

Appendix  
LAX Master Plan Final EIS

**A-1. Topical Response TR-EJ-4:  
Modifications to Responses to Comments  
Related to Environmental Justice For NEPA  
Purposes**

January 2005

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Aviation Administration

Prepared by:

PCR and CDM



---

## Table of Contents

1.	Introduction .....	1
2.	Background .....	1
	2.1 Refinements to Environmental Justice - Addendum to the Final EIR .....	1
	2.2 Refinements to Environmental Justice - Second Addendum to the Final EIR.....	1
3.	Summary of Final EIS EJ Findings and Comparison to Earlier Analyses .....	2
	3.1 General Approach and Methodology .....	2
	3.2 Aircraft Noise/Land Use .....	3
	3.3 Air Quality.....	5
	3.4 Human Health Risk .....	7
	3.5 Other Topics.....	8
	3.6 EJ Related Mitigation, Benefits, and Master Plan Commitments .....	8
4.	Revisions to Topical Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.....	9
	4.1 Revisions to Topical Responses.....	9
	4.2 Changes in Key EJ Related Cross-References.....	10
	4.3 Relevance of the Final EIS Environmental Justice Analysis to Individual Comments and Responses on the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR .....	10

## List of Tables

Table 1-1	Summary Comparison of Environmental Justice-Related Aircraft Noise Impacts (Final EIS vs. Final EIR) .....	4
Table 1-2	Summary Comparison of Environmental Justice-Related Air Quality Impacts (Final EIS vs. Final EIR) .....	6
Table 1-3	Matrix of Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4.....	11

## ***Table of Contents***

---

This page intentionally left blank.

---

# 1. INTRODUCTION

The Final EIR, which was certified by the City of Los Angeles prior to completion of the FAA's Final EIS, included an environmental justice analysis that was focused solely on findings for purposes of CEQA, while the FAA's analysis of environmental justice presented in the Final EIS is based solely on federal standards. As a result, the approach and methodology used in the Final EIS to comply with federal standards resulted in FAA findings on environmental justice that differ from those of LAWA as presented in the Final EIR and its addenda. The purpose of this appendix is to summarize refinements to the environmental justice analysis presented in the addenda to the Final EIR, and refinements and modifications to the analysis presented in Section A.2.2, *Environmental Justice*, of Volume A of the Final EIS. The differences between the EIR and EIS findings for environmental justice are also described. Finally, a discussion is provided of the relationship between these refinements and modifications to the environmental justice analysis, as presented in the addenda to the Final EIR and the Final EIS, and certain responses prepared to address public comments on the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

## 2. BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Refinements to Environmental Justice - Addendum to the Final EIR

The Addendum to the Final EIR for LAX Proposed Master Plan Improvements, September 2004, presented refinements to and clarification of information presented in Section 4.4.3, *Environmental Justice*, of the Final EIR with the primary focus on differences in approach and methodology for CEQA and NEPA purposes, and changes in terminology used to describe benefits proposed to address or offset disproportionately high and adverse effects on environmental justice under CEQA. These refinements and clarifications relating to environmental justice that were presented in the first Addendum to the Final EIR are summarized below.

**Clarifications Regarding Approach and Methodology.** The Addendum to the Final EIR indicated that the Final EIR erroneously stated that for certain impact categories, the 1996 baseline would serve as the basis for comparison of impacts and conclusions of significance for both NEPA and CEQA purposes. This misstatement was corrected in the addendum, which stated that LAWA's findings on environmental justice for purposes of CEQA are assessed using a 1996 environmental baseline, and that the FAA's findings on environmental justice use the No Action/No Project Alternative as the basis for comparison. The Addendum also indicated that this change did not alter the findings on environmental justice in the Final EIR, and that the FAA's findings on environmental justice, which may differ from those of the Final EIR, would be presented in the Final EIS.

**Refinement and Implementation of Environmental Justice Benefits.** As further described below in subsection 1.3.6, the Addendum to the Final EIR indicated that some of the environmental justice "benefits" in the Final EIR are now presented as "Master Plan commitments" in Section 4.6, *Air Quality*, and Section 4.3.2, *Off-Airport Surface Transportation*, of the Final EIR, in order to more closely correspond to the impacts they serve to address. The Addendum also noted that certain benefits are no longer proposed because further evaluation determined they were not related to impacts of the proposed Master Plan and were not feasible to fund and implement.

### 2.2 Refinements to Environmental Justice - Second Addendum to the Final EIR

The Second Addendum to the Final EIR for LAX Proposed Master Plan Improvements, December 2004, presented two new environmental justice mitigation measures to further address aircraft noise effects in minority and/or low-income communities, and refinements and clarifications that were made to the CEQA-related environmental justice analysis of air quality and human health risk. The refinements and clarifications presented in the Second Addendum to the Final EIR are summarized below.

## ***Appendix A-1 Topical Response TR-EJ-4: Modifications to Responses to Comments Related to Environmental Justice For NEPA Purposes***

---

**Refinement to Timing of Noise Mitigation for Affected Environmental Justice Communities.** The Second Addendum to the Final EIR, Section 3.1, *Refinements to Timing of Soundproofing Program for Affected Environmental Justice Communities*, included a refinement to Section 4.4.3, *Environmental Justice*, of the Final EIR, that added two new mitigation measures to help further address the potential for interim noise impacts on minority and/or low income communities that could occur prior to completion of soundproofing. The same mitigation measures are included in Section A.2.2, *Environmental Justice*, of Volume A of the Final EIS.

**Refinements and Clarifications to Air Quality and Human Health Risk Analyses.** As a result of the reevaluation of environmental justice impacts for the purposes of NEPA, refinements and clarifications were necessary to the CEQA-related environmental justice analysis of air quality and human health risk impacts included in the Section 4.4.3, *Environmental Justice*, of the Final EIR. These refinements and clarifications were provided in Appendix AD(2)-B of the Second Addendum to the Final EIR. Although the primary focus of the refinements and clarifications was on differences in approach and methodology for CEQA and NEPA purposes, the CEQA-related impacts and findings discussions were further modified to present more clear and concise conclusions relative to the potential for disproportionate effects on minority and/or low-income communities. The clarifications and findings of the environmental justice analysis pertaining to air quality and health risk that were presented in the Second Addendum to the Final EIR are summarized below in subsections 1.3.3 and 1.3.4, respectively.

**Clarifications Regarding Approach and Methodology.** Clarifications to the approach and methodology for the CEQA-related environmental justice analysis of air quality impacts include the following:

- ◆ The analysis pertaining to air quality focused on the relationship between air quality impacts from criteria pollutants and the potential for adverse health effects and evaluated the potential for the alternatives to result in disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority and/or low-income communities.
- ◆ Criteria pollutant emissions indicate the amount of pollutants entering the atmosphere from project-related sources, but do not necessarily correlate with the quantity of a particular pollutant in the air at the receptor. The quantity of a particular pollutant at a receptor is measured by the concentration of that pollutant in the air. Therefore, the determination as to adverse effect rested primarily on whether the build alternatives would result in exceedances of the health-based California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) or National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for criteria pollutants, which are based on pollutant concentrations at receptor locations.

