



091001 P09759

11 to the date at which it matters; that will be December
12 the 10th. And I expect that each of you will invite at
13 least one or two other persons to be at the MTA boardroom.
14 We need to pack that boardroom out and let them know that
15 we want to make sure that this rail is given the highest
16 priority that it deserves. And that it should be marked
17 by safety. It should be marked by aesthetics. And it
18 should be marked by the best technology available in order
19 for to us to have the kind of rail project that we wish.

20 I want to be clear about my position. It is
21 essentially this: That we have an opportunity to take
22 what is the largest public works project in this region
23 for a very long time if not ever, in excess of
24 \$1.5 billion, and make it work for the objectives of
25 traffic congestion relief, for improvement in air quality,

33

26.A
||

1 and for economic development. Those three objectives are
2 what we seek to fulfill.

3 I argue that there are two options, alternatives.
4 You know them. Bus is one, the light rail is the second
5 one. It would seem to me, if we want the most efficient
6 use of this corridor to maximize its impact, it would be
7 light rail. That's what I'm arguing for. I'm

26.B

8 unapologetic about it. It creates more jobs. And I think
9 the defining feature of what can happen is jobs, jobs, and
10 more jobs. And good quality jobs.

11 I'm not an opponent of bus; I'm not fully or
12 completely dependent on rail. I think you have to have an
13 appropriate mixture of the two modalities. But for this
14 particular line that has been in play for over a quarter
15 of a century, I think it should be clear to everybody that
16 we are overdue for the best that can be put on Crenshaw
17 corridor and be the hookup for the South Bay and then,
18 ultimately, to the airport. That's what this is about.

19 We are in play in a way that we've never seen
20 before. So let's advocate with enthusiasm, with
21 imagination, with the kind of sense of purpose and equity
22 that will make a difference so that everybody knows that

Page 24

091001 P09759

23 crenshaw is in the house.
24 Thank you very much and we appreciate it.
25 Ms. Reeves: Thank you, Supervisor.

34

□

1 Is there anything else that has a card or would
2 like to fill out a comment card? No.
3 we have, as the supervisor mentioned, we have two
4 hearings remaining. This Saturday morning we have a
5 hearing that starts at 10 a.m.; that's at Inglewood High
6 school from 10:00 a.m. until noon. Tuesday October 6th we
7 have our fourth and final hearing; that's at
8 Transfiguration Church on Martin Luther King Boulevard.
9 That's from 6:00 p.m. until 8:00 p.m. And you're welcome
10 to come to those hearings, one or both, and provide a
11 verbal comment at each.

12 And, of course, you're always welcome to provide
13 a written comment. The comment forms have all the
14 information on how to submit your written comment. They
15 have Roderick's contact information and the project
16 hotline. So we encourage your feedback.

17 I'd like to thank you this evening for coming
18 out. We appreciate you sharing your time and feedback.

19 And just a reminder that the comment period
20 closes Monday October 26th.

21 And, if you have any additional questions,
22 Roderick and other staff members will be here to answer
23 your questions.

24 Again, thank you very much for coming out.

25

35

Page 25

**Comment: 41-12. Damien Goodmon.****Response to comment 41-12A.**

The cost, constructability, safety, environmental and economic development benefits associated with linking proposed underground segments of the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor with a below grade connection between 48th and 59th Streets on Crenshaw Boulevard was considered during the final design of the Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit Project. While it was been determined an all underground alignment is physically feasible, the physical conditions and the lack of significant environmental impacts still do not require the alignment to be placed underground for the entirety of the alignment. The cost of constructing a fully grade-separated project along the entire length of Crenshaw Boulevard would be beyond the scope of Metro policies and the approved Metro budget for the project and financially infeasible.

Please Refer to Master Response 6 regarding selection of the locally preferred alternative.

Response to comment 41-12B.

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

Comment 41-13. Clint Simmons.

Response to comment 41-13A.

Comment noted. 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.

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

Response to comment 41-13B.

The selected LPA includes two underground segments for light rail along Crenshaw Boulevard, between 39th Street and 48th Street and between 60th Street and Victoria Avenue. The inclusion of these two underground segments follows a consistent application of criteria that examines each potential crossing for considering grade separations for LRT. These criteria include availability of right-of-way, environmental impacts (such as traffic impacts, visual impacts, impacts to historic resources, and environmental justice impacts), and Metro's established Grade Separation Policy.

Please Refer to Master Response 5 regarding traffic methodology and analysis.

Motorist safety treatments are described in detail in Section 2.0 Alternatives Considered of the Draft EIS/EIR. From the Exposition/Crenshaw Station southward, the LRT would operate at-grade in a semi-exclusive right-of-way separated from automobile traffic by a raised curb until the alignment transitions to a below-grade section at Crenshaw Boulevard and 39th Street and would not travel above 35 mph. Pedestrians and motorists would cross the LRT tracks with standard signal phases. As discussed in Section 3.0 Transportation Impacts of the Draft EIS/EIR, the signal phasing at intersections would be changed to accommodate the LRT operations. When LRT vehicles are present, movements that would conflict with LRT vehicles are prohibited. Pedestrians are permitted to cross the street during phases in which the LRT vehicles are not present. Additional safety features, such as dedicated left-turn phases, photo enforcement cameras, and in-pavement lights will be considered, as appropriate, along this segment.



Comment 41-14. Judi Redman.

Response to comment 41-14A.

Please Refer to Master Response 6 regarding selection of the locally preferred alternative.

Response to comment 41-14B.

Comment noted. Please see response to comment 41-14-A. A massive expansion of the bus system is not part of the Metro Long Range Plan. Comments regarding this overall goal should be directed towards the long range planning process.

Comment 41-15. Julian Lamb.

Response to comment 41-15A.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. Comment noted. Please see response to comment 41-14-A.

Response to comment 41-15B.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. Construction of the Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit Project would result in approximately 400 jobs per year over the five years that would be necessary to complete the project. In addition, approximately 128 annual jobs would be created during the operation of the project.

Response to comment 41-15C.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. The BRU Clean Air and Economic Justice Plan is not part of the proposed project. Please Refer to Master Response 6 regarding selection of the locally preferred alternative.



Comment 41-16. Tom Burke.

Response to comment 41-16A.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. While the concerns of the commenter regarding seniors and bus service are not part of the proposed project, Metro will pass on the concerns to the customer relations department.

Comment 41-17. Vernard Johnson.

Response to comment 41-17A.

Comment noted. Please Refer to Master Response 6 regarding selection of the locally preferred alternative.



Comment 41-18. Gina Fields.

Response to comment 41-18A.

Please Refer to Master Response 1 Regarding support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.

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

No adverse operational noise impacts were found to occur with the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project. Mitigation measures were also included in Section 4.6.4 of the FEIS/FEIR to reduce the impacts from noise and vibration during operation.

Please Refer to Master Response 5 regarding traffic methodology and analysis.

Comment 41-19. Marcial Vassel.

Response to comment 41-19A.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. The Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Project would connect the Metro Exposition Line with the Metro Green Line.

The extension of the Crenshaw Light Rail Transit Line to Wilshire Boulevard and to the Hollywood/Highland Station is not part of the Locally Preferred Alternative selected by the Metro Board of Directors. Feasibility studies have been conducted by Metro that indicated that a future extension of light rail transit to Wilshire Boulevard is feasible. 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.



Comment 41-20. Dante Flores.

Response to comment 41-20A.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. Chapter 4.14, Safety and Security, of the DEIS/DEIR determined that no adverse impacts to safety would occur from the construction and operation of the Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit Project. The Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit Project would provide lighting near station areas and security personnel to ensure that the line is part of a safe and secure system.

The Crenshaw/LAX Transit Project would not result in an increased exposure to the risk associated with fault lines, nor would it exacerbate pre-existing seismic conditions either in a below-grade or above-grade configuration. However, it would be more vulnerable to damage from ground shaking during an earthquake. As part of the mitigation proposed for the project, a geotechnical study would be conducted to identify design specifications required for maintaining structural integrity under static and seismic loading and operational demands. These design specifications would ensure that the risks from seismic hazards would be minimized to the greatest extent feasible.

Please Refer to Master Response 5 regarding traffic methodology and analysis.

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

Comment 41-21. Carol Tucker.

Response to comment 41-21A.

Please Refer to Master Response 1 Regarding support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.



Comment 41-22. Kevin Fridlington.

Response to comment 41-22A.

Please Refer to Master Response 1 Regarding support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.

Comment 41-23. Virginia Piper.

Response to comment 41-23A.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. Metro acknowledges that an LRT system would be easier for blind and visually impaired to access and use.



Comment 41-24. Vincent Harris.

Response to comment 41-24A.

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 regarding selection of the locally preferred alternative.

Comment 41-25. Karen Ceasar.

