments; Metro has hosted and presented at over 100 meetings, sharing project information with over 2,900 participants. In addition, through the use of public open houses, focus groups, workshops, tours, participation in community events, social media outlets, and webinars, project stakeholders have been involved in each of the major technical milestones of the project development process that has occurred to date.

Comment #	Response
PC237-34 through PC237-228	Please see the responses to comments PC237-1 through PC237-26 above.

Response to Comment PC238 - Diane Sydell

Comment #	Response
PC238-1	The entire San Fernando Valley is beyond the scope of the ESFVTC Project. However, through separate efforts, Metro is advancing a number of premium service projects in the Valley that would one day connect with the ESFVTC Project. Through these and other efforts, mass transit will become a more attractive alternative to a greater number of people who live and/or work in the Valley.

Response to Comment PC239 - Jeff Symonds

Comment #	Response
PC239-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC240 - Katharine Tepper

Comment #	Response
PC240-1	Please refer to the response to comment PC27-6.
PC240-2	It is recognized that a one-seat ride would provide faster and more convenient access between the San Fernando Valley and the Westside and LAX. However, the funding resources that are available via Measure R and Measure M for the construction of the ESFVTC Project are insufficient to construct this project beyond its 9.2 miles. Metro has conducted a Feasibility Study to identify and evaluate a range of high-capacity rail transit alternatives between the San Fernando Valley and the Westside and LAX with connections to the ESFVTC line. The Feasibility Study was completed in the Fall 2019 and will be the basis for an environmental analysis and project refinement, which is expected to begin in 2020. Also, for further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC241 - The Blues Bunker

Comment #	Response
PC241-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC242 - Lance and Rebecca Thomas

Comment #	Response
PC242-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC243 - Rebecca Thomas

Comment #	Response
PC243-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC244 - Roger Thomas

Comment #	Response
PC244-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC244-2	Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS/FEIR for a list of proposed stations that would be constructed under the LPA.
PC244-3	Pedestrian safety enhancements would be implemented as part of the proposed project. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-4. Additionally, Metro has identified and evaluated first/last mile opportunities at the 14 stations including pedestrian and bike infrastructure improvements as part of a First/Last Mile Plan.
PC244-4	The comment is noted for the record. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-3.
PC244-5	Please see the response to comment PC244-1 above.
PC244-6	The comment pertaining to consistency with land use plans is noted for the record. Additionally, Metro staff have periodically met, during the project planning, with city department and elected official staff from both the cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando to advise them of project progress and address their project concerns. Also, please see Section 4.1, <i>Land Use</i> , of this FEIS/FEIR for a discussion of the proposed project's land use impacts including conflicts with local land use plans.
PC244-7	The comments pertaining to the removal of palm trees within the corridor are noted for the record. Also, please note that the palm trees referenced in the comment are considered, for the purposes of the analyses in the DEIS/DEIR, a significant visual resource. They have not been identified as a historical resource.
PC244-8	Please see Chapter 3 of the Final EIR for a discussion of ridership within the project the corridor.

Comment #	Response
PC244-9	This will be fully addressed during the project engineering stage of the selected alternative, when Metro has a better understanding of the staging of project construction. However, the effort will be coordinated with the community.
PC244-10	No land would be acquired beyond what is needed for the ESFVTC Project itself.
PC244-11	A final location/footprint for the ESFVTC station that would be close to the Van Nuys Metrolink station has not been finalized. However, the station would likely be in the median of Van Nuys Boulevard at or near Keswick Street and would include a pedestrian-friendly walkway to the Metrolink/Amtrak station.
PC244-12	Metro is advancing the ESFVTC Project in close coordination with the City of Los Angeles.

Response to Comment PC245 - Jerry Tillet

Comment #	Response
PC245-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC246 – TL Auto Clinic

Comment #	Response
PC246-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC247 - Michael Tocydlowski

Comment #	Response
PC247-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC247-2	The ESFVTC Project would have a station/connection with the Metro Orange Line, which currently connects with the Metro Red Line.

Response to Comment PC248 - Top Shot Auto Sales

Comment #	Response
PC248-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC249 - Top Shop Towing

Comment #	Response
PC249-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC250 - Brian Trifon

Comment #	Response
PC250-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC251 – United Wheel Repair

Comment #	Response
PC251-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC252 - Alfred Urrutia

Comment #	Response
PC252-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC252-2	Please see the response to comment PC92-3.
PC252-3	Please see the response to comment PC238-1.
PC252-4	Making improvements and changes to other lines, such as the Gold Line, is outside the scope of the proposed project; however, this input will be taken into consideration for future Metro planning efforts.
PC252-5	Please see the response to comment PC252-1.

Response to Comment PC253 - Gina Uzunyan

Comment #	Response
PC253-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC254 - Dale Vaccarello

Comment #	Response
PC254-1	The September 28, 2017, meeting is not available online for streaming but information regarding past meetings and presentation materials is available on Metro’s project web site at https://www.metro.net/projects/east-sfv/east_sfv-past-meetings/ .

Response to Comment PC255 - Eamon Vahidi

Comment #	Response
PC255-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC256 - Nancy Valentine

Comment #	Response
PC256-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC257 - Valley Builders Supply Corp

Comment #	Response
PC257-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC258 - Valley Collision Center

Comment #	Response
PC258-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC259 - Denise Vandermeer

Comment #	Response
PC259-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC260 - Linda Variel

Comment #	Response
PC260-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC261 - Annie Vatov

Comment #	Response
PC261-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC262 - Vault

Comment #	Response
PC262-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC263 - Luis Vazquez

Comment #	Response
PC263-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC264 - VICA

Comment #	Response
PC264-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC265 - Judy Ann Von Aris

Comment #	Response
PC265-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC266 - Giovanni Walker

Comment #	Response
PC266-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC266-2	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC266-3	The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated and is no longer under consideration due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, and traffic impacts.
PC266-4	The comment in support of the LRT alternative with 14 stations is noted for the record. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC266-5	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC267 - Jason Walley

Comment #	Response
PC267-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC268 - Tony Waree

Comment #	Response
PC268-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT with MSF Option B has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. Also, please note that the refined plan for the ESFVTC station at the Metro Orange Line (MOL) places the station under the proposed MOL grade separation (see Appendix HH).
PC268-2	Please see the response to comment PC268-1 above.

Response to Comment PC269 - Warped Art Production

Comment #	Response
PC269-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC270 - Patricia Birgitta Webb - 1

Comment #	Response
PC270-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC271 - Patricia Birgitta Webb - 2

Comment #	Response
PC271-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PC272 - Scott Webb

Comment #	Response
PC272-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC273 - Kevin Wegienek

Comment #	Response
PC273-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC274 - Nis Wegienek

Comment #	Response
PC274-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC275 - Stephen Weinstein

Comment #	Response
PC275-1	Under the Locally Preferred Alternative, Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT, which would include 14 stations, existing mixed-flow lanes would be converted to a dedicated guideway for the LRT trains. The removal of mixed-flow lanes would result in additional roadway congestion due to the decreased roadway capacity, which could adversely affect emergency vehicle response and access or evacuation plans in the event of an emergency. The proposed motor vehicle turn restrictions could also result, in some instances, in emergency vehicles taking a slightly more circuitous route, and therefore require more time to respond to emergencies. Metro will continue to work with first responders to reduce the impacts as a result of the LPA, please refer to the mitigation measures described in Section 4.14.3 of the Final EIR/EIS for details.
PC275-2	Please see the response to comment PC92-3.
PC275-3	Those projects were not considered, as they are outside the scope being reviewed as part of the ESFVTC Project.

Response to Comment PC276 - Stephen Weinstein

Comment #	Response
PC276-1	The potential impacts on the pedestrian crosswalk referenced in the comment will be considered and evaluated as the project proceeds through preliminary engineering and design. Additionally, Metro has evaluated and identified first/last mile opportunities at the 14 stations, including pedestrian and bike infrastructure improvements, as part of a First/Last Mile Plan.
PC276-2	MSF Option B is the selected maintenance storage facility location, and MSF Option A is no longer being considered. Please see the response to Master Comment MC-2 for a full discussion of the selection of the MSF location.
PC276-3	Please see the response to comment PC276-2.

Response to Comment PC277 - Gregory Wilkinson, Panorama City NC

Comment #	Response
PC277-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC278 - Tony Wilkinson

Comment #	Response
PC278-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC278-2 through PC278-7	Please see the response to comment PC278-1 above.
PC278-8	The commenter’s support for light rail transit is noted for the record.
PC278-9	The southern terminus of the project is Van Nuys Boulevard where it crosses the Metro Orange Line. This location would enable patrons to transfer to Metro east/west service with connections to the Metro Orange Line. Also, please see the response to comment PC5-1.

Response to Comment PC279 - Tony Wilkinson

Comment #	Response
PC279-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC280 - Bernard Wisniewski

Comment #	Response
PC280-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PC281 - Jerard Wright

Comment #	Response
PC281-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PC281-2	The LRT stations would be designed to accommodate three-car trains. Providing four-car platforms would result in additional impacts including traffic and right-of-way impacts.
PC281-3	For the purposes of the proposed project, extending to the Newhall/Santa Clarita area is outside the scope of the project. However, this comment will be noted within the and included as part of the project record.

Response to Comment PC282 - Jennifer Wydra

Comment #	Response
PC282-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PC282-2	Please see the response to comment PC282-1.
PC282-3	Please see the response to comment PC282-1.

Response to Comment PC283 - Anthony Zepeda

Comment #	Response
PC283-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

A2.7 Responses to Public Hearing Comment Cards

Response to Comment PHC1 - Rosalia Acevedo

Comment #	Response
PHC1-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o <i>Locally Preferred Alternative</i> [LPA]) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC2 - Jason Ackerman

Comment #	Response
PHC2-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>
PHC2-2	<p>MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.</p>

Response to Comment PHC3 - Claudia Acosta

Comment #	Response
PHC3-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC4 - Vanessa Acosta

Comment #	Response
PHC4-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1 and the response to Master Comment MC-7 for a discussion of traffic impacts.</p>

Response to Comment PHC5 - Monica Acres

Comment #	Response
PHC5-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC6 - Michael Adams

Comment #	Response
PHC6-1	The commenter's preference that rail service be provided from the San Fernando station to Union Station and beyond to San Francisco and San Diego is noted for the record but is beyond the scope of the proposed project.

Response to Comment PHC7 - Zvart Agh

Comment #	Response
PHC7-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC8 - Abdon Aguilar

Comment #	Response
PHC8-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o "<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>" ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC9 - Flor Aguilar

Comment #	Response
PHC9-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC10 - Gerber M. Aguilar

Comment #	Response
PHC10-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1 and the response to Master Comment MC-4 for a discussion of safety impacts.

Response to Comment PHC11 - Aracely Aguilera

Comment #	Response
PHC11-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i> y la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-7</i> para la discusión sobre impactos al trafico.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1 and the response to Master Comment MC-7 for a discussion of traffic impacts.</p>

Response to Comment PHC12 - Anthony Aguirre

Comment #	Response
PHC12-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC13 - Zabel Aladzhyan

Comment #	Response
PHC13-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1 and the response to Master Comment MC-4 for a discussion of safety impacts.

Response to Comment PHC14 - Gloria Alanso

Comment #	Response
PHC14-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC15 - Rosa Alcala

Comment #	Response
PHC15-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC16 - Jose Luis Alcantara

Comment #	Response
PHC16-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC17 - Sara Aldana

Comment #	Response
PHC17-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i> y la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-4</i> para la discusión sobre impactos de seguridad.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1 and the response to Master Comment MC-4 for a discussion of safety impacts.</p>

Response to Comment PHC18 - Diana Alejandre

Comment #	Response
PHC18-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC19 - Oratio Alejandre

Comment #	Response
PHC19-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC20 - Georginia Alejandro

Comment #	Response
PHC20-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC21 - Eloisa Aleman

Comment #	Response
PHC21-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC22 - Maria Aleman

Comment #	Response
PHC22-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC23 - Sofia Aleman

Comment #	Response
PHC23-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC24 - Monica Alexandro

Comment #	Response
PHC24-1	The commenter’s opposition to the project because of the impacts on Van Nuys and traffic have been noted for the record by Metro. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-7 for a discussion of the proposed project’s impacts on traffic.

Response to Comment PHC25 - Silvia Alfaro

Comment #	Response
PHC25-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHC25-2	Under the proposed project, existing bike lanes extending north on Van Nuys Boulevard approximately two miles from Parthenia Street to Beachy Avenue and from Laurel Canyon Boulevard to San Fernando Road, approximately three quarters of a mile, would be removed. The existing bike path adjacent to San Fernando Road would remain in place. Although adding bike lanes along the entirety of Van Nuys Boulevard would not be physically possible with implementation of the LPA due to the constrained right-of-way, two parallel corridors have been identified for consideration and approval by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) as bike friendly corridors. These include Filmore Street to the west and Pierce Street to the east. Both of these streets could be designated and designed as Class III Bike Friendly streets through use of sharrows (markings indicating the lane is to be shared by bikes and cars) and signage. Metro will also continue to work with LADOT to identify, to the extent feasible, replacement locations for Class II bike lanes that meet the goals and policies in the City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan (also, please see mitigation measure MM-TRA-7 in Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR). In addition, through Metro’s new First/Last Mile directive, a First/Last Mile Plan was completed that identifies new bicycle and pedestrian improvements at or near the proposed LRT stations.