### **3. SUMMARY OF FINAL EIS EJ FINDINGS AND COMPARISON TO EARLIER ANALYSES**

#### **3.1 General Approach and Methodology**

In contrast to the environmental justice analysis presented in the Final EIR and in the addenda to the Final EIR, the Final EIS analysis of environmental justice uses the No Action/No Project Alternative as the basis for comparison for identifying significant impacts and the potential for such impacts to result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and/or low-income communities. Furthermore, certain of the Final EIS analyses use federal thresholds, standards, and/or guidance for evaluating issues and establishing significance where the final EIR used state thresholds, standards, and/or guidance. Generally, under the NEPA environmental justice analysis, there would be fewer instances of disproportionately high and adverse effects among the build alternatives for aircraft noise/land use, air quality, and other topics compared to the results presented in the Final EIR CEQA analysis. Most notably, and in contrast to the Final EIR, the Final EIS analysis finds that there would be no disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and/or low-income communities under Alternative D. This finding for Alternative D applies to all of the resource categories evaluated under environmental justice. The outcome of the analysis of environmental justice presented in Section A.2.2, *Environmental Justice*, of Volume A of the Final EIS is summarized below for each of the topics evaluated, along with an indication of how the analysis and findings differ from those presented in the Final EIR and the addenda to the Final EIR.

## **3.2 Aircraft Noise/Land Use**

The evaluation of aircraft noise in Section A.2.2, *Environmental Justice*, of the Final EIS, uses the No Action/No Project Alternative as the basis for comparison for identifying the impacts of the build alternatives and the potential for such impacts to result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and/or low-income populations. In accordance with FAA Order 5050.4A, the NEPA analysis of environmental justice identifies significant noise impacts in instances where a build alternative would expose a noise-sensitive use to an increase of 1.5 CNEL or higher at or above the 65 CNEL noise level when compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. The analysis also identifies noise-sensitive uses in minority and/or low-income areas that would be exposed to 65 CNEL noise levels under the build alternatives in comparison to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Although these effects are considered adverse, they are not considered significant. Based on this methodology, the following summarizes the findings for aircraft noise presented in Section A.2.2, *Environmental Justice*, of the Final EIS:

- ◆ Significant impacts, as defined by a 1.5 CNEL or higher increase at or above the 65 CNEL, would occur under Alternatives A, B, and C compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative with the majority of impacts occurring in minority/and or and low-income communities.
- ◆ For Alternatives A, B, and C these impacts on minority and/or low-income communities are considered disproportionately high and adverse for residential populations and public schools prior to implementation of mitigation measures.
- ◆ Adverse impacts, defined by exposure of noise-sensitive uses to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels would occur under Alternatives A, B, and C compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. The majority of these adverse impacts would occur in minority and/or low-income communities.
- ◆ Adverse impacts under Alternatives A, B, and C, include both an overall increase in population exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels and new exposure to these noise levels within minority and/or low-income areas when compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative.
- ◆ For Alternatives A, B, and C, mitigation measures presented in the Final EIR and the addenda to the Final EIR would address both significant and adverse impacts associated with aircraft noise, including two new environmental justice measures developed to address the potential for adverse interim noise effects within minority and/or low-income areas prior to completion of soundproofing. However, if the availability of comprehensive mitigation is not sufficient to avoid or minimize the aircraft noise impacts, Alternatives A, B, and C would still have some residual disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority and/or low-income populations.
- ◆ Under Alternative D, no significant noise impacts are anticipated within minority and/or low-income communities as no noise-sensitive uses within these areas would experience an increase in noise of 1.5 CNEL or higher at or above the 65 CNEL noise level.
- ◆ Alternative D would result in an overall reduction in population exposed to 65 CNEL or higher noise levels in minority and/or low-income communities compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. There would be adverse impacts under Alternative D as some noise-sensitive uses in minority and/or low-income areas would be newly exposed to noise levels of 65 CNEL or greater compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative, however, there would be a greater overall reduction in the number of noise sensitive land uses in minority and/or low-income areas exposed to these noise levels..
- ◆ Although Alternative D would not result in significant aircraft noise impacts in minority and/or low-income communities, would not have a disproportionately high and adverse noise effect on these communities, and would provide a reduction in overall adverse noise impacts in these areas compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative, mitigation measures proposed by LAWA for CEQA purposes and that would also address adverse impacts are identified in the Final EIS. Those measures would mitigate adverse impacts, which are considered to be significant impacts under the CEQA analysis and incidentally provide benefits for persons identified as newly exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels within minority or low-income communities. This includes a new environmental justice mitigation measure developed to address the potential for adverse interim noise effects within minority and/or low-income areas prior to completion of soundproofing.
- ◆ Based on the above information, under the federal analysis, Alternative D does not result in any disproportionately high and adverse noise impacts within minority and/or low-income communities.

## **Appendix A-1 Topical Response TR-EJ-4: Modifications to Responses to Comments Related to Environmental Justice For NEPA Purposes**

Because the Final EIS analysis used the No Action/No Project Alternative as the basis of comparison versus the 1996 baseline used in the Final EIR CEQA analysis, and because the Final EIS analysis defined significant impacts based on an increase in noise of 1.5 CNEL or higher at or above the 65 CNEL noise level, versus the threshold in the CEQA analysis that is primarily based on new exposure to 65 CNEL noise levels, the Final EIS environmental justice findings for aircraft noise are notably different from those presented in the Final EIR. The basic differences between the NEPA and CEQA environmental justice findings for aircraft noise are described below and in **Table 1-1**, Summary Comparison of Environmental Justice-Related Aircraft Noise Impacts (Final EIS vs. Final EIR).

- ◆ In the Final EIS, Alternative D would not have a significant impact or a disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority and/or low-income communities as there would be no noise sensitive uses in these communities that would experience a 1.5 increase within the 65 CNEL contour compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative and there would be an overall reduction in adverse noise exposure in these areas. The CEQA analysis in the Final EIR and Final EIR Addenda identified disproportionately high and adverse effects due to aircraft noise for all of the build alternatives, including Alternative D, based on the disproportionate number of noise sensitive uses in minority and/or low-income communities that would be newly exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels. This CEQA finding was also based on recognition that mitigation measures might not be adequate to address all significant noise impacts disclosed in the CEQA analysis, particularly due to constraints within minority and/or low-income communities.
- ◆ Although the Final EIS also identified noise-sensitive uses that would be exposed to 65 CNEL or greater noise levels compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative, such noise impacts were considered to be adverse but not significant.

In addition to the above finding, it is also important to note that the Final EIS environmental justice analysis does not include the analysis of single event aircraft noise presented in the Final EIR; this analysis is solely applicable to CEQA, as there are no federal standards or criteria for single event aircraft noise. Also, the Final EIS environmental justice analysis does not rely on Master Plan commitments to support its findings regarding disproportionately high and adverse effects.

Beyond the differences in findings and approach outlined above, both the NEPA and CEQA analyses similarly identified the potential for disproportionately high and adverse effects associated with aircraft noise for Alternative A, Alternative B, and Alternative C before and after implementation of mitigation measures.

