



Response to comment 30-216.

Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding general support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.



COMMENT: 30-217. Mary Jackson.

30-217

COMMUNITY MEMBER'S COMMENT ON MTA'S CRENSHAW LINE STUDY

NAME: MARY JACKSON EMAIL: DAVIS JACK@YAHOO.COM
ADDRESS: 11209 So La Salle ave PHONE: 323-777-4605
COMMENTS: Please keep underground! | A

MUST BE SENT TO MTA BY OCT. 26, SO PLEASE RETURN BY OCT. 23

Email: crenshaw@fixexpo.org • **Fax:** (323) 761 - 6435 • **Address:** P.O. Box 781267 LA, CA 90016



Response to comment 30-217.

Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding general support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.



COMMENT: 30-218. Val Jackson.

30-218

COMMUNITY MEMBER'S COMMENT ON MTA'S CRENSHAW LINE STUDY

NAME: Val Jackson EMAIL: [Signature]
ADDRESS: 11209 SO LASALLE PHONE: 323-777-4665
COMMENTS: Keep it underground | A

MUST BE SENT TO MTA BY OCT. 26, SO PLEASE RETURN BY OCT. 23

Email: crenshaw@fixexpo.org • **Fax:** (323) 761 - 6435 • **Address:** P.O. Box 781267 LA, CA 90016



Response to comment 30-218.

Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding general support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.



COMMENT: 30-219. Veronica Jackson.

30-219

COMMUNITY MEMBER'S COMMENT ON MTA'S CRENSHAW LINE STUDY

NAME: Veronica Jackson EMAIL: _____

ADDRESS: 2177 Crenshaw PHONE: _____

COMMENTS: By the way please keep the
underground

MUST BE SENT TO MTA BY OCT. 26, SO PLEASE RETURN BY OCT. 23

Email: crenshaw@fixexpo.org • **Fax:** (323) 761 - 6435 • **Address:** P.O. Box 781267 LA, CA 90016



Response to comment 30-219.

Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding general support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.

COMMENT: 30-220. Winnifred Jackson.

30-220

Abbott, Matthew

From: Winnifred Jackson [winnijao@yahoo.com]

Sent: Monday, October 26, 2009 6:13 PM

To: Diaz, Roderick

Subject: Crenshaw Metro line

There is a large student population in the Hyde Park community. Also, a large percent of seniors in the area. The traffic is heavy on Crenshaw. Therefore, the metro line should go underground. A

Winnifred Jackson, President
Hyde Park Organizational Partnership For Empowerment
H.O.P.E

11/5/2009

**Response to comment 30-220.**

Within or near the Hyde Park community, the project alignment is below grade from 60th Street on Crenshaw Boulevard to Victoria Avenue along the Harbor Subdivision. The DEIS/DEIR found that the at-grade light rail could operate safely in the median of Crenshaw Boulevard from 48th to 60th Street. The light rail alignment would operate in a semi-exclusive right-of-way separated from automobile traffic by a raised curb. Pedestrians are permitted to cross the street at designated crosswalk locations during protected pedestrian signal phases in which light rail vehicles are not present. Pedestrian safety along the proposed LRT line will involve gated crossings controlled using current Metro standards for crossings. Each crossing will be reviewed during design based on the California Public Utilities Report “Pedestrian – Rail Crossings in California”. Pedestrians crossing Crenshaw Boulevard across the LRT tracks will be controlled using normal pedestrian traffic signal indications; adequate crossing times will be provided at the traffic signals for pedestrians to cross the street at a normal walking pace. A pedestrian refuge area will be provided in the median at all crossings of the LRT tracks to provide a space for pedestrians to wait out of traffic and off the tracks should they not be able to complete their crossing of Crenshaw Boulevard during one signal phase. Each crossing was evaluated for pedestrian safety based on site visits and engineering design. The evaluation resulted in a list of design modifications and mitigation measures identified in the Safety and Security Section of the FEIS/FEIR to improve the level of safety at crossings. The final determination of safety measures to be implemented near school zones is determined through consultation and approval by the California Public Utilities Commission.



COMMENT: 30-221. Patrice Jackson-Fleming.

30-221

COMMUNITY MEMBER'S COMMENT ON MTA'S CRENSHAW LINE STUDY

NAME: Patrice Jackson Fleming EMAIL: ambroster@yatt.com

ADDRESS: 4711 S. LASALLE PHONE: 323-292-7507

COMMENTS: Keep It underground L.L!

MUST BE SENT TO MTA BY OCT. 26, SO PLEASE RETURN BY OCT. 23

Email: crenshaw@fixexpo.org • **Fax:** (323) 761 - 6435 • **Address:** P.O. Box 781267 LA, CA 90016



Response to comment 30-221.

Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding general support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.

COMMENT: 30-222. Krystal Jarrett.

30-222

Abbott, Matthew

From: krystalkind1@aol.com

Sent: Monday, October 26, 2009 4:55 PM

To: Diaz, Roderick

Dear MTA Board of Directors:

Please keep the Crenshaw Line underground on Crenshaw Boulevard for the safety of the children at Crenshaw High School and View Park Prep. Also traffic already backs up in both directions on Slauson. Please don't make a bad situation worse. Treat us the same as you intend to treat the Wilshire community. A

Sincerely,

Krystal Jarrett
3971 Hubert Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90008

11/10/2009



Response to comment 30-222.

Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding comments pertaining to an underground alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard due to children’s safety, traffic at Slauson Avenue, and environmental justice concerns.



COMMENT: 30-223. Arthur Johnson.

30-223

Abbott, Matthew

From: arthurjjr@sbcglobal.net
Sent: Saturday, October 17, 2009 8:34 PM
To: Diaz, Roderick
Subject: BELOW GROUND metro rail

My name is _Arthur Johnson, Jr._, and I am a resident of the Crenshaw community.

I live at _5346 S. Harcourt Ave._ Los Angeles, Ca 90043

BELOW GROUND metro rail | A
I SUPPORT a below ground rail system along Crenshaw Blvd.

11/5/2009



Response to comment 30-223.

Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding general support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.



COMMENT: 30-224. Conningsby Johnson.

30-224

COMMUNITY MEMBER'S COMMENT ON MTA'S CRENSHAW LINE STUDY

NAME: CONNINGSBY F. JOHNSON EMAIL: _____

ADDRESS: 3750 NORTHLAND DRIVE PHONE: (323) 296-6383

COMMENTS: PLEASE RUN THE TRAINS UNDERGROUND ON CRENSHAW

MUST BE SENT TO MTA BY OCT. 26, SO PLEASE RETURN BY OCT. 23

Email: crenshaw@fixexpo.org • **Fax:** (323) 761 - 6435 • **Address:** P.O. Box 781267 LA, CA 90016



Response to comment 30-224.

Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding general support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.



COMMENT: 30-225. Elizabeth Johnson.

30-225

COMMUNITY MEMBER'S COMMENT ON MTA'S CRENSHAW LINE STUDY

NAME: MRS ELIZABETH JOHNSON EMAIL: _____

ADDRESS: 3758 NORTHLAND DRIVE, LA CA 9008 PHONE: (323) 296-6383

COMMENTS: WE want the train, but make it underground

MUST BE SENT TO MTA BY OCT. 26, SO PLEASE RETURN BY OCT. 23

Email: crenshaw@fixexpo.org • Fax: (323) 761 - 6435 • Address: P.O. Box 781267 LA, CA 90016



Response to comment 30-225.

Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding general support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.

COMMENT: 30-226. Kristian Johnson.

30-226

Abbott, Matthew

From: First Lutheran Church [inglewoodfirst@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, September 25, 2009 1:39 PM
To: Diaz, Roderick
Subject: Crenshaw Project

Dear Mr. Diaz,

My name is Kristian Johnson, I serve as Pastor of First Lutheran Church in Inglewood, CA, on a Queen and Oak Streets, just 2 blocks south of Florence and one block east of the I-405,

I am a big supporter of Public Transportation, and from what I see on the brochures, the LRT alternative would be the most efficient and convenient. We would love to see a train system serve our community in this way.

If you ever need another venue to hold a forum regarding the proposed developments, please feel free to contact us.

Thanks and God bless you,

Kristian

First Lutheran Church/Iglesia Luterana Mi Salvador
600 W. Queen St. Inglewood, CA 90301 tel: 310-674-5103
email: inglewoodfirst@yahoo.com website: www.firsting.org
WORSHIP/SERVICIOS 10:00 A.M. SUNDAYS (ENGLISH)
en Español, 5 p.m. Los Domingos
Sharing God's Love and Joy with the World!
¡Compartiendo el amor y el gozo de Dios con el mundo!