Response to Comment PHC26 - Yesenia Alferez

Comment #	Response
PHC26-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC27 - Shaunda Allen

Comment #	Response
PHC27-1	<p>As detailed in Section 4.3, <i>Economic and Fiscal Impacts</i>, and the Executive Summary of the FEIS/FEIR, mitigation measures MM-TRA-1, MM-TRA-2, MM-TRA-3, MM-TRA-4, and MM-TRA-5 would be implemented to minimize impacts on businesses during construction and operation. As detailed in MM-TRA-1, the project contractor shall ensure appropriate “Open During Construction,” wayfinding, and promotional signage for businesses affected by sidewalk closures are provided and access to these businesses is maintained. Additionally, Metro’s Eat Shop Play Local, which is a business mitigation program meant to bring focused attention to local businesses affected by Metro construction, would be implemented.</p>

Response to Comment PHC28 - Marisela Alonso

Comment #	Response
PHC28-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC29 - Sofia Alsmazan

Comment #	Response
PHC29-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC30 - Angela Alvarado

Comment #	Response
PHC30-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC31 - Michelle Alvarado

Comment #	Response
PHC31-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC32 - Elizabeth Alvarado

Comment #	Response
PHC32-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC33 - Francisco Alvarez

Comment #	Response
PHC33-1	<p>The commenter’s concern about job losses due to business displacements is noted for the record. The large majority of the businesses that would be displaced due to the LRT alternatives, including the LPA, would occur as a result of the acquisition of properties to construct the MSF. As discussed in the response to Master Comment MC-2, MSF Option B was identified as the preferred MSF site because it is strategically located at the mid-point of the alignment, is the only option that does not affect residential properties, and because significant opposition to MSF Option A (adjacent to the Metro Orange Line) was expressed by the community due to the number of businesses that would be displaced under that MSF option. Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC34 - Jesus Alvarez

Comment #	Response
PHC34-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC35 - Am

Comment #	Response
PHC35-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC36 - Marabel Amecaur

Comment #	Response
PHC36-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC37 - Doris L. Anderson

Comment #	Response
PHC37-1	This comment card did not include any comments.

Response to Comment PHC38 - Blanca Andrado

Comment #	Response
PHC38-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC39 - Jessica Anguiano

Comment #	Response
PHC39-1	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-3 regarding the proposed project's parking impacts.
PHC39-2	As noted in Chapter 2, Project Description, Section 2.2.6.2, the number of travel lanes on Van Nuys Boulevard would be reduced from three to two lanes in each direction for the segment between the Metro Orange Line and Parthenia Street. North of that point, the corridor would maintain the two existing travel lanes in each direction, while traveling along Van Nuys Boulevard, except from Laurel Canyon Boulevard to San Fernando Road where the existing one northbound lane and two southbound lanes would be maintained. There are no plans to reduce the number of through lanes along Van Nuys Boulevard to one lane in each direction.
PHC39-3	Please see the response to comment PC25-2 above.
PHC39-4	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-4 for a description of the safety features that will be built into the design of Alternative 4's LRT line and stations.
PHC39-5	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-5 for a discussion of how Metro will continue to coordinate with the planning teams for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor, Metro Orange Line Improvements, and East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor.
PHC39-6	Construction of the LPA is likely to occur over a period of 4 to 5 years with construction anticipated to begin in 2021, if the proposed project is approved by the Metro Board of Directors.

Response to Comment PHC40 - Anna

Comment #	Response
PHC40-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC41 - Anita Anninyth

Comment #	Response
PHC41-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC42 - Anonymous1

Comment #	Response
PHC42-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC43 - Anonymous2

Comment #	Response
PHC43-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC44 - Carlos Anzora

Comment #	Response
PHC44-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC45 - Delgado Araceli

Comment #	Response
PHC45-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC46 - Arahid

Comment #	Response
PHC46-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC47 - Jeyendo Arana

Comment #	Response
PHC47-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC48 - Garry Arbitter

Comment #	Response
PHC48-1	<p>The commenter’s concern about job losses due to business displacements is noted for the record. The large majority of the businesses that would be displaced due to the LRT alternatives, including the LPA, would occur as a result of the acquisition of properties to construct the MSF. As discussed in the response to Master Comment MC-2, MSF Option B was identified as the preferred MSF site because it is strategically located at the mid-point of the alignment, is the only option that does not affect residential properties, and because significant opposition to MSF Option A (adjacent to the Metro Orange Line) was expressed by the community due to the number of businesses that would be displaced under that MSF option.</p>

Response to Comment PHC49 - Ayamel Arce

Comment #	Response
PHC49-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC50 - Steven Arevalo

Comment #	Response
PHC50-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC51 - Armine

Comment #	Response
PHC51-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC52 - Ernesto Arreguin

Comment #	Response
PHC52-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC53 - Artur

Comment #	Response
PHC53-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC54 - Jessie Ausan

Comment #	Response
PHC54-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. Restrooms would not be provided at the LRT stations as requested by the commenter but the comment is noted for the record by Metro.

Response to Comment PHC55 - Ada Avalos

Comment #	Response
PHC55-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC56 - Maribel Azula

Comment #	Response
PHC56-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC57 - Lana Baker

Comment #	Response
PHC57-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC58 - Ana Balanos

Comment #	Response
PHC58-1	<p>Thank you for your expressed support of the proposed project.</p>

Response to Comment PHC59 - Oswaldo Ballesteros

Comment #	Response
PHC59-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC60 - Annabelle Baltierra

Comment #	Response
PHC60-1	<p>Thank you for your expressed support of the proposed project.</p>

Response to Comment PHC61 - Matilde Barbara

Comment #	Response
PHC61-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC62 - BarJane

Comment #	Response
PHC62-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC63 - Joseph Barmettier

Comment #	Response
PHC63-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC64 - Skyla Barnes

Comment #	Response
PHC64-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>
PHC64-2	<p>Parking would continue to be provided at the Metro Orange Line station under the proposed LPA. The commenter’s concerns about the impact on the available supply of parking when Metro rents out parking is noted for the record. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-3 and Section 3.3.3.2 of this FEIS/FEIR for additional detail regarding the LPA’s parking impacts.</p>

Response to Comment PHC65 - Denia M. Barreto

Comment #	Response
PHC65-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC66 - Maria P. Barreto

Comment #	Response
PHC66-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC67 - Michelle Bartlett

Comment #	Response
PH67-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC68 - Scott Barton

Comment #	Response
PHC68-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC69 - Louie Basalo

Comment #	Response
PHC69-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. Also, please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS/FEIR, which includes a detailed description of the LPA including its operating characteristics.

Response to Comment PHC70 - Anne Bautista

Comment #	Response
PHC70-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC71 - Enrique Beltran

Comment #	Response
PHC71-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC72 - Jessica Benitez

Comment #	Response
PHC72-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC73 - Julita Bernstein

Comment #	Response
PHC73-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC74 - Rosa Berrelleza

Comment #	Response
PHC74-1	La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “ <i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i> ” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i> y la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-7</i> para la discusión sobre impactos al trafico.

Comment #	Response
	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1 and the response to Master Comment MC-7 for a discussion of traffic impacts.

Response to Comment PHC75 - Tashawn Blount

Comment #	Response
PHC75-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC76 - Martin Bolanos

Comment #	Response
PHC76-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC77 - Diane Brody

Comment #	Response
PHC77-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC78 - Geraldine Brown

Comment #	Response
PHC78-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC79 - Tri Budi

Comment #	Response
PHC79-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC80 - Bugra

Comment #	Response
PHC80-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC81 - Raul Caballero

Comment #	Response
PHC81-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC82 - Fabiola Caballero

Comment #	Response
PHC82-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC83 - Catherine Cabrillo-Merino

Comment #	Response
PHC83-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC84 - Rosio Cadena

Comment #	Response
PHC84-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC85 - Raul Calis

Comment #	Response
PHC85-1	<p>El documento DEIS/DEIR reconoce, como mencionado en la sección 4.17 del DEIS/DEIR y este FEIS/FEIR, que el proyecto propuesto resultaría en impactos a comunidades minoritarias y de bajo recursos a lo largo del corredor. Favor de leer esa sección para más información sobre los impactos así como otras secciones relevantes en el capítulo 4 de este FEIS/FEIR. Favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-6</i> para la discusión sobre impactos comerciales y de derecho a paso. MSF Opcion B (o MSF Option B) ha sido identificada como la sede MSF preferida por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Tambien, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-2</i>, que identifica las razones por las que se eligio MSF Opcion B como la sede MSF preferida.</p> <p>The DEIS/DEIR acknowledges, as discussed in Section 4.17 of the DEIS/DEIR and this FEIS/FEIR, that the proposed project would result in impacts to low-income and minority communities along the corridor. Please see that section for more information on impacts as well as other relevant sections in Chapter 4 of this FEIS/FEIR. Please see the response to Master Comment MC-6 for a discussion of right-of-way and business impacts. MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.</p>
PHC85-2	<p>Favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-4</i> para una descripción de las características de seguridad que serán parte del diseño de líneas e estaciones de la alternativa preferida local (o LPA).</p> <p>Please see the response to Master Comment MC-4 for a description of the safety features that will be built into the design of LPA line and stations.</p>
PHC85-3	<p>El comentarista es referido a sección 4.8 – <i>Noise and Vibration</i> de este reporte (FEIS/FEIR) para una discusión detallada acerca de impactos de ruido y medidas de mitigación propuestas.</p> <p>The commenter is referred to Section 4.8, <i>Noise and Vibration</i>, of this FEIS/FEIR for a detailed discussion of noise impacts and proposed noise mitigation measures.</p>

Response to Comment PHC86 - Laura Camarillo

Comment #	Response
PHC86-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC87 - Reyna Camberos

Comment #	Response
PHC87-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC88 - Valeria Cano

Comment #	Response
PHC88-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC89 - Juan Cardenas

Comment #	Response
PHC89-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC90 - Marta Cardona

Comment #	Response
PHC90-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC91 - Victor Cardona

Comment #	Response
PHC91-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC92 - Margarita Carvajal

Comment #	Response
PHC92-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC93 - Emma Casas

Comment #	Response
PHC93-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC94 - Marcos Castaneda - 1

Comment #	Response
PHC94-1	The closest schools to the MSF Option B site are Robert Fulton College Preparatory School and Lashon Academy located 0.15 miles to the southwest. MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PHC95 - Marcos Castaneda - 2

Comment #	Response
PHC95-1	<p>Four public hearings on the DEIS/DEIR were held in September of 2017. In addition, Metro hosted an information meeting on October 10, 2017, for business and property owners who had been notified that the property they own/lease is under consideration for possible acquisition to accommodate the proposed project. Additionally, as described in Chapter 7 of this FEIS/FEIR, the project outreach team participated in eight public events held over the months from March to December 2018 to provide more information on the project</p> <p>The commenter’s recommendation regarding the best time to hold public meetings will be taken into consideration for future public meetings required for the proposed project and other Metro projects as well.</p>

Response to Comment PHC96 - Marcos Castaneda - 3

Comment #	Response
PHC96-1	<p>Although a decision has not been made at this point of the planning process on construction hiring practices, the commenter’s recommendation that union workers should be hired to construct the proposed project has been noted for the record by Metro.</p>

Response to Comment PHC97 - Sonia Castellon

Comment #	Response
PHC97-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC98 - Maria Castillo

Comment #	Response
PHC98-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC99 - Veronica Castrellon

Comment #	Response
PHC99-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC100 - Aurora Viorato Castro

Comment #	Response
PHC100-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC101 - Evelyn Castro

Comment #	Response
PHC101-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC102 - Magdalena Catalan

Comment #	Response
PHC102-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC103 - Jenny Ceja

Comment #	Response
PHC103-1	The comment card did not include any comments. No response is required.

Response to Comment PHC104 - Susana Cermona

Comment #	Response
PHC104-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC105 - Gladys Cerna

Comment #	Response
PHC105-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC106 - Catherine Cervantes

Comment #	Response
PHC106-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC107 - Robert Cervantes

Comment #	Response
PHC107-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. The commenter's comments regarding the need for clean trains and more trains is also noted for the record by Metro.

Response to Comment PHC108 - Rolande Chavarria

Comment #	Response
PHC108-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. Regarding extending rail to LAX, please see the response to Master Comment MC-5. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-4 for a discussion of safety measures.

Response to Comment PHC109 - Eduardo Chavez

Comment #	Response
PHC109-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC110 - Eric Chavez

Comment #	Response
PHC110-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. Also, please see Chapter 3 and Section 4.8 of this FEIS/FEIR for a detailed discussion of Alternative 4’s traffic and noise impacts, respectively.</p>

Response to Comment PHC111 - Steven Chavez Maya

Comment #	Response
PHC111-1	<p>The LPA identified by the Metro Board or Directors is Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT. Under this alternative, the LRT vehicles would be electrically powered via overhead electrical wires.</p>

Response to Comment PHC112 - Nita Chopra

Comment #	Response
PHC112-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC113 - Lisa Chow

Comment #	Response
PHC113-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC114 - Richard Chow

Comment #	Response
PHC114-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC115 - Chris (employee)

Comment #	Response
PHC115-1	The commenter's concern that his business would lose customers from the businesses that would be displaced by the MSF option is noted for the record. However, please also note that MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site. For a discussion of the displacement impacts of Alternative 4, MSF Option B, please see Section 4.2, <i>Real Estate and Acquisitions</i> .

Response to Comment PHC116 - Philip Clarke

Comment #	Response
PHC116-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. Also please see the response to Master Comment MC-5 regarding other planned Metro transit projects and their relationship to the proposed project.
PHC116-2	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PHC117 - Maria Cobian

Comment #	Response
PHC117-1	Favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-4</i> para una descripción de las características de seguridad que serán parte del diseño de líneas e estaciones (a grado) de la alternativa 4 LRT. Please see the response to Master Comment MC-4 for a description of the safety features that will be built into the design of Alternative 4's LRT (at-grade) line and stations.