Response to comment 41-25A.

Please Refer to Master Response 6 regarding selection of the locally preferred alternative.
Please Refer to Master Response 5 regarding traffic methodology and analysis.

Please Refer to Master Response 1 Regarding support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.



Comment 41-26. Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas.

Response to comment 41-26A.

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 41-26B.

Please Refer to Master Response 6 regarding selection of the locally preferred alternative.

COMMENTS: 42-27 through 42-35 from the Inglewood High School Public Hearing

091003 P09761

1 CRENSHAW TRANSIT CORRIDOR
2 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
3 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

4
5
6
7
8
9

10

11 PUBLIC HEARING
12 INGLEWOOD HIGH SCHOOL - CAFETERIA
13 231 SOUTH GREVILLEA AVENUE
14 INGLEWOOD, CALIFORNIA
15 OCTOBER 3, 2009

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 FILE NO. P09761
25 REPORTED BY DEBRA L. PRESUTTI

1

0

1 Ms. Reeves: Good morning, everyone. Thanks for
2 coming out to the Draft Environmental Impact
3 Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report hearing for
4 the Crenshaw Transit Corridor.

5 My name is Roxi Reeves. I'm with the Lee Andrews
6 Group, and I'll be your facilitator this morning.

7 I hope that all of you have had a chance to walk
8 around and take a look at the boards and talk to project
9 staff and have some of your questions answered. If you

Page 1



091003 P09761

10 didn't get that chance, you'll have another opportunity at
11 the end of the meeting. Roderick our project manager and
12 some other staff members will be here to answer your
13 questions.

14 I'd like to introduce Councilmember Dan Tabor,
15 who would like to say a few words.

16 Councilmember Tabor: Good morning. There's a live
17 audience here, you're not taped.

18 First of all, let me start with what's really
19 important: I support the light rail option. Remember
20 that. This is supposed to be an objective, unbiased
21 presentation; so you need to know where I am.

22 Secondly, a \$1.7 billion investment in this
23 community along Crenshaw towards the airport, makes all
24 the absolute sense to (inaudible) the world. So now that
25 you know where I am, let me tell you where I am not.

2

||

1 I'm not interested in this project proceeding,
2 whether it's BRT, light rail, without your input, without
3 hearing from you. Whether you agree with me or not, I
4 think we need and deserve to have this discussion.
5 Because at the end of the day, our tax dollars, our public
6 investment, will be used to build this project or some
7 other project. And it is not a slam dunk. We move
8 forward along this timeline, we've seen the boards, and we
9 arrive at some place in the future.

10 Fortunately or unfortunately, there are other
11 communities also looking for Metro projects in their
12 communities to move forward along a timeline; so we're --
13 it is a competitive, merit-based process. And you're
14 going to hear from Roderick today that no decisions have
15 been made, but there are a series of public meetings.

16 So I'm going to end with this: Thank you for
17 coming this morning. There are at least two other local
18 alternative meetings and the following transportation
19 planning meetings. For some reason the dates are not in
20 my mind --

21 Unidentified Speaker: Meetings in November and
Page 2

091003 P09761

22 December.
23 Councilman Tabor: -- meetings in November and
24 December that are not going to be in Inglewood that we
25 need to turn out to. Bring your neighbors, your family,

3

||

1 your friends. We need to say to the MTA Board and the
2 process that we are interested and committed in being
3 engaged and making sure that our community is reinvested
4 in and that public transportation going into the future is
5 available and it is where we want it to be and where we
6 need it to be to sustain economic development and growth
7 in our city and in the surrounding neighborhoods.

8 So with that, thank you very much for being here
9 this morning.

10 Ms. Reeves: Thank you, Councilmember.

11 When you came in this morning, you were handed a
12 few items at the registration desk. You were given a fact
13 sheet and a comment form and a speaker card.

14 The fact sheet provides you with an overview of
15 the alternatives that are under consideration. The
16 comment form provides you with information on how to
17 submit a written comment.

18 The format for today's meeting will start with a
19 brief presentation from our Project Manager Roderick Diaz.
20 And then following that, we'll start the formal public
21 comment portion of the meeting.

22 If you'd like to make a comment, you need to
23 complete one of these blue speaker cards and then turn it
24 in to the registration desk or one of our team members.

25 This is your forum so the next hour will be

4

||

1 devoted strictly to public comment. And as such, our
2 staff won't interrupt during the hearing to make comments
3 or clarifications. Should you have additional questions
4 or comments after your time is up, like I stated earlier,

Page 3



5 staff will be around after the hearing to answer any
6 questions.

7 Each speaker will be given two minutes to make
8 your comments. Please note your comments are being
9 recorded by a court reporter; so please remember to start
10 by stating your name, speaking clearly and into the
11 microphone.

12 As a reminder, the deadline for comments is
13 Monday October 26th at 5:00 p.m. And that information can
14 be found on the fact sheet as well.

15 At this time I'd like to recognize some electeds
16 and representatives that are here with us today. We have,
17 of course, Councilmember Dan Tabor. We have Fernando
18 Ramirez from supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas's office, Keith
19 Lockard from the City of Inglewood, Joel Rane from the
20 City of Inglewood.

21 And we also have some members of community
22 organizations that we'd like to extend our appreciation to
23 as well.

24 We have representatives from the Empowerment
25 Congress West Area Neighborhood Development Council,

5

ii

1 Transit Coalition, the wave newspaper, First Church of
2 God, and the multi-service Stanley Center. So thank you
3 all very much for coming out.

4 Now I'd like to introduce our Project Manager
5 Roderick Diaz.

6 Mr. Diaz: Okay. Thank you all for coming. And I
7 think it's a testament to your dedication to the project
8 to learn about the project. And I'm very glad to see that
9 we have a diverse group from a lot of different
10 communities -- from Inglewood, Westchester, the
11 neighborhoods along Crenshaw Boulevard -- to learn a lot
12 more about the project today.

13 As Councilman Tabor mentioned, there are
14 decisions to be made related to the mode. Right now there
15 is no decision about which of the four alternatives we are
16 considering will be made and we'll proceed forward with.

Page 4

091003 P09761

17 Part of what we are here to do today is to hear your
18 testimony and to hear what you have to say about the
19 alternatives that we have analyzed and your concerns about
20 them and your desires for them.

21 We are at a major point within this
22 decision-making process. We have for the last two years
23 been engaging communities up and down this corridor to
24 develop alternatives and to develop analysis about these
25 alternatives. And here we are at this point where we have

6

||

1 published a document called the Draft Environmental Impact
2 statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report.

3 The reason why it has two names is that it serves
4 two functions: At the federal and the state level. And
5 copies of that report are available to look at here at the
6 tables, and you should have received a CD that contains
7 that report for you to take home if you want to look in
8 more detail.

9 I know it's an intimidating document; it's very
10 big. But if you want just a nice summary, there's an
11 executive summary at the beginning of that report.

12 What is required for us and because we want to
13 hear from you, we have what's called a comment period.
14 And that comment period extends between the 11th of
15 September and it ends on October 26th. And this is a
16 major component of that comment period. If you have
17 comments that occur after this meeting, please be sure to
18 take a comment form with you or just send me an e-mail.
19 I'll give you directions at the end of this meeting.

20 So, nonetheless, we also have more information at
21 our website: Metro.net/crenshaw.

22 So we begin then with looking at alternatives. I
23 did mention that we have four alternatives that we are
24 looking at and considering. Each of these has equal
25 standing at this point.

7

||

Page 5



091003 P09761

1 We have two alternatives that we're required to
2 look at. Basically, they represent what would we do if we
3 didn't really make a big investment.

4 And the first alternative is called the No-Build
5 Alternative. What would we do, what would happen, what
6 would the impacts be if we did nothing?

7 And then the Transportation System Management
8 Alternative represents an alternative of what would happen
9 if you only improve transit improvements in a minor way.
10 If you just improve some signal systems, if you added a
11 bus line or two and added more frequency to the buses that
12 are already out there. So these are the no-build and the
13 transportation system management alternatives.

14 The next slide, then, represents the other two
15 alternatives. And these are called build alternatives.
16 These represent something that we would build. And so we
17 have what's called the Bus Rapid Transit Alternative and
18 the Light Rail Transit Alternative.

19 And there's a diagram and a picture back there.
20 There's a Bus Rapid Transit that represents an integrated
21 bus system. It includes buses, special lanes for the
22 buses to travel in. And so, essentially, many of you are
23 familiar with the set of tracks that pass through the city
24 of Inglewood and near the airport area. A long time ago,
25 I guess in the early 90's, Metro purchased that set of

8

□

1 tracks.

