

Attachment F

Correspondence



ARSAC Alliance for a Regional Solution to Airport Congestion
322 Culver Blvd., #231 Playa del Rey, CA 90293
www.regionalsolution.org 310-641-4199

March 14, 2013

via email: mchild@planning.lacounty.gov

Airport Land Use Commission
County of Los Angeles
320 W Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Case R2013-0396, Los Angeles International Airport (LAX)

Dear ALUC Members:

ARSAC, the Alliance for a Regional Solution to Airport Congestion, requests that ALUC reject Los Angeles World Airports' (LAWA) application (the "Application") for SPAS Amendments (i.e. LAX Plan, LAX Specific Plan, Noise Element, etc.) for LAX as incomplete. If ALUC does accept the Application, then it should declare the proposed SPAS Amendments changes as "inconsistent" with the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP).

This is our first comment letter as we have not received and reviewed all of the documentation LAWA has submitted. ARSAC will be sending you an additional letter.

ALUC should be very concerned with this Application as LAWA is not submitting the paperwork and required materials required for both California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) approvals. One of the key NEPA documents is the proposed Airport Layout Plan. Normally, the CEQA and NEPA processes would be done concurrently. This time, LAWA is obtaining CEQA level approvals first and then going back to the FAA to begin the NEPA process. Even though an Airport Layout Plan has not been submitted with the LAWA Application, LAWA has submitted a Final EIR approved by the Los Angeles Board of Airport Commissioners (BOAC) and the Los Angeles City Planning Commission (CPC). Both BOAC and the CPC have approved the EIR with the staff recommended Alternative 1 (260 feet north). Knowing that CEQA and NEPA are being done at different times, ALUC should reject the Application at this time and instruct LAWA to come back to ALUC once LAWA has a Final EIS ready for City Council and FAA approval. ALUC should not work in an absence of information. There may be information provided in the EIS not provided in the EIR. ALUC should have all of the facts before determining CLUP consistency.

The LAWA Application is being submitted for proposed SPAS Amendments to the LAX Plan, LAX Specific Plan and Noise Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan. However, the proposed changes are part of a larger airport master plan amendment which includes an EIR with a staff preferred alternative, Alternative 1, to move the northern most runway, 24 Right, 260 feet to the north and therefore closer to homes, schools, businesses and churches in Westchester/Playa del Rey. The runway move would also change the arrival flight path over Westchester, Inglewood and South Los Angeles. In



ARSAC Alliance for a Regional Solution to Airport Congestion
322 Culver Blvd., #231 Playa del Rey, CA 90293
www.regionalsolution.org 310-641-4199

moving the runway, thousands of people will be newly affected by aircraft noise, pollution, vibration and aircraft safety issues. The existing noise contour would be pushed further north. The Final EIR has a “mandatory finding of significance” of an increase of 1.5dB in noise. This falls within ALUC jurisdiction and should result in an inconsistency determination.

Issues with the LAX SPAS Final EIR.

1. CEQA. Although CEQA is not in the purview of ALUC’s authority, we bring this issue to your attention to demonstrate LAWA’s lack of sincerity in complying with CEQA and other commitments such as the Stipulated Settlement Agreement. We have attached three letters addressed to BOAC that discuss CEQA process violations as well as safety and other issues with the EIR.
2. Noise. As mentioned above, Alternative 1 would move the northern most runway, 24 Right, 260 feet to the north. The noise contour would be moved further north resulting in greater noise, pollution, vibration and safety hazards to people in Westchester/Playa del Rey, Inglewood and South Los Angeles who previously had not been impacted by LAX operations. The proposed runway move would create a permanent impact situation on these residents and their communities. While it may be possible to soundproof one’s home, it is not possible to soundproof one’s backyard for a child’s birthday party. In the EIR, LAWA has a mandatory finding of significance that Alternative 1 (260 feet north) would result in a 1.5 dB increase in noise. This is a key finding for ALUC. Again, ALUC should reject the Application or find the Application inconsistent with the CLUP due to the noise increase. LAWA may argue that Alternative 1 will result in less homes being exposed to noise. This is a “net” number that does not look at the homes newly exposed to the north. What LAWA is proposing in Alternative 1 is shifting the noise contour, not reducing the noise contour.
3. Safety. There are several safety issues that ALUC should consider:

North Airfield Safety Study

As noted in the authoritative “North Airfield Safety Study” (NASS) conducted by an Academic Panel of six top aviation safety professors with NASA, the existing LAX north airfield is extremely safe and increased runway separation cannot be justified for runway safety reasons alone. As the professors reported, increased runway separation would not provide any significant increase in safety. Essentially, in dealing in absolute numbers instead of percentages, the risk on the LAX North Airfield drops from 80 to 78 deaths in 200 years. Please see attached ARSAC letter for more discussion on runway safety.

Runway Protection Zones

See attached ARSAC letter and FAA Interim Guidance on Runway Protection Zones.



ARSAC Alliance for a Regional Solution to Airport Congestion
322 Culver Blvd., #231 Playa del Rey, CA 90293
www.regionalsolution.org 310-641-4199

Runway Construction Risks

All of the Alternatives that propose moving Runway 24 Right to the north (“north alternatives”) have the same construction risks:

- a. Manchester Tunnel under Runway 24 Right. This six-lane tunnel was intended to provide a second entrance to LAX in the 1960’s. The LAWA provided estimate of \$15 million is too low to fill in this tunnel.
- b. Argo Ditch. All of the north alternatives propose converting the Argo Ditch flood control channel into a concrete box culvert. LAWA proposes to build a water permeable top over the Argo Ditch. We don’t know of any airport in the world that has built a runway on top of an almost two-mile long ditch. We are gravely concerned that an aircraft accident on this proposed runway could result in air crash survivors being further injured or killed by falling into the proposed concrete box culvert.
- c. Building on wetlands. The north alternatives would build a runway on 1.33 acres of wetlands.
- d. Rerouting of Lincoln Boulevard. Lincoln Boulevard would be rerouted closer to Westchester Parkway and then brought below grade on in a tunnel near where it connects to Sepulveda Boulevard. It is estimated that Lincoln would need to be closed for two years. Lincoln Boulevard is a state highway, California State Highway 1. CalTrans did not respond to either the LAX SPAS Draft EIR or Final EIR. Moving Lincoln is also fraught with major underground issues. Two of the three main sewer lines that go to the Hyperion Sewage Treatment Plant go under Lincoln Boulevard. There are also many other utilities and oil pipelines that go under Lincoln as well as Sepulveda which cannot be re-routed. These lines are vital to the City of Los Angeles and the local economy.

We will be happy to discuss this case with you.

Sincerely,

QuickTime™ and a decompressor are needed to see this picture.

QuickTime™ and a decompressor are needed to see this picture.