Response to Comment PHC118 - Elias Coe

Comment #	Response
PHC118-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC119 - Japhet Coe

Comment #	Response
PHC119-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC120 - Sam Coe

Comment #	Response
PHC120-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC121 - Rosie Cohen

Comment #	Response
PHC121-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC122 - Harry Colton

Comment #	Response
PHC122-1	The comment card does not include any comments on the proposed project. No response is required.

Response to Comment PHC123 - Trina J. Conley

Comment #	Response
PHC123-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC124 - Elizabeth Contreras

Comment #	Response
PHC124-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC125 - Maria Contreras

Comment #	Response
PHC125-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC126 - Norma Corona

Comment #	Response
PHC126-1	The comment card submitted contains no comments. No response is required.

Response to Comment PHC127 - Irania Cortez

Comment #	Response
PHC127-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC128 - Michelle Cortez

Comment #	Response
PHC128-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC129 - Family Cruz

Comment #	Response
PHC129-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC130 - Mario Cruz

Comment #	Response
PHC130-1	<p>The commenter’s suggestion to include bike racks and rentals is noted for the record. Also, please note that in accordance with Metro’s new First/Last Mile directive, bicycle and pedestrian improvements have been identified at or near the proposed stations under the LPA, which is Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT.</p>

Response to Comment PHC131 - Dyan Dallis

Comment #	Response
PHC131-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC132 - Mourad Daoud

Comment #	Response
PHC132-1	The commenter’s concerns about the proposed project’s impacts on his business are noted for the record by Metro. MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site. Additional, for more information on proposed project’s right-of-way acquisition and business displacement impacts and measures to mitigate those impacts, please see the response to Master Comment MC-6 and Section 4.2, <i>Real Estate and Acquisitions</i> , of this FEIS/FEIR.

Response to Comment PHC133 - Lee Davis

Comment #	Response
PHC133-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHC133-2	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-5 regarding the proposed project and its relationship to other planned transit project including the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project.

Response to Comment PHC134 - Ana De Jesus

Comment #	Response
PHC134-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC135 - Walter De Leon

Comment #	Response
PHC135-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC136 - Andrea Delgado

Comment #	Response
PHC136-1	The comment recommends that there should only be one speaker at public hearings and that change needs to be done. Because public meetings for proposed projects allow the opportunity for the public to comment and often require multiple project members to speak on the project, limiting the number of speakers to one is not feasible. However, the recommendation to decrease the number of speakers at meetings has been noted and will be taken into consideration at future public hearings.

Response to Comment PHC137 - Natalie Delgado

Comment #	Response
PHC137-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC138 - Yolanda Delgado

Comment #	Response
PHC138-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC139 - Veronica DelRazo

Comment #	Response
PHC139-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC140 - Sean DePeppe

Comment #	Response
PHC140-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC141 - Shimal Dhanjec

Comment #	Response
PHC141-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC142 - Chais Diaz

Comment #	Response
PHC142-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC143 - Liza Diaz

Comment #	Response
PHC143-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC144 - Rosa Diaz

Comment #	Response
PHC144-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC145 - S Diaz

Comment #	Response
PHC145-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC146 - Odra Dixon

Comment #	Response
PHC146-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC147 - Pedro Dominguez

Comment #	Response
PHC147-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC148 - Gregory Duin

Comment #	Response
PHC148-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC149 - C Dursun

Comment #	Response
PHC149-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC150 - Jacob Ebriani

Comment #	Response
PHC150-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-6 regarding the proposed project's right-of-way acquisition and business displacement impacts.

Response to Comment PHC151 - Frances Echeverria

Comment #	Response
PHC151-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC152 - Luz Echeverro

Comment #	Response
PHC152-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC153 - Emma Ecute

Comment #	Response
PHC153-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o "<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>" ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC154 - Eliza

Comment #	Response
PHC154-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC155 - Elliott

Comment #	Response
PHC155-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC156 - Elsa

Comment #	Response
PHC156-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC157 - Eddy Escamma

Comment #	Response
PHC157-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p> <p>MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.</p> <p>For a detailed discussion of traffic impacts, please see Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR.</p>
PHC157-2	Please see the response to comment PHC157-1 above.

Response to Comment PHC158 - Obdulia Escobar

Comment #	Response
PHC158-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC159 - Ruben Escobar

Comment #	Response
PHC159-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC160 - Fidelina Escobedo

Comment #	Response
PHC160-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC161 - Romeo Escot

Comment #	Response
PHC161-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC162 - Dash Escrofami

Comment #	Response
PHC162-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC163 - Jacqueline D. Espinoza

Comment #	Response
PHC163-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC164 - Margarita Estrada

Comment #	Response
PHC164-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC165 - Sergio Estrada

Comment #	Response
PHC165-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC166 - Liset Farrera

Comment #	Response
PHC166-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC167 - Emma Fazeli

Comment #	Response
PHC167-1	On-street parking along Van Nuys Boulevard would be eliminated as a part of the project. In the Van Nuys Civic Center area, there are several for pay, off-street public parking facilities. Along other segments of the corridor, on-street parking on nearby streets other than Van Nuys Boulevard is also available. Parking is currently available at three existing stations including Sylmar, Van Nuys Metrolink, and Metro Orange Line. Metro will not construct parking at any other stations as a part of this project.
PHC167-2	With regards to funding, the proposed project currently has funding through multiple state and local sources including Measure M.
PHC167-3	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC168 - Adriana Feliciano

Comment #	Response
PHC168-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC169 - Belle Fernandez

Comment #	Response
PHC169-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC170 - Hilda Fernandez

Comment #	Response
PHC170-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC171 - Mario Fernandez

Comment #	Response
PHC171-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC172 - Leslie Florentino

Comment #	Response
PHC172-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC173 - Elizabeth Flores

Comment #	Response
PHC173-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC174 - Maria Flores

Comment #	Response
PHC174-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC175 - Mario Flores

Comment #	Response
PHC175-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC176 - Mayra Flores

Comment #	Response
PHC176-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC177 - Kisha Fowler

Comment #	Response
PHC177-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC178 - Ricardo Fuentes

Comment #	Response
PHC178-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC179 - Raymond N. Fuento

Comment #	Response
PHC179-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC180 - Ana Gab

Comment #	Response
PHC180-1	The commenter’s support of the proposed project and the offer of the services of the commenter’s non-profit organization to raise awareness of the project is noted for the record by Metro.

Response to Comment PHC181 - Monica Gaitan

Comment #	Response
PHC181-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC182 - Jose Gama

Comment #	Response
PHC182-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC183 - Alexandro Garcia

Comment #	Response
PHC183-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC184 - Cecilia Garcia

Comment #	Response
PHC184-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC185 - Iris Garcia

Comment #	Response
PHC185-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC186 - Juana Garcia

Comment #	Response
PHC186-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC187 - Lupa Garcia

Comment #	Response
PHC187-1	Thank you for your expressed support of the proposed project.

Response to Comment PHC188 - Rocio Garcia

Comment #	Response
PHC188-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC189 - Gilberto Garrido

Comment #	Response
PHC189-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC190 - Alisha Garrison

Comment #	Response
PHC190-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC191 - Sedik Gharibi

Comment #	Response
PHC191-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC192 - Melba Gilkey

Comment #	Response
PHC192-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PHC192-2	The alignment of the LPA, Alternative 4, would extend 9.2 miles from Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink station to the Metro Orange Line in Van Nuys.

Response to Comment PHC193 - Sajayra Gil

Comment #	Response
PHC193-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC194 - Abraham Gomez

Comment #	Response
PHC194-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC195 - Cladua Gomez

Comment #	Response
PHC195-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC196 - David Gomez

Comment #	Response
PHC196-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site. Also, see Section 4.2, <i>Real Estate and Acquisitions</i> , of this FEIS/FEIR for an updated information on business acquisitions.

Response to Comment PHC197 - Garardo Gomez

Comment #	Response
PHC197-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC198 - Jennifer Gomez

Comment #	Response
PHC198-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC199 - Lorena Gomez

Comment #	Response
PHC199-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC200 - Maria Gonzaga

Comment #	Response
PHC200-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC201 - Matilda Gonzalez

Comment #	Response
PHC201-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC202 - Michelle Gonzalez

Comment #	Response
PHC-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC203 - Miguel Gonzalez Saldana

Comment #	Response
PHC203-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC204 - Sandra Gonzalez

Comment #	Response
PHC204-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC205 - Sheila Gorrida

Comment #	Response
PHC205-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC206 - Mandy Gough

Comment #	Response
PHC206-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC207 - Ted Green

Comment #	Response
PHC207-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC208 - Nohemy Guadalupe

Comment #	Response
PHC208-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC209 - Maria Guerra

Comment #	Response
PHC209-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC210 - Yamilet Guerra

Comment #	Response
PHC210-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC211 - Jennifer Guerrero

Comment #	Response
PHC211-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC212 - Maricele Gutierrez

Comment #	Response
PHC212-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC213 - Hasmik Gyunaslyan

Comment #	Response
PHC213-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC214 - Annie Haddad

Comment #	Response
PHC214-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC215 - Dante Hall

Comment #	Response
PHC215-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC216 - Jesus Hanes

Comment #	Response
PHC216-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC217 - Vivian Hanes

Comment #	Response
PHC217-1	The commenter's recommendations are noted for the record. Metro will apply lessons learned from the design and operation of other Metro transit lines to the design and implementation of the ESFVTC Project.

Response to Comment PHC218 - Jessica Hazas

Comment #	Response
PHC218-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC219 - Gabby Henriquez

Comment #	Response
PHC219-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC220 - Saine Henriquez

Comment #	Response
PHC220-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC221 - Alondra Hernandez

Comment #	Response
PHC221-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC222 - Cindy Hernandez

Comment #	Response
PHC222-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC223 - Martha Hernandez Cornejo

Comment #	Response
PHC223-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC224 - Deysi Hernandez

Comment #	Response
PHC224-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC225 - George Hernandez

Comment #	Response
PHC225-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC226 - Maria Hernandez

Comment #	Response
PHC226-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC227 - Miguel Hernandez

Comment #	Response
PHC227-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC228 - Monica Hernandez

Comment #	Response
PHC228-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC229 - Olga Hernandez

Comment #	Response
PHC229-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC230 - Silvia Hernandez

Comment #	Response
PHC230-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC231 - Silvia Hernandez

Comment #	Response
PHC231-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC232 - Simri Hernandez

Comment #	Response
PHC232-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC233 - Shelem Herrera

Comment #	Response
PHC233-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC234 - Ken Hicro

Comment #	Response
PHC234-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC235 - Sandra Hipshman

Comment #	Response
PHC235-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC236 - Giti Hour-Nabayi

Comment #	Response
PHC236-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC237 - Housed Mazaryan

Comment #	Response
PHC237-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC238 - Maria Elena Huarte

Comment #	Response
PHC238-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC239 - David Hunt

Comment #	Response
PHC239-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC240 - Wendy Hunt

Comment #	Response
PHC240-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC241 - Yolanda Ibanez

Comment #	Response
PHC241-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC242 - S Ibarra

Comment #	Response
PHC242-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC243 - Abigail Ignacio

Comment #	Response
PHC243-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC244 - Mari Isayan

Comment #	Response
PHC244-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC245 - Jamine

Comment #	Response
PHC245-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC246 - Lorenzo Jaramillo

Comment #	Response
PHC246-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC247 - Odilia Jara

Comment #	Response
PHC247-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC248 - Clarissa Jimenez

Comment #	Response
PHC248-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC249 - Erriqueta Jimenez

Comment #	Response
PHC249-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC250 - Alexia Jiminez

Comment #	Response
PHC250-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC251 - Carlos Jiminez

Comment #	Response
PHC251-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC252 - Gemma Jimenez

Comment #	Response
PHC252-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT, which has been selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative, which would extend from the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink station on the north to the Metro Orange Line in Van Nuys on the south.
PHC252-2	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC253 - Oscar Jimenez

Comment #	Response
PHC253-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC254 - Kristina Johnson

Comment #	Response
PHC254-1	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-6 regarding the proposed project's right-of-way acquisition and business displacement impacts. Additionally, please refer to Section 4.2 of this FEIS/FEIR for details on the property acquisitions required to construct the LPA.

Response to Comment PHC255 - Christine Josepah

Comment #	Response
PHC255-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC256 - Claudia Joya

Comment #	Response
PHC256-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC257 - Silvia Juarez

Comment #	Response
PHC257-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC258 - Veronica Julio

Comment #	Response
PHC258-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC259 - Eva Ketolium

Comment #	Response
PHC259-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC60 - Martha Kilbourn

Comment #	Response
PHC260-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC261 - S. Michelle Klein-Hass

Comment #	Response
PHC261-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PHC261-2	The commenter’s recommendation regarding bike lanes is noted for the record by Metro. Metro is working with the City of Los Angeles to identify potential measures to mitigate the loss of bike lanes that are currently on Van Nuys Boulevard due to implementation of the LPA. Two parallel corridors have been identified for consideration and approval by LADOT as bike friendly corridors. These include Filmore Street to the west and Pierce Street to the east. Both of these streets could be designated and designed as Class III Bike Friendly streets through use of sharrows (markings indicating the lane is to be shared by bikes and cars) and signage. Metro will also continue to work with LADOT to identify, to the extent feasible, replacement locations for Class II bike lanes that meet the goals and policies in the City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan (also, please see mitigation measure MM-TRA-7 in Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR). In addition, through Metro’s new First/Last Mile directive, a First/Last Mile Plan has been developed, which identifies new bicycle and pedestrian improvements at or near all 14 stations.