2 And so the Bus Rapid Transit Alternative would
3 have a special lane in that right-of-way for the buses to
4 travel. It would pass by here at the airport at Aviation
5 and Century where there's a lot of businesses there and a
6 connection to the People Mover that the airport is
7 planning. It would pass through downtown Inglewood and
8 serve downtown Inglewood here at La Brea. And then it
9 would end here at Crenshaw Boulevard where it would start
10 to turn north.

11 Within Crenshaw Boulevard we would follow -- we
Page 6

091003 P09761

12 would have exclusive lanes that travel in Crenshaw
13 Boulevard to the north to the Exposition Line, and then
14 north of there it would drive in mixed traffic with the
15 rest of traffic up to a connection to the Purple Line
16 subway. So that's the BRT Alternative.

17 And the LRT Alternative -- actually, let me run
18 through the details when I run through the detail slides.
19 So the next slide, please.

20 This is essentially the BRT Alternative. We have
21 a guided busway along the Harbor Subdivision, exclusive
22 lanes in Crenshaw, and mixed-flow operation north of the
23 Exposition Line. It's important to note that there are
24 some narrow sections of Crenshaw where we're still not
25 certain whether we can get those exclusive lanes or not.

9

1 The base cost of that alternative is roughly
2 between \$500- and \$600 million.

3 Then we have the LRT Alternative. So the LRT
4 Alternative is -- roughly follows the same general
5 alignment, but rather than a roadway, it would have
6 tracks. And so you'd have tracks that follow the Harbor
7 Subdivision and then go north along Crenshaw. And this
8 time they just end here at the Exposition Line.

9 And what's important to note is that there are
10 various configurations of these tracks. In essence, we
11 have to go underneath the runway complex here so that we
12 don't interfere with the flight paths of the airplanes.
13 We'd go over Century, elevated across the 405 and La
14 Cienega, elevated across La Brea here in downtown
15 Inglewood, and then elevated here between 60th and 67th
16 streets -- actually to Victoria Avenue along the Harbor
17 Subdivision to 60th Street -- and then in the Leimert Park
18 Village area, because Crenshaw is narrow there and in that
19 area there's a scenic corridor designated and some
20 historic department stores, we are underground in Leimert
21 Park Village. And then we come back to the surface here.

22 Another important feature of the LRT Alternative

Page 7



091003 P09761
 23 is that it does connect with the Green Line. So the LRT
 24 service would continue down through El Segundo, down
 25 toward the Redondo Beach Station. And it would also allow

10

||

1 the Green Line to come up to the station that serves the
 2 airport a little bit better.
 3 And then we do not extend north of the Exposition
 4 Line, but it does allow for a future extension should this
 5 be the alternative that is selected.
 6 There is a cost associated with that alternative
 7 of about 1.3 billion; here it's indicated as \$1300
 8 million.
 9 So the next slide is, in the course of doing our
 10 analysis, we wanted to leave ourselves the flexibility to
 11 respond to environmental impacts that we observed along
 12 the line as well as to look at places where there may be
 13 adjustments to a station or two.
 14 And there are design options that we've
 15 incorporated that are also analyzed in the environmental
 16 document. And there are six of these design options. And
 17 it's important to note that, other than the station moves,
 18 most of these design options are here because they respond
 19 to a specific environmental impact.
 20 And so we have this Design Option 1 is a station
 21 closer to Century.
 22 Design Option 2 is a potential overcrossing over
 23 Manchester so as not to interfere with the traffic on
 24 Manchester coming off the 405.
 25 Design Option 3 is a potential undercrossing

11

||

1 across Centinela.
 2 Design Option 4 would take this elevated section
 3 and place it underground.
 4 Design Option 5 would add a station at Vernon
 5 Avenue where there is none proposed now. Right now the
 6 station would be at King and maybe with an entrance or

Page 8

091003 P09761

7 exit at stocker, but this would add a station at vernon
8 Avenue.

9 And Design Option 6 would, rather than having the
10 underground station come up to the surface, we would
11 continue underground here to have a transfer with the
12 Exposition Line.

13 So these design options vary in cost from about
14 11 million, 11 to 16 million. Then there are some more
15 expensive design options 155 and 236. That would also
16 impact the project budget.

17 So next slide, please.

18 There are two -- it's important to also note that
19 with new vehicles comes the need to maintain those
20 vehicles. And so we have two maintenance sites that are
21 being considered for analysis in the report. And so we
22 have two maintenance facility sites. And the criteria for
23 developing the sites is that they have to be near the
24 right-of-way so that you can access them. So this would
25 apply both to the buses which are natural gas vehicles,

12

11

1 alternative fuel; and, to the trains which are electric.

2 And then we have the one site here in El Segundo
3 that exists between two railroad tracks northeast of the
4 corner of Rosecrans and Sepulveda. And then we have one
5 site here just on the edge of the Westchester neighborhood
6 near the 405 Freeway, adjacent to -- I think this is still
7 Florence here, down by 83rd, Osage, and the Harbor
8 Subdivision right-of-way.

9 These two sites are evaluated in the report and,
10 if you have any opinion, we'd be interested to hear on
11 your testimony here.

12 Next slide, please.

13 So then we have the two alternatives, and we have
14 a general comparison of those two alternatives. When we
15 want to compare the similar segment of the Green Line to
16 the Exposition Line, both of them save travel time over
17 what Metro Rapid service would be.

Page 9



091003 P09761
 18 The BRT Alternative saves about 20 percent. The
 19 LRT Alternative saves about 43 percent. It would make
 20 that trip between the Green Line and the Exposition Line
 21 in about 20 minutes.

22 The Green Line does extend to Wilshire Boulevard
 23 for an additional 11 minutes to get up to Wilshire
 24 Boulevard in mixed-flow traffic.

25 Now, as far as ridership, we can think about the

13

□

1 Green Line to the Exposition Line. The BRT Alternative
 2 has between 10- and 14,000. The LRT Alternative is
 3 roughly between 13- and 21,000. The BRT Alternative does,
 4 however, extend to Wilshire Boulevard where the LRT
 5 Alternative needs tracks that are not part of this
 6 definition of the project. And so the BRT Alternative is
 7 able to capture those riders with the transfer at Wilshire
 8 Boulevard and have additional ridership.

9 There is a comparison of capital cost. BRT is
 10 between 500- 600 million. And the LRT Alternative
 11 (indicating).

12 And then there's a comparison of jobs generated,
 13 and that roughly is correlated with the cost and the level
 14 of construction of the alternative.

15 Now, this is an environmental document we put
 16 out, and that environmental document is very comprehensive
 17 in terms of what it has to analyze. There are a lot of
 18 features of environmental impact that are analyzed in the
 19 report. And, hopefully, you did get a chance to discuss
 20 what these impacts might be with the staff people. If you
 21 have further questions, you can ask us afterwards. But
 22 all of these are addressed in the report and, if you have
 23 a particular condition, you can certainly talk about that
 24 through your comment.

25 Next slide, please.

14

□

1 So we are here at the comment phase. This is a
 Page 10



091003 P09761

2 public hearing. It's a major forum for public comments if
3 you want to share your comments with everyone else. But
4 also you can send your comments to me. You can either
5 send your form to me or a separate letter to me at my
6 address at Metro. You can send me an e-mail or you can
7 call our project hotline and have someone write down your
8 comment for you if you don't feel like writing it down
9 yourself.

10 It's important though that this process is very
11 official and that it ends on October 26th. I have to
12 receive your comments by October 26th. And what happens
13 is all of these official comments we have to take them and
14 respond to each and every one of them in the next phase of
15 our environmental analysis.

16 Next slide, please.

17 Now, where do we go from here? No decisions are
18 being made today. We're here simply to listen to you.
19 End of the comment period is October 26th.

20 Councilman Tabor mentioned that there is a
21 meeting of the Metro Board to discuss the Long-Range
22 Transportation Plan. I think that's the Thursday before
23 October 26th. So that's when that discussion will take
24 place, and that's when long-range transportation planning
25 will be discussed.

15

ii

1 But then important for this project is when our
2 board selects what's called a locally preferred
3 alternative. So of these four alternatives, one of them
4 will get selected. And then we'll present it at the
5 Planning and Programming Committee. But the big decision
6 will be made at our December 10th board meeting.

7 And then after all of that, we'll take the final
8 alternative and then do some more analysis and more design
9 refinement and publish the final version of that document
10 that you see there and then go into construction some time
11 thereafter with hopes of starting the service in 2018.

12 Actually, we're going to hear from you now over

Page 11



13 the next hour or so, depending on how many people signed
14 up to speak.

15 And I would urge you to provide as much detail as
16 you can related to your public comment because -- or what
17 you write down -- because more detail gives something more
18 for us to be able to respond to. And, certainly, share
19 what you have to say with us about anything and everything
20 you have to say about the project.