Denny Schneider
President
(213) 675-1817
denny@welivefree.com

Robert Acherman
Vice President
(310) 927-2127
racherman@netvip.com

ATTACHMENTS:

Doug Carstens letters to BOAC, 1/30/2013 and 2/3/2013
ARSAC letter to BOAC, 1/31/2013
FAA Air Traffic Control A380 Procedure
FAA Interim Land Use Guidance for Runway Protection Zones

CHATTEN-BROWN & CARSTENS LLP

TELEPHONE:(310) 314-8040
FACSIMILE: (310) 314-8050

2200 PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY
SUITE 318
HERMOSA BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90254
www.cbcearthlaw.com

E-MAIL:
DPC@CBCEARTHLAW.COM

January 30, 2013

Board of Airport Commissioners
Los Angeles World Airports
One World Way
Los Angeles, CA 90045-5803

Re: Comments on Final Environmental Impact Report for Specific Plan
Amendment Study, SCH 1997061047

Honorable Commissioners:

On behalf of the Alliance for a Regional Solution for Airport Congestion (ARSAC), we provide these comments on the Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) prepared for the Specific Plan Amendment Study (“SPAS” or “Project”) at Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). Upon review of the FEIR’s responses to our comments and those of others, we conclude that LAWA may not legally approve the proposed Project on the basis of the FEIR and a statement of overriding considerations. The FEIR remains deficient in a number of areas and its responses to public comments.¹ Now that LAWA has identified a proposed project other than the environmentally superior Alternative 2, the EIR must be recirculated so the public and public agencies reviewing it can focus their comments on the proposed combination of Alternatives 1 and 9 that is recommended by staff.

Even if the FEIR were improved to legally sufficient standards, and was recirculated, LAWA may not approve a project that includes Alternative 2 rather than Alternative 1 on the basis of a statement of overriding considerations. Alternative 2 is feasible and avoids significant environmental impacts associated with Alternative 1 including significant impacts to air quality, exposure of people to significant noise, and avoidable biological resource and land use impacts associated with condemning properties north of the airport for northward runway movement.

For these reasons, we urge you to recirculate the EIR, to obtain and provide adequate information about the various impacts associated from the proposed project,

¹ Due to the short time available to review the lengthy FEIR since it was released last week, we incorporate all of our previous objections and do not waive any because they are not be mentioned in this letter.

including air quality, traffic, noise, biological resources, land use impacts, and the Lincoln Boulevard realignment including coordinating with Caltrans, and to choose Alternative 2, rather than Alternative 1, in combination with Alternative 9.

I. Recirculation is Required Now that a Proposed Project Has Been Identified That is Not the Environmentally Superior Alternative 2.

ARSAC objected that LAWA's failure to designate a single proposed project deprived the public of its ability to meaningfully review and comment on the draft EIR. (FEIR, p. 4-441.) The FEIR states that the staff recommended project, and therefore, the proposed project that is the subject of environmental review, includes the movement of the northern runway 260 feet to the north (260 North Alternative-Alternative 1). (FEIR, p. 2-1). Identification of the specific proposed project at this late date in the Final EIR rather than the Draft EIR defeats the purpose of CEQA to involve the public in a meaningful way in project review and modification to mitigate environmental damage.

An EIR is supposed to be an environmental "alarm bell" whose purpose it is to alert the public and its responsible officials to environmental changes before they have reached the point of no return. (*Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 392.)

LAWA's process of failing to designate a specific proposed project stifled the alarm bell and deprived the public of the ability to focus their comments on the proposed project earlier in the process. In early meetings about the Project, the public was not advised the LAWA was likely to choose the 260 North Alternative.² Attendance at meetings was low, though not sparse. However, after LAWA designated the 260 North as its preferred alternative, hundreds of people became aware of the actual nature of the proposed project and turned out to object to it. At the meeting held on January 8, 2013 at the Proud Bird, approximately 800 people attended, with "scores of residents" expressing opposition to the proposal that was made clear at that point, but had not been clear earlier when the DEIR was released. (<http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2013/01/lax-neighbors-question-north-runway-separation-plan.html>.)

The FEIR claims that the analysis of nine alternatives instead of a single proposed project comports with CEQA's requirements. (FEIR, p. 4-441.) However, this process defeated the public's ability to meaningfully participate in commenting on a single, identifiable, proposed project. LAWA claims that its process of giving what it calls a

² There is considerable evidence that LAWA staff knew that its recommendation would be the 260 North Alternative all along. The progression to the 260 feet north alternative is evident in PowerPoint presentations given by staff to BOAC.

component approach in a project description was upheld in *California Oak Foundation v. Regents of the University of California* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 227. (FEIR, p. 4-171, RTC SPAS-AL00007-6). However, *California Oaks* is significantly different since in that case, the public agency proposing the project disclosed the buildings that were proposed, and their locations. While it did not disclose the material that would be used to build them, their environmental impacts were still understandable and identifiable from the information given. Here, on the other hand, LAWA's description of nine different alternatives without any indication of which the public should focus attention and comments on was distracting and confusing.

CEQA Guideline section 15088.5 requires that an EIR be recirculated when significant new information is added such as "a new significant environmental impact would result from the project" or "The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate . . . that meaningful public review and comment were precluded." (CEQA Guidelines s. 15088.5.) To the extent the public could have believed LAWA would choose the less impactful and designated Environmentally Superior Alternative 2 (DEIR Table 4.7-2-8), possibly in combination with Alternative 9, rather than choosing the 260 North Alternative, the FEIR contains new information of new significant impacts which would result from the choice of the 260 North Alternative. Additionally, the draft EIR was fundamentally and basically inadequate in failing to identify a single propose project so that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. Therefore, recirculation of the EIR is required.

II. LAWA Would Violate the Settlement Agreement and CEQA by Rejecting Environmentally Superior Alternative 2.

ARSAC objected that the DEIR contradicted the Settlement Agreement signed in 2006 between LAWA and various petitioners including ARSAC because it emphasizes north runway movement, while failing to address traffic and other consequences, rather than focusing on alternatives that would provide solutions to the problems that the Yellow Light Projects were designed to address. (FEIR, p. 4-442.) The FEIR responds that the combination of Alternative 1 and Alternative 9 provides mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate significant impacts. (FEIR, p. 4-442.) However, the choice of Alternative 1 rather than Alternative 2 creates significant additional impacts that could be avoided by the choice of Alternative 2. These impacts, as we stated, would be on noise, vibration, air and water pollution, and aircraft safety hazards. (FEIR, p. 4-443.) The FEIR responds that such impacts would be created under all alternatives. (FEIR, p. 4-443.) However, they would be less under Alternative 2 compared to Alternative 1. Hence, Alternative 2 was correctly designated in the DEIR as the environmentally superior alternative.

Alternative 2 was identified in the Draft EIR as the Environmentally Superior

Alternative. (DEIR, p. 1-103 to 1-104.) It would eliminate the same Yellow-Light projects as Alternative 1 would, but would not require northerly movement of a runway, as Alternative 1 would. (DEIR, p. 2-14.) It was considered superior to the other alternatives, including Alternative 1, because it would result in few construction and operation-related air quality impacts, including greenhouse gas emissions; it would result in no biological resource impacts that would occur in connection with movement of the Argo channel associated with Alternative 1 and others; and it would result in fewer people being exposed to significant noise levels. (DEIR, p. 1-104.) Although not identified in this section of the DEIR, Alternative 2 would also avoid the potentially significant land use impact of requiring existing structures to be removed from the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) that is associated with Alternative 1. (DEIR, p. 4-522 [stating FAA may require existing structures to be removed]; FEIR, p. 4-444 [ARSAC objection to northward expansion requiring demolition of existing homes or businesses³].) The environmentally superior alternative 2 is feasible and it is preferable since it avoids impacts associated with Alternative 1. Therefore, LAWA may not approve Alternative 1 on the basis of a statement of overriding considerations.