Response to Comment PHC262 - Ferah Kocabas

Comment #	Response
PHC262-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC263 - Meri Koshishlan

Comment #	Response
PHC263-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC264 – Bernice Laero

Comment #	Response
PHC263-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC265 - Vama La Hoz

Comment #	Response
PHC265-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC266 - Rozik Lasakhaniar

Comment #	Response
PHC266-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC267 - Loyce Lascon

Comment #	Response
PHC267-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC268 - Natalie Lawrence

Comment #	Response
PHC268-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC269 - Rebecca-Ramirez Lechuga

Comment #	Response
PHC269-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC270 - Oscar Leclere

Comment #	Response
PHC270-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC271 - Maura Leon

Comment #	Response
PHC271-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC272 - Lisa

Comment #	Response
PHC272-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC273 - Martika Livera

Comment #	Response
PHC273-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC274 - Alicia Lopez

Comment #	Response
PHC274-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC275 - Alicia Lopez

Comment #	Response
PHC275-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC276 - Ansyonov Lopez

Comment #	Response
PHC276-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC277 - Aurelia Lopez

Comment #	Response
PHC277-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i> y la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-7</i> para la discusión sobre impactos al trafico.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1 and the response to Master Comment MC-7 for a discussion of traffic impacts.</p>

Response to Comment PHC278 - Crystal Lopez

Comment #	Response
PHC278-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC279 - Maria Eva Lopez De Torres

Comment #	Response
PHC279-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC280 - Maria1 Lopez

Comment #	Response
PHC280-1	La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “ <i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i> ” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i> , favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i> .

Response to Comment PHC281 - Maria2 Lopez

Comment #	Response
PHC281-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC282 - Ramon Lopez

Comment #	Response
PHC282-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC283 - Sal Lopez

Comment #	Response
PHC283-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC284 - Simon Lopez

Comment #	Response
PHC284-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC285 - Shari Love

Comment #	Response
PHC285-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC286 - Joseta Luna

Comment #	Response
PHC286-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC287 - Natalie Magarian

Comment #	Response
PHC287-1	<p>With regards to the comment that the LRT alternatives would not provide provisions for emergency vehicles, please see the proposed mitigation measures in Section 4.14.3.11 of this FEIS/FEIR, which would reduce potential operational impacts on emergency vehicle access to the project corridor.</p> <p>With regards to visual impacts, the DEIS/DEIR and this FEIS/FEIR acknowledges that electrical lines and vertical structures that comprise the LRT’s overhead contact system would result in unavoidable significant visual impacts.</p> <p>Also, please note that Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC288 - Maira

Comment #	Response
PHC288-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC289 - Vanessa Maldonado

Comment #	Response
PHC289-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC290 - Maria

Comment #	Response
PHC290-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC291 - Maria

Comment #	Response
PHC291-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC292 - Marina

Comment #	Response
PHC292-1	The comment card does not include any comments. No response is required.

Response to Comment PHC293 - Andrea Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC293-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC294 - Andrea Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC294-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC295 - Angelina Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC295-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC296 - Cynthia Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC296-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC297 - Daniel Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC297-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>. Bajo el LPA, intersecciones con señales que permitirán el paso seguro a peatones a través de Van Nuys Boulevard y acceso a las estaciones propuestas serán proveídas.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. Under the LPA, signalized intersections that will allow pedestrians to safely cross Van Nuys Boulevard and access the proposed stations will be provided.</p>

Response to Comment PHC298 - Elena Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC298-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC299 - Erlin Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC299-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC300 - Eva Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC300-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC301 - Liz Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC301-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC302 - Liz Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC302-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC303 - Maria Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC303-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC304 - Maria Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC304-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC305 - Maria Alma Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC305-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC306 - Melba Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC306-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC307 - Nely Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC307-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>
PHC307-2	<p>The comment that Metro should stop increasing the cost of a transit pass is noted for the record by Metro.</p>

Response to Comment PHC308 - Pedro Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC308-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC309 - Rosa Elena Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC309-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC310 - Tina Martinez

Comment #	Response
PHC310-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC311 - Jerry Martin

Comment #	Response
PHC311-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>
PHC311-2	<p>Please see the response to Master Comment MC-5 for a discussion of how Metro will continue to coordinate with the planning teams for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor, Metro Orange Line Improvements, and East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor.</p>
PHC311-3	<p>The LPA, Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT, would extend from the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink station on the north to the Metro Orange Line on the south.</p>

Response to Comment PHC312 - James Matzen

Comment #	Response
PHC312-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC313 - Larry Matz

Comment #	Response
PHC313-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC314 - Tina Matz

Comment #	Response
PHC314-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC315 - Mayle

Comment #	Response
PHC315-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC316 - Jorge Maynard

Comment #	Response
PHC316-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC317 - Justin Mazanego

Comment #	Response
PHC317-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC318 - Justin McGee

Comment #	Response
PHC318-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC319 - Angel Medina

Comment #	Response
PHC319-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC320 - Jonatan Medina

Comment #	Response
PHC320-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-4 for measures that will be implemented to ensure the safety of pedestrians and motorists.

Response to Comment PHC321 - Julie Mejia

Comment #	Response
PHC321-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC322 - Loida Mercado

Comment #	Response
PHC322-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC323 - Alex Meza

Comment #	Response
PHC323-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC324 - Laura Meza

Comment #	Response
PHC324-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC325 - Miguel

Comment #	Response
PHC325-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC326 - Karl Miller

Comment #	Response
PHC326-1	This FEIS/FEIR acknowledges the economic impacts that could occur to businesses that are displaced to construct the proposed project and the impacts to other businesses that depend on the revenue that those displaced businesses generate. However, please note that MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. The response to Master Comment MC-2 identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PHC327 - Gloria Miranda

Comment #	Response
PHC327-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC328 - Ivette Miranda

Comment #	Response
PHC328-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC329 - Cynthia Molina

Comment #	Response
PHC329-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>. Tambien, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-7</i> y el capitulo 3 de este reporte (FEIS/FEIR) para la discusión de los impactos de trafico asociados con el proyecto propuesto.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-7 and Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR for a discussion of the proposed project’s traffic impacts.</p>

Response to Comment PHC330 - Ignacio Molina

Comment #	Response
PHC330-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC331 - Luz Molina

Comment #	Response
PHC331-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC332 - Monge

Comment #	Response
PHC332-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC333 - Monica

Comment #	Response
PHC333-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC334 - Esther Montoya

Comment #	Response
PHC334-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC335 - Lina Morales

Comment #	Response
PHC335-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC336 - Christian Moreno

Comment #	Response
PHC336-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC337 - Raymond Moreno

Comment #	Response
PHC337-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC338 - Kayla Morgan

Comment #	Response
PHC338-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC339 - Morta

Comment #	Response
PHC339-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC340 - Donna Munoz

Comment #	Response
PHC340-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC341 - Alicia Nagy

Comment #	Response
PHC341-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC342 - Norbert Nagy

Comment #	Response
PHC342-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC343 - Megan Naji

Comment #	Response
PHC343-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC344 - Alicia Nava

Comment #	Response
PHC344-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC345 - Connie Nava

Comment #	Response
PHC345-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC346 - Michael Naval

Comment #	Response
PHC346-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC347 - Mishel Navarrete

Comment #	Response
PHC347-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC348 - Susana Nayera

Comment #	Response
PHC348-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC349 - Hrachik Nazarian

Comment #	Response
PHC349-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC350 - Ramon Nolasco

Comment #	Response
PHC350-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC351 - No Name1

Comment #	Response
PHC351-1	The comment recommending providing transit line service from North Hollywood to Burbank Airport is noted for the record. Although it's outside of the scope of the proposed project, the recommendation will be taken into consideration for future Metro planning efforts.

Response to Comment PHC352 - No Name2

Comment #	Response
PHC352-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PHC353 - No Name3

Comment #	Response
PHC353-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC354 - No Name4

Comment #	Response
PHC354-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site. Also, please note that MSF Option C would be located in close proximity to a number of residential units, and as a consequence, that option has the potential for greater impacts, including noise impacts, on those nearby residences.

Response to Comment PHC355 - Victor Novoa

Comment #	Response
PHC355-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o "<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>" ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC356 - Veronica Nunez

Comment #	Response
PHC356-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC357 - Barbara Obemna

Comment #	Response
PHC357-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC358 - Riley O'Brien

Comment #	Response
PHC358-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC359 - Lilian Olera

Comment #	Response
PHC359-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC360 - Mario Olivas

Comment #	Response
PHC360-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC361 - Martha Orantes

Comment #	Response
PHC361-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC362 - Rosario O

Comment #	Response
PHC362-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC363 - Cecelia Ortega

Comment #	Response
PHC363-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC364 - Dinora Ortiz

Comment #	Response
PHC364-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC365 - Jessica Ortiz

Comment #	Response
PHC365-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC366 - Maria Ortiz

Comment #	Response
PHC366-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC367 - Mireya Pacheco

Comment #	Response
PHC367-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC368 - Rosa Pacheco

Comment #	Response
PHC368-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC369 - Maria Padilla

Comment #	Response
PHC369-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC370 - Naura Pajonin

Comment #	Response
PHC370-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC371 - Aldrin Paolo Palad

Comment #	Response
PHC371-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC372 - Gail Panatier

Comment #	Response
PHC372-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC373 - Elizabeth Pano

Comment #	Response
PHC373-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC374 - Blanca Paredes

Comment #	Response
PHC374-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC375 - Estela Patlan

Comment #	Response
PHC375-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC376 - Donna Pearma

Comment #	Response
PHC376-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. An alignment along Sepulveda Boulevard was considered but eliminated during the screening process based on community characteristics such as density, ridership potential, traffic impacts, and community feedback. Please see Sections 2.1 through 2.3 in Chapter 2 of this FEIS/FEIR for information on the alternatives development and screening process and the response to Master Comment MC-1. With regards to business impacts, this FEIS/FEIR acknowledges that construction impacts on business access and the removal of on-street parking along Van Nuys Boulevard could have adverse economic effects on local businesses. For a more detailed discussion of parking impacts, please see the response to Master Comment MC-3 and Sections 3.3.1.3 and 3.3.3.1 of this FEIS/FEIR.

Response to Comment PHC377 - Donna Pearman

Comment #	Response
PHC377-1	The commenter’s concerns about Metro’s TAP card system have been noted for the record and will be taken into consideration for future Metro planning efforts.

Response to Comment PHC378 - Salvador Pelaez

Comment #	Response
PHC378-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHC378-2	Bicycle parking would be provided at the Sylmar, Van Nuys Metrolink, and Metro Orange Line Stations. Bicycle parking at other stations would be provided where feasible and will be determined during the design/build phase of the project. The decision as to whether bike lockers or bike racks are installed will also be decided at that time.
PHC378-3	Metro is working with the City of Los Angeles to identify potential measures to mitigate the loss of bike lanes that are currently on Van Nuys Boulevard due to implementation of the LPA. Two parallel corridors have been identified for consideration and approval by LADOT as bike friendly corridors. These include Filmore Street to the west and Pierce Street to the east. Both of these streets could be designated and designed as Class III Bike Friendly streets through use of sharrows (markings indicating the lane is to be shared by bikes and cars) and signage. Metro will also continue to work with LADOT to identify, to the extent feasible, replacement locations for Class II bike lanes that meet the goals and policies in the City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan (also, please see mitigation measure MM-TRA-7 in Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR). In addition, through Metro’s new First/Last Mile directive, a First/Last Mile Plan has been prepared that identifies new bicycle and pedestrian improvements at or near all 14 stations.

Response to Comment PHC379 - Maria Pena

Comment #	Response
PHC379-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC380 - Mayra Pena

Comment #	Response
PHC380-1	<p>MSF Opcion B (o MSF Option B) ha sido identificada como la sede MSF preferida por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Tambien, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-2</i>, que identifica las razones por las que se eligio MSF Opcion B como la sede MSF preferida.</p> <p>MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred site by the Metro Board of Directors. Please see the response to Master Comment MC-2 for the reasons MSF Option B was identified as the preferred site.</p> <p>Also, the DEIS/DEIR and this FEIS/FEIR acknowledge that localized intersection impacts due to the increased congestion resulting from the removal of one travel lane in each direction along Van Nuys Boulevard would occur. However, it should be noted that the transit benefits that would be provided to the community and región by the proposed project would include improved access and mobility for transit users, reduced vehicle miles travelled by motor vehicles, and the resulting reductions in pollutant emissions and greenhouse gases from motor vehicles.</p>

Response to Comment PHC381 - Ross Pendegraft

Comment #	Response
PHC381-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC382 - Penka

Comment #	Response
PHC382-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC383 - Loree Peraan

Comment #	Response
PHC383-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC384 - Catalino Perez

Comment #	Response
PHC384-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC385 - Dipna Perez

Comment #	Response
PHC385-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC386 - Javier Perez

Comment #	Response
PHC386-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC387 - Monica Perez

Comment #	Response
PHC387-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC388 - Rosa Perez

Comment #	Response
PHC388-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC389 - Shevonne Perez

Comment #	Response
PHC389-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC390 - Martha Perulta

Comment #	Response
PHC390-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC391 - May Phosri

Comment #	Response
PHC391-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC392 - Ana Pineda-Gonzalez

Comment #	Response
PHC392-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC393 - Vocker Plea

Comment #	Response
PHC393-1	<p>MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-6 regarding the proposed project's right-of-way acquisition and business displacement impacts. Please also see the discussion located in Section 4.2, <i>Real Estate and Acquisitions</i>, in the FEIS/FEIR.</p> <p>Additionally, please note that Metro is very sensitive to the impacts of its projects on the business and residential communities adjacent to its bus and rail transit lines. Potential sites for the placement of an LRT MSF are based on location in relation to a proposed alignment, surrounding land use, site size, geometry, and number of properties needed for acquisition. The availability and cost of land are also factors that would be considered at a later stage of study along with potential construction scenarios.</p> <p>MSF sites must be in close proximity to the alignment so as to not require the construction of extensive additional track to transfer vehicles from the mainline to the facility and vice versa. It is advantageous to minimize deadhead miles and hours, the non-revenue distance and time from the end of the service route to the MSF. Reducing deadhead miles and hours would reduce operations and maintenance costs in the form of electrical energy, miles traveled and vehicle maintenance required, operator time, and so on.</p> <p>With these criteria in mind, there was no City-owned land available or under-utilized in close proximity to the corridor that meets the needs of the aforementioned criterion.</p>