21 And so I'm looking forward to hearing from you
22 and to learn what your perspectives might be on what the
23 potential investment might be in the corridor.

24 And so I'll hand it off to Roxi who will then
25 officiate the rest of the hearing.

16

ii

1 Ms. Reeves: Okay. So we'll start our public comments
2 now.

3 And just to reiterate the protocol: Please come
4 to the microphone when your name is called. Each speaker
5 will have two minutes to make his or her comment. There
6 will be a timer on the screen for your reference. And
7 just please remember to start by stating your name,
8 speaking clearly and into the microphone so that our court
9 reporter can accurately transcribe your comments.

10 Our first speaker is Joel Rane followed by Dante
11 Flores.

12 Joel Rane: Thank you. My name is Joel Rane, and I'm
13 a librarian for the City of Inglewood.

14 I just wanted to say that I'm not here in an
15 official capacity. I'm also a home owner in Hyde Park and
16 I've been following this for some time. But I would say
17 (inaudible) city newspapers. We do have them across the
18 street on the second floor of the library for you to look
19 at.

20 I think this is great. I'm definitely in support
21 of the light rail line. I think it's fantastic that we're
22 rebuilding a system that we had here until the 1950's so
23 that we can bring the city together basically. I think
24 it's a great thing for the city of Inglewood and for the

Page 12

27.A



091003 P09761

25 whole city that some day you can get on the train up at
17

27.B 1 Manchester and La Brea and in less than four hours you can
2 be in San Francisco or San Diego or Sacramento or anywhere
3 in California.
4 I would just say to everyone here, we should
5 really emphasize that we shouldn't do this on the cheap.
6 we should really make sure that all of the alternatives
7 for that small cost -- it seems like millions of dollars,
8 but the idea of putting a grade separation at Centinela
9 for people who commute around here -- I ride a bike to
10 work through that intersection -- this is something that
11 is really essential. We need to make sure we get all the
12 grade separations we can for this whole route so it
13 doesn't become an issue of controversy but it becomes a
14 very fast way for someone to get from the airport all the
15 way up to, hopefully, some day up to West Hollywood.
16 Thank you.
17 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.
18 Following Dante we have Claydine Burt.
19 Dante Flores: Hello. My name is Dante Flores, and I
20 support this project.
21 What I think we need is security because in these
22 areas, especially at night, it gets really bad. At all
28.A 23 stations I think we should have light rail, no buses. I
24 also think there should be lots of nature to look at, and
25 it will attract more and more people.
18

28.B 1 Also the train should be at grade and above
2 grade. And, if we do have it underground, make it safe
3 because we have earthquakes here in California.
4 I am 11 years old, and I attend the St. John
5 Chrysostom School as a 7th grader. And please, please,
6 have it underground so it won't affect our learning and it
7 will keep us safer.



8 Also on Centinela it will not be safe; there will
9 be too much traffic.

10 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

11 Following Claydine Burt we have Damien Goodmon,
12 Claydine Burt: Hello. My name is Claydine Burt.
13 I've lived in Inglewood since 1949, and I'm a member of
14 the Centinela Valley Historical Society.

15 I'm very much interested in public
16 transportation. Because of limited physical conditions, I
17 may have to give up driving.

18 The worst thing about living a long time, I
19 think, is that we do tend to look backward at the
20 wonderful red cars, at the trolley cars where one could
21 get on in Hawthorne and go all the way to Eagle Rock
22 without getting off if you paid your extra fare.

23 The statistics that are used, I would remind
24 those in charge, are people. Each of us here today is one
25 of those statistics. And when something new goes in,

29.A

||

19

1 something old usually has to come out, and it may be very
2 painful.

3 But I appreciate the opportunity of coming today.
4 I wish there were more of our citizens here.

5 And before I leave the microphone, I must tell
6 you, don't leave this area without crossing the street and
7 looking at the transportation (inaudible).

8 Thank you.

9 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

10 Following Damien we have Alan Havens.

11 Mr. Goodmon: Good morning. My name is Damien
12 Goodmon. I'm the coordinator of the Fix Expo Campaign.

13 I'd like to see inclusion in the final EIR all of
14 the options which are currently being explored and options
15 for crossings which are currently supposed to be at street
16 level for grade separations, including extending existing
17 grade separation options or mandating grade separations,
18 baseline grade separations. I think this is important for
19 a variety of reasons. One, it expedites the crossings.

30.A

Page 14



091003 P09761

20 what we realize right now at (inaudible) is, because a
21 grade separation was not explored, that project is going
22 to be delayed. We can avoid that in the future by
23 including in the final EIR grade-separation options.

24 The grade separation is not just safety
25 mitigation, it's traffic mitigation. It also helps

20

30.B

1 address the issue of environmental injustice. Because the
2 reality is here that on the Westside they're talking about
3 a \$6- to \$9 billion subway.

4 And those people who were behind that line which
5 include the Mayor of Los Angeles and supervisor
6 Yaroslavsky have twice attempted to steal necessary money
7 for this project for grade separation. So when that
8 happens and when these people say this area should be
9 given a bus rapid transit instead of a light rail line
10 with grade separation, understand what's being told here.
11 we're being told that we should get 3500 jobs instead of
12 7800 jobs.

13 And let me just ask quickly: who here in this
14 room is for South L.A. having 4300 less jobs and Inglewood
15 having 4300 less jobs?

16 Let the court reporter reflect that no one raised
17 their hand.

18 It's important, as Councilmember Tabor mentioned,
19 that we show up at those meetings on November 18th and
20 December 10th, when these people who have twice tried to
21 rob this project of necessary money will be in a voting
22 position. They need to see us. We need to be there. We
23 need to demand our fair share because we're being taxed
24 for Measure R. we're being taxed for the federal dollars.
25 we're being taxed for the project that will go on the

21

1 westside just the same as we are being taxed for this
2 project, and we want our money returned here.

Page 15



091003 P09761

3 Thank you.

4 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

5 Following Alan we have Matthew Hetz.

6 Alan Havens: My name is Alan Havens. I worked for 22
7 years (inaudible) transit (inaudible) movement.

8 I strongly support the light rail option for the
9 Crenshaw Corridor based on travel time, (inaudible) speed,
10 and safety.

31.A

11 In terms of safety, LRT has three sets of brakes,
12 three kinds of brakes, not the one that buses usually
13 have. By the way, the maximum speed of an LRT can be 60
14 to 65 miles an hour between stations.

15 Noise. Someone at the Wilshire meeting said the
16 buses would be quieter, but this is only true if they're
17 running very slowly through grade crossings.

18 To match LRT speeds you need gates, and lights at
19 crossings and so forth where you have at-grade crossings.
20 To control noise, directionalized grade crossing
21 (inaudible) can be used -- horns, bells, voice messages,
22 and so forth. So noise is not a serious issue.

23 Ride quality (inaudible) have comparable ride
24 quality. In comparison --

25 The Court Reporter: I'm having trouble hearing him.

22

□

1 Ms. Reeves: Could you speak up a little.

2 Alan Havens: Okay.

3 In comparison, the articulated buses like the
4 NABI that we have now will provide a bumpy ride behind the
5 center axle at the articulating joint.

6 On (inaudible) the travel time LRT's have four
7 doors on the side; that is actually eight door openings on
8 the side. The articulated buses have three doors;
9 basically, one plus two plus two openings. At the front
10 door the driver is (inaudible).

11 Ms. Reeves: We're having trouble hearing you. The
12 court reporter.

13 The Court Reporter: I'm sorry.

14 Unidentified Speaker: Slow down.

Page 16

091003 P09761

15 Alan Havens: Let's see. Also the sliding plate doors
16 of the NABI buses can go on a curve.

17 So, anyway, basically support LRT.

18 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

19 Following Matthew we have Cora Chong.

20 Matthew Hetz: Good morning, I'm Matthew Hetz. I live
21 in Westchester. I'm a long-term transit rider and transit
22 supporter.

23 I greatly support light rail because -- for many
24 issues. One is it's more efficient fuel-wise. It's a
25 better ride for the riders, and I believe people along the
23

||
32.A

1 route -- Leimert Park to Inglewood/Crenshaw area --
2 deserve light rail. So I support the line completely, and
3 I want the mitigation that we looked at and talked about
4 and reviewed to make it a safe line.

5 But as a Westchester resident I'll tell you,
6 there's a lot of flak. There's a lot of anger in
7 Westchester, a lot of fear and gossip going on about
8 what's going to happen. And they're very upset because
9 Metro did not put a meeting in Westchester.

10 I have no trouble coming to Inglewood. I lived
11 in Westchester my whole life, I shop in Inglewood. I grew
12 up here.

13 But they're upset. And I think part of their
14 concern is the maintenance facility. And I think it's
15 number D, which is the one off Nash should be preferred,
16 opposed to the one close to Hindry which would take some
17 building and so forth.