CEQA requires public agencies to deny approval of a project with significant adverse effects when feasible alternatives (such as Alternative 2) or feasible mitigation measures can substantially lessen such effects. (Pub. Resources Code § 21002; *Sierra Club v. Gilroy City Council* (6th Dist. 1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 30, 41.) The Legislature has stated:

The Legislature finds and declares that it is the policy of the state that public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects. . . .

(Pub. Resources Code § 21002.) CEQA mandates that:

Pursuant to the policy stated in Sections 21002 and 21002.1, no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the Project is approved or carried out unless both of the following occur:

3 The FEIR asserts that the westward movement of the RPZ would mean homes are no longer in the RPZ, but it does not address the potential demolition of existing businesses. (FEIR, pp. 4-444 to 4-445.)

(a). . . (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations . . . make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

(Pub. Resources Code § 21081.) The Guidelines that implement CEQA restate this requirement. (Guidelines § 15091 (a)(3).) Therefore, LAWA may not legally approve Alternative 1 rather than Alternative 2 because the LAWA cannot substantiate the findings required by Public Resources Code section 21081 for the lack of a feasible, environmentally superior alternative.

III. Several Significant Impacts Could Be Mitigated or Avoided by Alternative 2, But Not Alternative 1.

A. Impacts on Communities East of LAX Will be More Severe Under Alternative 2 Than Under Alternative 1.

ARSAC objected that significant impacts would affect communities located east of LAX. (FEIR, p. 4-445, comment SPAS-PC00130-6.) The FEIR responded that “some or all SPAS alternatives would result in significant impacts after mitigation.” (FEIR, p. 4-445.) However, the FEIR does not acknowledge that, as stated in the DEIR, several impacts including air quality impacts would be more severe under Alternative 1 than they would be under Alternative 2. (DEIR, p. 1-104.)

B. More Detailed Analysis of the Impacts of Lincoln Boulevard Realignment Is Required.

ARSAC noted that runway movement northward as would occur with Alternative 1 would require relocation and potential tunneling of the busy Lincoln Boulevard (California State Highway 1), with widespread traffic impacts. (FEIR, p. 4-445.)

The FEIR evades answering questions about the planned realignment of Lincoln Boulevard by asserting that detailed analysis will be disclosed in a future project level environmental review and that the draft EIR is “a program-level document.” (FEIR, p. 4-59 to 4-60.) However, the fact that this EIR is labeled a “program” EIR rather than a “project” EIR matters little for purposes of the sufficiency of its analysis and informational value to the public. “The level of specificity of an EIR is determined by the nature of the project and the ‘rule of reason’ (*Laurel Heights [I]*, *supra*, 47 Cal.3d at p. 407 [253 Cal.Rptr. 426, 764 P.2d 278]), rather than any semantic label accorded to the EIR.” (*Al Larson Boat Shop, Inc. v. Board of Harbor Commissioners* (1993) 18 Cal.App.4th 729, 741-742; see also Guidelines, § 15146.) Here, the nature of the project

includes a planned runway realignment. Since sufficient specific information is available about the planned realignment including its approximate length of 540 linear feet, its location, and approximate depth of 30 feet (FEIR, p. 4-59), specific analysis should also have been included in the EIR not deferred to a future process. “An agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can.” (CEQA Guidelines § 15145.)

LAWA may not evade review of the Lincoln Boulevard Realignment or responding to public questions about it by deferring to possible, but uncertain, future CEQA review. Additionally, LAWA does not commit to a future EIR for the Lincoln Boulevard Realignment but rather vaguely refers to “project-specific CEQA review” that might be done by LAWA or by Caltrans, depending upon who has responsibility for ownership and control of that portion of road in the future. (FEIR, p. 4-61.) This is a vague deferral to an unspecified future form of environmental review by an undetermined agency. Such future review might result in a negative declaration or claim of exemption from CEQA. Thus, the FEIR’s deferral of analysis does not meet CEQA’s requirements for full disclosure of meaningful information.

C. Biological Resource Impacts Would Be More Significant Under Alternative 1 Than Alternative 2.

ARSAC objected that sensitive biological resources could be impacted by the relocation of navigational aids to support the relocated runway. (FEIR, p. 4-445.) The FEIR responded that such impacts would be mitigated with implementation of various measures. (FEIR, p. 4-445.) However, the effectiveness of the mitigation measures is not clear, and the impacts could be avoided altogether by the choice of Alternative 2. Additionally, the FEIR admits that Alternative 1 would create significant biological resource (ACOE jurisdictional waters and wetlands, and CDFG streambed and riparian habitat) impacts associated with the modification of the Argo Drainage Channel that would not occur under Alternative 1. (DEIR 1-104.) Although the EIR claims these impacts would be mitigated by acquisition or creation of wetlands and habitat elsewhere, no such mitigation would be required for Alternative 2.

D. Wastewater Treatment Line and Water Seepage Issues Would be Avoided Under Alternative 2 But Not Alternative 1.

ARSAC noted that tunneling that would be required under Alternative 1 would give rise to issues with wastewater treatment line relocation and water seepage. (FEIR, p.

4-445.) However, the FEIR avoids confronting these issues in Topical Response TR-SPAS-LR-1 by deferring them to a future analysis. Deferral of this analysis, as with deferral of analysis and mitigation for other impacts, violates CEQA. The FEIR denies that the project would impact the North Outfall Replacement Sewer (NORS) and the North Central Outfall Sewer (NCOS) because of their depth at 60 feet under the surface. (FEIR, p. 4-70.) However, the FEIR admits “LAWA has not identified other major utilities, including oil pipelines, in the vicinity of the Lincoln Boulevard realignment.” (FEIR, p. 4-70.) LAWA anticipates there will be numerous utility lines such as sewers, water lines, storm drains, electrical lines, pipelines, and other utilities, but relies on a yet-to-be-developed utility relocation program to minimize impacts. (FEIR, p. 4-71.) This is impermissible deferral of analysis and mitigation for a foreseeable impact that is already planned under Alternative 1. LAWA must either choose Alternative 2 to avoid these impacts, or find out and disclose all that it can about them before approving Alternative 1.

E. Airspace Redesign Information Should Have Been Supplied.

We requested information on the potential airspace redesign about LAX. (FEIR, 4-456.) The FEIR referred to its answer to comment SPAS-PC00130-301. The FEIR states no proposed airspace designs or alternatives have yet been proposed. However, the FEIR should describe what designs were studied in the August 2011 preliminary study mentioned in the FEIR.