Response to Comment PHC394 - Elizabeth Pool

Comment #	Response
PHC394-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC395 - Freddie Portillo

Comment #	Response
PHC395-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC396 - Araceli Prado

Comment #	Response
PHC396-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC397 - Noelia Prado

Comment #	Response
PHC397-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC398 - Roberto Prado

Comment #	Response
PHC398-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC399 - Rosemary Preciado

Comment #	Response
PHC399-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC400 - Johanna Quiahua

Comment #	Response
PHC400-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC401 - Jonathan Quiahua

Comment #	Response
PHC401-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC402 - Jeronimo Quiamo

Comment #	Response
PHC402-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC403 - Dorris Quintero

Comment #	Response
PHC403-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC404 - Adia R

Comment #	Response
PHC404-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC405 - Benito Ramblas

Comment #	Response
PHC405-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC406 - Eduardo Ramirez

Comment #	Response
PHC406-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC407 - Gabriella Ramirez

Comment #	Response
PHC407-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC408 - Mirna Ramirez

Comment #	Response
PHC408-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC409 - Angela Randolph

Comment #	Response
PHC409-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC410 - Cristobal Rendon

Comment #	Response
PHC410-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC411 - Maria Renteria

Comment #	Response
PHC411-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC412 - Carla Reyes

Comment #	Response
PHC412-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC413 - Diana Reyes

Comment #	Response
PHC413-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC414 - Luis Reyes

Comment #	Response
PHC414-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC415 - Nery Reyes

Comment #	Response
PHC415-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC416 - Maria G. Reynaga

Comment #	Response
PHC416-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC417 - Gladys Rius

Comment #	Response
PHC417-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC418 - Alma Rivera

Comment #	Response
PHC418-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC419 - Blanca Rivera

Comment #	Response
PHC419-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC420 - Matilde Rivera G.

Comment #	Response
PHC420-1	<p>Trenes LRT son electricos y no contaminan. Tambien, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-8</i> acerca de los impactos de calidad del aire del proyecto propuesto.</p> <p>LRT trains are electrically powered and are non-polluting. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-8 regarding the proposed project's air quality impacts.</p>

Response to Comment PHC421 - Jonathan J. Riveros

Comment #	Response
PHC421-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC422 - Bertha Robles

Comment #	Response
PHC422-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC423 - Caroline Robles

Comment #	Response
PHC423-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC424 - Nora Robles

Comment #	Response
PHC424-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC425 - Soila Robles

Comment #	Response
PHC425-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC426 - Sandra Rocha

Comment #	Response
PHC426-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC427 - Irma Rodarte

Comment #	Response
PHC427-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC428 - Rodrigo

Comment #	Response
PHC428-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC429 - Angel Rodriguez

Comment #	Response
PHC429-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC430 - Aurora Rodriguez

Comment #	Response
PHC430-1	The commenters request for a bus along the freeway has been included in the project record. However, this request is outside the scope of this project.

Response to Comment PHC431 - Brenda Rodriguez

Comment #	Response
PHC431-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC432 - Maria Rodriguez

Comment #	Response
PHC432-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC433 - Maria Roman

Comment #	Response
PHC433-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC434 - Roberta Romero

Comment #	Response
PHC434-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC435 - Clarissa Romos

Comment #	Response
PHC435-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC436 - Maria Rosales

Comment #	Response
PHC436-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC437 - Martin Rosales

Comment #	Response
PHC437-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>
PHC437-2	<p>Favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-3</i> acerca de los impactos a estacionamiento del proyecto propuesto. Favor de tambien referirse al capitulo 3 de este reporte (FEIS/FEIR), el cual contiene detalles adicionales acerca de los impactos de estacionamiento de la alternativa preferida local (o LPA).</p> <p>Please see the response to Master Comment MC-3 regarding the proposed project’s parking impacts. Please also refer to Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR, which contains additional details regarding the LPA’s parking impacts.</p>

Response to Comment PHC438 - Cynthia Rosas

Comment #	Response
PHC438-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC439 - Rosy

Comment #	Response
PHC439-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC440 - Robert A. Rouge

Comment #	Response
PHC440-1	<p>The comment is noted for the record, however, LRT from San Pedro to Point Fermin/Cabrillo is outside the scope of the proposed project.</p>

Response to Comment PHC441 - Rosa R

Comment #	Response
PHC441-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC442 - Petro Rubalecio

Comment #	Response
PHC442-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC443 - Olivia Rubio

Comment #	Response
PHC443-1	Thank you for expressing your input on wanting the design of the proposed project to be similar to that of the Blue Line. Metro will take this input into consideration during the planning effort.

Response to Comment PHC444 - Isabel Ruiz

Comment #	Response
PHC444-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC445 - Oscar Ruiz

Comment #	Response
PHC445-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC446 - Maria Saavedra

Comment #	Response
PHC446-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC447 - Sasenik Safranya

Comment #	Response
PHC447-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC448 - Reyna Salas

Comment #	Response
PHC448-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC449 - Rosa E Salas

Comment #	Response
PHC449-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC450 - Daniela Salgado

Comment #	Response
PHC450-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC451 - Alondra Salinas

Comment #	Response
PHC451-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC452 - Glenda Salinas

Comment #	Response
PHC452-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC453 - Pam Salinas

Comment #	Response
PHC453-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC454 - Teia Salisgun

Comment #	Response
PHC454-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC455 - Lydia Salvadge

Comment #	Response
PHC455-1	<p>Thank you for the input regarding bike security on Metro buses. This concern and recommendation will be taken into consideration for current and future planned Metro projects.</p>

Response to Comment PHC456 - Sandra Sanboraz

Comment #	Response
PHC456-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC457 - Anayanzi Sanchez

Comment #	Response
PHC457-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC458 - CarranzaFco Sanchez

Comment #	Response
PHC458-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC459 - Gabriel Samson

Comment #	Response
PHC459-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC460 - Jose Sanchez

Comment #	Response
PHC460-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC461 - Liliana Sanchez

Comment #	Response
PHC461-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC462 - Maria Sanchez

Comment #	Response
PHC462-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC463 - Morena Sanchez

Comment #	Response
PHC463-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC464 - Angelo Santizo

Comment #	Response
PHC464-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC465 - Erik Santoscoy

Comment #	Response
PHC465-1	The comment recommending expansion of transit service to the Olive View – UCLA Medical Center is outside the scope of the proposed project. However, Metro will take this input into consideration for future planning efforts.

Response to Comment PHC466 - Wendy Santos

Comment #	Response
PHC466-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC467 - Coleman Saucier

Comment #	Response
PHC467-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC468 - Crystal Savino

Comment #	Response
PHC468-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC469 - Susanna Scafaryan

Comment #	Response
PHC469-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC470 – Lauren Siegel

Comment #	Response
PHC469-1	Comment noted for the record. No response is required.

Response to Comment PHC471 - Eric Seiderylarz

Comment #	Response
PHC471-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. Building a maintenance and storage facility underground would not be practicable.</p> <p>With regards to the commenter’s suggestion that Metro purchase land in Sun Valley (it is presumed the commenter is referring to land for the MSF), the Sun Valley community is located too far from the project alignment for that community to be a feasible MSF location.</p>

Response to Comment PHC472 - Robert Serra

Comment #	Response
PHC472-1	The commenter provides input on Proposition 13. This topic is outside of the scope of the proposed project.

Response to Comment PHC473 - Adriana Serrento

Comment #	Response
PHC473-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC474 - Leslie Sevilla

Comment #	Response
PHC474-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC475 - Joe Seward

Comment #	Response
PHC475-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PHC476 - Sergio Sewiller

Comment #	Response
PHC476-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC477 – Sharice Shahuerman

Comment #	Response
PHC477-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC478 – Himbya J. Sherry

Comment #	Response
PHC478-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC479 – Gen Sherry

Comment #	Response
PHC479-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC480 – Simon Simonian

Comment #	Response
PHC480-1	<p>This FEIS/FEIR acknowledges that economic impacts could occur to the businesses that are displaced for right-of-way as well as other businesses who are dependent on the income generated by those displaced businesses. To minimize those impacts, relocation assistance and benefits will be provided to displaced businesses in accordance with state and federal regulations and in accordance with Metro policies.</p> <p>Also, please note that MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.</p>

Response to Comment PHC481 – Rohani Sinambela

Comment #	Response
PHC481-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC482 – Jolly Slaby

Comment #	Response
PHC482-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Comment #	Response
	Metro is working with the City of Los Angeles to identify potential measures to mitigate the loss of bike lanes that are currently on Van Nuys Boulevard due to implementation of the LPA. Two parallel corridors have been identified for consideration and approval by LADOT as bike friendly corridors. These include Filmore Street to the west and Pierce Street to the east. Both of these streets could be designated and designed as Class III Bike Friendly streets through use of sharrows (markings indicating the lane is to be shared by bikes and cars) and signage. Metro will also continue to work with LADOT to identify, to the extent feasible, replacement locations for Class II bike lanes that meet the goals and policies in the City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan (also, please see mitigation measure MM-TRA-7 in Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR). In addition, through Metro’s new First/Last Mile directive, Metro has prepared a First/Last Mile Plan that identifies new bicycle and pedestrian improvements at or near all 14 stations.

Response to Comment PHC483 – Kathy Sloan

Comment #	Response
PHC483-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC484 – Rhonda Smith

Comment #	Response
PHC484-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC485 – Desiree Sotelo

Comment #	Response
PHC485-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC486 – Armando Soto

Comment #	Response
PHC486-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC487 – Candelana Soto

Comment #	Response
PHC487-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC488 – Tony Soto

Comment #	Response
PHC488-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC489 – Aygul Stevens

Comment #	Response
PHC489-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC490 – Lorraine Stewart

Comment #	Response
PHC490-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC491 – Patricia Strawbrid

Comment #	Response
PHC491-1	<p>The commenter’s concern about how the proposed project would affect their existing commute is noted for the record.</p>
PHC491-2	<p>The commenter’s concerns regarding the availability of TAP cards is noted for the record by Metro. Currently, TAP cards are available at Metro Rail Stations and at local vendors.</p>

Response to Comment PHC492 - Patricia Kay Stawbridge

Comment #	Response
PHC492-1	The commenter’s concerns regarding the availability of TAP cards is noted for the record by Metro. Currently, TAP cards are available at Metro Rail Stations and at local vendors.

Response to Comment PHC493 - Jose Tapia

Comment #	Response
PHC493-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC494 - Taina Tapia

Comment #	Response
PHC494-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p> <p>Also, please note that passenger safety is paramount in all of Metro’s design considerations. At all 14 stations, access/egress to station platforms will be via ADA compliant ramps, well lit, have wayfinding signage and control features such as pedestrian gates or pedestrian signals where appropriate. Additional amenities for hearing and sight impaired passengers will also be a part of the station environment. LAPD and Metro Police would also patrol the proposed LRT stations to further ensure the safety of transit users and employees.</p>

Response to Comment PHC495 - Tom Taverne

Comment #	Response
PHC495-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC496 - Sarah Taylor

Comment #	Response
PHC496-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Comment #	Response
PHC496-2	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC497 - Diane Tellez

Comment #	Response
PHC497-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC498 - Luis Tellez

Comment #	Response
PHC498-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC499 - Kim Temme

Comment #	Response
PHC499-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PHC500 - Hugo Tepe

Comment #	Response
PHC500-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC501 - Anne Thomas

Comment #	Response
PHC501-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC502 - Tina

Comment #	Response
PHC502-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o LPA, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario Master Comment MC-1. Tambien, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-4</i> para una discusión acrc de impactos a seguridad y medidas a implementar para abordar dichos impactos.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-4 for a discussion of the proposed project’s safety impacts and measures to address those impacts.</p>

Response to Comment PHC503 - Arcelia Tinoco

Comment #	Response
PHC503-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC504 - Arlene Titna

Comment #	Response
PHC504-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC505 - Fabiola Toascano

Comment #	Response
PHC505-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC506 - Carmit Tordjman

Comment #	Response
PHC506-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC507 - Maria Torres

Comment #	Response
PHC507-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC508 - Sandra Torres

Comment #	Response
PHC508-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC509 - Sergio A. Torres

Comment #	Response
PHC509-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC510 - Wendy Torres

Comment #	Response
PHC510-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC511 - Guillermo A Tortola

Comment #	Response
PHC511-1	<p>The comment is noted and it's acknowledged that the acquisition of properties and the displacement of the businesses on those properties can have economic impacts on the displaced businesses as well as impacts on other businesses who are dependent on the income from those displaced businesses.</p> <p>Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-6 regarding the proposed project's right-of-way acquisition and business displacement impacts. MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site</p>

Response to Comment PHC512 - Alexandra Tovar

Comment #	Response
PHC512-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC513 - Peria Truvillo

Comment #	Response
PHC513-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC514 - Narine Tugharyan

Comment #	Response
PHC514-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC515 - Libna Vanadarez

Comment #	Response
PHC515-1	La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “ <i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i> ” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i> , favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i> .

Response to Comment PHC516 - Catalina Vasquez

Comment #	Response
PHC516-1	Favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-3</i> acerca de los impactos a estacionamiento del proyecto propuesto. Favor de tambien referirse al capitulo 3 del reporte ambiental FEIS/FEIR. Please see the response to Master Comment MC-3 regarding the proposed project’s parking impacts. No new parking would be provided at the proposed stations. Please also refer to Chapter 3 within the FEIS/FEIR.