18 So I want to warn you there's a meeting tomorrow
19 night in Westchester with Councilman Rosendahl. I've been
20 trying to tell people it's to the benefit of everybody;
21 it's a good system, it's a good line. But, by not
22 engaging the Westchester residents, you may have stirred
23 up a little hornets nest which you could have avoided.

24 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

25 Cora Chong is the last card that I have.

Page 17



091003 P09761

24

||

1 Was there anyone else that has a speaker card or
2 would like to fill one out?

3 Cora Chong: Hello, my name is Cora Chong, and I'm a
4 resident of Westchester.

5 Unidentified Speaker: Speak up.

6 Ms. Reeves: We can't hear you.

7 Cora Chong: Coming from Hong Kong, a city that has a
8 highly efficient bus and rail system, I am really -- I'm
9 fully enthusiastic hearing about this project. I fully
10 support the light rail line because I believe it will help
11 alleviate traffic and it will provide more convenience for
12 people to move around.

33.A

13 People can more easily communicate with each
14 other since the light rail line, people can -- yeah --
15 let's see.

16 I'm a high school student and I'm also taking the
17 environmental studies class. And seeing between light
18 rail and bus transit line, I think that the light rail
19 line has greater potential to have less environmental
20 impact because, as you know, electricity and also less
21 people (inaudible).

22 Ms. Reeves: Any other cards?

23 Okay. We have a --

24 Dave Monks: I just would like to address the
25 Westchester issue. And I would like to let everyone know

25

||

1 that our project team will be meeting with the Westchester
2 Neighbors Associates on Monday night. We'll bring a
3 selection of boards and information to the community.
4 We've been working with Denny Schneider, who is with that
5 group, and we will make sure the Westchester community is
6 fully informed about this project.

7 Ms. Reeves: We have another special guest with us
8 this morning. I'd like to introduce Supervisor Mark
9 Ridley-Thomas.

091003 P09761

10 Supervisor Ridley-Thomas: Thank you very much,
11 everyone. I'm pleased that you are here.

12 This is a rather important time and opportunity
13 for all of us. And the one request that I wish to make is
14 that you tell others about the significance of this
15 project.

16 And I want to say from the top: My view is that
17 this is one of the most important projects going on
18 anywhere in the county of Los Angeles. There is no
19 project that I can think of that is more important than
20 this effort with respect to transportation, with respect
21 to air quality, with respect to economic development.
22 Those three objectives are important.

23 It is my view working with your city council,
24 your city leadership, that Inglewood has a lot to gain and
25 benefit by way of this Crenshaw-South Bay Line. It is

26

34.A

1 fundamentally important in terms of the issue of the
2 transformation of communities from an economic development
3 perspective as well as other important issues, not the
4 least of which would be the infrastructure that is
5 required to do important work on transportation as well as
6 the air-quality issues that I mentioned.

7 Two options, two alternatives. I want to make it
8 as clear as I possibly can I am for the Light Rail
9 Alternative.

10 I don't think about this in a one-dimensional
11 way. I think about it in terms of the quality of
12 transportation that can and should be beneficial to the
13 residents of this part of the county of Los Angeles that
14 have waited a very, very long time to benefit from these
15 extraordinary resources.

16 There is no public works projects of which I am
17 aware that is larger than this 1.5, approximately
18 \$1.5 billion to do very, very significant work in this
19 part of the county of Los Angeles. This makes sense in
20 terms of a rational planning effort that involves

Page 19



091003 P09761

21 transportation.

22 This is not a vanity project of any sort. This
23 is a project that is need based. It gives definition to
24 what it means to have a rational policy for planning and
25 transportation in the county of Los Angeles.

27

||

1 The point has already been made about the issue
2 of jobs; it is an important point. And I'm confident that
3 anybody here who wants to contribute to unemployment
4 didn't show up to this meeting. This is the place where,
5 in fact, we talk about improving the quality of life. And
6 jobs is an important factor in that equation.

7 So if you look at this comprehensively, if you
8 look at this holistically, it's hard to argue with forward
9 movement. We're not looking backward, we're looking
10 forward. This is about technology for the future. This
11 is about building for generations to come. That's why I'm
12 here; that's why I stand resolute in my effort to bring
13 this project home on the 10th of December.

14 I would hope that there's not a vacant seat at
15 the MTA. I would hope that people are spilling out of the
16 auditorium and down the escalator and out into the patio
17 area and let them know that the Crenshaw-South Bay Line is
18 a must. We want to see it happen. We want it properly
19 funded. And don't skimp at the point of funding.
20 Everybody here ought to say, "don't skimp."

21 The Audience: Don't skimp.

22 Supervisor Ridley-Thomas: They ought to fund it as it
23 should be funded: Fully. That's what we're pushing for.

24 So don't let me down. Be there on the 10th of
25 December. Be there early. We'll give you ample

28

||

1 notification of the time. We need to be in the house.
2 Because, as you know, Inglewood is strategically in a
3 position to make this better than it would otherwise be.
4 And, if you do that, I can assure you that Councilman
Page 20



091003 P09761

5 labor will do a dance that we won't find forgettable on
6 that day.

7 Thank you very much. I appreciate your time
8 today.

9 unidentified speaker: supervisor, before you go.
10 Will we be able to get preferred parking for the buses we
11 want to bring in?

12 Supervisor Ridley-Thomas: Yes. And if you wish to
13 bring buses, we will help in whatever way that we can on
14 that, and we'll make sure that the buses are properly
15 accommodated.

16 So bring somebody. Don't be reluctant. Don't be
17 bashful about asking your friends, your neighbors, persons
18 in your sororities, those who worship with you in your
19 various contexts. Bring them. Bring them. This is
20 important.

21 This is important because Julian Dixon tried to
22 work on this 25 years ago. Tom Bradley was working on
23 this a long, long time ago. Henry Waxman and Diane Watson
24 working on this. I say it's time and it's time now to
25 bring this project home.

29

||

1 Thank you very much. I'm delighted that you
2 could be here.

3 Ms. Reeves: We have one more card. Hugh
4 Brockington.

35.A | 5 Hugh Brockington: I just want to say go light rail;
6 that's all.

7 Ms. Reeves: Well, thank you very much for coming out
8 on a weekend and sharing your time and comments with us.

9 Just a reminder that your comments need to be in
10 Monday October 26th by 5:00 p.m.

11 We have one additional hearing -- it's the fourth
12 and final -- coming this Tuesday evening at
13 Transfiguration Church on Martin Luther King Boulevard in
14 Los Angeles. That's from 6:00 p.m. until 8:00 p.m. There
15 are some fliers on the registration table with that date.

Page 21



091003 P09761
16 And just feel free to grab a stack if you have some
17 friends you think are interested in attending.
18 And again, thank you very much. We appreciate
19 your comments.
20
21
22
23
24
25

30

Comment: 42-27. Joel Rane.

Response to comment 42-27A.

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 regarding selection of the locally preferred alternative.

Response to comment 42-27B.

Comment noted. The selected LPA includes two underground segments for light rail along Crenshaw Boulevard, between 39th Street and 48th Street and between 60th Street and Victoria Avenue. The inclusion of these two underground segments follows a consistent application of criteria for considering grade separations for LRT. These criteria include availability of right-of-way, environmental impacts (such as traffic impacts, visual impacts, impacts to historic resources, and environmental justice impacts), and Metro's established Grade Separation Policy. In locations where there is available right-of-way, where there is a lack of significant environmental impacts, or where conditions fail to meet the criteria of Metro's Grade Separation Policy, the Light Rail Transit alignment is proposed to remain at grade. The light rail alignment will have aerial crossings at Aviation Boulevard and Manchester Avenue and at La Brea Avenue and the Harbor Subdivision railroad right-of-way. A below-grade crossing at Centinela Avenue was carried forward for further consideration in the design process where it was determined that the lack of significant traffic impacts did not require the crossing to be grade separated.

**Comment 42-28. Dante Flores****Response to comment 42-28A.**

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. Chapter 4.14, Safety and Security, of the DEIS/DEIR determined that no adverse impacts to safety would occur from the construction and operation of the Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit Project. The Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit Project would provide lighting near station areas and security personnel to ensure that the line is part of a safe and secure system.

Response to comment 42-28B.

The Crenshaw/LAX Transit Project would not result in an increased exposure to the risk associated with fault lines, nor would it exacerbate pre-existing seismic conditions either in a below-grade or above-grade configuration. However, it would be more vulnerable to damage from ground shaking during an earthquake. As part of the mitigation proposed for the project, a geotechnical study would be conducted to identify design specifications required for maintaining structural integrity under static and seismic loading and operational demands. These design specifications would ensure that the risks from seismic hazards would be minimized to the greatest extent feasible.