**Table 1-1**

**Summary Comparison of Environmental Justice-Related Aircraft Noise Impacts (Final EIS vs. Final EIR)**

	<b>Final EIS</b>	<b>Final EIR</b>
<b>Findings - Disproportionately High &amp; Adverse Effects</b>		
Alternative A		
- Residential	Yes	Yes
- Public Schools	Yes	Yes
- Libraries	No	Yes
Alternative B		
- Residential	Yes	Yes
- Public Schools	Yes	Yes
- Libraries	Yes	Yes
Alternative C		
- Residential	Yes	Yes
- Public Schools	Yes	Yes
- Libraries	No	Yes
Alternative D		
- Residential	No	Yes
- Public Schools	No	Yes
- Libraries	No	No

Source: PCR 2005.



### **3.3 Air Quality**

As with the aircraft noise/land use analysis, the evaluation of air quality in the Final EIS environmental justice section uses the No Action/No Project Alternative as the basis for comparison for identifying the significant impacts of the build alternatives and the potential for such impacts to result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and/or low-income populations. Similar to the CEQA analysis, the NEPA analysis focused on the relationship between air quality impacts from criteria pollutants and the potential for adverse health effects and evaluated the potential for the alternatives to result in disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority and/or low-income communities. Also similar to the CEQA analysis, for the determination of significance, the NEPA analysis relies upon the concentration of criteria pollutants measured in the air. However, unlike the CEQA analysis, for the NEPA analysis, the determination as to adverse effect is based solely on whether the build alternatives would result in exceedances of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for criteria pollutants; state ambient air quality standards are not considered. Based on this methodology, the following provides a summary of the findings for air quality presented in the environmental justice section of the Final EIS:

- ◆ Under all the build alternatives, higher ozone levels could result from increased NO<sub>x</sub> emissions associated with aircraft operations. Because ozone is formed through a complex array of photochemical reactions in the atmosphere, however, resulting ozone concentrations are regional in nature and often realized far from the emission source. Therefore, the increased NO<sub>x</sub> emissions are not expected to contribute to increased ozone concentrations that would result in disproportionately high and adverse impacts to the minority and/or low-income populations within the study area.
- ◆ Under Alternatives A, B, and C, exceedances of the PM<sub>10</sub> NAAQS are not expected to fall within minority and/or low-income communities, although, in the absence of conclusive data, it is possible that these exceedances could occur within minority and/or low-income communities, and that pollutant concentrations could be disproportionately high and adverse.
- ◆ Under Alternative A, the exceedance of the CO NAAQS is predicted to occur in areas located away from minority and/or low-income populations, and, due to the localized nature of CO, is not expected to result in disproportionately high and adverse effects in minority and/or low-income communities.
- ◆ Under Alternative A, predicted exceedances of the NAAQS for NO<sub>2</sub> in the Interim Year are not expected to occur within minority and/or low-income communities, although, in the absence of conclusive data, it is possible that these exceedances could occur within minority and/or low-income communities, and that pollutant concentrations could be disproportionately high and adverse.
- ◆ Under Alternatives B and C, predicted exceedances of the NAAQS for NO<sub>2</sub> in the Interim Year are expected to occur within minority and/or low-income communities, with the potential to cause irritation to mucous membranes (eyes and respiratory system) of sensitive individuals. The Interim Year exceedance of the NAAQS for NO<sub>2</sub> under Alternatives B and C is expected to result in disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority and/or low-income communities.
- ◆ Pollutant concentrations under Alternative D are predicted to be lower than the NAAQS for all criteria pollutants in both the Interim Year and 2015. As a result, adverse health impacts to the minority and/or low-income populations within the study area are not anticipated. As there would be no exceedances of the NAAQS and no significant impacts, there is no potential for disproportionately high and adverse impacts.
- ◆ Under all the build alternatives, cumulative exposure to ozone and other criteria pollutants that are linked to chronic respiratory illnesses may, in theory, result in adverse health effects in certain populations. However, the existence and nature of health impacts from cumulative exposure to air pollutants is speculative at present. In addition, available data on the health effects of air pollutants do not allow a quantitative analysis of this type of effect from exposure to multiple pollutants. Obtaining the data necessary to conduct such an analysis and evaluate the potential for disproportionate impacts on minority and/or low-income individuals would require long-term health studies of a kind well outside the scope of a NEPA document.

Because the Final EIS relies upon exceedances of the NAAQS only, unlike the Final EIR, which relied upon exceedances of the NAAQS as well as the CAAQS, the Final EIS environmental justice findings for air quality are different from those presented in the Final EIR. The basic differences between the NEPA

## Appendix A-1 Topical Response TR-EJ-4: Modifications to Responses to Comments Related to Environmental Justice For NEPA Purposes

and CEQA environmental justice findings for air quality are summarized below and in **Table 1-2**, Summary Comparison of Environmental Justice Related Air Quality Impacts (Final EIS vs. Final EIR).

- ◆ Both the Final EIR and the Final EIS expect that Alternative A would not result in disproportionate impacts to minority and/or low communities due to exceedances of CO (Interim Year), PM<sub>10</sub> (Interim Year under both NEPA and CEQA and 2015 under CEQA), and NO<sub>2</sub> (Interim Year), although the Final EIS concludes that, in the absence of definitive data, it is possible that disproportionate impacts associated with PM<sub>10</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub> could occur.
- ◆ Whereas the Final EIR found that Alternatives B and C would result in disproportionate impacts to minority and/or low-income communities due to exceedances of PM<sub>10</sub> (Interim Year under both NEPA and CEQA and 2015 under CEQA), the Final EIS found that these alternatives are not expected result in disproportionate impacts due to these exceedances, although it was concluded that, in the absence of definitive data, it is possible that disproportionate impacts could occur.
- ◆ In the Final EIS, air quality impacts under Alternative D would not result in disproportionate effects on minority and/or low-income communities in the study area because pollutant concentrations under Alternative D would be lower than the NAAQS for all criteria pollutants in both the Interim Year and 2015. In the Final EIR, Alternative D would result in predicted exceedances of the CAAQS for PM<sub>10</sub>, which would occur disproportionately in minority and/or low-income communities in the study area.

**Table 1-2**

**Summary Comparison of Environmental Justice-Related Air Quality Impacts  
(Final EIS vs. Final EIR)**

	<b>Final EIS</b>	<b>Final EIR</b>
<b>Approach &amp; Methodology</b>		
Threshold of Significance	Exceedances of NAAQS	Exceedances of NAAQS or CAAQS
Findings - Disproportionately High & Adverse Effects		
Alternative A		
- NO <sub>x</sub> emissions (related to increased ozone)	No	No
- PM <sub>10</sub> concentrations	Possible	No
- NO <sub>2</sub> concentrations	Possible	No
- CO	No	No
- Cumulative exposure to multiple criteria pollutants	Cannot be determined based on available data	Cannot be determined based on available data
<b>Alternative B</b>		
- NO <sub>x</sub> emissions (related to increased ozone)	No	No
- PM <sub>10</sub> concentrations	Possible	Yes
- NO <sub>2</sub> concentrations	Yes <sup>1</sup>	Yes <sup>1</sup>
- CO	No	No
- Cumulative exposure to multiple criteria pollutants	Cannot be determined based on available data	Cannot be determined based on available data
<b>Alternative C</b>		
- NO <sub>x</sub> emissions (related to increased ozone)	No	No
- PM <sub>10</sub> concentrations	Possible	Yes
- NO <sub>2</sub> concentrations	Yes <sup>1</sup>	Yes <sup>1</sup>
- CO	No	No
- Cumulative exposure to multiple criteria pollutants	Cannot be determined based on available data	Cannot be determined based on available data
Alternative D		
- NO <sub>x</sub> emissions (related to increased ozone)	No	No
- PM <sub>10</sub> concentrations	No	Yes
- NO <sub>2</sub> concentrations	No	No
- CO	No	No
- Cumulative exposure to multiple criteria pollutants	Cannot be determined based on available data	Cannot be determined based on available data

<sup>1</sup> Interim Year only.