Response to Comment PHC517 - Eufrocina Vasquez

Comment #	Response
PHC517-1	Favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-3</i> acerca de los impactos a estacionamiento del proyecto propuesto. Favor de tambien referirse al capitulo 3 del reporte ambiental FEIS/FEIR. Please see the response to Master Comment MC-3 regarding the proposed project’s parking impacts. No new parking would be provided at the proposed stations. Please also refer to Chapter 3 within the FEIS/FEIR.

Response to Comment PHC518 - Gissel Vasquez

Comment #	Response
PHC518-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC519 - Michelle Vasquez

Comment #	Response
PHC519-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC520 - Veronica Vasquez

Comment #	Response
PHC520-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC521 - Elena Velasquez

Comment #	Response
PHC521-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC522 - Joseph Villero

Comment #	Response
PHC522-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC523 - Claudia Vlloa

Comment #	Response
PHC523-1	The exact fare of the proposed project is not determined, but the fare will be consistent with existing Metro policies.
PHC523-2	The request for a low fare for low-income populations has been noted for the record by Metro. Also, please see the response to comment PHC523-1 above.
PHC523-3	Two travel lanes in each direction would be provided on Van Nuys Boulevard. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-7 for a discussion of the proposed project's traffic impacts, in addition to Chapter 3 of the FEIS/FEIR.

Response to Comment PHC524 - Jack Waizenegger

Comment #	Response
PHC524-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Comment #	Response
PHC524-2	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-5 for a discussion of how Metro will continue to coordinate with the planning teams for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor, Metro Orange Line Improvements, and East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor.
PHC524-3	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PHC524-4	Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS/FEIR for a list and the locations of the proposed LRT stations.
PHC524-5	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC525 - Wayne

Comment #	Response
PHC525-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC526 - Rosanne Welch

Comment #	Response
PHC526-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site

Response to Comment PHC527 - Mike Williams

Comment #	Response
PHC527-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC528 - Susan Wise

Comment #	Response
PHC528-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC529 - Seth Wulkan

Comment #	Response
PHC529-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC530 - Sonia X

Comment #	Response
PHC530-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC531 - Kenn Yama

Comment #	Response
PHC531-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC532 - Victoria Yonker

Comment #	Response
PHC532-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC533 - Romel Yousinfri

Comment #	Response
PHC533-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC534 - Rufino Yucamed

Comment #	Response
PHC534-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHC535 - Maria Zamudio

Comment #	Response
PHC535-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC536 - Simon Zanodwker

Comment #	Response
PHC536-1	It’s acknowledged that acquisition of properties and displacement of businesses located on the properties could have adverse economic impacts on the businesses as well as indirect impacts on other businesses that rely on income from the displaced businesses. However, please note that relocation assistance and benefits will be provided to displaced businesses in accordance with state and federal regulations and Metro policies. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-6 and Section 4.2 of this FEIS/FEIR for additional information on the proposed project’s right-of-way acquisition and business displacement impacts. Also, please note that Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT with MSF Option B, which would displace fewer businesses than Option A, has been identified as the by Metro (please see the responses to Master Comments MC-1 and MC-2 for more information on that decision).

Response to Comment PHC537 - Gabina Zavaretta

Comment #	Response
PHC537-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC538 - Simon Zavodiuker

Comment #	Response
PHC538-1	<p>The commenter’s concerns regarding the proposed project’s impacts on his business are noted for the record. Metro acknowledges that acquisition of properties and displacement of businesses located on the properties could have adverse economic impacts on the businesses as well as indirect impacts on other businesses that rely on the income of the displaced businesses.</p> <p>Also please note that Alternative 4 – LRT and MSF Option B have been identified as the by Metro. The responses to Master Comments MC-1 and MC-2 provide additional information on the reasons for that decision.</p>

Response to Comment PHC539 - Monica Zeller

Comment #	Response
PHC539-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC540 - Hilario Zepeda

Comment #	Response
PHC540-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC541 - Georgina Zgarano

Comment #	Response
PHC541-1	<p>La Alternativa 4 Modificada o “<i>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT</i>” ha sido identificada como la alternativa preferida local (o LPA) por la Junta Directiva de Metro. Para mas información acerca de como se eligio la alternativa preferida local o <i>LPA</i>, favor de ver la respuesta al comentario <i>Master Comment MC-1</i>.</p> <p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC542 - Zoya

Comment #	Response
PHC542-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHC543 - Fatima Zumija

Comment #	Response
PHC543-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the LPA by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

A2.8 Responses to Public Hearing Transcript Comments

Response to Comment PHT1 - David Govea

Comment #	Response
PHT1-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p> <p>The traffic impact calculations are based on 2040 projections derived from the Metro travel forecast model for the ESFV project. The highway assignment is unconstrained, meaning the 2040 volumes are based on the travel demand potential with no consideration given to constraints that may exist, such as the capacity of the roadway or constraints imposed by bottlenecks far upstream from these crossings. On Hubbard Avenue the per lane volumes exceeds 1,000 vehicles per hour, which is theoretically feasible but unlikely. This is compensated by the fact that the calculation of spillback queue lengths may be somewhat underestimating the effects of irregular and frequent train arrivals at the crossing.</p> <p>At the Hubbard crossing, the traffic signals and crossing controls will be upgraded to address concerns of the CPUC by modifying the traffic signals at Truman Street and 1st Street/Frank Modugno Drive to conform to the preemption needs per CPUC and responsible agencies. Automatic devices should control all pedestrian and vehicular movements. Rail crossing warning time will be set to handle the longest trucks. Additional pedestrian gates, where feasible, should control the pedestrian route across LRT and Metrolink tracks.</p> <p>Also, please see the discussion of traffic impacts and mitigation measures in Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR and the response to Master Comment MC-7.</p>
PHT1-2	<p>The Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) (Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT) does not include new parking structures or lots for transit riders. Although parking demand and potential “spillover” parking impacts are not considered to be an environmental impact under CEQA, Metro acknowledges and notes for the record the commenter’s concerns.</p>
PHT1-3	<p>The commenter’s suggestion that construction start in the City of San Fernando will be taken into consideration by Metro.</p>

Response to Comment PHT2 - Ivan Gomez

Comment #	Response
PHT2-1	<p>MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.</p>

Response to Comment PHT3 - Coby King

Comment #	Response
PHT3-1	The commenter's support of the proposed project is noted for the record by Metro.
PHT3-2	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHT4 - Suman Prabhakar

Comment #	Response
PHT4-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p> <p>With regards to air quality impacts, the LPA would result in reductions of criteria pollutants in the future compared to what would occur if the project was not implemented under No-Build scenario.</p>
PHT4-2	<p>Please see Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR and the response to Master Comment MC-7 for a discussion of the proposed project's traffic impacts.</p> <p>It is recognized the removal of on-street parking would result in an inconvenience to many business patrons. Although on-street parking along Van Nuys Boulevard would be removed, many of the commercial businesses along the corridor have off-street parking available for their customers. There is also on-street parking available in the immediate vicinity [one to two blocks] of the corridor.</p>
PHT4-3	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHT5 - Khan, Xavier

Comment #	Response
PHT5-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHT5-2	The commenter's recommendations regarding the timeline and order of construction of the proposed project is noted for the record and will be taken into consideration during the design and planning process for construction.
PHT5-3	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PHT6 - Maggi Espada-Hernandez

Comment #	Response
PHT6-1	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-4 for a description of the safety features that will be built into the design of the Locally Preferred Alternative’s alignment and stations.

Response to Comment PHT7 - Robert Rieth

Comment #	Response
PHT7-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHT7-2	Please see the response to comment PHT7-1 above. Also, please note that the LPA would afford connections to all of the transit services along the ESFV project corridor including, Metro buses, LADOT DASH, Metrolink, and Amtrak. At the Sylmar/San Fernando and Metro Orange Line stations, transfers would be via direct connections. At the other 12 stations, connections/transfers would be via a short walk between the LRT line and connecting services.
PHT7-3	Past public meeting presentations are available at Metro’s site for the proposed project at https://www.metro.net/projects/east-sfv/east_sfv-meeting-presentations/ .
PHT7-4	Please see the response to comment PHT7-1 above. Also, please note that a TSM alternative was considered as a part of the alternatives analysis and was presented to stakeholders during the community engagement/outreach phase of the project.
PHT7-5	Please see the response to comment PHT7-1 above. Constructing BRT in the railroad right-of-way would be cost prohibitive and impracticable for this technology. The railroad tracks, train signals, and other utilities would need to be relocated to allow for the construction of a two-way BRT and station facilities. The expense to accommodate BRT alongside Metrolink and UP freight trains could not be justified.

Response to Comment PHT8 - Ani Issaian

Comment #	Response
PHT8-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-6 for a discussion of the proposed project’s right-of-way and business displacement impacts and information on The Uniform Act, which provides for uniform and equitable treatment for persons displaced from their homes or businesses and establishes uniform and equitable land acquisition policies. The commenter is also referred to Section 4.2 – Real Estate and Acquisitions of this FEIS/FEIR.

Response to Comment PHT9 - Natalie Magarian

Comment #	Response
PHT9-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PHT9-2	<p>Please see the response to comment PHT9-1 above</p> <p>For a discussion of construction impacts and measures to mitigate those impacts, please see Section 4.19 of this FEIS/FEIR.</p> <p>With regards to public noticing and outreach, Metro has hosted more than 100 meetings, provided notifications via direct mail and email, press releases, newspaper and online ads, and a project website, and has engaged the community using other outreach methods (see Chapter 7 for additional details).</p>
PHT9-3	<p>Metro is working with the City of Los Angeles to identify potential measures to mitigate the loss of class II bike lanes, due to implementation of the LRT alternative, that are currently on Van Nuys Boulevard. In addition, through Metro’s new First/Last Mile directive, a First/Last Mile study was completed that identifies new bicycle and pedestrian improvements at or near the proposed LRT stations.</p> <p>Also, please note that the project is intended to provide a high level of transit mobility along the 9.2-mile corridor and that the LPA was identified as the preferred alternative during the community engagement process. Transit mobility can be defined in part by faster service with fewer station stops. The 14 stations are spaced at approximately ¾-mile intervals. A 20-station LRT would be comparatively slower than a 14-station system, would cost more to construct and operate, and would attract few riders. Currently, and in the future, local bus service along the corridor will provide access to destinations that fall between the 14 LRT stations.</p>

Response to Comment PHT10 - Coby King

Comment #	Response
PHT10-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHT10-2	The comment regarding Metro’s efforts to mitigate impacts on businesses is noted for the record. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2 for information on The Uniform Act, which provides for uniform and equitable treatment for persons displaced from their homes or businesses and establishes uniform and equitable land acquisition policies.
PHT10-3	Metro is working with the City of Los Angeles to identify potential measures to mitigate the loss of class II bike lanes, due to implementation of the LRT alternative, that are currently on Van Nuys Boulevard. In addition, through Metro’s new First/Last Mile directive, Metro intends to identify new bicycle and pedestrian improvements at or near all 14 stations.

Comment #	Response
PHT10-4	As detailed in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the FEIS/FEIR, the proposed project would prohibit curbside parking along the LRT alignment. However, designated parking lots for businesses located on parcels that would not be acquired by the proposed project would remain in place and accessible to customers. Additionally, the comment that Metro should work with the City of Los Angeles to preserve parking spaces is noted for the record and will be taken into consideration by Metro.
PHT10-5	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHT11 - Dianne Hand

Comment #	Response
PHT11-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHT11-2	Under the Locally Preferred Alternative, mixed-flow lanes would be removed to accommodate the LRT alignment, which would result in additional roadway congestion due to the decreased roadway capacity. As acknowledged in the DEIS/DEIR and this FEIS/FEIR, the increase in congestion could adversely affect emergency vehicle response and access or evacuation plans in the event of an emergency. The proposed motor-vehicle turn restrictions could also result, in some instances, in emergency vehicles taking a slightly more circuitous route, and therefore require more time to respond to emergencies.
PHT11-3	The comment suggesting Metro review transit systems in Sydney and Brisbane, Australia is noted for the record.

Response to Comment PHT12 - Severiana Pablo

Comment #	Response
PHT12-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHT13 - Tony Wilkinson

Comment #	Response
PHT13-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Comment #	Response
PHT13-2	The comment that the City of Los Angeles Transportation Element be revisited to remove bicycle lanes from the highest traffic corridors in the San Fernando Valley for safety reasons is noted for the record by Metro.
PHT13-3	The comment in support of bicycling in the community is noted for the record. Also, please see Section 3.3.4.2 of this FEIS/FEIR for measures to minimize the impact due to the removal of existing bike lanes along Van Nuys Boulevard (mitigation measure MM-TRA-7).

Response to Comment PHT14 - Joanne D'Antonio

Comment #	Response
PHT14-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHT14-2	The comment recommending future conversion of the Metro Orange Line to light rail is noted for the record by Metro.
PHT14-3	The comment that the proposed transit line should be 100 percent renewable is noted for the record by Metro. Also, please note that the LRT trains would be electrically powered via an overhead wire catenary system.

Response to Comment PHT15 - Steve Breched

Comment #	Response
PHT15-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHT16 - Bob Anderson

Comment #	Response
PHT16-1	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-5 for a discussion of how Metro will continue to coordinate with the planning teams for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor, Metro Orange Line Improvements, and East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor.
PHT16-2	The design of the ESFVTC terminus station has been revised to accommodate a planned elevated Metro Orange Line guideway over Van Nuys Boulevard. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS/FEIR for a detailed description of the Locally Preferred Alternative, Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT.
PHT16-3	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Comment #	Response
PHT16-4	Please see the response to comment PHT16-3 above.
PHT16-5	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative by the Metro Board of Directors. The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated from consideration due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and because it would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, and traffic impacts. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHT17 - Fran Scaglione

Comment #	Response
PHT17-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHT17-2	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-6.