11/5/2009



Response to comment 30-226.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. Metro also appreciates offering your facility to aid in the public participation process. The Metro Board of Directors selected the Light Rail Alternative as the Locally Preferred Alternative. The Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit Alternative proved to generate the greatest travel time savings and reliability, higher ridership for comparable segments, a stronger support of community goals for economic development, and connectivity with other elements of Metro's regional transit system (specifically, the Metro Green Line).



COMMENT: 30-227. M Johnson.

30-227

COMMUNITY MEMBER'S COMMENT ON MTA'S CRENSHAW LINE STUDY

NAME: M Johnson EMAIL: _____

ADDRESS: 6709 LA Tijera LA CA 90045 PHONE: 310 286 8675

COMMENTS: Do to safety factors, environmental hazards
and visual pollution. I want the
MTA transit UNDERGROUND!!!

A

MUST BE SENT TO MTA BY OCT. 26, SO PLEASE RETURN BY OCT. 23

Email: crenshaw@fixexpo.org • Fax: (323) 761 - 6435 • Address: P.O. Box 781267 LA, CA 90016

**Response to comment 30-227.**

A light rail transit system operating through the Crenshaw/LAX Corridor, would consist of a new bi-directional two-track, fixed guideway system that would travel through the median of Crenshaw Boulevard. The system would be powered by overhead wires and overhead contact system (OCS) poles spaced approximately 100 feet apart. Along Crenshaw Boulevard, the light rail alignment would be below grade from 39th Street to 48th Street and from 60th Street to the Harbor Subdivision railroad right-of-way. The DEIS/DEIR found that the at-grade light rail could operate safely in the median of Crenshaw Boulevard from Exposition Boulevard to 39th Street and from 48th to 60th Street.

Please refer to Master Response 7 for safety treatments and the approach to safety for the project.

The light rail system would be similar in character to the existing transportation infrastructure along Crenshaw Boulevard, which includes lighting, utility poles, signage, and signals. The DEIS/DEIR found that a light rail transit system traveling at grade in the Crenshaw median would not introduce new hazards or hazardous materials into the environment and that it would be consistent in character with surrounding land uses. No significant impacts to safety, hazards, or visual resources would occur from the operation of the light rail alignment in an at-grade configuration along Crenshaw Boulevard.



COMMENT: 30-228. S Johnson.

30-228

COMMUNITY MEMBER'S COMMENT ON MTA'S CRENSHAW LINE STUDY

NAME: S. Johnson EMAIL: SarahannaJohnson@yahoo.com

ADDRESS: 5503 S. Wilton Pl LA CA 90067 PHONE: 310-946-7024

COMMENTS: Keep it underground please A

MUST BE SENT TO MTA BY OCT. 26, SO PLEASE RETURN BY OCT. 23

Email: crenshaw@fixexpo.org • **Fax:** (323) 761 - 6435 • **Address:** P.O. Box 781267 LA, CA 90016



Response to comment 30-228.

Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding general support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.

COMMENT: 30-229. Mark Johnston.

30-229

**Crenshaw Transit
 Corridor Project**

Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report

Comment Form

The Crenshaw Transit Corridor project team welcomes your comments on the findings of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report or any other aspect of the project or process. Please fill out this form and use additional sheets of paper, if necessary. Give this form to project staff or return to Metro (see directions on reverse).

Name (First & Last Name, Organization)

Mark Johnston (TRAEC, MRP)

Address (Street, City, State, Zip)

4185 Van Buren St, CHino, CA, 91710

Email (enter address to receive periodic project updates)

Canamnj@yahoo.com

Would you like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes No (should already be on)

THIS COMMENT RELATES TO:

My support for (check one):

- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Alternative
- Light Rail Transit (LRT) Alternative
- No Improvement Necessary (No-Build Alternative)
- Minor Improvements (Transportation Systems Management [TSM] Alternative)
- No Opinion

My thoughts about (check any or all that apply):

- Construction
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Traffic
- Safety
- Visual Effects
- Displacement of Property
- Disruption to Business
- Public Services
- Local Land Use & Development
- Economic Impacts and Jobs
- Specific Design Features
- Other

Comment (please print):

LRT only! NO BUS!

- #1 Plan for wildlife restoration - make sure Tunnel as Crenshaw crosses under Expo A
- #2 Crenshaw needs to go up La Brea beyond Wilshire to Red Line at Hollywood B
- #3 The Parkway Eden mid-Crenshaw with wide sidewalks & lots of trees = good! C
- #4 The Curve at Crenshaw into Florence should go under if \$\$ permit otherwise, Aerial if designed correctly. D
- #5 The Busf Harbor sub has to be designed to allow Regional Rail from LA Union station TO LAX. Why not put the Regio Rail under and Light Rail on Top of the Right-of-way. The Regio (LAX Express!) only needs a downtown Inland stop and LAX stop. (Double-Deck station for transfers). After local LRT station stop on Top (Mardela, West/Florence) E
- #6 Make sure Crenshaw line through Route 6 to Redondo Beach & hopefully, one day, to South Bay Galleria F
- #7 green line needs to turn north at G

OVER



Comment (continued):

Aviation to go to LAX, and hopefully one day to
 Marina Del Rey, Venice Santa Monica. Make sure to
 plan for connection off to green job. to Westchester - Marina Del Rey - Santa Monica
 8) For the people who want to ride off green line coming from
 The East, why not build another platform at Aviation and make
 this a transfer station. majority of ridership will go to LAX
 (ridership used at Marina, El Segundo, Douglas with demise of Amospec)
 LAX is a destination, tourists & LAX employees

9) Projects in order should be
 ✓ Purple to Redoubt = most ridership
 ✓ Orange Connector = major system connector + ridership
 ✓ Gold - Azusa = quick build - federal \$\$\$ we are owed
 ✓ Expo - Santa Monica = Westside service long before Subur
 ✓ Crenshaw = Expo → Aviation = finally LAX service
 major north-south line (Anthony Blue)

10) Couple more miles underground in congested areas
 11) The ridership on BRT from Expo is wishful offset
 ridership on LRT from Aviation to Redondo Beach

TELL US ABOUT YOURSELF

What is your home zip code? 91710 Work zip code? 91765

Do you: (check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Live in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/> Commute through the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/> Bicycle?	<input type="checkbox"/> Bus?
<input type="checkbox"/> Work in the project area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other? <u>Transit Advocate</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Car or Truck?	<input type="checkbox"/> Walk?
<input type="checkbox"/> Own a business in the project area?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other <u>Don't Live In Area</u>	

How do you regularly travel in the project area?
(check all that apply)

AFFILIATION

Resident Business

Community or Neighborhood Organization

Public Agency

Environmental Organization

Civic Organization

Economic Development Organization

Other Transit Advocate

Thank You!

Give this form to project staff or return to Metro:

Postal Mail

Roderick Diaz, Project Manager
 Los Angeles County Metropolitan
 Transportation Authority
 One Gateway Plaza
 Mail Stop: 99-22-3
 Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Email:
 diazroderick@metro.net

Project Hotline
 (213) 922-2736

Comments must be received by October 26, 2009, 5:00 p.m.



12) Design La Brea / Wilshire as a 4-way
 station when you build Purple Line
 (Do it first) Earlier when Crenshaw comes north



Mr Mark Johnson
4188 Van Buren St
Chico, CA 95719-3131

CITY OF INDUSTRY CA 917
PASADENA CA
92302-2828 PM-2 T



Roderick Plaza - Project manager
LA city Transportation Authority
1 gateway plaza
mail stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles CA 90012-2952
90012+2952

**Response to comment 30-229-A.**

The light rail alignment at Exposition Boulevard was designed so that it would not preclude the future northern extension of the line to Wilshire Boulevard. This station option would be located beneath the median of Crenshaw Boulevard with a station portal on the southeast corner of the Crenshaw/Exposition Boulevards intersection. The acquisition of all the parcels on this block would likely be required for construction staging, parking, and transit-related improvements.

Response to comment 30-229-B.