Source: CDM 2005.

## **3.4 Human Health Risk**

The Final EIS includes a discussion of health risks based on the findings of the Human Health Risk Assessment prepared pursuant to State of California requirements as part of the Final EIR. At present, there are no federal standards regarding exposure to toxic air pollutants (TAPs), which are the focus of study for purposes of conducting human health risk assessments. In addition, the data that would be necessary to make conclusive statements regarding certain health risks associated with TAPs are not available at this time. As a result, information concerning cancer and non-cancer health risks from the Human Health Risk Assessment of the Final EIR, which was prepared in compliance with CEQA and is based upon CEQA thresholds of significance, is provided as part of the environmental justice analysis in the Final EIS for disclosure purposes only and no findings are made regarding the potential for disproportionately high and adverse impacts. As with the air quality analysis, the discussion of human health risk in the Final EIS environmental justice section uses the No Action/No Project Alternative as the basis for comparison for identifying the significant impacts of the build alternatives. Based on this methodology, the discussion below provides a summary of the human health risk impacts disclosed in the environmental justice section of the Final EIS. These disclosures are based upon impacts following the implementation of proposed mitigation measures.

- ◆ Incremental cancer risks would occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative in both the Interim Year and 2015. These risks would occur in a large area extending east-northeast from the east end of the north runway, within minority and/or low-income communities.
- ◆ Alternatives A, B, C, and D would result in substantially lower incremental cancer risks in the Interim Year and 2015 compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative, including in areas of minority/low-income population.
- ◆ Under Alternatives A and D, incremental non-cancer chronic hazards would be lower than under the No Action/No Project Alternative in both the Interim Year and 2015.
- ◆ Under Alternatives B and C, incremental non-cancer chronic hazards would increase slightly in minority and/or low-income areas compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative in 2015. These hazards would be lower than the No Action/No Project Alternative in the Interim Year.
- ◆ Incremental acute non-cancer health hazards under Alternatives A, B, and C would be similar in magnitude to the No Action/No Project Alternative, although the maximum hazard indices would be greater under each of these alternatives than the No Action/No Project Alternative, with the exception of on-site hazards under Alternative B.
- ◆ Incremental acute non-cancer health hazards under Alternative D would be lower than the No Action/No Project Alternative.
- ◆ Under Alternatives A, B, and C, increases in cumulative cancer risk would be slightly lower than under the No Action/No Project Alternative.
- ◆ Under Alternative D, cumulative cancer risks would mostly be beneficial; any adverse effects would be lower than those under the No Action/No Project Alternative.
- ◆ With regard to non-cancer risks, Alternatives A, B, and C could add to total chronic and acute non-cancer hazards. However, the potential for increases in acute hazards to fall disproportionately in minority and/or low-income communities cannot be ascertained in the current analysis.
- ◆ Alternative D might have beneficial effects with regard to chronic and acute non-cancer health hazards, and would reduce cumulative effects compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative.

Because the Final EIS analysis used the No Action/No Project Alternative as the basis of comparison, while the 1996 baseline is used in the Final EIR CEQA analysis, information pertaining to cancer risks and non-cancer health hazards differ between the two. However, as no conclusions regarding the potential for disproportionately high and adverse impacts were made in the Final EIS due to the absence of federal standards for ambient concentrations of toxic air pollutants and for assessing potential acute non-cancer health hazards, a comparison of environmental justice findings cannot be made.

## **3.5 Other Topics**

In addition to the analyses for aircraft noise/land use, air quality, and human health risk, Section A.2.2, *Environmental Justice*, of the Final EIS, evaluated the potential for disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and/or low-income communities associated with Surface Transportation, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, Construction Impacts, Historic and Cultural Resources, Light Emissions, and Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics. Although some of the quantitative data related to these analyses changed in the Final EIS due to use of the No Action/No Project Alternative as the basis of comparison, the basic conclusions regarding disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and/or low-income communities remain the same. Similar to the Final EIR, for all of the build alternatives the Final EIS environmental justice analysis indicates there would be no disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and/or low-income communities associated with Surface Transportation, Relocation of Residences and Businesses, Construction Impacts, Historic and Cultural Resources, Light Emissions, and Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics. Further details regarding the evaluations of these topics are provided in Section A.2.2, *Environmental Justice*, of the Final EIS.

## **3.6 EJ Related Mitigation, Benefits, and Master Plan Commitments**

Section 4.4.3, *Environmental Justice*, of the Final EIR, referenced Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures presented in other sections of the document that addressed significant physical impacts of the proposed project that had the potential to fall disproportionately on minority and/or low-income communities. The Final EIR section also presented a set of environmental justice "benefits" that went beyond the Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures from other sections of the Final EIR. The Addendum to the Final EIR indicated that some of the environmental justice "benefits" are now presented as "Master Plan commitments" in Section 4.6, *Air Quality*, and Section 4.3.2, *Off-Airport Surface Transportation*, of the Final EIR, in order to more closely correspond to the impacts they serve to address. Specifically, three benefits relating to air quality were incorporated into Section 4.6, *Air Quality*, of the Final EIR as Master Plan commitments. These include Master Plan Commitment AQ-1, Air Quality Source Apportionment Study (previously listed as an Air Toxic Study benefit), Master Plan Commitment AQ-2, School Air Filters, and Master Plan Commitment AQ-3, Mobile Health Research Lab (previously listed as a Mobile Health Clinic benefit). Benefits that would expand Gateway LAX Improvements/Greening of Impacted Communities (including Roadway Improvements, Special Landscaping, and Street Signage) were incorporated into Section 4.3.2, *Off-Airport Surface Transportation*, of the Final EIR as Master Plan commitments. The Addendum to the Final EIR also noted that the benefits for Neighborhood Cultural/Artistic Projects, a Nature Center, and Health Risk Assessments were no longer proposed, because further evaluation determined they were not related to impacts of the proposed Master Plan and were not feasible to fund and implement. Consistent with the Final EIR, the Addendum indicated that all of the proposals for what were termed benefits may be influenced by funding constraints, such as legal limitations placed on the use of airport revenue, although LAWA will investigate, pursue, and implement such proposals as feasible and allowable by law. Regarding mitigation measures, the Second Addendum to the Final EIR included two new environmental justice mitigation measures to help further address the potential for interim aircraft noise impacts on minority and/or low income communities that could occur prior to completion of soundproofing. This measure facilitates completion of residential soundproofing in minority and/or low-income to the extent feasible prior to commencing operations on new runways under Alternatives A, B, C, and D.