Response to Comment PHT18 - Jan Kidwell

Comment #	Response
PHT18-1	The commenter's support for Alternative 4 - LRT (at-grade), which has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative by Metro, is noted for the record. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHT19 - Glenn Bailey

Comment #	Response
PHT19-1	The comment that no ADA access was provided for the first half hour of the meeting is noted for the record. Metro is committed to providing ADA access to all future public meetings throughout the duration of the meetings.
PHT19-2	The commenter's objection to the removal of bicycle lanes is noted for the record by Metro. As noted in Chapter 2 of this FEIS/FEIR, the existing bike lanes extending approximately 2 miles north on Van Nuys Boulevard from Parthenia Street to Beachy Avenue and from Laurel Canyon Boulevard to San Fernando Road would be removed in order to accommodate the LRT guideway. Two parallel corridors have been identified for consideration and approval by the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) as bike friendly corridors. These include Filmore Street to the west and Pierce Street to the east. Both of these streets can

Comment #	Response
	be developed as Class III Bike Friendly streets by striping sharrows and providing signage. Metro will also continue to work with LADOT to identify, to the extent feasible, replacement locations for Class II bike lanes that meet the goals and policies in the City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan (see mitigation measure MM-TRA-7 in Section 3.3.4.2).
PHT19-3	Please see the response to PHT19-2 above.
PHT19-4	Please see the response to PHT19-2 above. Also, please note that bicycle parking would be provided at the Sylmar, Van Nuys Metrolink, and Metro Orange Line stations. Per Metro’s Rail Design Criteria (MRDC), bicycle parking at other stations would be provided where feasible and will be determined during the design/build phase of the project.
PHT19-5	The LRT Alternative, Alternative 4 (at grade), has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative. Compatibility of the ESFVTC LRT with the Metro Orange Line will be a factor that is considered in future planning to convert the Metro Orange Line to LRT.
PHT19-6	One MSF would be constructed to serve the proposed LRT line along the ESFVTC. Also, please note that the preferred location, MSF Option B, is not located in the immediate vicinity of any noise-sensitive land uses.
PHT19-7	Of the four build alternatives evaluated in the DEIS/DEIR, Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT, would provide the greatest benefit with respect to the reduction in transit rider travel time within the corridor.

Response to Comment PHT20 - Nate

Comment #	Response
PHT20-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHT20-2	Please see the response to PHT20-1 above. Also, please note that signal priority for the proposed project would be considered and the type of signal treatment would be determined during the preliminary engineering phase of the ESFVTC Project. It is envisioned that possible timing changes could be implemented by one of four means: an LRT priority system, Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control (ATSAC) Critical Intersection Control (CIC), ATSAC Critical Arterial Control (CAC), or LADOT’s Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS). Bus priority, which already exists on several corridors within the San Fernando Valley, provides additional green time to approaching buses when identified as late per the schedule. Similar priority treatment could be afforded to LRT operations. CIC adjusts the relative phase splits on a cycle-by-cycle basis. CAC adjusts offsets to provide progression in the peak direction. ATCS constantly adjusts the green time as needed based on the competing demands of approaching traffic.
PHT20-3	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Comment #	Response
PHT20-4	Metro will continue to evaluate ways to improve bus operations in adjacent corridors and how best to provide an integrated and efficient regional transportation system.
PHT20-5	Left turns from Van Nuys Boulevard onto cross streets will be maintained at most of the currently signalized intersections where the LRT will be running in the median. However, all vehicle movements across the median at currently unsignalized intersections will be prohibited. This will include left turns from Van Nuys Boulevard as well as left turns and through traffic from un-signalized side streets and private driveways. Motorists who desire to make a left turn onto an unsignalized cross street or into a driveway will have to make a U-turn at a signalized left-turn location or choose a route that will allow them to use a signalized cross street. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-4.
PHT20-6	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHT21 - Scott Walton

Comment #	Response
PHT21-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-6.
PHT21-2	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHT21-3	Please see the responses to PHT21-1 and PHT21-2 above.

Response to Comment PHT22 - Donna Pearman

Comment #	Response
PHT22-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHT22-2	The commenter's concern about the impact of the proposed project on local bus line 788 is noted for the record by Metro. Line 788 is under review as part of the NextGen study, which must also consider the implementation of major projects including the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project and the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project. Line 788 provides express service over the Sepulveda Pass and connects Westwood and the Expo Line from the San Fernando Valley. Once the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project Alternative Analysis is completed, Service Planning Staff will evaluate the selected route of the project and develop a Bus Rail Interface Plan to determine how buses will best serve the proposed new stations. At that time, staff can better address how Line 788 will operate in the future.

Comment #	Response
PHT22-3	Alternative 4 - LRT (at-grade) with MSF Option B has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative by Metro. Also, please see the responses to Master Comment MC-1, MC-2, and MC-6.
PHT22-4	Please see the response to comment PHT22-1 above.
PHT22-5	The commenter’s concern that seniors and the disabled who don’t have a TAP card have to pay full fare is noted for the record by Metro. However, please note that seniors 62 years or older and the disabled that qualify for a Senior TAP Card or reduced fare don’t have to pay for the card itself. To qualify, seniors must supply a full-face photo (1" X 1-1/4" or 2" X 2") along with an official ID showing proof of age (California ID, California Driver’s License, passport, or a birth certificate accompanied by any photo ID). In addition to a photo and ID, the disabled have to provide proof of their disability. Seniors and the disabled can apply online or at any Metro Customer Center. Seniors and the disabled may also mail in copies of the required documentation and a full-face photo to the TAP Reduced Fare Office, One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop: 99-PL-4, Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952.
PHT22-6	Please see the response to comment PHT22-1 above.
PHT22-7	Please see the response to comment PHT22-1 above.

Response to Comment PHT23 - Francine Oschin

Comment #	Response
PHT23-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHT24 - Fara Narznadavi

Comment #	Response
PHT24-1	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-6.
PHT24-2	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHT24-3	The Locally Preferred Alternative (Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT) proposes the construction of LRT at grade for the entire 9.2-mile length of the corridor. The subway portion of Alternative 4, as described in the DEIS/DEIR, has been eliminated from consideration. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. With regards to signal priority or preemption, the type of signal treatment would be determined during the preliminary engineering phase of the ESFVTC Project. It is envisioned that possible timing changes could be implemented by one of four means: an LRT priority system, Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control (ATSAC) Critical Intersection Control

Comment #	Response
	(CIC), ATCSAC Critical Arterial Control (CAC), or LADOT’s Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS). Bus priority, which already exists on several corridors within the San Fernando Valley, provides additional green time to approaching buses when identified as late per the schedule. Similar priority treatment could be afforded to LRT operations. CIC adjusts the relative phase splits on a cycle-by-cycle basis. CAC adjusts offsets to provide progression in the peak direction. ATCS constantly adjusts the green time as needed based on the competing demands of approaching traffic.
PHT24-4	The commenter’s recommendation to include bicycle lanes is noted for the record by Metro. Metro is working with the City of Los Angeles to identify potential measures to mitigate the loss of class II bike lanes, due to implementation of the LRT alternative, that are currently on Van Nuys Boulevard. In addition please note that through Metro’s new First/Last Mile directive, Metro intends to identify new bicycle and pedestrian improvements at all 14 LRT stations.
PHT24-5	Most stations will have entrances from both ends of the station. At the Sylmar/ San Fernando station a grade-separated pedestrian crossing, either a tunnel or a bridge, would be provided between the LRT platform and existing station parking lot.
PHT24-6	The commenter’s suggestion that the proposed pedestrian bridge at the Sylmar/San Fernando station be eliminated for cost reasons is noted for the record by Metro.
PHT24-7	The comment recommending the implementation of bus only lanes on connecting corridors has been noted for the record by Metro and will be considered during project planning for other corridors in the project area.
PHT24-8	Metro would continue to outreach to engage local schools and other stakeholders to solicit their concerns and suggestions during the preliminary engineering, final design, and construction phases of the project.

Response to Comment PHT25 - Jesus Ramos

Comment #	Response
PHT25-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHT26 - Michael Roberts

Comment #	Response
PHT26-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-6 for a discussion of the proposed project’s right-of-way impacts and the regulations that Metro is required to comply with to ensure the uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes or businesses.

Response to Comment PHT27 - Gary Rodrigues

Comment #	Response
PHT27-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p> <p>With regards to the conversion of the Metro Orange Line to light rail, that is not within the scope of the ESFVTC Project. However, please note that Measure M funds have been identified for the Metro Orange Line's conversion to light rail for the year 2057.</p>
PHT27-2	Please see the response to comment PHT27-1 above.
PHT27-3	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-5 for a discussion of the relationship between the proposed project and the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project.

Response to Comment PHT28 - Doris Novavolper

Comment #	Response
PHT28-1	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-4 for a description of the safety features that will be built into the design of Locally Preferred Alternative line and stations.

Response to Comment PHT29 - Bob Falini

Comment #	Response
PHT29-1	The proposed project would operate along a 9.2-mile route from the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station to the north, to the Van Nuys Metro Orange Line Station to the south. For information on the travel time performance of the Locally Preferred Alternative, and the other alternatives, please see Table 3-9 in Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR.
PHT29-2	Please see the response to comment PHT29-1 above.
PHT29-3	Please see the response to comment PHT29-1 above. Also, please note that an alignment along Sepulveda Boulevard was considered but eliminated during the project's screening process due to strong community opposition and a number of traffic and engineering design constraints and challenges
PHT29-4	Please see the response to comment PHT29-3 above.
PHT29-5	Please see the response to Master Comment MC-3 for a discussion of the proposed project's parking impacts.
PHT29-6	<p>Please see the response to Master Comment MC-7 and Chapter 3 of this FEIS/FEIR for a discussion of the proposed project's traffic impacts.</p> <p>Also, please note that a traffic analysis along Kester Avenue was not conducted. The study corridors and intersections were determined under consultation with the City of San Fernando Public Works Department and the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation.</p>

Comment #	Response
PHT29-7	Metro would only acquire properties that are required to construct and operate the Locally Preferred Alternative. It is not anticipated that there would be a significant amount of unused land after construction of the proposed project. Any unused land or remnant parcels that remain after the project is implemented may be sold to the public if Metro determines there is not a need for the property.

Response to Comment PHT30 - Mel Wilson

Comment #	Response
PHT30-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHT31 - Kristian Storli

Comment #	Response
PHT31-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT with MSF Option B has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative by Metro. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-6 and Section 4.2 of this FEIS/FEIR for a discussion of the proposed project’s right-of-way acquisition and business displacement impacts and the measures required by law to treat displaced property owners in a fair and equitable manner.

Response to Comment PHT32 - Gary Rodrigues

Comment #	Response
PHT32-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT with MSF Option B has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative by Metro. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHT32-2	<p>MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-6 and Section 4.2 of this FEIS/FEIR for a discussion of the proposed project’s right-of-way acquisition and business displacement impacts and the measures required by law to treat displaced property owners in a fair and equitable manner.</p> <p>While the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) has the authority to acquire properties through eminent domain, every effort will be made to reach an agreeable settlement through voluntary negotiations. However, if agreement cannot be reached after a reasonable time, Metro will follow the State of California eminent domain laws, and initiate a formal condemnation process to acquire necessary property. This process is meant to protect property owners by allowing a court to determine the fair market value of the property. It’s important to note that even after a condemnation action has been initiated, Metro may continue to negotiate with property owners in an attempt to reach agreement in-lieu of a continuing the condemnation action.</p>

Response to Comment PHT33 - Kevin Davis

Comment #	Response
PHT33-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p> <p>The alternate route identified by the commenter would not serve the large transit dependent populations along Van Nuys Boulevard and therefore was not considered during the alternatives development and screening process for the ESFVTC Project. However, Metro will take into consideration the commenter’s suggestion in future planning studies in the eastern San Fernando Valley.</p>

Response to Comment PHT34 - Bart Reed

Comment #	Response
PHT34-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT, which has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative by the Metro Board of Directors, would include a station at San Fernando Road and Van Nuys Boulevard. The suggestion that there should also be a Metrolink station at this location is beyond the scope of the proposed project but will be forwarded to Metro’s planning staff.</p>
PHT34-2	<p>The station platforms would be designed for three cars. Redesigning the platforms to accommodate four- to six-car trains would result in additional right-of-way, traffic, and other impacts.</p>
PHT34-3	<p>With regards to the 405 project (Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project) and a connection to UCLA, please see the response to Master Comment MC-5.</p>

Response to Comment PHT35 - Ani Issaian

Comment #	Response
PHT35-1	<p>Although parking and economic impacts are not considered significant impacts to the environment under CEQA, it’s acknowledged that the loss of on-street and off-street parking could have an adverse economic impact on the businesses that rely on that parking. The acquisition off-street parking used by the commenter’s tenants will be considered by Metro in determining an appropriate purchase price for the property. However, it should also be noted that further refinements will be made to the Locally Preferred Alternative, including the proposed station and TPSS locations, as the project proceeds through preliminary engineering and final design (which is contingent upon approval of the proposed project by the Metro Board). During the project refinement process, Metro would consider whether there are alternative locations for the TPSS that could avoid or minimize parking impacts to the commenter’s business.</p>
PHT35-2	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p>

Response to Comment PHT36 - Rolando Chavarria

Comment #	Response
PHT36-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHT36-2	Extending the proposed project to the south to provide access to UCLA and LAX is beyond the scope of the proposed project. However, alternatives that would provide a transit connection between the San Fernando Valley and west Los Angeles are being studied as part of the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project, which likely one-day would connect with the ESFVTC project. Please note, however, that the mode and alignment for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor project have not been determined. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-5.