The northern extension of the Crenshaw Light Rail Transit Line to Wilshire Boulevard is not part of the Locally Preferred Alternative selected by the Metro Board of Directors. A Feasibility study has been conducted by Metro that indicated that a future northern extension of light rail transit to Wilshire Boulevard is feasible and that the Wilshire/La Brea terminus was the preferred option. Such a connection is included in the Strategic Element of Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan adopted in October 2009. A separate planning process could explore a transit investment in the corridor if a future update to Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan identifies this as a funded project. Information related to the Long Range Transportation Plan is available at www.metro.net, following the links to "Long Range Transportation Plan" under the "Projects and Programs" tab.

Response to comment 30-229-C.

Landscaping improvements along the at-grade portion of the alignment would be minimal. Vegetative buffers would be drought tolerant and low maintenance. In the area where the light rail alignment is at grade along Crenshaw Boulevard (south of 48th to 60th Streets), Crenshaw Boulevard would be reconfigured, resulting in the removal of the frontage roads. Sidewalks would be maintained on both sides of Crenshaw Boulevard and improvements would be made near the Slauson Station to ensure pedestrian capacity. Appropriate pedestrian crossing control devices for at-grade crossings are critical for rail system safety. In addition to standard cross-walk markings, control devices for pedestrian crossings include flashing light signals, signs, markings along the outside of the rail line, curbside pedestrian barriers, pedestrian automated gates, swing gates, bedstead barriers and crossing channelization. A pedestrian refuge area will be provided in the median at all crossings of the LRT tracks to provide a space for pedestrians to wait out of traffic and off the tracks should they not be able to complete their crossing of Crenshaw Boulevard during one signal phase. The exact safety measures to be implemented are determined through consultation and approval by the California Public Utilities Commission.

Response to comment 30-229-D.

Design Option 4, a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard from 60th Street to Victoria Avenue along the Harbor Subdivision railroad right-of-way was incorporated as part of the Locally Preferred Alternative by the Metro Board of Directors. This would allow the light rail line to transition from Crenshaw Boulevard to the Harbor Subdivision without interrupting the flow of vehicular traffic.

Response to comment 30-229-E.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. An aerial, bi-level alignment along the Harbor Subdivision railroad right-of-way

designed to allow for a regional rail system is beyond the scope of the approved budget for the project and financially infeasible. The Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project will follow an expansion of the existing Harbor Subdivision right-of-way along a portion of the alignment. The LRT alignment will run alongside the Harbor Subdivision ROW from the intersection of Crenshaw Boulevard and Florence Avenue, along Florence Avenue and Aviation Boulevard to W. Imperial Highway.

Response to comment 30-229-F.

The southern terminus of the light rail alignment was designed so that it would not preclude a potential future southern extension of the line to the South Bay.

Response to comment 30-229-G.

The extension of the Metro Green Line to the airport is not part of the proposed project. A separate planning process could explore this transit investment if a future update to Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan has identified this connection as a funded project.

Response to comment 30-229-H.

The location of the Century Station will be spanning the Aviation Boulevard and Century Boulevard. This station will be developed in conjunction with a bus transit center adjacent to the station on the west. The Crenshaw Transit corridor functions and Metro Green Line functions will merge at this station, which is proposed to become the central hub for all municipal transit services to the LAX area, supplementing or replacing existing LAX bus facilities at the Aviation Green Line Station and the City Transit Center located on LAX parking lot C. This station would be located within a proposed transit plaza that would accommodate all LAX-oriented bus services provided by Metro, Beach Cities Transit, Santa Monica Big Blue Bus, Culver City Transit, the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), South Bay MAX and Torrance Transit and the Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) "G" shuttles that serve the Central Terminal Area of LAX.

Response to comment 30-229-I.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. The projects listed by the commenter are not part of the proposed project. Comments concerning the regional transit system as a whole should be directed to the Metro Long Range Transportation Plan. Information related to the Long Range Transportation Plan is available at www.metro.net, following the links to "Long Range Transportation Plan" under the "Projects and Programs" tab.

Response to comment 30-229-J.

Comment noted. During the preparation of the DEIS/DEIR, six additional design options were considered and evaluated to assess environmental impacts and address community concerns. Design Options 2, 3, and 6 were incorporated specifically to address potential traffic impacts. Design Option 2 incorporates an aerial grade separation at Manchester Avenue. Design Option 3 incorporates a below-grade separation at Centinela Avenue. Design Option 6 involved a below grade segment from Exposition Boulevard to 39th Street with a below-grade station at Exposition Boulevard. Design Option 2 was included



as part of the Locally Preferred Alternative and Design Options 3 and 6 were carried into the design process for further evaluation and consideration.

Response to comment 30-229-K.

Comment noted. Table 3-12 in Section 3.0 of the DEIS/DEIR provides boardings by comparable segments (Crenshaw/Exposition Station to the Aviation/Century Station) to allow for a similar comparison between alternatives.

Response to comment 30-229-L.

The northern extension to Wilshire Boulevard is included in the Strategic Element of Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan adopted in October 2009. A separate planning process could explore a transit investment in the corridor if a future update to Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan identifies this as a funded project. Design comments related to a Wilshire/La Brea station should be directed to the Westside Extension Project. Information related to this project is available at www.metro.net, following the links to "Long Range Transportation Plan" under the "Projects and Programs" tab.

COMMENT: 30-230. Mark Johnston.

30-230

Crenshaw Transit Corridor DEIS/DEIR Comments28
 Results from Form 1 of Page projects_studies/crenshaw/comment_form.htmFrom: Webmaster
 Sent: Friday, October 23, 2009 9:09 AM
 To: Diaz, Roderick
 Subject: Crenshaw Transit Corridor DEIS/DEIR Comments

 firstName: mark
 lastName: johnston
 organization: trac-narp
 emailAddress: canamej@yahoo.com
 street: 4185 van buren street
 city: chino
 state: ca
 zipcode: 91710
 Yes: ON
 No:
 support: LightRailTransit(LRT)Alternative
 Construction: ON
 AirQuality:
 TrafficSafety:
 Visualeffects:
 DisplacementofProperty:
 Disruptiontobusiness:
 PublicServices:
 LocalLandUseDevelopment:
 EconomicImpactsandJobs:
 SpecificDesignFeatures: ON
 Other: ON
 Homezip: 91710
 workzip: 91765
 Liveintheprojectarea?:
 Workintheprojectarea?:
 Ownabusinessintheprojectarea?:
 Commutethroughtheprojectarea?: YES
 Other: ON
 Bicycle?:
 CarorTruck?: ON
 Bus?:
 walk?:
 Other?:
 Resident:
 Business:
 Communityorneighborhoodorganization:
 PublicAgency:
 Environmentalorganization: ON
 Civicorganization: ON
 EconomicDevelopmentorganization:
 Other: ON
 Date: Friday, October 23, 2009
 Time: 09:09:24 AM

- additionalComments:
- A - 1/ Get rid of trench at LAX- use that money elsewhere on the line. San Jose can do it, why not us?
 - B - 2/ Crenshaw line must make it north to at least Wilshire for it to achieve ridershp
 - C - 3/ Therefore, make sure you put it underground where it crosses the Expo line, so you are set for future north extension. You can not have an at grade crossing at Expo.
 - D - 4/ Subway in center section good- make sure you have 2 stations
 - 5/ On the curve into the BNSF right-of-way, make sure you consider what kind of line is coming down from LAUS on the harbor sub.
 - E - I think the line from LAUS if not light rail, needs to be express style line with EMU's, hopefully you can use the same track and catenary or put the express underneath, since will only stop at Inglewood and the light rail on top.
 - F - 6/ Make sure you through route this line to Redondo Beach , then next segment to SBayGalleria and hopefully beyond
 - G - 7/ when this is built, curve the Green line up from Aviation to the LAX/Century station- this starts the segment where the green line should eventually get to Santa Monica.
 - H - 8/Be sure to design the Century station to accomodate Crenshaw and Green line light rail, plus whatever line is coming from LAUS and the people mover into LAX

**Response to comment 30-230-A.**

Whether the alignment adjacent to LAX is required to be below-grade is subject to the determination of the FAA. Several design coordination meetings were held with FAA to explore alternate configurations adjacent to the South Runway Complex at LAX. Ultimately, the FAA decided that the alignment would be required to be below grade adjacent to the runway

Response to comment 30-230-B.

Metro acknowledges that connecting the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project to Wilshire Boulevard would increase ridership. However, due to engineering constraints and the corresponding increased capital costs that would have exceeded the project budget, that potential future extension was not included as part of the proposed project. A separate planning process could explore a transit investment in the corridor if a future update to Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan identifies this as a funded project.

Response to comment 30-230-C.