The approach to environmental justice in the Final EIS reflects the following differences in the treatment and applicability of mitigation measures and Master Plan Commitments compared to the Final EIR and Final EIR addenda:

- ◆ The Master Plan commitments included in LAWA's Environmental Justice Program are not a component of the FAA's environmental justice analysis, and do not influence its findings. They are presented in the Final EIS to reflect LAWA's efforts to address environmental justice under CEQA through their Environmental Justice Program.

## **Appendix A-1 Topical Response TR-EJ-4: Modifications to Responses to Comments Related to Environmental Justice For NEPA Purposes**

---

- ◆ Single event noise impacts related to sleep disturbance and classroom disruption as evaluated and identified in the Final EIR, along with their corresponding mitigation measures, do not apply to the FAA's environmental justice analysis as there are no federal standards or criteria for single event noise.

Despite the noted differences in the treatment and applicability of mitigation measures and Master Plan Commitments in the Final EIS, LAWA has indicated its intention to implement as feasible the Environmental Justice Program proposed in the Final EIR and in the Final EIR addenda, to address environmental justice concerns under CEQA.

### **4. REVISIONS TO TOPICAL RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIS/EIR AND SUPPLEMENT TO THE DRAFT EIS/EIR**

The following discussions describe how Section A.2.2, *Environmental Justice*, of Volume A of the Final EIS modifies or refines the Environmental Justice-related topical responses contained in the Part II of the Final EIS. For each subject Environmental Justice-related topical response, the comments and general concerns that led to development of the topical response will be summarized and the changes to the response triggered by the FEIS EJ analyses will be described.

#### **4.1 Revisions to Topical Responses**

The refinements to the CEQA analysis of environmental justice and the findings of the new NEPA-based environmental justice analysis and their implications on responses to comments associated with environmental justice are described below as they relate to Topical Responses TR-EJ-1, Potential Air Quality and Health Risk Impacts on Low-Income and Minority Communities, and TR-EJ-2, Environmental Justice-Related Mitigation and Benefits.

##### **TR-EJ-1, Potential Air Quality and Health Risk Impacts on Low-Income and Minority Communities.**

As presented in Part II of the Final EIR, Topical Response TR-EJ-1 included a brief discussion of findings regarding air quality effects of Alternatives A, B, C, and D. As noted above, findings pursuant to CEQA were refined and clarified in the Second Addendum to the Final EIR, and new findings pursuant to NEPA are presented in the Final EIS. These findings are summarized in subsection 1.3 of this appendix. Topical Response TR-EJ-1 also presented environmental justice findings pertaining to human health risk. For purposes of CEQA, environmental justice findings pertaining to human health risk were refined and clarified in the Second Addendum, and summarized in this Appendix. For purposes of NEPA, as noted above, due to the absence of federal standards for ambient concentrations of toxic air pollutants and for assessing potential acute non-cancer health hazards, no findings regarding the potential for disproportionately high and adverse impacts are made in the Final EIS.

**TR-EJ-2, Environmental Justice-Related Mitigation and Benefits.** As presented in Part II of the Final EIR, Topical Response TR-EJ-2 addressed environmental justice-related comments received during the 295-day review period for the Draft EIS/EIR and the 120-day review period for the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, including comments received during the environmental justice community outreach process; petitions from individuals or organizations; and agency/public comments of similar nature.

Many of the comments requested a detailed environmental justice program or questioned the mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR. Others consisted of recommendations for possible mitigation measures or benefits such as the need for youth/education programs; business and employment assistance; more schools; libraries; and other public services. The topical response described where and how such concerns were initially addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR, and were further addressed in the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR and the Final EIR.

The refinements and modifications that have occurred since the Final EIR was prepared that relate to the environmental justice benefits and mitigation measures presented in TR-EJ-2, are reflected in the addenda to the Final EIR and in Section A.2.2, *Environmental Justice*, of the Final EIS. Generally, the Environmental Justice Program proposed by LAWA remains similar to what was presented in the Final EIR, although the applicability of Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures to environmental

## **Appendix A-1 Topical Response TR-EJ-4: Modifications to Responses to Comments Related to Environmental Justice For NEPA Purposes**

---

justice differs between the Final EIR and the Final EIS. The refinements and modifications to environmental justice benefits and mitigation measures presented in TR-EJ-2 are summarized as follows:

- ◆ Environmental justice "benefits" identified in the Final EIR are now identified and referred to as "Master Plan commitments" with a number of the previously termed benefits relocated to Section 4.6, Air Quality, and Section 4.3.2, Off-Airport Surface Transportation, in order to more closely correspond to the impacts they serve to address.
- ◆ The benefits for Neighborhood Cultural/Artistic Projects, a Nature Center, and Health Risk Assessments are no longer proposed, because further evaluation determined they were not related to impacts of the proposed Master Plan and were not feasible to fund and implement.
- ◆ New environmental justice mitigation measures have been added to the Environmental Justice Program to address the potential for interim aircraft noise impacts on minority and/or low income communities that could occur prior to completion of soundproofing.
- ◆ The Final EIS environmental justice analysis does not rely on Master Plan commitments to support its findings regarding disproportionately high and adverse effects.
- ◆ Single event aircraft noise impacts related to sleep disturbance and classroom disruption as evaluated and identified in the Final EIR, along with corresponding mitigation measures, do not apply to the FAA's environmental justice analysis as there are no federal standards or criteria for single event noise.

### **4.2 Changes in Key EJ Related Cross-References**

Many of the responses to comments provided on the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, and provided in Part II of the Final EIS, cross-referenced the analysis provided in Section 4.3.3, *Environmental Justice*, of the Final EIS/EIR, as well as topical responses, including Topical Responses TR-EJ-1 and TR-EJ-2, also provided in Part II of the Final EIS. All cross-references to Section 4.3.3, *Environmental Justice*, of the Final EIS/EIR are hereby replaced with a cross reference to Section 4.3.3., *Environmental Justice*, of the Final EIR and Section A.3.2, *Environmental Justice (NEPA Analysis)*, of Volume A of the Final EIS. Similarly, all references to Topical Response TR-EJ-1 are hereby replaced by a reference to Topical Responses TR-EJ-1 (provided in Part II of the Final EIS) and TR-EJ-4 (provided herein); and all references to Topical Response TR-EJ-2 are hereby replaced by a reference to Topical Responses TR-EJ-2 (provided in Part II of the Final EIS) and TR-EJ-4 (provided herein).

### **4.3 Relevance of the Final EIS Environmental Justice Analysis to Individual Comments and Responses on the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR**

In order to ensure that those who commented on the Draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR understand and have access to information regarding refinements and modifications to the environmental justice analyses presented in the Final EIR addenda and in Section A.2.2, *Environmental Justice*, of Volume A of the Final EIS, a matrix has been prepared. The matrix is provided in **Table 1-3**, Matrix of Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4, below. The matrix lists individual Environmental Justice-related comments where the responses to comments on the Draft EIS/EIR and Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR have been modified or refined by information contained in Section A.2.2, *Environmental Justice*, of Volume A of the Final EIS and by information provided in this appendix to the Final EIS. The individual Environmental Justice comments are listed by comment number and include the name and affiliation of the commentator. Notations are made for each comment that direct the commentator or interested reader to topics discussed under subsection 1.3 of this appendix that are relevant to the original comment or response.

Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
AF00001-05	Manzanilla, Enrique	United States Environmental Protection Agency	•	•	•		•
AF00001-08	Manzanilla, Enrique	United States Environmental Protection Agency	•	•	•	•	
AF00001-11	Manzanilla, Enrique	United States Environmental Protection Agency	•	•	•		•
AF00001-17	Manzanilla, Enrique	United States Environmental Protection Agency	•				•
AF00001-41	Manzanilla, Enrique	United States Environmental Protection Agency	•				•
AF00001-42	Manzanilla, Enrique	United States Environmental Protection Agency	•				•
AF00001-43	Manzanilla, Enrique	United States Environmental Protection Agency	•				•
AF00001-48	Manzanilla, Enrique	United States Environmental Protection Agency	•	•			
AF00001-60	Manzanilla, Enrique	United States Environmental Protection Agency	•				
AS00001-56	Buswell, Stephen	State of California	•				•
AL00004-08	Hill, Tamara	Lennox School District Board of Trustees	•				•
AL00017-007	Dickerson, III, Esq., Charles	City of Inglewood	•	•			
AL00017-008	Dickerson, III, Esq., Charles	City of Inglewood	•				•
AL00017-009	Dickerson, III, Esq., Charles	City of Inglewood	•				•
AL00017-011	Dickerson, III, Esq., Charles	City of Inglewood	•				•
AL00017-012	Dickerson, III, Esq., Charles	City of Inglewood	•				•

Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
AL00017-066	Dickerson, III, Esq., Charles	City of Inglewood	•				•
AL00017-189	Dickerson, III, Esq., Charles	City of Inglewood	•		•		•
AL00017-190	Dickerson, III, Esq., Charles	City of Inglewood	•		•		
AL00017-191	Dickerson, III, Esq., Charles	City of Inglewood	•		•		•
AL00017-192	Dickerson, III, Esq., Charles	City of Inglewood	•			•	
AL00017-194	Dickerson, III, Esq., Charles	City of Inglewood	•		•		
AL00017-198	Dickerson, III, Esq., Charles	City of Inglewood	•				•
AL00017-199	Dickerson, III, Esq., Charles	City of Inglewood	•				•
AL00017-215	Dickerson, III, Esq., Charles	City of Inglewood	•				
AL00021-002	Urrutia, Ed	Lennox School District Board of Trustees	•				•
AL00021-004	Urrutia, Ed	Lennox School District Board of Trustees	•				•
AL00022-003	Antonovich, Michael	County of Los Angeles	•				
AL00022-020	Antonovich, Michael	County of Los Angeles	•				
AL00022-026	Antonovich, Michael	County of Los Angeles	•	•			
AL00022-042	Antonovich, Michael	County of Los Angeles	•				
AL00022-066	Antonovich, Michael	County of Los Angeles	•				•



Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
AL00022-067	Antonovich, Michael	County of Los Angeles	•				
AL00022-073	Antonovich, Michael	County of Los Angeles	•				
AL00022-076	Antonovich, Michael	County of Los Angeles	•				•
AL00022-077	Antonovich, Michael	County of Los Angeles	•	•	•	•	•
AL00022-093	Antonovich, Michael	County of Los Angeles	•	•			
AL00033-056	Taylor, Christy	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP	•				•
AL00033-125	Taylor, Christy	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP	•				•
AL00033-129	Taylor, Christy	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP	•	•			•
AL00033-130	Taylor, Christy	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP	•				•
AL00033-131	Taylor, Christy	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP	•	•			
AL00033-135	Taylor, Christy	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP	•				•
AL00034-06	Salek, Sima	Lennox School District	•				•
AL00034-07	Salek, Sima	Lennox School District	•	•			•
AL00034-15	Salek, Sima	Lennox School District	•		•		
AL00034-18	Salek, Sima	Lennox School District	•				
AL00034-22	Salek, Sima	Lennox School District	•				•

Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
AL00035-06	Salek, Sima	Inglewood Unified School District	•				•
AL00035-07	Salek, Sima	Inglewood Unified School District	•	•			•
AL00035-15	Salek, Sima	Inglewood Unified School District	•		•		
AL00035-17	Salek, Sima	Inglewood Unified School District	•				
AL00035-21	Salek, Sima	Inglewood Unified School District	•				•
AL00037-12	Gordon, Mike	City of El Segundo	•				
AL00040-095	Haley, Eric	Riverside County Transportation Commission	•				•
AL00051-86	Alonso, Francisco	City of Monterey Park	•				•
AL00051-89	Alonso, Francisco	City of Monterey Park	•				•
PC00055-01	Sligh, Aldene	None Provided	•				•
PC00178-02	Verduzco, Maria	Lennox Coordinating Council	•				•
PC00178-03	Verduzco, Maria	Lennox Coordinating Council	•				•
PC00178-04	Verduzco, Maria	Lennox Coordinating Council	•				•
PC00558-03	Brathwaite Burke, Yvonne	County of Los Angeles	•				•
PC00558-10	Brathwaite Burke, Yvonne	County of Los Angeles	•				•
PC00558-11	Brathwaite Burke, Yvonne	County of Los Angeles	•				•

Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
PC00558-14	Brathwaite Burke, Yvonne	County of Los Angeles	•				•
PC00577-04	Lyon, Ph.D., Irving	Senior Citizens Center	•		•		
PC00599-09	Beale, Olga	None Provided	•	•			•
PC00599-23	Beale, Olga	None Provided	•	•			•
PC00599-24	Beale, Olga	None Provided	•				•
PC00675-03	Martinez, Maria	None Provided	•				
PC00683-02	Verduzco, Maria	Lennox Coordinating Council	•				•
PC00683-03	Verduzco, Maria	Lennox Coordinating Council	•				•
PC00683-04	Verduzco, Maria	Lennox Coordinating Council	•				•
PC01018-32	De Deurwaerder, Charles	El Segundo Residents Association	•				•
PC01420-07	Horton, Jerome	California State Assembly	•				
PC01499-02	Tiddle, Martha	None Provided	•				
PC01499-04	Tiddle, Martha	None Provided	•				
PC01499-13	Tiddle, Martha	None Provided	•				•
PC01647-03	Martinez, J. Jesus	None Provided	•				
PC01662-13	Long, Clarene	None Provided	•				•

Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
PC01750-07	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01750-08	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01750-10	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01750-12	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01750-13	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01750-15	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01750-16	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01750-17	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01750-19	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01750-20	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01750-21	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01750-24	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•	•			•
PC01750-29	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01750-30	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01750-33	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01750-36	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•

Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
PC01750-37	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01750-39	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01750-41	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01750-42	No Author Identified,	South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce	•				•
PC01791-02	Le Falle, Ph.D., Jacqueline	None Provided	•				•
PC01819-02	Sligh, Aldene	None Provided	•				•
PC01881-013	Hefner, Roy	Los Angeles Intl. Airport Area Advisory Committee	•				•
PC01881-102	Hefner, Roy	Los Angeles Intl. Airport Area Advisory Committee	•				
PC01881-164	Hefner, Roy	Los Angeles Intl. Airport Area Advisory Committee	•				
PC01897-03	Cole, Walter	Congressmember Maxine Waters' Office	•	•	•		
PC01899-02	Murray, Sharon	Supervisor Yvonne Burke's Office	•				•
PC01903-08	Freytag, John	None Provided	•	•			
PC01904-03	Vandenburg, Tom	Radcliff, Frandsen & Dongell	•				•
PC01930-03	Baker, Elaine	None Provided	•	•			
PC01953-08	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•				•
PC01957-10	Lazzaretto, Dominic	A. C. Lazzaretto & Associates	•				

Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
PC02063-01	No Author Identified,	None Provided	•				•
PC02071-01	Miller, Dawn	None Provided	•				•
PC02073-03	No Author Identified,	None Provided	•				•
PC02079-02	Buchanan, Warren	None Provided	•				•
PC02081-03	No Author Identified,	None Provided	•				•
PC02083-01	No Author Identified,	None Provided	•				•
PC02087-01	No Author Identified,	None Provided	•				•
PC02203-002	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•	•			•
PC02203-020	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•	•			•
PC02203-021	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•	•			•
PC02203-023	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•	•			•
PC02203-024	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•	•			•
PC02203-027	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•	•			•
PC02203-028	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•	•			•
PC02203-029	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•				•
PC02203-032	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•		•		

Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
PC02203-047	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•	•			
PC02203-068	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•		•		
PC02203-107	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•	•			•
PC02203-115	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•	•			•
PC02203-126	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•	•			
PC02203-151	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•		•		
PC02203-157	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•				•
PC02203-161	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•	•			•
PC02203-172	Waters, Maxine	U.S. House of Representatives	•	•			•
PC02208-10	Nelson, David	Playa Vista	•				•
PC02221-05	Mendoza, Jerilyn Lopez	Environmental Defense	•				•
PC02221-07	Mendoza, Jerilyn Lopez	Environmental Defense	•				•
PC02221-08	Mendoza, Jerilyn Lopez	Environmental Defense	•				•
PC02221-09	Mendoza, Jerilyn Lopez	Environmental Defense	•	•	•	•	•
PC02221-10	Mendoza, Jerilyn Lopez	Environmental Defense	•				•
PC02221-11	Mendoza, Jerilyn Lopez	Environmental Defense	•				•

Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
PC02221-12	Mendoza, Jerilyn Lopez	Environmental Defense	•				•
PC02221-13	Mendoza, Jerilyn Lopez	Environmental Defense	•				•
PC02221-14	Mendoza, Jerilyn Lopez	Environmental Defense	•				•
PC02223-30	Campbell, M.E.S., M.P.P., Todd	Coalition for Clean Air	•				•
PC02223-31	Campbell, M.E.S., M.P.P., Todd	Coalition for Clean Air	•	•	•		•
PC02223-32	Campbell, M.E.S., M.P.P., Todd	Coalition for Clean Air	•				
PC02223-36	Campbell, M.E.S., M.P.P., Todd	Coalition for Clean Air	•	•			
PC02225-06	Teplitz, Pamela	None Provided	•				
PC02231-08	Park, Noel	Palisades Residents Association of San Pedro	•	•			•
PC02236-07	Kuhn, Scott	Communities for a Better Environment	•				•
PC02236-08	Kuhn, Scott	Communities for a Better Environment	•				•
PC02236-09	Kuhn, Scott	Communities for a Better Environment	•				•
PC02236-14	Kuhn, Scott	Communities for a Better Environment	•		•		•
PC02273-13	Jones, Donald	None Provided	•				
PC02302-17	Galanter, Ruth	City of Los Angeles	•		•		
PC02302-45	Galanter, Ruth	City of Los Angeles	•	•			



Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
PC02302-46	Galanter, Ruth	City of Los Angeles	•		•		
PC02330-02	Benveniste, Ph.D., Valerie	None Provided	•	•			
PC02401-091	No Author Identified,	Los Angeles Intl. Airport Area Advisory Committee	•				
PC02401-145	No Author Identified,	Los Angeles Intl. Airport Area Advisory Committee	•				•
PC02401-158	No Author Identified,	Los Angeles Intl. Airport Area Advisory Committee	•				
PC02523-04	Hough, Marcus	None Provided	•				•
PC02523-05	Hough, Marcus	None Provided	•				•
PC02523-06	Hough, Marcus	None Provided	•				•
PC02523-07	Hough, Marcus	None Provided	•				•
PC02523-08	Hough, Marcus	None Provided	•				•
PC02591-03	Tiddle, Martha	None Provided	•				
PC02591-05	Tiddle, Martha	None Provided	•				
PC03501-01	Galanter, Ruth	City of Los Angeles	•	•	•	•	•
PC03501-05	Galanter, Ruth	City of Los Angeles	•	•	•		•
PC03501-08	Galanter, Ruth	City of Los Angeles	•	•	•	•	
PC03501-09	Galanter, Ruth	City of Los Angeles	•				•

Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
PC03505-17	Stevens, Mike	LAX Expansion No!	•	•	•		
PC03523-08	Gordon, Bryan	None Provided	•				•
PC03564-02	Waters, Maxine	None Provided	•	•			•
PC03574-05	Cabrales, Luis	California League of Conservation Voters Education Fund	•				
PFH00001-01	Hemesa, Jose	None Provided	•				•
PFI00001-01	Rivas, Jose	L.U.L.A.C.	•				•
PFL00001-03	Watts, Mary	None Provided	•				
PFL00001-04	Watts, Mary	None Provided	•				•
PFL00001-05	Watts, Mary	None Provided	•				•
PFL00001-06	Watts, Mary	None Provided	•				•
PHF00013-03	Groza, Holly	County of Los Angeles	•				
PHF00013-06	Groza, Holly	County of Los Angeles	•				•
PHM00004-08	Lazzaretto, Andy	County of Los Angeles	•				•
PHM00027-05	Johnstone, Tom	Lennox School District	•				
PHM00027-07	Johnstone, Tom	Lennox School District	•				•
PHP00001-02	Brathwaite Burke, Yvonne	County of Los Angeles	•				

Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
PHP00001-04	Brathwaite Burke, Yvonne	County of Los Angeles	•				
PHP00003-10	Lazzaretto, Dominic	County of Los Angeles	•				
PHP00005-05	Dickerson, Esq., Charles	City of Inglewood	•		•		•
PHP00016-01	Sligh, Aldene	None Provided	•				•
PHP00016-03	Sligh, Aldene	None Provided	•				
PHP00019-09	Cole, Walter	Congressmember Maxine Waters' Office	•				•
PHP00038-01	Verduzco, Maria	Lennox Coordinating Council	•				•
PHP00038-02	Verduzco, Maria	Lennox Coordinating Council	•				•
PHMP00029-05	Cabrales, Luis	California League of Conservation Voters Education Fund	•				•
PHA00011-02	Blanks, Bobby	Congressmember Maxine Waters' Office	•	•			•
SAF00005-10	Manzanilla, Enrique	United States Environmental Protection Agency	•		•		
SAL00004-05	Janssen, David	County of Los Angeles	•	•			•
SAL00004-09	Janssen, David	County of Los Angeles	•	•			
SAL00010-05	Janssen, David	County of Los Angeles	•	•			•
SAL00010-09	Janssen, David	County of Los Angeles	•	•			
SAL00013-016	Janssen, David	County of Los Angeles	•	•			

Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
SAL00013-017	Janssen, David	County of Los Angeles	•	•			•
SAL00013-051	Janssen, David	County of Los Angeles	•				
SAL00013-053	Janssen, David	County of Los Angeles	•	•			
SAL00013-058	Janssen, David	County of Los Angeles	•	•			•
SAL00013-061	Janssen, David	County of Los Angeles	•	•			•
SAL00013-068	Janssen, David	County of Los Angeles	•	•			
SAL00015-051	Taylor, Christy	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP	•				•
SAL00015-052	Taylor, Christy	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP	•	•			
SAL00016-055	Dorn, Roosevelt	City of Inglewood	•	•	•	•	•
SAL00016-057	Dorn, Roosevelt	City of Inglewood	•				•
SAL00016-059	Dorn, Roosevelt	City of Inglewood	•				•
SAL00016-065	Dorn, Roosevelt	City of Inglewood	•				•
SAL00016-138	Dorn, Roosevelt	City of Inglewood	•				
SAL00016-142	Dorn, Roosevelt	City of Inglewood	•	•			•
SAL00016-143	Dorn, Roosevelt	City of Inglewood	•	•			
SAL00016-144	Dorn, Roosevelt	City of Inglewood	•				•

Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
SAL00016-145	Dorn, Roosevelt	City of Inglewood	•				•
SAL00016-146	Dorn, Roosevelt	City of Inglewood	•				•
SAL00016-147	Dorn, Roosevelt	City of Inglewood	•				•
SAL00016-148	Dorn, Roosevelt	City of Inglewood	•				•
SAL00017-04	None Provided, None Provided	Inglewood Unified School District	•	•			
SAL00017-05	None Provided, None Provided	Inglewood Unified School District	•				•
SAL00017-06	None Provided, None Provided	Inglewood Unified School District	•	•			
SAL00017-12	None Provided, None Provided	Inglewood Unified School District	•		•		
SAL00017-14	None Provided, None Provided	Inglewood Unified School District	•				
SAL00017-15	None Provided, None Provided	Inglewood Unified School District	•	•			•
SAL00018-04	None Provided, None Provided	Lennox School District	•	•			
SAL00018-05	None Provided, None Provided	Lennox School District	•				•
SAL00018-06	None Provided, None Provided	Lennox School District	•	•			
SAL00018-12	None Provided, None Provided	Lennox School District	•		•		
SAL00018-15	None Provided, None Provided	Lennox School District	•				
SAL00018-16	None Provided, None Provided	Lennox School District	•	•			•

Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
SPC00005-02	Hayes, Theresa	None Provided	•				•
SPC00064-16	Miscikowski, Cindy	City of Los Angeles	•				•
SPC00065-02	Burke, Yvonne	County of Los Angeles	•	•			•
SPC00065-06	Burke, Yvonne	County of Los Angeles	•	•			
SPC00071-01	Worthington, Emma	None Provided	•				•
SPC00074-04	Verduzco-Smith, Maria	None Provided	•	•			•
SPC00079-04	Rose, Harry	OSAGE Neighbors Association	•	•			•
SPC00095-01	Cerdos, Maria	None Provided	•	•	•		•
SPC00095-03	Cerdos, Maria	None Provided	•				•
SPC00095-04	Cerdos, Maria	None Provided	•				•
SPC00095-05	Cerdos, Maria	None Provided	•				•
SPC00131-04	Schneider, Denny	LAX Community Noise Roundtable	•	•			
SPC00141-04	Lindstrom, Dean	None Provided	•	•			
SPC00168-02	Nimrod, Nimrod	Self-Esteem and World Peace Association	•	•			•
SPC00218-01	Worthington, Emma	None Provided	•				•
SPC00273-09	Flynn, John	None Provided	•				•

Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
SPC00273-10	Flynn, John	None Provided	•	•			
SPC00275-53	Kenton, Jack	LAX Area Advisory Committee	•	•			
SPC00275-61	Kenton, Jack	LAX Area Advisory Committee	•	•			•
SPC00289-14	Galanter, Ruth	Galanter and Company	•				
SPC00292-08	Drollinger, Howard	H.B. Drollinger Co.	•	•			
SPC00292-09	Drollinger, Howard	H.B. Drollinger Co.	•	•			•
SPC00296-06	Lopez Mendoza, Jerilyn	LAX Coalition for Environmental, Economic and Educational Justice	•	•			•
SPC00296-16	Lopez Mendoza, Jerilyn	LAX Coalition for Environmental, Economic and Educational Justice	•				•
SPC00296-17	Lopez Mendoza, Jerilyn	LAX Coalition for Environmental, Economic and Educational Justice	•				•
SPC00296-18	Lopez Mendoza, Jerilyn	LAX Coalition for Environmental, Economic and Educational Justice	•				•
SPC00296-21	Lopez Mendoza, Jerilyn	LAX Coalition for Environmental, Economic and Educational Justice	•				•
SPC00296-22	Lopez Mendoza, Jerilyn	LAX Coalition for Environmental, Economic and Educational Justice	•				•
SPC00296-26	Lopez Mendoza, Jerilyn	LAX Coalition for Environmental, Economic and Educational Justice	•				•
SPC00296-27	Lopez Mendoza, Jerilyn	LAX Coalition for Environmental, Economic and Educational Justice	•	•	•		•
SPC00296-40	Lopez Mendoza, Jerilyn	LAX Coalition for Environmental, Economic and Educational Justice	•				•
SPC00307-13	Stevens, Mike	LAX Expansion No!	•	•			•

Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
SPC00307-15	Stevens, Mike	LAX Expansion No!	•	•			•
SPC00307-19	Stevens, Mike	LAX Expansion No!	•	•			
SPC00308-01	Parks, Bernard	City of Los Angeles	•				•
SPC00308-04	Parks, Bernard	City of Los Angeles	•				
SPC00308-31	Parks, Bernard	City of Los Angeles	•				•
SPHMP00003-04	Venti, Benjamin	City of Monterey Park	•				
SPHSP00018-02	Rose, Harry	None Provided	•				•
SPHF00003-02	Burke, Yvonne	County of Los Angeles	•	•			•
SPHF00003-05	Burke, Yvonne	County of Los Angeles	•	•			
SPHF00025-01	Porras, Carlos	Communities for a Better Environment	•				
SPHF00032-01	Worthington, Emma	None Provided	•				•
SPHF00040-04	Verduzco-Smith, Maria	Lennox Coordinating Council	•	•			•
SPHE00006-01	Worthington, Emma	None Provided	•				•
SPHE00007-01	Muhammad, Tony	Nation of Islam	•				•



Table 1-3 Matrix of Responses to Comments Modified or Refined by TR-EJ-4							
Comment ID	Author	Organization	General Approach and Methodology	Aircraft Noise/Land Use	Air Quality	Human Health Risk	EJ-Related Mitigation Benefits and Master Plan Commitments
SPHE00024-09	Solomon, Willie	None Provided	•				•
SPHE00045-01	Harris-Dawson, Marqueece	Community Coalition in South Central Los Angeles	•				•
SPHE00045-02	Harris-Dawson, Marqueece	Community Coalition in South Central Los Angeles	•				•
SPHE00049-01	Crittendon, Willie	Inglewood School District Board of Education	•				•

This page intentionally left blank.