Please Refer to Master Response 5 regarding traffic methodology and analysis.

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

Comment 42-29. Claydine Burt.

Response to comment 42-29A.

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. 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. Upon completion of the Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit 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 42-30. Damien Goodmon.

Response to comment 42-30A.

Please Refer to Master Response 1 Regarding support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.

Response to comment 42-30B.

Please Refer to Master Response 6 regarding selection of the locally preferred alternative.

Comment 42-31. Alan Havens.

Response to comment 42-31A.

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 regarding selection of the locally preferred alternative.



Comment 42-32. Matthew Hetz.

Response to comment 42-32A.

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 regarding selection of the locally preferred alternative.

Response to comment 42-32B.

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

Comment 42-33. Cora Chong.

Response to comment 42-33A.

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 regarding selection of the locally preferred alternative.



Comment 42-34. Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas.

Response to comment 42-34A.

Please Refer to Master Response 6 regarding selection of the locally preferred alternative.

Comment 42-35. Hugh Brockington.

Response to comment 42-35A.

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 regarding selection of the locally preferred alternative.



COMMENTS: 43-36 through 43-56 from the Transfiguration Church Hall Public Hearing

091006 P09765

1 CRENSHAW TRANSIT CORRIDOR
 2 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
 3 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11 PUBLIC HEARING
 12 TRANSFIGURATION CHURCH HALL
 13 2515 WEST MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. BOULEVARD
 14 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
 15 OCTOBER 6, 2009

16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24 FILE NO. P09765
 25 REPORTED BY DEBRA L. PRESUTTI

1

0

1 Ms. Reeves: Well, good evening, and thank you for
 2 coming to the public hearing for the Draft Environmental
 3 Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report.
 4 My name is Roxi Reeves. I'm with the Lee Andrews
 5 Group, and I'll be facilitating this evening.
 6 I hope you've all had a chance to walk around the
 7 room and look at the boards and have your questions
 8 answered by project staff. If you haven't, the project
 9 team will stay after the public comment portion so you'll

091006 P09765

10 have that opportunity then.

11 when you came in tonight, you were given a few
12 different handouts. You were given a comment form, fact
13 sheet, and speaker card. The comment form provides you
14 with information on how to submit your comments in
15 writing, and the fact sheet gives you information on the
16 alternatives that are under consideration.

17 The format tonight will begin with a brief
18 presentation by our Project Manager Roderick Diaz.

19 And, if you would like to speak this evening, you
20 need to complete one of the blue speaker cards and then
21 turn it in to our registration table or one of the other
22 staff members this evening.

23 This is your forum so the next hour is solely
24 devoted to your comments. And as such, project staff
25 won't interrupt during the hearing to make comments or

2

||

1 clarifications. If you have additional questions that are
2 not answered, again, you will have a chance to speak with
3 Roderick and other team members at the end of the meeting.
4 And, if you still need additional time after your two
5 minutes are up, you're welcome to submit a comment in
6 writing.

7 Just to remind you, the deadline for public
8 comment is Monday October 26th at 5:00 p.m.

9 And at this time I'd like to recognize some
10 electeds and their representatives that are here with us
11 this evening. We have Councilmember Bernard Parks. We
12 also have Dennis Rodriguez from Councilmember Parks's
13 office, Fernando Ramirez from Supervisor Mark
14 Ridley-Thomas's office. And we have Nasa Alkire here from
15 the City of El Segundo. We have Dan Rosenfeld from
16 Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas's office, and Vincent Harris
17 also from the supervisor's office.

18 Thank you all for coming this evening.

19 We also have several community organizations with
20 us, and we'd like to extend our appreciation to them as
21 well. We have members of the Empowerment Congress West

Page 2



091006 P09765

22 Area Neighborhood Development Council. We have Park Mesa
23 Heights Community Council, Healthy African American
24 Families, Bus Riders Union, the Leimert Park Business
25 Improvement District, Citizen's Coalition for a Safe

3

||

1 Community, United Homeowners Association, Cherrywood Block
2 Club, Los Angeles Neighborhood Initiative, McClung Drive
3 Block Club, Transfiguration Church, and Save Leimert.

4 If I have missed anyone, I apologize.

5 At this time I'd like to turn it over to
6 Roderick, who will take us through our presentation.

7 Mr. Diaz: Okay.

8 As Roxi said, my name is Roderick Diaz. Some of
9 you have seen me before. For those of you who are new,
10 thank you for coming out and catching up to the project.
11 We welcome you all this evening.

12 The past two years have been a significant
13 process for us, analyzing solutions of how to make
14 investments in this corridor that make sense and improve
15 transit accessibility in a north-south fashion, centered
16 around Crenshaw Boulevard.

17 We have started -- we've been in the middle of
18 what's called an environmental review process, where we've
19 been analyzing alternatives. And the culmination is in
20 the report that we've just published, and you see hard
21 copies of that report over there on the tables. You
22 should have received either in the mail or when you signed
23 in today a CD of that report.

24 And so that report is basically the major
25 milestone that we have here to mark the fact that we are

4

||

1 about to make a decision related to the project.

2 And what that report is called is a Draft
3 Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact
4 Report. It has two names because it satisfies

Page 3



091006 P09765
5 requirements both at the federal and the state level.
6 And so what we have here is the report as
7 published as of September 11th. And we have a 45-day
8 comment period. And that comment period is open to
9 members of the public as well as to public agencies and
10 other entities for you to make a comment about the
11 alternatives contained therein, how they are analyzed, and
12 any ideas you have related to how the alternatives compare
13 to one another and what features you'd like to see
14 incorporated or changed about the project.

15 And the report is available at all local public
16 libraries for review, and it's also at available at
17 www.metro.net/crenshaw. And that's also a good
18 information resource if you want other information about
19 the project.

20 So next slide, please.

21 Essentially, the report analyzes four different
22 alternatives. And the first two alternatives represent
23 the lower-cost alternatives: what would we do if we did
24 nothing in the corridor and what would we do if we did a
25 low-cost investment improvement to bus service. And so

5

ii

1 those two alternatives are called the No-Build, and the
2 second one is called the Transportation System Management
3 Alternative.

4 Why we compare the other alternatives to these
5 two alternatives is we have to make sure that whatever
6 investment we make is an improvement over doing nothing
7 and is an improvement over doing something that is
8 potentially lower in cost. So those are the two
9 alternatives that are evaluated in the report.

10 Then we get to the two other alternatives. And
11 those two alternatives are called the build alternatives.
12 And so what would we do if we build something, if we made
13 an investment? And there are two alternatives: One
14 called the Bus Rapid Transit Alternative, BRT; and, one
15 called the Light Rail Transit Alternative, LRT.

16 So roughly they follow the same general alignment
Page 4



091006 P09765

17 between the Harbor subdiv -- the Green Line, and Crenshaw
18 Boulevard along the Harbor subdivision there. So I'm
19 going to go over these two alternatives in a little bit
20 more detail.

21 Next slide, please.

22 So the first alternative is the Bus Rapid Transit
23 Alternative. Starting from the south we start here at the
24 Green Line and then we move north to a location at
25 Aviation and Century. Many of you know there's a

6

||

1 Travelodge there and, unfortunately, an adult business
2 there, and a Carl's Jr. That is a potential site for a
3 connection that connects to what's called the People
4 Mover, where the airport will make connections to get into
5 the airport terminals.

6 And then we follow the railroad right-of-way
7 called the Harbor Subdivision that Metro purchased back in
8 the early 90's. And that right-of-way serves downtown
9 Inglewood and then approaches Crenshaw here at the Park
10 Mesa neighborhood of L.A., and then, when it reaches
11 Crenshaw, it goes north along Crenshaw Boulevard through
12 Leimert Park Village, stopping several times and
13 connecting here with the Expo Line. And then it continues
14 north to a connection at the Purple Line at
15 Wilshire/Western.

16 Now along Crenshaw Boulevard between the Harbor
17 Subdivision and the Expo Line, the BRT Alternative is
18 planned to operate, is proposed to operate, in what are
19 called exclusive bus lanes; lanes that are reserved just
20 for buses and in some cases right-turning vehicles to go
21 north. North of the Expo Line, Crenshaw starts to get
22 really narrow, especially as you approach the 10 and you
23 go toward Wilshire Boulevard, and it's not as easy to
24 devote street space for bus lanes. So in this section
25 there are no bus lanes and the buses will have to travel

7

||



091006 P09765

1 in the midst of traffic.

2 Some of you joined us on some tours of the Orange
3 Line, and that is similar to what may go on here as
4 proposed at the Harbor Subdivision.