IV. Joinder in Other Public Comments And Request for Notification.

We join in the comments submitted by Barbara Lichman on behalf of the City of Inglewood, Culver City, and Ontario, and County of San Bernardino, the comments of William T. Fujioka on behalf of the County of Los Angeles Chief Executive Office Operations and Budget; Drollinger Properties; and other comments raising issues identified in our various letters. These comments include, but are not limited to, objections to the analysis regarding traffic congestion, air pollution, hazardous materials, public safety, noise, land use, and other impacts. We also request notification of any future hearings and notices pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21092.2.

V. CONCLUSION.

ARSAC urges you to provide the additional information and responses to comments identified in our letter and other comments on the draft EIR. After that, we request that you recirculate the EIR with its recent identification of a particular proposed project so that members of the public can meaningfully review and provide comments on

Board of Airport Commissioners
Los Angeles World Airports
January 30, 2013
Page 8 of 8

it. The process of approval of such an important expansion of LAX deserves compliance with the letter and spirit of California's environmental laws and the Settlement Agreement reach between LAWA and petitioners in 2006.

Finally, after the procedural requirements of CEQA are observed, we ask you select Alternative 2 rather than Alternative 1, as Alternative 2 would be most protective of the environment while still achieving most of LAWA's project objectives. Choosing Alternative 1 would be a disservice to the community and all others who hope to see approval of environmentally and fiscally responsible plans for LAX. As we have stated, the Settlement Agreement is based on a good faith effort to reach a workable solution for everyone, and ARSAC is disappointed with the results of that agreement thus far. Even so, ARSAC remains committed to working with LAWA to improve and modernize LAX. Thank you for your time and consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Douglas P. Carstens

CHATTEN-BROWN & CARSTENS LLP

TELEPHONE:(310) 314-8040
FACSIMILE: (310) 314-8050

2200 PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY
SUITE 318
HERMOSA BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90254
www.cbcearthlaw.com

E-MAIL:
DPC@CBCEARTHLAW.COM

February 3, 2013

Board of Airport Commissioners
Los Angeles World Airports
One World Way
Los Angeles, CA 90045-5803

Re: Comments on Final Environmental Impact Report for Specific Plan
Amendment Study, SCH 1997061047

Honorable Commissioners:

On behalf of the Alliance for a Regional Solution for Airport Congestion (ARSAC), we appeared at your special hearing on Thursday, January 31, 2013 to present our views regarding the inadequacies of the Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) prepared for the Specific Plan Amendment Study (“SPAS” or “Project”), the need to re-circulate it, and the superiority of choosing Alternatives 2 and 9 rather than Alternatives 1 and 9. Alternates 2 and 9 (with APM, ConRAC and Metrorail into Central Terminal Area) should be also be selected as the Preferred Alternative.

We were surprised and dismayed to discover critical documents not made available to the public on LAWA’s website (<http://www.lawa.org/laxspas/Reports.aspx>) until Friday, February 1, the day after the public hearing on January 31. It appears that these documents were prepared long ago, but were not posted until Friday, February 1. We find it incomprehensible why LAWA would choose to post these documents the day *after* the hearing rather than the day *before*, or better yet *well in advance of*, the public hearing so members of the public and other public agencies could review and comment about them. These recently-posted documents include the following:

Document	Pages	Initial Date(s)	Last Date
SPAS Final EIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	148	1/31/2013	1/31/2013 4:33pm
SPAS Final EIR Statement of Overriding Considerations	7	1/31/2013	1/31/2013 3:55pm
SPAS Final EIR CEQA Findings	162	1/29/2013	1/29/2013 8:16am
SPAS Proposed Plan Amendments	72	1/17/2013, 1/24, 1/30	2/1/2013 9:15am

Furthermore, we understand that LAWA has taken advantage of the Internet to mail out notices to certain individuals who have added their email addresses to LAWA's lists, but has not physically mailed any notices. We do not believe electronic mail is a substitute for LAWA mailing notice to interested parties by traditional means who have commented on the draft EIR. Such notices are necessary about the availability of the Final EIR and the Board of Airport Commissioner hearings about it. There are numerous people who either do not have email or do not receive LAWA's email messages regarding the FEIR and hearings.

Finally, we note that, as observed by Commissioner Velasco during the hearing on Thursday, January 31, there were about 100 people who attempted to attend the hearing that were turned away because of the lack of available room capacity, even with the overflow room in LAWA's Administration Building filled to capacity [approximately 200 people]. We believe LAWA should have better anticipated the number of people that would have liked to attend the hearing, in view of the fact that the Los Angeles City Planning Commission hearing regarding LAX modernization plans at the Proud Bird Restaurant on January 8, 2013 apparently drew over 539 people*.

Again, we repeat our request that LAWA re-circulate the FEIR and associated proposed Statement of Overriding Considerations, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Final EIR CEQA Findings, and SPAS Proposed Plan Amendments in order to give the public and public agencies a fair chance to review and comment on this important modernization proposal. The review period should be a minimum of 60 days.

Sincerely,

Douglas P. Carstens

- Planning Commission report noted 539 people signed in. Estimates were over 700 people because an additional ballroom was opened at the Proud Bird to handle the overflow crowd.



ARSAC Alliance for a Regional Solution to Airport Congestion
322 Culver Blvd., #231 Playa del Rey, CA 90293
www.regionalsolution.org 310-641-4199

January 31, 2013

Board of Airport Commissioners
City of Los Angeles
1 World Way
Westchester, CA 90045

Re: Comments on LAX Specific Plan Amendment Study Final EIR

Dear Commissioners:

Since 1995, ARSAC has been at the forefront of fighting LAX expansion and fighting for expanding our regional airports (e.g. Ontario and Palmdale) to meet Southern California's future airport capacity needs. We support making LAX safe, secure and convenient so long as it does not expand airport and aircraft operations, noise, pollution, vibration and ground traffic into surrounding communities.

We know that your task as a decision maker on this EIR must be very thorough and thoughtful, cognizant of the law (especially CEQA), aware of the history and sentiment of the surrounding communities against LAX expansion into airport neighborhoods, and the consequences of your decision for the next 50 years.

We again strongly encourage you to adopt Alternative 2, the Environmentally Superior Alternative, and Alternative 9 with the Automated People Mover (APM) and Consolidated Rental Car Garage (CONRAC) at Manchester Square.

We also strongly reject any runway movement towards the north. We already know from the experience of El Segundo residents living near Imperial Highway that their perceived noise levels have increased since the Runway 25 Left was moved 55 feet south and closer to homes. We not only do not want to inflict more noise on Westchester/Playa del Rey residents, but also we do not want any more LAX impacts on our friends and neighbors in Inglewood and South Los Angeles. Increasing noise, vibration, pollution and safety impacts on LAX area neighborhoods becomes an environmental justice issue. While it may be possible to soundproof someone's home, one cannot soundproof a backyard for a child's birthday party or family BBQ. All Angelinos should be able to enjoy quality of life. Some neighbors do not have to be newly impacted or more impacted for the "greater good" of a modern, world class airport. LAWA and BOAC do have options to move aircraft and airport impacts away from neighborhoods while meeting the needs of passengers and airlines. Please consider those options, especially Alternatives 2 and 9.



ARSAC Alliance for a Regional Solution to Airport Congestion
322 Culver Blvd., #231 Playa del Rey, CA 90293
www.regionalsolution.org 310-641-4199

These comments are our first letter on the Final EIR and we reserve the right to submit additional comments. The release of the Final EIR with about 10 days to read and respond is not sufficient to address all deficiencies.