Response to Comment PHT37 - Raul Bocanegra

Comment #	Response
PHT37-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p> <p>For a discussion of the proposed project’s parking impacts, please see the response to Master Comment MC-3 as well as Chapter 3 of the FEIS/FEIR. For a discussion of construction impacts, including impacts on access to businesses, please see Section 4.19 of this FEIS/FEIR.</p>
PHT37-2	<p>In 2018, the Metro Board of Directors adopted the TOC Policy (http://media.metro.net/projects_studies/joint_development/images/toc_policy_final.pdf) in recognition of the importance of Metro incorporating equity, community development, and land use as it advances public transit investments. The Board-adopted TOC Policy (Section Vi. Administration, Transparency and Accountability) also established the commitment to developing a TOC Implementation Plan: “With adoption of the TOC Policy, Metro will establish a TOC Implementation Plan that will include performance metrics. Thereafter, staff will prepare an annual TOC report.” Metro is currently in the process of developing the TOC Implementation Plan and anticipates taking the draft to the Board in 2020. A key proposed implementation action in the TOC Implementation Plan includes conducting TOC Corridor Baseline Assessments (description below) for all Measure M Transit Corridors, including ESFVTC.</p> <p>TOC Corridor Baseline Assessments (not yet approved by the Board)</p> <p>Metro proposes to create TOC Corridor Baseline Corridor Assessments (Baselines) for every Measure M Transit Corridor in partnership with local jurisdictions and with stakeholder engagement integrated throughout the entire process.</p> <p>The Baselines will focus on the communities surrounding the transit corridor and will provide a snapshot of existing demographic characteristics, an inventory and assessment of existing jurisdiction TOC-related policies, and a series of recommended strategies that jurisdictions can pursue, with Metro support, to realize equitable TOCs in their community.</p> <p>The Baselines will be a resource for jurisdictions and communities that will identify opportunities to leverage the transit infrastructure investments, identify potential community-level risks and vulnerabilities (including around issues like gentrification and displacement), and recommended strategies on what jurisdictions can do, with Metro support, to realize equitable TOCs.</p>

Response to Comment PHT38 - Fidel Vasquez

Comment #	Response
PHT38-1	The Locally Preferred Alternative identified by the Metro Board does include an LRT station at Van Nuys Boulevard and San Fernando Road.
PHT38-2	One half of one percent of the overall project construction costs will be set aside for the integration of site-specific public art. The aesthetic design of stations and related transit facilities will aim to promote a sense of place and minimize adverse visual effects on surrounding neighborhoods. Metro project precedents are featured here: metro.net/art .
PHT38-3	The commenter's concerns about parking and support for Metro's efforts to date on the project have been noted for the record.

Response to Comment PHT39 - Mayra Soto

Comment #	Response
PHT39-1	The commenter's support for the proposed project is noted for the record by Metro. Also, please note that Metro will work closely with an art advisory group composed of local community representatives throughout the implementation of the project art program. An artist selection panel, which will include arts professionals connected to the project corridor communities, will make recommendations for the commission of artists.
PHT39-2	The commenter's suggestion that knocking on doors and speaking in person to residents and business owners is the most effective way to conduct outreach and inform the community is noted for the record and will be considered by Metro when conducting further outreach on the proposed project and other Metro projects.

Response to Comment PHT40 - Kristian Storli

Comment #	Response
PHT40-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT with MSF Option B has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative by Metro. Please see the responses to Master Comments MC-1 and MC-2 for a discussion of the reasons for selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative and MSF Option B. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-6 for a discussion of the measures required by law to ensure displaced property owners are compensated and treated equitably. Also, please see Section 4.2, <i>Real Estate and Acquisitions</i> , of this FEIS/FEIR.

Response to Comment PHT41 - Ivan Gomez

Comment #	Response
PHT41-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site. Also, please note that the LADWP property referenced in the comment was considered by Metro as a possible location for a maintenance and storage facility. However, the site was deemed difficult to access for light rail and LADWP informed Metro that it planned to begin construction on the site soon for the “Mid Valley Water Facility” project.
PHT41-2	Please see the response to comment PHT41-1 above.
PHT41-3	Please see the response to comment PHT41-1 above.

Response to Comment PHT42 - Michelle Klein-Hass

Comment #	Response
PHT42-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1. MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PHT42-2	The commenter’s suggestion that the bicycle lanes along Van Nuys Boulevard be relocated to Woodman Avenue is noted for the record. Also please note that two parallel corridors have been identified for consideration and approval by the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) as bike friendly corridors. These include Filmore Street to the west and Pierce Street to the east. Both of these streets can be developed as Class III Bike Friendly streets by striping sharrows and providing signage. Metro will also continue to work with LADOT to identify, to the extent feasible, replacement locations for Class II bike lanes that meet the goals and policies in the City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan (see mitigation measure MM-TRA-7 in Section 3.3.4.2).

Response to Comment PHT43 - Alf Temme

Comment #	Response
PHT43-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHT43-2	The commenter’s suggestion that one-way streets and roundabouts be considered as ways to mitigate traffic impacts is noted for the record by Metro.
PHT43-3	The commenter’s suggestion that an app be developed to match people with jobs closer to their homes is beyond the scope of the proposed project but is noted for the record by Metro.

Response to Comment PHT44 - Jason Ackerman

Comment #	Response
PHT44-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred maintenance and storage facility (MSF) site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PHT44-2	<p>Please see the response to comment PHT44-1 above.</p> <p>Also, please note that potential sites for the placement of an LRT MSF are based on location in relation to a proposed alignment, surrounding land use, site size, geometry, and number of properties needed for acquisition. The availability and cost of land are also factors that would be considered at a later stage of study along with potential construction scenarios.</p> <p>MSF sites such as A, B, and C are in close proximity to the alignment so as to not require the construction of extensive additional track to transfer vehicles from the mainline to the facility and vice versa. The close proximity minimizes deadhead miles and hours, which is defined as the non-revenue distance and time from the end of the service route to the MSF. This in turn will reduce operations and maintenance costs in the form of electrical energy, miles traveled and vehicle maintenance required, and operator time. The Metro team determined that the site identified by the commenter did not meet any of these criteria.</p>
PHT44-3	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative by the Metro Board of Directors. The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated from consideration due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and because it would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, right-of-way acquisition, and traffic impacts. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHT45 - Robert Serra

Comment #	Response
PHT45-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PHT46 - Issaian Haick

Comment #	Response
PHT46-1	<p>Although economic impacts are not considered to be significant impacts on the environment under CEQA, a discussion of economic impacts is required under NEPA. In accordance with NEPA, it's acknowledged that the removal of on-street parking could have an adverse economic impacts on local businesses along Van Nuys Boulevard.</p> <p>Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-3 for a discussion of the proposed project's parking impacts.</p>

Comment #	Response
PHT46-2	Metro is not proposing to construct public parking lots as part of the proposed project. For a discussion of the Locally Preferred Alternative's (Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT) parking impacts, please see the response to Master Comment MC-3.
PHT46-3	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative by the Metro Board of Directors. The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated from consideration due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and because it would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, right-of-way acquisition, and traffic impacts. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHT47 - Lisa Dryer

Comment #	Response
PHT47-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PHT47-2	The LADWP property referenced in the comment was considered by Metro as a possible location for a maintenance and storage facility. However, the site was deemed difficult to access for light rail and LADWP informed Metro that it planned to begin construction on the site soon for the "Mid Valley Water Facility" project.
PHT47-3	The DEIS/DEIR and this FEIS/FEIR describe the adverse impacts of the proposed project alternatives, including the economic impacts due right-of-way acquisitions and resulting displacement of existing businesses. Please see Section 4.3, Economic and Fiscal Impacts, for more details.

Response to Comment PHT48 - Marilyn Balduff

Comment #	Response
PHT48-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site. Also please see the response to comment PHT47-2 above.

Response to Comment PHT49 - Darrell Clark

Comment #	Response
PHT49-1	Extending the proposed project to the south to provide access to UCLA and LAX is beyond the scope of the proposed project. However, alternatives that would provide a transit connection between the San Fernando Valley and west Los Angeles are being studied as part of the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project, which likely one-day would connect with the ESFVTC project. Please note, however, that the mode and alignment for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor project have not been determined. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-5.
PHT49-2	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative by the Metro Board of Directors. The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated from consideration due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and because it would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, and traffic impacts. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHT49-3	<p>Please see the response to Master Comment MC-2 for a discussion of how MSF Option B was identified as the preferred site for the MSF because it is strategically located at the mid-point of the alignment, is the only option that does not affect residential properties, and because significant opposition to MSF Option A (adjacent to the Metro Orange Line) was expressed by the community.</p> <p>The LADWP property referenced in the comment was considered by Metro as a possible location for a maintenance and storage facility. However, the site was deemed difficult to access for light rail and LADWP informed Metro that it planned to begin construction on the site soon for the “Mid Valley Water Facility” project.</p>

Response to Comment PHT50 - Karl Armelin

Comment #	Response
PHT50-1	The commenter’s concerns are noted for the record by Metro, MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PHT51 - Signal Danisky

Comment #	Response
PHT51-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PHT51-2	Please see the response to PHT51-1 above.

Comment #	Response
PHT51-3	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative by the Metro Board of Directors. The subway portion of Alternative 4 has been eliminated from consideration due to it greatly delaying the timeline for delivery of the project and because it would not result in substantially faster travel times. The subway portion would also result in additional construction impacts, including noise, air quality, and traffic impacts. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHT52 - Michael Roberts

Comment #	Response
PHT52-1	<p>MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.</p> <p>The LADWP property referenced in the comment was considered by Metro as a possible location for a maintenance and storage facility. However, the site was deemed difficult to access for light rail and LADWP informed Metro that it planned to begin construction on the site soon for the “Mid Valley Water Facility” project.</p>

Response to Comment PHT53 - Garrett Marks

Comment #	Response
PHT53-1	<p>MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.</p> <p>Review of the Fourth Quarter 2019 San Fernando Valley and Ventura County Industrial Report indicates that the Central and East San Fernando submarkets have vacancy rates of 0.2% and 0.5%, respectively (Colliers International 2019). This is based on a total inventory for the San Fernando Valley of 89,924,400 square feet, while the Central and East San Fernando submarkets account for 13,742,200 and 50,529,500 square feet of existing inventory, respectively. There is an additional 332,300 square feet of industrial space currently under construction in the San Fernando Valley; however, none of the space currently under construction is located in the Central or East San Fernando Valley submarkets. The proposed acquisitions account for 0.52% of the total existing inventory of the San Fernando Valley and 0.73% of the Central and East San Fernando Valley submarkets.</p> <p>The ability of the displaced businesses to relocate in the immediate area will depend on the availability of suitable vacant properties. Since local and regional economic conditions drive market demand for commercial and light industrial space in the project study area, it’s not known how many of the displaced businesses will be able to or choose to relocate within the corridor or surrounding areas; however, it’s acknowledged that, based on the vacancy rate data provided above, industrial facilities, in particular, may have difficulty finding comparable properties near their existing locations. Displaced businesses (and residents), however, will be eligible for relocation assistance and compensation in accordance with federal and state regulations (please see Section 4.2 of this FEIS/FEIR for more information on relocation assistance and compensation as well as a detailed discussion of right-of-way impacts). Also, please note that Metro will strive to provide displaced businesses facing complex moves with adequate time to minimize relocation hardships. Metro will work with these displaced businesses to understand any relocation challenges and determine necessary professional services required for planning the relocation of their businesses.</p>

Comment #	Response
PHT53-2	Please see the response to comment PHT53-1 above and the response to Master Comment MC-6.

Response to Comment PHT54 - Monica Alexenko

Comment #	Response
PHT54-1	<p>Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.</p> <p>MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.</p> <p>Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-6 for a discussion of the proposed project's right-of-way acquisition and business displacement impacts. Also, please see Section 4.2, <i>Real Estate and Acquisitions</i>, of this FEIS/FEIR. Please refer to Chapter 3 of the FEIS/FEIR and the response to Master Comment MC-7 for a discussion of traffic impacts.</p>
PHT54-2	Please see the response to comment PHT54-1 above.

Response to Comment PHT55 - James Stewart

Comment #	Response
PHT55-1	<p>Please see the response to Master Comment MC-7 and Chapter 3 of the FEIS/FEIR for a discussion of the proposed project's traffic impacts.</p> <p>Also, please note that the number of travelers taking transit over cars is not available as this metric was not calculated.</p>

Response to Comment PHT56 - Steve Brecht

Comment #	Response
PHT56-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.
PHT56-2	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHT57 - Peter Scholz

Comment #	Response
PHT57-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PHT58 - Robert Falini

Comment #	Response
PHT58-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.
PHT58-2	The proposed project would operate along a 9.2-mile route from the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station on the north to the Van Nuys Metro Orange Line Station on the south.
PHT58-3	Please see the responses to Master Comment MC-5 for a discussion of the relationship between the proposed project and the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project. The Sepulveda Transit Corridor study is still in the early planning stage and a final mode and alignment, including a tunnel option, have not yet been determined.
PHT58-4	Please see the response to comment PHT58-3 above.
PHT58-5	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHT59 - Janice Marks

Comment #	Response
PHT59-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PHT60 - Evelyn Simonian

Comment #	Response
PHT60-1	MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.

Response to Comment PHT61 - Yvette Lopez-Ledesma

Comment #	Response
PHT61-1	Alternative 4 Modified: At-Grade LRT has been identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors. For further information on how the LPA was identified, please see the response to Master Comment MC-1.

Response to Comment PHT62 - Annie Vatov

Comment #	Response
PHT62-1	The petitions cited by the commenter opposing MSF Option A have been included in this FEIS/FEIR. MSF Option B has been identified as the preferred MSF site by the Metro Board of Directors. Also, please see the response to Master Comment MC-2, which identifies the reasons for selection of MSF Option B as the preferred MSF site.