5 Now, that alternative costs roughly between \$500-
6 and \$600 million.

7 Then the next alternative is called the LRT
8 Alternative, and this emphasizes rail service basically.
9 And so the rail alternative roughly follows the same
10 alignment, starting at the Green Line, continuing along
11 the Harbor Subdivision through downtown Inglewood and then
12 coming north, serving Leimert Park Village, and then
13 stopping here at the Exposition Line.

14 Now, it's important to note that it does stop
15 here at the Exposition Line because going north would
16 incur a significant expense that is not covered by the
17 project budget.

18 It also connects here in the south end to the
19 Green Line so that you can conceivably ride the service
20 somewhere along the line and continue toward the south in
21 El Segundo and toward Redondo Beach. Toward the north we
22 leave open the possibility for a future extension toward
23 Wilshire Boulevard.

24 The base cost of this alternative is about
25 \$1.3 billion, \$1300 million. And so that's a rough

8

□

1 comparison of how the two alternatives compare.

2 Now, a lot of you have talked to us over the past
3 two years, pointing out environmental considerations that
4 you want us to consider, and we've done our own
5 environmental analysis as well.

6 And so the LRT Alternative has associated with it
7 design options. And all of these design options are also
8 reviewed in the context of that environmental review
9 report.

10 So we have six design options. The first one
11 would -- actually, let me go back a little bit. Let me
Page 6



091006 P09765

12 explain also.

13 The LRT Alternative passes by the south runways
14 of the airport in a trench underground. It passes over
15 Century Boulevard in an elevated fashion, over La Brea and
16 downtown Inglewood in an elevated fashion, and over
17 between 60th and 67th streets or roughly between 60th and
18 Victoria Avenue in an elevated configuration. In Leimert
19 Park Village it has an underground configuration between
20 48th and 39th streets to pass basically in a subway
21 underground configuration through the heart of Leimert
22 Park Village.

23 so those are what are called grade separations or
24 elevated or below-grade sections. And all of those are
25 documented in the plans of the report. Okay. so there

9

II

1 are grade separations incorporated into the LRT
2 Alternative.

3 Now, as I said, we did some additional analysis
4 to identify what other design options and what other
5 environmental impacts we need to respond to. In order to
6 have that response to those environmental impacts properly
7 analyzed, we included these design options and they
8 basically are -- I'll describe the six design options.

9 The first design option would move a station near
10 Century, closer to Century, to make the connection to the
11 People Mover to the airport a little bit better with a
12 shorter walk.

13 The second design option involves a grade
14 separation at Manchester Avenue, Manchester Boulevard,
15 basically, because there's a lot of traffic coming off the
16 405 and there's potentially a lot of conflicts there.

17 The third design option involves a grade
18 separation at Centinela with basically an underpass right
19 in front of St. John Chrysostom Church there.

20 The fourth design option takes what is proposed
21 as an elevated configuration between 60th and 60 -- and
22 the Harbor subdivision and places that elevated line

Page 7



091006 P09765
23 underground. So between 60th and the Harbor Subdivision,
24 Design Option 4 would place that underground.
25 The fifth design option there is in Leimert Park

10

||

1 Village. There would be a station right at King possibly
2 with an entrance at Stocker. But the fifth design option
3 would place a station about 0.4 miles from that other
4 station at King to add a station near Vernon Avenue.
5 And then the sixth design option involved:
6 Rather than coming up to grade to meet the Exposition Line
7 at 39th Street would involve continuing underground to
8 join the Expo Line underground. So, rather than having an
9 at-grade connection, you have an underground connection
10 where there'd be a level change and people would climb a
11 set of stairs or elevators to get to the Expo Line
12 station.

13 So, importantly, we have included those design
14 options into the environmental analysis, and they respond
15 to specific environmental concerns and impacts that we
16 face. We've incorporated design options to respond to
17 specific environmental impacts.

18 And you see the cost there. Roughly between 11-
19 and \$236 million. Some of the more expensive design
20 options involve those with additional underground
21 stations.

22 Now, let's see. We have potential maintenance
23 facilities sites. So trains or buses have to go someplace
24 to be repaired, cleaned. There is one site here in the
25 city of El Segundo between two railroad tracks northeast

11

||

1 of the corner of Rosecrans and Sepulveda. And then we
2 have one site here near the neighborhood of Westchester
3 just west of the 405 Freeway here in this half-arrow
4 shaped piece of land. So those are also subjects of the
5 environmental document.

6 Next slide, please.

Page 8



091006 P09765

7 So when our board makes a decision, they consider
8 how these alternatives compare with respect to each other.
9 So I provided a simple comparison for you today: Travel
10 time, ridership, capital cost, and dollars generated.
11 Certainly, there are more factors that compare.

12 Now, when we compare apples to apples, let's say
13 on the same section, both of the alternatives save travel
14 time with respect to an equivalent Metro Rapid bus. So we
15 have the BRT Alternative which operates between the Green
16 Line and the Expo Line in less than 30 minutes, 28 to 30
17 minutes. And the LRT alternative at about 20 minutes. So
18 the LRT Alternative does save a little bit more in travel
19 time.

20 The BRT Alternative does extend to Wilshire
21 Boulevard and that adds another about 11 minutes to the
22 travel time to get up to Wilshire.

23 In terms of ridership between the Green Line and
24 the Exposition Line, the BRT Alternative is in the low
25 10's, 10,000 riders; the LRT Alternative is a bit higher.

12

11

1 The BRT Alternative, though, is able to reach Wilshire
2 Boulevard and attract more riders that way.

3 Capital cost. You see the comparison, and I
4 talked about that before.

5 And then we have number of jobs generated. And
6 that's also documented in the report.

7 Now, the report documents a lot of different
8 types of environmental impacts. They're all of these
9 located here. A lot of you have brought up in past
10 meetings concerns about noise and vibrations, visual
11 impact, impacts to businesses, impacts related to
12 construction; so those are all documented in the report
13 and disclosed.

14 Next slide, please.

15 So we have a comment period, and this is
16 essentially where we are. We have public hearings here.
17 This is the last of the four public hearings.

Page 9

091006 P09765
18 We have -- you can send the comment forms you
19 received today, either give it to a staff member before
20 you leave or you can e-mail them to me at Metro. That's
21 my address there, and that's the address listed on the
22 back of the comment form. You can also e-mail them to me.
23 And you can also, if you'd rather speak to someone and
24 have them record your comment, you can call the project
25 hotline. The comments do need to be received by

13

□

1 October 26th 2009.
2 And next slide.
3 Now, where do we go from here? All of the
4 comments of the public hearings contribute to what's
5 called a selection of the locally preferred alternative.
6 And that is a two-phase process where a committee of our
7 board and then the whole board consider the decision,
8 which alternative to move forward with. And that is
9 December 10th 2009, the final board meeting.
10 After that is selected -- whether it's the light
11 rail, bus rapid transit, or do nothing -- we move forward
12 with further environmental analysis of a project, the
13 project selected. And then we open for service in 2018.
14 So here we then go to our comment period. I
15 think it's a historic day now. And a lot of you may
16 remember that time when streetcars used to run along
17 Crenshaw Boulevard, come down King and Leinert Boulevard
18 and then come down Crenshaw when the yellow cars used to
19 run in the center of the street. And this is a chance to
20 basically bring that type of service back to these
21 communities here.
22 And so this is then your chance to talk about the
23 alternatives that are on the table. And so, hopefully, if
24 you want to speak, you filled out a comment form. And a
25 court reporter, this lovely lady up here, she's trained to

14

□

1 listen to every word you say and type it so that it's in a
Page 10



091006 P09765

2 transcript for our purposes.

3 So, Roxi, I believe -- did you have someone --

4 Ms. Reeves: I'd like to acknowledge one other person
5 with us this evening. We have James Westbrook from the
6 office of Senator Curren Price.

7 And now I would like to introduce Supervisor Mark
8 Ridley-Thomas.

9 Supervisor Ridley-Thomas: Thank you very much. And
10 good evening to everyone. I'm delighted that you are
11 here.

12 I want to say from the very beginning that the
13 way in which this community displays its strength, its
14 purpose, its intention for the best that can be delivered
15 by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority and any other
16 government entity is to show up in force like you're doing
17 tonight.

18 So I think you should begin by giving yourselves
19 a big round of applause.

20 May I say the following: That for us the real
21 significant point of presence is on December the 10th at
22 the MTA Board meeting. Let me say that again: December
23 the 10th at the MTA Board meeting. That is when the board
24 will make the determination as to what it will or will not
25 do.

15

ii

1 Now, I can tell you, your presence will make a
2 difference.

3 It is my hope and beyond that it is my
4 expectation that we will be there in force to essentially
5 demonstrate that we expect the best of what this agency
6 can afford this community with respect to the
7 Crenshaw-south Bay Line. And that means light rail as an
8 alternative for the community rather than any other
9 alternative. Because the best that can be afforded any
10 particular community from a regional perspective at this
11 point in time is light rail. And we will push for as much
12 of it as is humanly possible to be underground.