We have arranged our comments by topic:

1. CEQA non-compliance
2. ARSAC preference for Alt 2- Environmentally Superior Alternative and Alt 9 (APM and ConRAC)
3. No response from CalTrans
4. Key questions unanswered
5. Insufficient analysis
6. Other ideas not considered
7. Airfield safety
8. Airfield efficiency
9. Competition for international service
10. Construction phasing
11. Independent engineering Peer Review needed

TOPICAL COMMENTS

1. CEQA non-compliance

ARSAC believes that LAWA has failed to comply with CEQA. Please see the letter from our attorney Doug Carstens for complete details.

2. ARSAC preference for Alt 2- Environmentally Superior Alternative and Alt 9 (APM and ConRAC)

ARSAC supports Alternatives 2 and 9 with the APM and CONRAC at Manchester Square.

The selection of Alternatives 2 and 9 will assure that LAX modernization can move forward faster than any of the other alternatives without delays due to litigation.

Clearly, Alt 2 and Alt 9 make the best sense for the community, airport, and travelers and have one of the lowest build costs and least complicated construction.

These alternatives offer the least risks of runaway costs from unanticipated complications from design and construction issues.

The draft Environmental Impact Report presented by LAWA backs this selection of Alternative 2:

- Alternative 2 can be constructed more quickly and creates jobs sooner.



ARSAC Alliance for a Regional Solution to Airport Congestion
322 Culver Blvd., #231 Playa del Rey, CA 90293
www.regionalsolution.org 310-641-4199

- Alternative 2 will cost several billion dollars but is far less expensive than Alternative 1.
- Alternative 2 substantially reduces unanticipated construction cost increases and construction delays.
- Alternative 2 is rated most operationally efficient due to the taxiway upgrades it incorporates.
- Alternative 2 is the least impacting on surrounding communities. No moving of major highways.
- Alternative 2 creates the most jobs for the dollars spent.

3. No response from CalTrans

Since the release of the Final EIR, ARSAC has been making inquiries with CalTrans as to why they did not submit comments. Considering that CalTrans has an extremely important role to play in any alternatives that deal with re-routing Lincoln Boulevard (California State Highway 1), it seems highly unusual that their input is missing.

4. Key questions unanswered

Although LAWA has prepared this EIR document of thousands of pages as a programmatic level review, we have expected LAWA to perform sufficient evaluations to ensure project feasibility. This has not been demonstrated and numerous questions raised before the NOP, during NOP comments, and during draft EIR comments remain unaddressed or incomplete. Because of the nature of this SPAS and its genesis being the 2006 Stipulated Settlement we are concerned that not only technical questions remain unanswered, but also fiscal and schedule ones as well. The intent of SPAS was to result in a buildable Master Plan. The dovetailing of major renovations and repairs must fit into this planning, but has never been addressed.

5. Insufficient analysis

ARSAC finds that the Final EIR is insufficient on a few issues. We may address more of them in a future letter.

a. Air Pollution Apportionment Study

The EIR should not move forward without first having the results of the Air Pollution Apportionment Study. LAWA started this study, but has sat on the data for about 6 years. BOAC should have this information to consider before making a decision. Waiting a short time to receive and analyze this information will assure that a good decision on the entire EIR is being made for the future.

b. Design Day fleet mix problems

The Design Day Fleet mix is wrought with errors. For example, two widebody aircraft, the Airbus A330 and A350XWB are underreported or missing, respectively. The design day chosen did not show an A330 flight, although that aircraft has operated at LAX during 2009 and continues to operate at LAX on a regular basis. The future design day of 2025 also does



ARSAC Alliance for a Regional Solution to Airport Congestion
322 Culver Blvd., #231 Playa del Rey, CA 90293
www.regionalsolution.org 310-641-4199

not reflect a new aircraft, the Airbus A350 XWB, which is expected to come into service in 2014. The A350 is a competitor aircraft to both of the Boeing 777 and Boeing 787. As of December 31, 2012, there are 592 orders for the A350. Several airlines at LAX have ordered the A350 and will likely operate it at LAX including United Airlines, Hawaiian Airlines, Singapore Airlines, Cathay Pacific and others. The A350 may have wingspan, length, tail height, wheel track and other features that should be studied to assure aircraft compatibility with LAX. The future design day did not list Boeing 717 in 2025 that did operate at LAX (Midwest Airlines, AirTran) and probably will come back to LAX (Delta). The 717 was manufactured between 1998 and 2006 and should be in service for the next 20 years. Please also see our comments in the Final EIR for other examples of fleet mix problems.

c. Runway Status Lights and Final Approach Runway Occupancy Signal

The EIR did not adequately consider Runway Status Lights and Final Approach Runway Occupancy Signal (FAROS) as airfield safety measures. The response was that LAWA considers these to be Project Level EIR issues.

d. Runway Safety Area analysis

For north movement of runways, EIR does not appear to consider FAA Interim Guidance on Runway Protection Zones- one of the first steps is not to add more hazards into RPZ. Also see ATTACHMENT- FAA Interim Guidance on Runway Safety Areas.

LAWA staff has made statements in public meetings and at the BOAC meeting announcing the Staff Preferred Alternative that In-N-Out Burger and the Parking Spot would not be affected by Alternative 1. We do not see how LAWA can make any assurances to affected property owners, affected businesses and the public when the FAA has not analyzed LAWA's RSA plans and the FAA has issued a Record of Determination.

e. Impacts of Non-SPAS projects

Cumulative and increased impacts of Non-SPAS projects were not fully examined: Terminals 1.5 and 2.5 and Midfield Satellite Concourse Processor east of parking garages P3 and P4. MSC Processor will take out parking garages P2B and P5 and eliminate the roadway ramp that goes between the departures and arrivals levels. Traffic impacts and circulation could be significant. There was no detail for Terminal 2.5 in either the Draft or Final EIR.

6. Other ideas not considered

The Final EIR did not fully examine other options submitted by commenters. In the ARSAC 340 feet south / LCC plan submitted to expand the range of alternatives, the comments received back that LCC Terminal 1, 2 and 3 was almost same as Alt D. However, since the 340 / LCC plan was not considered an alternative (a more cost effective Alt D without tearing down parking garages and needing a GTC at Manchester Square), decision makers (BOAC and City Council) cannot consider this as an option.



ARSAC Alliance for a Regional Solution to Airport Congestion
322 Culver Blvd., #231 Playa del Rey, CA 90293
www.regionalsolution.org **310-641-4199**

7. Airfield safety

Airfield safety is being used as a red herring to justify increasing runway separation.

The north complex is deemed safe otherwise the FAA would prohibit its use. The largest aircraft, the Airbus A380 and the Boeing 747-8, regularly land and depart on the north runway complex. LAX has safely handled the 747 since 1970 and the A380 since October 2008.