During advanced conceptual engineering, an at-grade configuration was determined to be technically infeasible along this segment. The incorporation of Design Option 6 would be required to connect to the Exposition Line. Budgetary limitations may require this segment to be constructed in a second phase for the project, should the Metro Board incorporate it into the final project definition.

Response to comment 30-230-D.

Comment noted. The Locally Preferred Alternative currently contains a below-grade station at Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard along the below-grade segment from 39th Street to 48th Street. Please refer to Master Response 12 for a station at Crenshaw/Vernon.

Response to comment 30-230-E.

The transit line the commenter refers to is not part of the proposed project. A separate planning process could explore this transit investment if a future update to Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan has identified this connection as a funded project.

Response to comment 30-230-F.

The operating plan for the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Line has a southern terminus at the Metro Green Line Redondo Beach Green Line Station. An extension of the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project to the South Bay Galleria is not part of the proposed project. A separate planning process for the South Bay Metro Green Line Extension is being explored in its own EIS/EIR. Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan has identified this connection as a funded project.

Response to comment 30-230-G.

The extension of the Metro Green Line to the airport is not part of the proposed project. A separate planning process could explore this transit investment if a future update to Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan has identified this connection as a funded project.

Response to comment 30-230-H.

The Aviation/Century Station was designed to accommodate a convenient connection to the planned LAX automated people mover (APM) and a new consolidated bus transfer facility. The station site has been designed so that it would not preclude future expansion should it reach capacity, and will be developed in conjunction with the new bus transit center adjacent to the station on the west. The Crenshaw Transit corridor functions and Metro Green Line functions will merge at this station, which is proposed to become the central hub for all municipal transit services to the LAX area, supplementing or replacing existing LAX bus facilities at the Aviation Green Line Station and the City Transit Center located on LAX parking lot C. This station would be located within a proposed transit plaza that would accommodate all LAX-oriented bus services provided by Metro, Beach Cities Transit, Santa Monica Big Blue Bus, Culver City Transit, the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), South Bay MAX and Torrance Transit and the Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) “G” shuttles that serve the Central Terminal Area of LAX.



COMMENT: 30-231. Harvad Jones.

30-231

COMMUNITY MEMBER'S COMMENT ON MTA'S CRENSHAW LINE STUDY

NAME: Harvad Jones EMAIL: _____

ADDRESS: 1062 Broadway PHONE: _____

COMMENTS: Keep it undelayed

MUST BE SENT TO MTA BY OCT. 26, SO PLEASE RETURN BY OCT. 23

Email: crenshaw@fixexpo.org • **Fax:** (323) 761 - 6435 • **Address:** P.O. Box 781267 LA, CA 90016

Response to comment 30-231.

Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding general support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.



COMMENT: 30-232. Kathryn Jones.

CUT AND SEND

30-232

COMMUNITY MEMBER'S COMMENT ON MTA'S CRENSHAW LINE STUDY

NAME: Kathryn Jones EMAIL: _____

ADDRESS: 2815 S. Hauser Bl PHONE: (323) 9347147

COMMENTS: My grandson goes to View Park Prep. and his safety is of utmost importance to me. An above ground rail system would jeopardize the safety of the students at that school. An underground system is the only fair way to implement that rail system.

A
B

MUST BE SENT TO MTA BY OCT. 26, SO PLEASE RETURN BY OCT. 23

E mail: crenshaw@fixexpo.org • Fax: (323) 761 - 6435 • Address: P.O. Box 781267 LA, CA 90016

Response to comment 30-232-A.

A light rail transit system operating through the Crenshaw/LAX Corridor, would consist of a new bi-directional two-track, fixed guideway system that would travel through the median of Crenshaw Boulevard. The system would be powered by overhead wires and overhead contact system (OCS) poles spaced approximately 100 feet apart. Along Crenshaw Boulevard, the light rail alignment would be below grade from 39th Street to 48th Street and from 60th Street to the Harbor Subdivision railroad right-of-way. The DEIS/DEIR found that the at-grade light rail could operate safely in the median of Crenshaw Boulevard from Exposition Boulevard to 39th Street and from 48th to 60th Street.

Please refer to Master Response 7 for safety treatments and the approach to safety for the project.

Response to comment 30-232-B.

Please refer to Master Response 9 for grade separations and environmental justice.



COMMENT: 30-233. Kimberly Jones.

30-233

Abbott, Matthew

From: Damien Goodmon [damienwg@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2009 9:05 AM
To: Diaz, Roderick
Subject: Fwd: No to mta rail down crensshaw blvd.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **kimberly jones** <kjones09@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Mon, Oct 26, 2009 at 9:04 AM
Subject: No to mta rail down crensshaw blvd.
To: crensshaw@fixexpo.org

I feel that a mta rail line should be underground and not directly on crensshaw blvd. I live off of crensshaw blvd and it is a very busy street with kids and the elderly, therefore a lite rail would be unsafe. Sent on the Now Network™ from my Sprint® BlackBerry

A

11/10/2009

Response to comment 30-233.

Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding comments pertaining to an underground alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard due to safety concerns.



COMMENT: 30-234. Larry Jones.

30-234

Crenshaw Transit
Corridor Project

Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report

Comment Form

The Crenshaw Transit Corridor project team welcomes your comments on the findings of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report or any other aspect of the project or process. Please fill out this form and use additional sheets of paper, if necessary. Give this form to project staff or return to Metro (see directions on reverse).

Name (First & Last Name, Organization)

LARRY JONES - KENWOOD PLAYERS

Address (Street, City, State, Zip)

8301 HINDRY AV., LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

Email (enter address to receive periodic project updates)

Would you like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes No

THIS COMMENT RELATES TO:

My support for (check one):

- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Alternative
- Light Rail Transit (LRT) Alternative.
- No Improvement Necessary (No-Build Alternative)
- Minor Improvements (Transportation Systems Management [TSM] Alternative)
- No Opinion

My thoughts about (check any or all that apply):

- Construction
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Traffic
- Safety
- Visual Effects
- Displacement of Property
- Disruption to Business
- Public Services
- Local Land Use & Development
- Economic Impacts and Jobs
- Specific Design Features
- Other

Comment (please print):

PLEASE SELECT EL SEGUNDO
SITE FOR MAINTENANCE
YARD ON NEW CRENSHAW
TRANSIT CORRIDOR
PLEASE LEAVE THE
WESTCHESTER THEATER
ALONE.

- OVER -



Response to comment 30-234.

Please refer to Master Response 2 regarding comments pertaining to the effects of potential Maintenance Facility Site B or D.



COMMENT: 30-235. Sam Jones.

30-235

COMMUNITY MEMBER'S COMMENT ON MTA'S CRENSHAW LINE STUDY

NAME: Sam Jones EMAIL: _____

ADDRESS: _____ PHONE: _____

COMMENTS:

*There should be an equal opportunity. But
Should be the safest way*

MUST BE SENT TO MTA BY OCT. 26, SO PLEASE RETURN BY OCT. 23

Email: crenshaw@fixexpo.org • **Fax:** (323) 761 - 6435 • **Address:** P.O. Box 781267 LA, CA 90016



Response to comment 30-235.

Please refer to Master Response 9 for grade separations and environmental justice.

COMMENT: 30-236. Sheryl Jones.

30-236

Abbott, Matthew

From: Sheryl Jones [sherylj@designmerchants.com]
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2009 12:45 PM
To: Diaz, Roderick; crenshaw@fixexpo.org
Cc: mbacon6@yahoo.com
Subject: Rail line to run down Crenshaw Blvd

Dear MTA Board of Directors:

Please keep the Crenshaw Line underground on Crenshaw Blvd for the safety of the children at Crenshaw High School and View Park Prep. Also traffic already backs up in both directions on Slauson. Don't make a bad situation worse. Treat us the same as you intend to treat the Wilshire community.

A

Sincerely,
Sheryl Jones
P.O Box 653
Inglewood, CA 90307

11/10/2009



Response to comment 30-236.

Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding comments pertaining to an underground alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard due to children’s safety, traffic at Slauson Avenue, and environmental justice concerns.



COMMENT: 30-237. Shirley Jones.

30-237

COMMUNITY MEMBER'S COMMENT ON MTA'S CRENSHAW LINE STUDY

NAME: Shirley Jones EMAIL: _____
ADDRESS: 3754 W 59th place, Los Angeles CA 90043 PHONE: 323-295-2277
COMMENTS: Request entire crenshaw Blvd portion
of the line be built underground, plus a station
at vennon. I support and request MTA study
the people's option

A
B

MUST BE SENT TO MTA BY OCT 26 5:00 PM RETURN BY OCT 23

Email: crenshaw@mtxpo.org • Fax: (323) 761 - 6435 • Address: P.O. Box 781267 LA, CA 90016

1/1

2009-Oct-13 05:59 AM USPS - Los Angeles, CA 32358661255



Response to comment 30-237-A.

Please refer to Master Response 4 regarding the People's Choice Alternative.

Response to comment 30-237-B.

Please refer to Response to comment 30-237-A.

COMMENT: 30-238. Shirley Jones.

30-238

Abbott, Matthew

From: Shirley Jones [shirley9515@sboglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2009 3:59 PM
To: Diaz, Roderick
Subject: Crenshaw Line

Dear MTA Board of Directors:

Please keep the Crenshaw Line underground on Crenshaw Blvd for the safety of the children at Crenshaw High School and View Park Prep. Also traffic already backs up in both directions on Slauson. Don't make a bad situation worse. Treat us the same as you intend to treat the Wilshire community. A

Sincerely,

Shirley Jones
3754 W. 59th Place
Los Angeles CA 90043

11/5/2009



Response to comment 30-238.

Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding comments pertaining to an underground alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard due to children’s safety, traffic at Slauson Avenue, and environmental justice concerns.



COMMENT: 30-239. Alice Joyce.

30-239

**Crenshaw Transit
 Corridor Project**

Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report

Comment Form

The Crenshaw Transit Corridor project team welcomes your comments on the findings of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report or any other aspect of the project or process. Please fill out this form and use additional sheets of paper, if necessary. Give this form to project staff or return to Metro (see directions on reverse).

Name (First & Last Name, Organization)

ALICE Joyce

Address (Street, City, State, Zip)

5442 W 82nd St LA CA 90045

Email (enter address to receive periodic project updates)

aj4cats@sbcglobal.net

Would you like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes No

THIS COMMENT RELATES TO:

My support for (check one):

- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Alternative
- Light Rail Transit (LRT) Alternative
- No Improvement Necessary (No-Build Alternative)
- Minor Improvements (Transportation Systems Management [TSM] Alternative)
- No Opinion

My thoughts about (check any or all that apply):

- Construction
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Traffic
- Safety
- Visual Effects
- Displacement of Property
- Disruption to Business
- Public Services
- Local Land Use & Development
- Economic Impacts and Jobs
- Specific Design Features
- Other

Comment (please print):

Please do not destroy our neighborhood for some politician's dream. I have lived here for 36 years and hoped to live out my life in the peace and quiet of this neighborhood. The added traffic and infusion of strangers into this neighborhood

- OVER -



Comment (continued)

will take away the safety and security of this little part of Westchester

(SORRY I FORGOT TO PRINT)

Joyce

TELL US ABOUT YOURSELF

What is your home zip code? _____

Work zip code? _____

Do you: (check all that apply)

Live in the project area?

Commute through the project area?

Work in the project area?

Other? _____

Own a business in the project area?

How do you regularly travel in the project area?
(check all that apply)

Bicycle?

Bus?

Car or Truck?

Walk?

Other: _____

AFFILIATION

Resident

Business

Community or Neighborhood Organization

Public Agency

Environmental Organization

Civic Organization

Economic Development Organization

Other _____

Thank You!

Give this form to project staff or return to Metro:

Postal Mail

Roderick Diaz, Project Manager
Los Angeles County Metropolitan
Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Email:

diazroderick@metro.net

Project Hotline
(213) 922-2736

Comments must be received by October 26, 2009, 5:00 p.m.





LOS ANGELES CA 900

26 OCT 2009 PM 8 L



Roderick Diaz
LA County
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles CA 90012-2952

**Response to comment 30-239.**

There is no documented evidence that light rail brings more criminals into an area than the existing bus system. Metro is aware that structures, walls, and fences associated with a light rail system may be targets for graffiti “taggers” and the operation of the Project would include plans for security and maintenance personnel to minimize this potential problem. Metro has an active system in place to apprehend taggers and has a Cleanliness (Graffiti Abatement) policy that it follows. The program includes graffiti removal programs, vandalism repair and replacement, new capital expenditures, educational outreach, community involvement, and aggressive law enforcement.

The Westchester community is situated next to an industrial area and does not contain transit friendly commercial uses that would attract a significant number of riders from outside the area. As a result, the optional station at Manchester had one of the lowest ridership potentials of all of the stations along the alignment. The station would be primarily used by residents of the community or by workers of the adjacent industrial uses. The DEIS/DEIR determined that the operation of an at-grade light rail system along the existing Harbor Subdivision railroad right-of-way would not result in an adverse traffic, noise, or safety and security impact to the Westchester community.



COMMENT: 30-240. Bessie Kaine.

30-240

COMMUNITY MEMBER'S COMMENT ON MTA'S CRENSHAW LINE STUDY

NAME: Bessie Kaine EMAIL: bessiekaine@usa.com

ADDRESS: 6504 W. Olympic Blvd. PHONE: 310-929-9048

A COMMENTS: Putting the train over ground as opposed to
underground is a big mistake not only for the immediate
community near Crenshaw, but ~~to~~ to the greater
Los Angeles community as a whole.

MUST BE SENT TO MTA BY OCT. 26, SO PLEASE RETURN BY OCT. 23

Email: crenshaw@fixexpo.org • **Fax:** (323) 761 - 6435 • **Address:** P.O. Box 781267 LA, CA 90016

**Response to comment 30-240.**

Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding general support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.

The Community and Neighborhoods Chapter of the FEIS/FEIR found that the operation of an at-grade light rail system would not result in an adverse impact. Specifically, no changes in population, community cohesion and interaction, social values, quality of life, or isolation would result from the operation of the Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit Alternative.

Metro acknowledges that the construction of the light rail system would affect surrounding communities during construction. Metro will coordinate with the surrounding residents and local businesses of the adjacent communities to minimize adverse effects to the extent feasible during construction.

Underground segments of the alignment would result in increased disruption to communities during construction because of the longer time required for excavation. Upon completion of the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project, operation of the light rail system would provide enhanced access to members of the surrounding communities. This enhanced access would occur along all portions of the alignment, particularly near station areas.



COMMENT: 30-241. Musa Kannike.

30-241

Abbott, Matthew

From: Chief Musa Kannike [chiefkannike@yahoo.com]

Sent: Friday, October 30, 2009 8:52 PM

To: Diaz, Roderick; crenshaw@fixexpo.org

Dear MTA Board of Directors:

Please keep the Crenshaw Line underground on Crenshaw Blvd for the safety of the children at Crenshaw High School and View Park Prep. Also traffic already backs up in both directions on Slauson. Don't make a bad situation worse. Treat us the same as you intend to treat the Wilshire community.

A

Sincerely,
Musa Kannike

11/5/2009



Response to comment 30-241.

Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding comments pertaining to an underground alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard due to children’s safety, traffic at Slauson Avenue, and environmental justice concerns.

COMMENT: 30-242. John Kawakami.

30-242

Abbott, Matthew

From: John Kawakami [johnk@riceball.com]
Sent: Friday, October 23, 2009 4:32 PM
To: Diaz, Roderick
Cc: crenshaw@fixexpo.org
Subject: I support running the Crenshaw line underground near View Park Prep and Crenshaw High

I support running the Crenshaw line underground near View Park Prep and Crenshaw High. It would not only increase safety, but also improve the neighborhood's appeal. It's a great, old Los Angeles neighborhood, and we should consider it's historical importance.

A

The train will undoubtedly improve the neighborhood, but, if it's not lain underground near schools, it will also limit the neighborhood. It will set an upper limit to the improvement, by contributing noise, pedestrian and traffic hazards, and visual blight. Please consider this.

B

Also, it would be nice if the train ran all the way up Crenshaw and connected directly with the Purple Line at the Western station. This isn't part of the big plan, but, wouldn't it be great to be able to get from Union Station to LAX?

C

John Kawakami
23rd St. near Vermont

**Response to comment 30-242-A.**

A light rail transit system operating through the Crenshaw/LAX Corridor, would consist of a new bi-directional two-track, fixed guideway system that would travel through the median of Crenshaw Boulevard. The system would be powered by overhead wires and overhead contact system (OCS) poles spaced approximately 100 feet apart. Along Crenshaw Boulevard, the light rail alignment would be below grade from 39th Street to 48th Street and from 60th Street to the Harbor Subdivision railroad right-of-way. The DEIS/DEIR found that the at-grade light rail could operate safely in the median of Crenshaw Boulevard from Exposition Boulevard to 39th Street and from 48th to 60th Street.