The north runways are currently at 700 feet separation and that meets the current FAA airport design standard. If runway separation is increased by 300 feet and a centerline taxiway is added, then the aircraft would be less than 500 feet apart when an aircraft is on the taxiway. Keep in mind that the Airbus A380 has a wingspan of 262 feet; the Boeing 747-8 has a wingspan of 213 feet. The 787 Dreamliner is smaller than a 747 with a 199 feet wingspan. Less lateral (side to side) distance between aircraft increases the possibility of a wing strike against another aircraft.

Table 1- Centerline taxiways decrease safety margins between aircraft

Alternatives	Runway separation	Runway to centerline taxiway separation	A380 to A380 wingtip separation (including 8 feet over steer)
Alt 2 & 4	700'	n/a	430'
Alt 6 & 7- 100'	800'	400'	130'
Alt 1- 260' N	960'	500' & 460'	230' & 190'
Alt 3- 340' S	1040'	520'	250'
Alt 5- 350' N	1050'	525'	255'

All centerline taxiway options reduce wingtip-to-wingtip separation increasing the possibility of wingstrikes between aircraft. Wingstrikes have become an increasing problem. Just this month there were two incidents involving jumbo jets in Miami (Aerolineas Argentinas Airbus A340 and Air France Boeing 777) and Washington Dulles airports (two United Airlines Boeing 777's).

Story links:

- <http://www.usatoday.com/story/travel/flights/2013/01/18/jets-collide-miami-airport/1844513/>
- <http://www.usatoday.com/story/todayinthesky/2013/01/24/report-planes-clip-wings-at-washington-dulles/1862319/>

Excursions have not been addressed by LAWA and are identified by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) as a major cause of accidents. Lesser spacing logically



ARSAAC Alliance for a Regional Solution to Airport Congestion
322 Culver Blvd., #231 Playa del Rey, CA 90293
www.regionalsolution.org 310-641-4199

increases the risk of accidents from excursions. In response to the excursion problem Boeing and Embraer announced plans to work together in helping pilots avoid runway excursions.

Story link:

http://www.aviationweek.com/Article.aspx?id=/article-xml/avd_12_19_2012_p03-01-530044.xml&p=1

A centerline taxiway adds a new failure mode as well: landing/departing on it by mistake. Taxiway takeoff and landing errors have become a worldwide problem in places such as Amsterdam, Hong Kong, Seattle, Las Vegas and Palm Springs. In 2004, the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) made taxiway safety one of its top ten safety issues.

Runway safety has been dramatically improved with the community advocated Runway Status Lights (RWSL). The FAA has credited RWSL with a 50% reduction in runway incursions. Other LAX airfield safety improvements that can be made include a new control tower to give controllers an unobstructed view of the entire airfield, a fully staffed tower with highly experienced controllers, and installation of new technology such as Final Approach Runway Occupancy Signal (FAROS) to warn pilots not to land on a runway that is use by another aircraft.

8. Airfield efficiency

Airfield efficiency is being used as a red herring to justify increasing runway separation.

When LAWA analyzed the north runway complex for the SPAS EIR they demonstrated equal efficiency ratings with and without the runway movement that included construction of a new centerline taxiway. Runway movement to the north increases pollution and noise impacts on Westchester/Playa del Rey homes, businesses, schools and churches. The number of large aircraft operating at LAX will remain so small (about 1% of 2,053 daily flights; that's 12 A380's and 10 747-8's a day) through at least 2025 that no impact on capacity is expected even during peak activity. No matter what the runway separation is, the A380 will always require special handling at LAX. Some of the taxiways are not fully A380 compatible. Wake turbulence produced by the A380 on takeoff and landings will require the shutdown the north or south runway complex for a few minutes until the A380 has left the runway (flying or taxiing). ATTACHMENT: FAA Tower Procedures for Airbus A380.

Alternative 1, 260 feet north, actually worsens conditions for Group VI on north airfield- **See Final EIR, Table SRA-2.3.7.2-1 (page 2-112; PDF page 124).** Among these downgrades of standards and capabilities:

1. Good Weather- Maximum Aircraft Design Group (ADG) allowed on Runway 6R/24L drops from Group VI to Group V.



ARSAAC Alliance for a Regional Solution to Airport Congestion
322 Culver Blvd., #231 Playa del Rey, CA 90293
www.regionalsolution.org 310-641-4199

2. Poor Weather- Maximum ADG allowed on Runway 6R/24L (departures only) drops from Group VI to Group V.
3. Taxilane D- Maximum ADG Size Allowed drops from Group III/VI to Group V.

Also, please do not buy into the argument that LAX noise will be reduced by newer, cleaner and quieter aircraft. In its Current Market Outlook, Boeing predicts that worldwide commercial aircraft fleet will double by 2031 and only 85% of the fleet will be new deliveries. Keep in mind that 15% of older aircraft will still be around creating annoying single-event noise. Stand underneath the flight path by In-N-Out Burger and see if you can hear a significant decrease in noise to a tolerable level between older and newer aircraft. You probably won't!

http://www.boeing.com/commercial/cmo/global_trends.html

The same report also notes that 69% of the fleet will be single aisle aircraft (e.g. Boeing 737, Airbus A320) and only 3% will be 747 or larger. Looking at the LAX year 2025 forecast, LAX projects 2,053 daily flights (about the same as the year 2000). Of these 2,000+ daily flights, about 1% will be for the Airbus A380. Should we be spending billions of dollars in support of 12 or so A380 daily flights that will require special handling around the airfield and gates no matter what the runway configuration is?

RETURN ON INVESTMENT- \$15 million in annual fuel savings- 100-year payback on \$1.5 billion in airfield improvements.

9. Competition for international service

Competition for international flights is being used as a red herring to justify increasing runway separation. There is no fully Group VI compatible airport in the United States. Only 19 airports in the United States are known to be able to handle the Airbus A380 and Las Vegas and Phoenix are not among those airports. Today 7 US airports have A380 service and LAX is the top A380 destination in the United States with 7 daily flights. The next airport is New York JFK with 6. Other US airports have 1 daily flight. San Francisco has summer only A380 with Lufthansa. The north airfield at LAX has 700 feet separation between runways which meets current FAA airport design standards. SFO has 750 feet separation between runways. Runway separation has not had any affect on attracting or retaining A380 flights.

LAX is not losing international flights to other airports. If a route has been dropped, it was due to the route not being profitable (Qantas- LAX to Auckland, New Zealand) or the airline went out of business (e.g. Aero California, Mexicana). Other airlines have immediately jumped in to fill those service gaps (Air New Zealand added more LAX-Auckland flights and Volaris took over Mexicana's routes).



ARSAAC Alliance for a Regional Solution to Airport Congestion
322 Culver Blvd., #231 Playa del Rey, CA 90293
www.regionalsolution.org 310-641-4199

The quality of the terminal facilities has nothing to do with an airlines desire to serve a market. Qantas did threaten to send the A380 to San Francisco instead of LAX. Qantas and Asian A380 airlines made that threat to push LAWA to install A380 capable gates; LAWA responded by adding 2 A380 gates on the ends of the Tom Bradley Terminal. Today, LAX has 3 A380 gates and will have a total of 9 when the Bradley West project is completed in 2014. While San Francisco did open a “gleaming international terminal” with 3 A380 gates in 2000, the first A380 capable terminal in the USA, it only has one summertime A380 flight. SFO also lost airline service in 2002 due to its high landing fees (over \$5 per 1,000 pounds of landed weight). Southwest Airlines departed SFO in 2002 and only returned in 2007 when SFO had lowered its fees and when JetBlue and Virgin America began service at SFO. San Francisco did lose its Qantas flight to Dallas/Fort Worth (DFW). This was due to \$3.1 million in incentives DFW offered Qantas so that Qantas would connect with American Airlines at American's home base at DFW. Qantas and American Airlines are partners in the OneWorld airline alliance. SFO is no threat to the Los Angeles market!