Please refer to Master Response 7 for safety treatments and the approach to safety for the project.

The light rail system would be similar in character to the existing transportation infrastructure along Crenshaw Boulevard, which includes lighting, utility poles, signage, and signals. The FEIS/FEIR found that a light rail transit system traveling at grade in the Crenshaw median would not introduce new hazards or hazardous materials into the environment and that it would be consistent in character with surrounding land uses. No significant impacts to safety or visual resources would occur from the operation of the light rail alignment in an at-grade configuration along Crenshaw Boulevard.

Response to comment 30-242-B.

Please see response to comment 30-242-A.

Please refer to Master Response 5 for traffic methodology and analysis.

Response to comment 30-242-C.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. The northern extension of the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project to Wilshire Boulevard is not part of the proposed project. A separate planning process could explore this transit investment if a future update to Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan has identified this connection as a funded project.

COMMENT: 30-243. Janet Kelly.

30-243

Abbott, Matthew

From: Janet Kelly [j_ganaway@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2009 4:13 PM
To: Diaz, Roderick
Subject: Public Comment on the Crenshaw/SouthBay Transit

I am a constituent who reside at 7023 Haas Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90047. It appears the proposed transit will be near my neighbor and possibly blocks away.

In the event, I am not able to make it to the meeting. I am in full support of a light rail system as long as the necessary precautions are implemented to prevent any pedestrian fatalities. Additionally, I strongly urge the development of mixed income housing and under employed housing along the corridors.

I see no real value in a rapid bus system. A light rail is needed to promote economic growth in the community.

Please keep me updated as to progress in this effort.

Janet Denise Kelly 😊

A

B

11/5/2009

**Response to comment 30-243-A.**

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. The Metro Board of Directors selected the Light Rail Alternative as the Locally Preferred Alternative. The Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit Alternative proved to generate the greatest travel time savings and reliability, higher ridership for comparable segments, a stronger support of community goals for economic development, and connectivity with other elements of Metro's regional transit system (specifically, the Metro Green Line).

Please refer to Master Response 7 for safety treatments and the approach to safety for the project. While Metro actively pursues joint development projects adjacent to station areas, there is no housing element to the proposed project. Local planning and redevelopment agencies often pursue housing proposals in response to new transit investments.

Response to comment 30-243-B.

Comment noted. While the extent of the greater economic development potential of light rail transit is uncertain; because the Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit Alternative has a higher capital cost, the economic effects are assumed to be greater than the BRT Alternative.



COMMENT: 30-244. Cymone Kemp.

30-244

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Cymone Kemp** <ckemp@viewparkprep.org>

Date: Mon, Oct 26, 2009 at 2:29 PM

Subject:

To: crenshaw@fixexpo.org

Dear MTA Board of Directors:

Please keep the Crenshaw Line underground on Crenshaw Blvd for the safety of the children at Crenshaw High School and View Park Prep. Also traffic already backs up in both directions on Slauson. Don't make a bad situation worse. Treat us the same as you intend to treat the Wilshire community.

A

Sincerely,

Cymone Kemp

Assistant Office Manager

View Park Prep Charter High School

5701 S. Crenshaw Blvd

Los Angeles, CA 90043

(323) 290-6975

11/5/2009



Response to comment 30-244.

Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding comments pertaining to an underground alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard due to children’s safety, traffic at Slauson Avenue, and environmental justice concerns.

COMMENT: 30-245. Helen Kendrick.

30-245

Abbott, Matthew

From: helen kendrick [helenkndrck@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2009 3:43 PM
To: Diaz, Roderick

Dear MTA Board of Directors:

Please keep the Crenshaw Line underground on Crenshaw Boulevard for the safety of the children at Crenshaw High School and View Park Prep. Also traffic already backs up in both directions on Slauson. Please don't make a bad situation worse. Treat us the same as you intend to treat the Wilshire community..

Sincerely,

HELEN KENDRICK
2406 W. 62ND STREET
Los Angeles, CA 90043

11/10/2009



Response to comment 30-245.

Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding comments pertaining to an underground alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard due to children’s safety, traffic at Slauson Avenue, and environmental justice concerns.

COMMENT: 30-246. Lance Kessler.

30-246

Abbott, Matthew

From: Lance Kessler [lance@twistpromotions.com]
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2009 12:01 PM
To: Diaz, Roderick
Subject: Crenshaw Transit Corridor Project

Roderick,

I am sending this email to you to protest the possibility of the MTA building a maintenance yard in my neighborhood (Osage & La Cienega).

It absolutely does not make sense for you to put this in this location. The alternate proposed lot at Sepulveda & Rosecrans is clearly the better choice for this facility. There are too many ramifications to building this in our neighborhood.

The Rosecrans site does not have residential neighbors adjacent to the lot. Therefore, once again, the Rosecrans proposed site definitely makes more sense.

PLEASE DO NOT BUILD NEXT TO OUR RESIDENCES!

Lance J. Kessler
7812 Toland Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90045

A

B



Response to comment 30-246-A.

Please refer to Master Response 2 regarding comments pertaining to the effects of potential Maintenance Facility Site B or D.

Response to comment 30-246-B.

Please see response to comment 30-246-A.



COMMENT: 30-247. Nazeer Khabeer.

30-247

COMMUNITY MEMBER'S COMMENT ON MTA'S CRENSHAW LINE STUDY

NAME: Nazeer Khabeer EMAIL: original2men@yahoo.com

ADDRESS: 3942 Buckingham Rd PHONE: _____

COMMENTS: Keep it underground.

MUST BE SENT TO MTA BY OCT. 26, SO PLEASE RETURN BY OCT. 23

Email: crenshaw@fixexpo.org • **Fax:** (323) 761 - 6435 • **Address:** P.O. Box 781267 LA, CA 90016



Response to comment 30-247.

Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding general support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.

COMMENT: 30-248. Joseph Khory.

30-248

Abbott, Matthew

From: jtkhoury@gmail.com on behalf of Joseph Khoury [JKhoury@UCLAlumni.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2009 9:40 AM
To: Diaz, Roderick
Subject: Crenshaw Transit Corridor

I live in Village Green, in the Crenshaw District. As a member of the Village Green Owners Association Board of Directors, I urge you to support the **Light Rail Option** for the Crenshaw Transit Corridor. | A

Thank you!

Joseph Khoury
5394 Village Green
Los Angeles CA 90016

Metro is holding four public hearings on September 30, October 1, 3 & 6 to receive public comment during a 45-day review period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/DEIR) for this project. The deadline for comments is Monday, October 26, 2009, 5 pm. Comments may be submitted to:

Roderick Diaz,

Project Manager
Metro, One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012
or via email to: diazroderick@metro.net

Comments will be considered by the Metro Board when it selects a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for this transit improvement project. Comments made on the DEIS/DEIR will be addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement/Report (FEIS/FEIR).

--
JKhoury@UCLAlumni.net
Los Angeles CA

11/5/2009



Response to comment 30-248.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. The Metro Board of Directors selected the Light Rail Alternative as the Locally Preferred Alternative. The Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit Alternative proved to generate the greatest travel time savings and reliability, higher ridership for comparable segments, a stronger support of community goals for economic development, and connectivity with other elements of Metro's regional transit system (specifically, the Metro Green Line).



COMMENT: 30-249. Liz King.

30-249

Abbott, Matthew

From: Liz King [lizking@pacbell.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2009 5:35 PM
To: Diaz, Roderick
Subject: Crenshaw Transit Plan

Greetings Mr. Roderick

I read the article in the Daily Breeze about the MTA's Crenshaw Transit Plan and how they are seeking public input. I planned to attend tonight's public meeting, but I was unable to leave work.

I have been riding MTA full time for the last 7-8 years. I have enjoyed the many improvements made by the MTA especially the Rapid buses.

I personally think that whatever plan is chosen by the MTA, I hope that you also take into consideration those of us using the local buslines to get to and from work. I also believe a busline would have better use for both locals and people traveling from LAX and nearby cities than the train.

The main reason I am writing though is to ask you to please take into consideration when you incorporate your new proposal the tough times that most locals have catching many of the rapid/regular bus routes going north and south (e.g. for me the Crenshaw line 210/710, but for others the La Brea; La Cienega, Normandie, etc.) lines.

The rapid and the regular bus lines running north and south are usually on separate sides of the street separated by a light. This is terrible planning. Most busriders can catch either line and would prefer (especially if lines are not running on time to catch the first bus they see). I personally work from 9:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., and the Crenshaw 710 line runs very erratic after 6:00 p.m.

For example, on September 24th there was an incident where King Boulevard was closed further up the street. I arrived at Olympic and Crenshaw at 6:25 p.m. and went across the street to wait for a 210 bus line heading south. A 210 bus came about 20 minutes later but was packed and drove past us. I then crossed the street for the 710 line running south. A 710 line never showed and another 210 went pass while we waited. Finally at 8:00 p.m. we saw a 210, and then all of us at the 710 stop ran to catch the 210.

On September 25th, I arrived at 6:25 p.m. and waited for the 710 until 7:55 p.m. The bus driver informed me a bus broke down. But during this time three 210 buses went by.

If the busstops had been together, we could have caught the first bus that showed up. Instead, I feel like I am always having to guess if my bus will be on time, if not do I cross the street? do I stay put? While everyone else is running across the street on a yellow/red light, should I follow?

On bad days, it can take me as long to get home (from Century City to Crenshaw Center) as it takes my friend who takes the dash to the Long Beach train line home.

Most of the buses traveling from downtown to the westside (Pico, Olympic, Wilshire), not only are the rapid and regular bus lines at the same stop, but usually the local lines of other cities are also right next to the MTA's bus stops (for example, Culver City Green busline, or Santa Monica blue busline).

Which means anyone on the westside (e.g. Beverly Hills, Santa Monica, etc.,) can stand at one stop and have a number of choices, while those of us going into south Los Angeles have to race across the street on yellow or red lights or wait an hour if a bus does not show.

I have personally run across the street with the elderly, women holding children, people who are injured just trying to catch a bus.

I write this hoping that you will seriously consider not only helping the travelers coming from LAX, El Segundo, etc., but will also consider helping all of us who catch the local bus lines around Los Angeles.

11/5/2009



Putting the rapid and local lines on the same side of the street, would make life easier and much more convenient.

Thank you for taking the time to read this email.

Very truly yours,

Liz King
4060 9th Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90008
Tel: 323.296.2490

11/5/2009

Response to comment 30-249.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process.

Please refer to Master Response 6 for the selection of the locally preferred alternative. The siting of bus stops is not part of the proposed project. Comments regarding existing bus service should be directed to a Metro Passenger Relations representative at (213) 922-6235 or at www.Metro.net, under the About Us tab, How to Reach Us/Customer Comments. The selected LRT project incorporates in as many locations as possible, facilitated connections between LRT stations and local buses.



COMMENT: 30-250. Yolanda King.

30-250

COMMUNITY MEMBER'S COMMENT ON MTA'S CRENSHAW LINE STUDY

NAME: Yolanda King EMAIL: ydking@sbglobal.net

ADDRESS: 4131 S. Bronson Av PHONE: _____

COMMENTS: NO TRAIN AT ALL!!

MUST BE SENT TO MTA BY OCT. 26, SO PLEASE RETURN BY OCT. 23

Email: crenshaw@fixexpo.org • **Fax:** (323) 761 - 6435 • **Address:** P.O. Box 781267 LA, CA 90016

Response to comment 30-250.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. Chapter 1, Purpose and Need, of the FEIS/FEIR, provides a comprehensive analysis of why transit improvements are needed within the Crenshaw/LAX Corridor. The factors include peak period congestion, limited transportation accessibility, poor regional connectivity, limited access to services outside the Corridor, future economic development, high transit demand, transit dependency, and benefit to the environment and improved sustainability.

Please refer to Master Response 6 for the selection of the locally preferred alternative.



COMMENT: 30-251. Bernadette Kirkwood.

30-251

Abbott, Matthew

From: bskpartners [bsk@bskpartners.com]
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2009 1:09 PM
To: Diaz, Roderick
Subject: Amended Comments on the Crenshaw Transit Corridor Project
Attachments: Crenshaw Transit Corridor Project - Comments 10.09.doc

Mr. Diaz,

Please substitute the attached comments for those I emailed you earlier today. In the first email I didn't clearly state my choice for the type of transit; at grade, above grade or under ground. It is my strong preference that it be Underground the Entirety of the Crenshaw Corridor. Providing the transit in this fashion would satisfactorily address many of my concerns. My other concerns are noted in my comments, attached. A

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (323) 292-6232.

Thank you,

Bernadette Kirkwood, resident

11/5/2009

Crenshaw Transit Corridor Project – Comments

After reviewing the documents and attending various meetings in regard to the Crenshaw Transit Corridor Project, I offer the following comments:

I favor Under grounding the entirety of the Crenshaw Corridor Transit Project as it would best address my concerns.

- Preserve the residential character, feel and aesthetics of the established communities adjacent to the Crenshaw Corridor. | A
- Create minimal disturbance to the mature trees, plantings and ambience of this established environment. | B
- Preserve still remaining architectural features. | C
- Preserve the Boulevard feel along the corridor. Not add visual clutter and impair sight lines and vistas. | D
- Provide greatest possible connectivity to LAX, Downtown Los Angeles and the Westside. | E
- Be as convenient to use for area residents as possible thereby encouraging local ridership. Adjacent residents should be as much a priority as those using the new transportation to get from point A to Point B along the Crenshaw Corridor. | F
- Strong considerations should be given to adding a station at Crenshaw Blvd. /Vernon Avenue to accommodate the revitalization of Leimert Park, and as another node for View Park residents to utilize the transportation system. | G
- Adequate and ample park and ride facilities must be considered along the Crenshaw Corridor to avoid unwanted parking and congestion on residential streets. | H
- Provide the lowest possible emissions, environmental pollutants, and noise during construction and operation. | I
- | J



Response to comment 30-251-A.

Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding general support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.

Response to comment 30-251-B.

The Community and Neighborhoods Chapter on page 4-81 of the DEIS/DEIR found that the operation of an at-grade light rail system would not result in an adverse impact. Specifically, no changes in population, community cohesion and interaction, social values, quality of life, or isolation would result from the operation of the LRT Alternative.

Metro acknowledges that the construction of the light rail system would affect surrounding communities during construction. Metro will coordinate with the surrounding residents and local businesses of the adjacent communities to minimize adverse effects to the extent feasible during construction.

Underground segments of the alignment would result in increased disruption to communities during construction because of the longer time required for excavation. Upon completion of the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project, operation of the light rail system would provide enhanced access to members of the surrounding communities. This enhanced access would occur along all portions of the alignment, particularly near station areas.

Response to comment 30-251-C.

During construction of the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project the trees in the median of Crenshaw Boulevard and along the street side of the frontage road, from south of 48th Street to 60th Street would have to be removed. Mitigation Measure V3 in the Visual Quality Section of the FEIS/FEIR require the replacement of these trees with trees of equal value.

Response to comment 30-251-D.

The light rail transit system would travel in the median of Crenshaw Boulevard and the architectural features of the Corridor would not be disrupted or altered.

Response to comment 30-251-E.

A light rail transit system operating through the Crenshaw/LAX Corridor, would consist of a new bi-directional two-track, fixed guideway system that would travel through the median of Crenshaw Boulevard. The system would be powered by overhead wires and overhead contact system (OCS) poles spaced approximately 100 feet apart. This light rail system would be similar in character to the existing transportation infrastructure along Crenshaw Boulevard, which includes lighting, utility poles, signage, and signals. The DEIS/DEIR found that a light rail transit system traveling at grade in the Crenshaw median would be consistent in character with surrounding land uses and would not result in a significant visual impact.

Response to comment 30-251-F.

The Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project was designed to maximize the connectivity of the regional rail system. The Crenshaw/LAX Line would connect to LAX and the Expo and Green Lines. These connections would be consistent with the commenter's request to provide the greatest possible connectivity to (LAX, Downtown, Westside).

Response to comment 30-251-G.

Comment noted. The design of the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project has six stations included into the Project definition with the possibility of two future stations Manchester and/or Vernon). Station locations are sited in locations adjacent to provide safe, convenient access for residents and businesses within the communities along the alignment.

Response to comment 30-251-H.

Please refer to Master Response 12 for a station at Crenshaw/Vernon.

Response to comment 30-251-I.

Comment noted. The traffic analysis found that the existing inventory of off-street parking was underutilized and that there would be sufficient parking capacity after implementation of the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project. Therefore, no adverse effect on parking would occur. Park and ride locations would be provided at the West, La Brea, and Exposition Stations.