Other airports are using incentives to attract airline service such as waived or reduced landing fees and rents. San Jose, Denver, Tampa and Orlando have used these corporate welfare techniques to attract air service that otherwise would not have bothered to look at these airports. All Nippon Airways would not be at San Jose without incentives. As in many cases, once the subsidy runs out, the airline drops the service. This was sadly true with the United Express service in Palmdale. LAX does not have to engage in incentives to attract air service because airlines want to serve this passenger rich market.

The airlines are going to fly where there is most potential for profit. So long as the sun shines, Hollywood makes movies and the amusement parks remain in operation, LAX will continue to one be of the top 10 airports in the world. The strength of the LAX market is Southern California- its geography as the center of the world, our great weather, the second largest metropolitan area in the US, premiere tourist attractions and its creative, financial and industrial economies.

LAX has remained the number 3 busiest passenger airport in the United States probably from the start of the “Jet Age” in October 1958 to today. (Annual reports from the Air Transport Association show LAX’s #3 rank going back as far the 1960’s. Jet service started at LAX in January 1959.) LAX has maintained its number 3 ranking despite the effects of 9/11, the Great Recession, airline bankruptcies and mergers and high oil prices. While LAX has not regained its pre 9/11 passenger levels, this is not due to aging terminal facilities or airfield configuration; it is due to the US airline industry changing its prime focus from market share to profitability. After 9/11, airlines dropped unprofitable routes, “right sized” aircraft to increase passenger loads, retired less efficient older aircraft, instituted fees for services such as baggage check that had been traditionally included in ticket prices and used bankruptcy actions to lower overhead carrying costs such as aircraft and airport leases, employee pay and pension costs. Again, despite the 20% post 9/11 cutbacks by the airlines, LAX continues to



ARSAC Alliance for a Regional Solution to Airport Congestion
322 Culver Blvd., #231 Playa del Rey, CA 90293
www.regionalsolution.org 310-641-4199

be the number one origin-and-destination airport in the world. Moreover, since 9/11 many airlines have added new international service at LAX to diverse locations such as Dubai, United Arab Emirates; Berlin, Germany; Istanbul, Turkey; Tokyo-Haneda Airport, Japan; and Lima, Peru. Existing international services at LAX are being enhanced with new aircraft such as the Airbus A380, Boeing 747-8 (passenger and freighter versions) and the Boeing 787 Dreamliner (Boeing 767 replacement).

Furthermore, while new longer-range aircraft come into service and “Open Skies” bi-lateral air service agreements between the US and many foreign countries have allowed for more US airports to attract international service, these two developments will not have a detrimental effect on LAX. Since the start of the Jet Age, worldwide air traffic has generally doubled every 20 years. This means that the “pie” of passengers is growing over the long term; the pie is not a fixed size and is not being cut into smaller-and-smaller pieces.

Airline service is a very good barometer of the economy. When other US cities add international service, this is a positive development for LAX as it demonstrates the growth of the economy. On one hand, when passengers do not have to transfer at LAX and can fly non-stop, this then opens a seat for someone who wants to fly to or from LAX, thereby purifying the passenger base to the more valuable (to City tax revenue) origin-and-destination passenger. On the other hand, new international service at other US airports provides more connectivity options for people wanting to come to or fly from LAX. For example, a connecting flight from LAX to Frankfurt via Philadelphia, PA may allow a business traveler to arrive earlier in the day in Germany (6:15am arrival) than if he had flown the non-stop from LAX to Frankfurt (10:45am arrival). Leisure travelers using frequent flyer miles also benefit from the connectivity if non-stop seats are not available to their desired destination from LAX.

Finally, LAX does not need to worry about the A380 overflying LAX to Las Vegas and Phoenix. Both of these airports cannot support the A380 and there are only about 19 US airports capable of handling the A380. Some of the A380 capable US airports are cargo hubs (e.g. Anchorage, Louisville, Memphis, Ontario) and none are likely to see an A380 since the A380 freighter program was cancelled.

Here is a link to the Las Vegas McCarran Airport Emergency Contingency Plan. It explicitly states, “Unable to accept the A380 aircraft”
https://www.mccarran.com/Portals/0/LAS_ECP.pdf

Also, here is a Las Vegas Sun article describing why McCarran Airport won’t accept the A380:
<http://www.lasvegassun.com/news/2006/jan/23/airbus-wouldnt-fly-in-las-vegas/>



ARSAC Alliance for a Regional Solution to Airport Congestion
322 Culver Blvd., #231 Playa del Rey, CA 90293
www.regionalsolution.org **310-641-4199**

Here is a link to the Phoenix Sky Harbor Emergency Contingency Plan. It states, “PHX has approximately 40 remote parking positions. Of those, approximately 15 are capable of supporting larger aircraft, up to aircraft group 5.” Note that the Airbus A380 is an Aircraft Design Group VI aircraft.

<http://skyharbor.com/pdfs/ExtendedTarmacDelayPlan.pdf>

US Airports capable of A380 operations and current A380 service as of January 31, 2013

Airport	Airline	Route	Comments
Anchorage			FedEx and UPS hub. FedEx and UPS cancelled their orders for the A380 Freighter
Fort Worth Alliance			FedEx hub
Atlanta	Korean Air	Seoul-Incheon	Starts August 2013
Chicago O’Hare			
Dallas/Fort Worth			
Denver			
Houston Intercontinental	Lufthansa	Frankfurt	
Indianapolis			FedEx hub
Los Angeles	Air France China Southern Korean Air Qantas Airways Qantas Airways Singapore Airlines	Paris-Charles de Gaulle Guangzhou Seoul-Incheon Sydney Melbourne Tokyo-Narita and onto Singapore-Changi	12 weekly flights
Louisville			UPS hub
Memphis			FedEx hub
Miami	Lufthansa	Frankfurt	Winter only; aircraft switches to San Francisco route in summer
New York-JFK	Air France Emirates Korean Air Lufthansa	Paris-Charles de Gaulle Dubai Seoul Frankfurt	2 daily flights 2 daily flights



ARSAC Alliance for a Regional Solution to Airport Congestion
322 Culver Blvd., #231 Playa del Rey, CA 90293
www.regionalsolution.org **310-641-4199**

Ontario			UPS hub
Orlando			
Philadelphia			UPS hub
San Francisco	Lufthansa	Frankfurt	Summer only (Winter in Miami)
Tampa			
Washington-Dulles	Air France	Paris	

10. Construction phasing

Since the customer experience is the most important, work on landside projects should be completed first. Any airfield projects such as runways should be done last should there be unresolved legal and/or construction issues on the north airfield.