Response to comment 30-251-J.

Comment noted. The potential impacts of air quality and noise were evaluated in the environmental document. A localized air quality analysis, which includes the emissions from automobiles queuing at intersections, determined that no applicable thresholds would be exceeded from operation of the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project. The federal air quality regional thresholds would not be exceeded during the operation of the light rail system. Because operation of the light rail system would result in a reduction of automobile trips, no adverse greenhouse gas impacts would occur. No adverse noise impacts from light rail operations would occur with implementation of the proposed project. Metro acknowledges that the construction of the light rail system would affect surrounding communities during construction. Metro will coordinate with the surrounding residents and local businesses of the adjacent communities to minimize adverse effects to the extent feasible during construction.



COMMENT: 30-252. Kevin Klowden.

30-252

Greetings,

Although I realize that much of this feedback may be somewhat redundant, I wanted to take a moment to express my concerns regarding the possible solutions provided for the Crenshaw Corridor in the Draft Environmental Impact Report. My specific position is in favor of the Light Rail solution for the corridor, for a few reasons that I will spell out below.

A

- Role of the airport: Although numerous locations, including Los Angeles, have successfully implemented dedicated shuttle bus services to and from major airports, I know of no city that has successfully relied on a standardized bus route as the primary means of business travellers reaching the airport. A fixed rail link that connects the Green Line, Expo Line and eventually Purple Line would have the advantage of not only appealing to business travellers, but also allowing passengers to transfer between travel modes of the same type, rather than from train to bus. Passengers will already have to change modes to a people mover once near the airport. An additional vehicle type is unlikely to be preferred. Trains are also significantly easier to bring baggage onto than buses, which should also be a key factor.
- Vehicle routing: Although I do not know if any plans are in place to do so, having a light rail route significantly increases routing options for trains along the Metro system. An integrated track that links with both the Expo Line and Green Line would create possibilities for routing a direct train from Downtown to LAX and the South Bay, as well as providing the possibility of a line running from Santa Monica to LAX as well, depending on track configurations. This is a significant advantage to long term planning.
- Future-Proofing: Light rail trains offer the ability to carry significantly more passengers than buses, both in the short and long term. The Orange Line works because it provides a feeder system to an existing heavy rail line, but unless the line is eventually converted to fixed track, there will always be lower limits to its total capacity. Starting with fixed rail means that greater capacity is built into the project. Any future conversion of the route to rail will not only cost more money, but also will run the risk of neighborhood resentment at the idea of a second round of construction. Also, such a project would force disruptions to the established bus service, which would not be well received.
- Potential issues: My main concern at the moment is how interchange at the Crenshaw-Exposition line junction is going to be handled. Any station that is constructed must be able to handle trains being routed in multiple directions, which is not, unto itself, an easy task- particularly for an at-grade station. Construction must take into account future uses, otherwise the impact of any changes in the future could cause significant problems for businesses that develop around the station. Also, the decision to terminate the north end of the line where there is currently no Purple Line station is a potential problem. As long as the Purple Line is extended to La Brea within a reasonable time frame of the station opening (up to 1 year later), there shouldn't be a significant problem, but it will impact ridership.

B

C

D

E

Thank you very much for your attention.

Sincerely,

Kevin Klowden
Member, Los Angeles Airport Area Advisory Committee for Culver City
Managing Economist, California Center
Milken Institute
1250 4th Street, Santa Monica, CA 90401
Phone: (310) 570-4626
Fax: (310) 570-4653

11/5/2009

Response to comment 30-252-A.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. The Metro Board of Directors selected the Light Rail Alternative as the Locally Preferred Alternative. The Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit Alternative proved to generate the greatest travel time savings and reliability, higher ridership for comparable segments, a stronger support of community goals for economic development, and connectivity with other elements of Metro's regional transit system (specifically, the Metro Green Line).

Response to comment 30-252-B.

Comment noted. Please see response to comment 30-252-A

Response to comment 30-252-C.

Comment noted. Although future connections are not part of the proposed project, Metro would concur that the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project has a much stronger potential for future regional connectivity than a bus rapid transit system.

Response to comment 30-252-D.

Comment noted. Please see response to comment 30-252-A.

Response to comment 30-252-E.

Comment noted. Metro thanks the commenter for their input as it is a vital component of the planning process. The Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit Alternative is designed such that it does not preclude the future northern extension of the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Line to Wilshire Boulevard.



COMMENT: 30-253. Cheryl La Beau.

30-253

Abbott, Matthew

From: Cheryl.V.Labeau@kp.org
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2009 6:34 PM
To: Diaz, Roderick
Subject: Crenshaw MTA line

Dear MTA Board of Directors:

Please keep the Crenshaw Line underground on Crenshaw Blvd for the safety of the children at Crenshaw High School, View Park Prep and the many other day care centers that are in the community. Also traffic already backs up in both directions on Slauson. Don't make a bad situation worse. Treat us the same as you intend to treat the Wilshire community.

A

Sincerely,
Cheryl La Beau
4052 Fairway Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90043

Also Property Owner
4509 Don Tomaso Dr.,
Los Angeles, CA 90008

Cheryl La Beau
Manager/DA
Medical Office Records Department
LAMC
323-783-3032

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT: If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are prohibited from sharing, copying, or otherwise using or disclosing its contents. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and permanently delete this e-mail and any attachments without reading, forwarding or saving them. Thank you.

11/5/2009

Response to comment 30-253.

Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding comments pertaining to an underground alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard due to children's safety, traffic at Slauson Avenue, and environmental justice concerns.



COMMENT: 30-254. Jofaye Lambert.

30-254

COMMUNITY MEMBER'S COMMENT ON MTA'S CRENSHAW LINE STUDY

NAME: Jofaye Lambert EMAIL: free2be1263@yahoo.com

ADDRESS: 215 N. Inglewood Ave #4 PHONE: 310-6745417
Inglewood, CA 90301

COMMENTS: Make the MTA Rail underground!!! | A

Thank You 😊

MUST BE SENT TO MTA BY OCT. 26, SO PLEASE RETURN BY OCT. 23

Email: crenshaw@fixexpo.org • **Fax:** (323) 761 - 6435 • **Address:** P.O. Box 781267 LA, CA 90016

Response to comment 30-254.

Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding general support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.



COMMENT: 30-255. Alexis Lantz.

30-255

Abbott, Matthew

From: Webmaster
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2009 1:20 PM
To: Diaz, Roderick
Subject: Crenshaw Transit Corridor DEIS/DEIR Comments

firstName: alexis
lastName: lantz
organization:
emailaddress: alexislantz@gmail.com
street: 863 n. dillon st, #5
city: los angeles
state: ca
zipcode: 90026
Yes:
No: ON
support: BusRapidTransit (BRT) Alternative | A
Construction:
AirQuality:
TrafficSafety:
VisualEffects:
DisplacementofProperty:
DisruptiontoBusiness:
PublicServices:
LocalLandUseDevelopment:
EconomicImpactsandJobs:
SpecificDesignFeatures:
Other: YES
HomeZip: 90026
workZip: 90029
Liveintheprojectarea?:
Workintheprojectarea?:
Ownabusinessintheprojectarea?:
Commutethroughtheprojectarea?:
Other: YES
Bicycle?:
CarorTruck?: ON
Bus?:
Walk?:
Other?:
Resident:
Business:
CommunityorNeighborhoodOrganization: ON
PublicAgency:
EnvironmentalOrganization:
CivicOrganization:
EconomicDevelopmentOrganization:
Other: YES
Date: Monday, October 26, 2009
Time: 12:20:21 PM
additionalComments:

11/5/2009

Response to comment 30-255.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. Please refer to Master Response 6 for the selection of the locally preferred alternative.



COMMENT: 30-256. Karen Lawrence.

30-256

COMMUNITY MEMBER'S COMMENT ON MTA'S CRENSHAW LINE STUDY

NAME: KAREN LAWRENCE EMAIL: KML37@hotmail.com

ADDRESS: 750 W 109th St LA, CA 90044 PHONE: (310) 702-3136

COMMENTS: MTA go under ground
on Crenshaw.

MUST BE SENT TO MTA BY OCT. 26, SO PLEASE RETURN BY OCT. 23

Email: crenshaw@fixexpo.org • **Fax:** (323) 761 - 6435 • **Address:** P.O. Box 781267 LA, CA 90016

Response to comment 30-256.

Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding general support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.