11. Independent engineering Peer Review needed

LAX modernization can rightly be characterized as a “mega project.” There is no doubt that LAX modernization will be the largest public works project in the City of Los Angeles, if not the nation. Considering the “mega projects” such as the “Big Dig” in Boston, Denver International Airport and other places have encountered major engineering challenges that have resulted in major cost overruns and delayed completion dates, it behooves the City to have an independent panel review and recommend on potential construction risks before any plans are committed to concrete. Without considering and avoiding potential pitfalls at the beginning of the project, LAX modernization costs may spiral out of control and force LAX to raise rates to tenant airlines. If the costs become too high, airlines may reduce operations at LAX or leave LAX thereby placing a higher cost burden on the remaining airline tenants. While LAWA is a self-supporting City agency, if LAWA should fail on its financial obligations then the City of Los Angeles, as the sponsor agency for LAX, will be responsible for any shortfalls. Considering the City’s existing financial problems with budget deficits and ballooning pension and healthcare obligations, the City needs to protect itself from an avoidable self-inflicted, and potentially fatal, financial wound.

CONCLUSION

LAWA must follow CEQA. Please adopt Alternatives 2 and 9 (APM with CONRAC). LAWA may be able to complete LAX modernization if it avoids litigation by respecting the wishes of the surrounding communities (does not move the runway north).

If you have any questions, then please contact us. We have worked many years to make LAX safe, secure, and convenient and we want to continue in that quest with you.



ARSAC Alliance for a Regional Solution to Airport Congestion
322 Culver Blvd., #231 Playa del Rey, CA 90293
www.regionalsolution.org 310-641-4199

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Denny Schneider in black ink.

Handwritten signature of Robert Acherman in black ink.

Denny Schneider
President
(213) 675-1817
denny@welivefree.com

Robert Acherman
Vice President
(310) 645-8528
racherman@netvip.com

Attachments:
FAA Interim Runway Status Area Guidance
FAA Control Tower A380 Procedure

cc:
Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa
Los Angeles City Council
Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
Governor Jerry Brown
Assemblyman Steve Bradford
State Senator Ted Lieu
Congresswoman Maxine Waters
Congresswoman Janice Hahn
Congressman Henry Waxman
Senator Barbara Boxer
Senator Dianne Feinstein
Petitioners

NOTICE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
Air Traffic Organization Policy

N JO 7110.582

Effective Date:

June 18, 2012

Cancellation Date:

June 17, 2013

SUBJ: Procedures for Airbus A380-800 (A388) Flights

1. Purpose of This Notice. This notice replaces N JO 7110.567, Procedures for Airbus A380-800 (A388) Flights, effective October 1, 2011. This notice delineates air traffic procedures that are applicable specifically for Airbus A388 operations. The procedures contained in this notice supplement existing guidance contained in Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Order JO 7110.65, Air Traffic Control.

2. Audience. This notice applies to the following Air Traffic Organization (ATO) service units: En Route and Oceanic, Terminal, and System Operations.

3. Where Can I Find This Notice? This notice is available on the MyFAA employee Web site at https://employees.faa.gov/tools_resources/orders_notices/ and on the air traffic publications Web site at http://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/publications.

4. Explanation of Changes. This notice clarifies visual separation procedures to be used with the A388 aircraft, as well as changes to the minimum separation required on final approach. Standard air traffic control procedures contained in FAA Order JO 7110.65, Air Traffic Control, and facility letters of agreement must be applied in support of A388 operations.

5. Procedures.

a. Air traffic control facilities must apply visual separation, as specified in FAA Order JO 7110.65, Chapter 7, Section 2, Visual Separation, as follows:

(1) *TERMINAL.* Visual separation must not be applied to aircraft operating directly behind, within 2,500 feet of the flight path of the leading aircraft, or directly behind and less than 1,000 feet below the A388.

(2) *EN ROUTE.* Visual separation must not be applied with respect to the A388.

b. Air traffic control facilities must use the following procedures when applying the provisions of FAA Order JO 7110.65, Chapter 5, Section 5, Radar Separation.

TERMINAL

(1) Separate aircraft operating directly behind, or directly behind and less than 1,000 feet below, or following an aircraft conducting an instrument approach by:

NOTE-

1. *When applying wake turbulence separation criteria, directly behind means an aircraft is operating within 2,500 feet of the flight path of the leading aircraft over the surface of the earth.*

2. Consider parallel runways less than 2,500 feet apart as a single runway because of the possible effects of wake turbulence.

- (a) Heavy behind A388 – 6 miles.
- (b) Large behind A388 – 7 miles.
- (c) Small behind A388 – 8 miles.

(2) When applying wake turbulence separation criteria for terminal operations that are defined in minutes, add 1 additional minute.

EN ROUTE

(3) Separate aircraft operating directly behind the A388 by the following minima:

- (a) Heavy behind A388 – 5 miles.
- (b) Large behind A388 – 5 miles.
- (c) Small behind A388 – 5 miles.

(4) Unless otherwise specified in applicable letters of agreement, aircraft following the A388 should be provided a minimum of 8 miles in-trail spacing when being handed-off/transitioning to terminal airspace. This interval should exist when the leading aircraft crosses the terminal/en route boundary or transfer of control point.

c. The word “SUPER” must be used immediately after the aircraft call sign as follows:

- (1) *TERMINAL*. In all communications with or about A388 aircraft.
- (2) *EN ROUTE*.
 - (a) In communications with a terminal facility about A388 operations.
 - (b) When issuing traffic advisories regarding an A388 aircraft.

6. Distribution. This notice is distributed to the following ATO service units: Terminal, En Route and Oceanic, Mission Support, and System Operations; the ATO Office of Safety and Technical Training; the Air Traffic Safety Oversight Service; the William J. Hughes Technical Center; and the Mike Monroney Aeronautical Center.

7. Background. In 2008, the FAA, European Organization for the Safety of Air Navigation (EuroControl), the Joint Aviation Authorities, and the aircraft manufacturer modified existing separation standards for the Airbus A380-800 (A388) aircraft. The separation standards apply to terminal facilities as specified above.

Although a “J” indicator for the A388 has been identified by ICAO in its October 9, 2006, guidance, the FAA has not rendered a final determination in support of such an indicator. Accordingly, existing flight data processing systems and records have not yet been modified to reflect a “J” indicator for the A388 on electronic flight lists or printed flight progress strips. Studies indicate that wake vortices generated by the A388 may be more substantial than those of aircraft in the “Heavy” wake turbulence category, thus requiring special designation (“Super”) and additional wake turbulence separation during certain segments of flight. The A388 must identify itself as call sign “Super” in radio communications with air traffic control.

8. Safety Management System. These procedures are based on guidance received from the International Civil Aviation Organization and the joint FAA/EuroControl Wake Turbulence Steering Group that studied the wake vortices of the A388 in July 2008. Accordingly, the separation standards and procedures contained in this notice are based on the approved study; therefore, no further safety risk analysis is necessary.



Elizabeth L. Ray
Vice President, Mission Support Services
Air Traffic Organization

5/14/2012

Date Signed