Page 11

091006 P09765
13 Now, any explanations that have been offered that
14 ultimately suggest that we can't do it, the message that
15 we ought to be intent on delivering is the following:
16 Excuses don't count. Excuses don't count.
17 We're all adults, and we all understand that we
18 have to be governed by the resources at our disposal;
19 right? Some of us want to do a range of things, but, in
20 fact, we have to lower those expectations when we begin to
21 count the nickels and dimes and dollars and the like.
22 I want to say this: All of us are prepared to be
23 reasonable. Don't start skipping and saying what can't
24 happen when it comes to the rail that goes through the
25 communities in which we live. If anybody -- we've had

16

ii

1 enough of that. And if it's good enough for other
2 communities to have light rail as an alternative, well,
3 it's good enough for it to be in the Crenshaw-South Bay
4 Corridor. And that's what we have to argue for. We have
5 to argue for that by being present in substantial numbers.
6 How many of you have been down to the MTA for any
7 public meetings?
8 Well, let me just say this: It would be my view
9 that if all of us were there to the extent that the
10 escalators were jammed, it wouldn't hurt my feelings. You
11 understand my point? In other words, you have to be
12 present to communicate this point.

13 Now, why is light rail an appropriate
14 alternative? The issue is pretty clear. More efficient.
15 More time certain. More with respect to the ultimate
16 issue of economic development, air quality, as well as the
17 reduction of traffic congestion.

36.A

18 But let me say something about the economic
19 development aspect of it. Jobs. Buses, you get 3800
20 jobs, 3500 jobs, correction. Light rail, 7800. Now,
21 don't talk to me about the new math, just give me the
22 simple math. Everywhere you go, 7800 jobs beats 3500 jobs
23 any day of the week. Particularly in an economy that is
24 in trouble.

Page 12



091006 P09765

25 this is the largest public works project that

17

||

1 will see this community for the balance of the days that
2 any of us will live; in excess of \$1.5 billion. And this
3 community is overdue.

4 This project was talked about over 25 years ago,
5 when Julian Dixon was in Congress, when Diane Watson was
6 in the State Senate, when Tom Bradley was the mayor. Do
7 you hear what I'm saying? And they were talking about it
8 starting at Crenshaw and Wilshire. And it was mostly
9 their vision that sought to make this happen.

10 Well, now we're going to turn that vision into a
11 reality, and we're going to cause it to go straight to the
12 South Bay with the support of the Metropolitan Transit
13 Authority there. And then we're going to cause it to,
14 hopefully, make its way to the airport as would be
15 appropriate. And so there are many, many reasons for us
16 to be supportive of this.

17 I am unapologetically supportive for this effort
18 to take place. It can happen. It will happen if we
19 organize ourselves and make the case as is evolving. So
20 make sure that you are in place and don't come alone;
21 bring somebody with you.

22 And there's a lot of discussion about the
23 significance of Martin Luther King Hospital in terms of
24 how important it is to the broader community. And let me
25 just simply say to you that is a very significant project.

18

||

1 It is my highest priority. But I want to quantify it for
2 you.

3 This project is three to four times more in terms
4 of economic investment. Did you get that? I said three
5 to four times more. So let's put it all in perspective
6 and deal with this issue in a way that is ours to deal,
7 long over due.



8 I'm pleased to be able to represent you and argue
9 for the case that it's time for us to get the quality
10 transportation corridor in the community by which we are
11 impacted. And, if you stand up, we can get it done.
12 Thank you very much.
13 Ms. Reeves: Thank you, Supervisor.
14 I would like to introduce Councilmember Bernard
15 Parks.
16 Councilmember Bernard Parks: Good evening. Let me
17 say thank you all for being here. And I want to thank
18 those of the staff for reaching out to the community over
19 the last couple of years. And I think the last count we
20 had was something like 60 different organizations have
21 been touched by this information.
22 I was a member of the MTA Board a while back and
23 was very pleased to be a part of Measure R, to bring this
24 \$1.5 billion to the community because, having grown up in
25 Los Angeles, it gives us the first opportunity to really
19

ii

1 develop a network of rail which many of us grew up riding
2 in the times in the past.
3 When we can envision that this rail system, first
4 of all, on Exposition Boulevard it takes us all the way to
5 the beach, connects to the Crenshaw Line where it can take
6 us to the airport. It can connect us to the Green Line
7 that can take us back to the east and connect us to the
8 Blue Line that takes us either to Long Beach or downtown
9 to Union Station. At the same time with the Red Line
10 going down Wilshire Boulevard and eventually the Subway to
11 the Sea, you begin to see a network of rail systems that
12 can service this community where you actually can get
13 somewhere in a timely fashion, create a clean environment,
14 and it's not cost prohibitive.
15 What I hope, as we move forward on this line and
16 others, is that we will entice people who have options to
17 ride the rail and bus systems. Currently, the large
18 percentage of people that are on buses tend to be those
19 who have no choices and that's their only form of
Page 14



091006 P09765

20 transportation. I believe, as we create this network of
21 buses and rail, we now have an opportunity to entice
22 people to come and park along the rail system, not pay
23 enormous parking downtown, be able to ride the system to
24 where they can get to work and play without having to take
25 their car everywhere.

20

||

1 The neighborhoods you live in, if it's anything
2 like the one I live in, people leave in three or four cars
3 every morning and three or four cars come back. And then
4 we wonder why Crenshaw Boulevard, Slauson, the freeways
5 and all those other areas are blocked with traffic.

6 Certainly, I'm looking forward in the sense of
7 this rail system becoming a reality.

8 What's important for us to realize it's going to
9 have some limitations. It's not going to give everybody
10 what they want. It's not going to be something for which
11 there will be unlimited funds. \$1.5 million sounds like a
12 lot of money until you start spending it. So these are
13 things that over the next decade or so we're going to be
14 able to see how these funds are going to be spent and how
15 they spend well for the benefit of the community.

16 The one thing I think is so important is how the
17 EIR has been put together for the community. Personally,
18 I have seen where the staff has actually given multiple
19 options so that they can be vetted during the
20 environmental process; so that you, as you go through it,
21 can see what their intent is, what the options are so, if
22 there is a decision made at a later time to add a station
23 somewhere, you don't have to stop the process for two
24 years, go back out for an environmental impact to
25 determine if there should be an underground station at

21

||

1 Leimert Park or another facility.

2 These are things that are important for us to



37.A

091006 P09765
3 know: that these options as they are laid out also cost
4 more money than the \$1.2 billion, 1.5 billion. So these
5 are things that we have to realize. It's not unlimited;
6 it's a finite amount of money. And so that means that we
7 all need to be in a position to make sure the money is
8 spent properly and spent in a way in which we all will get
9 the biggest bang for our buck.

10 But, again, the real issue is for us to have a
11 line that's finished, that's complete; that completes the
12 network to the airport and gives us all an opportunity to
13 move safely through our community.

14 At today's City Council I moved for a motion to
15 make sure that the City takes a rightful and active role
16 in also responding to this environmental impact. So we
17 will have our Planning Department, our Transportation
18 Department, our CRA and others coming together so that
19 they will have a City report that will be put in the file
20 before the October 26th date.

21 The one thing I'd recommend to all of you is
22 that, although you may be here and want to speak on the
23 mike, please do not ignore the importance of filling out a
24 card and putting in your question. Because when you put
25 your question in the system, it's mandatory that it's

22

1 responded to. You can often come to these meetings and
2 speak on the microphone, and you might get a response
3 back. But there's no guarantee or mandate that your
4 question verbally is going to be responded to in a formal
5 manner.

6 So make sure that whatever you think or that you
7 believe is important, fill out that card. Also you have,
8 even after this meeting, going online. You have until the
9 26th to put in whatever comment you believe is important.
10 And it's mandatory that those comments will be responded
11 to.

12 So, if you're interested, we have the actual
13 motion that went in today. It's on the back table. You
14 get an idea of some of the issues that are of most concern

Page 16



091006 P09765

15 to the 8th District. And we hope that as the force
16 departments within the City put forth a report that they
17 will also pull together the information so that the City
18 will be on record as to what it believes should be the
19 important issues and priorities as we build this line.

20 So thank you for coming out. We look forward to
21 not only being at the ground breaking -- often this
22 community in legislating we have more ground breaking than
23 ribbon cuttings. We want to be at the ground breaking and
24 the ribbon cutting to make sure we all benefit from the
25 expenditure of these funds.

23

ii

1 Thank you.

2 Mr. Diaz: Before I hand it back to Roxi, I want to
3 make sure as we enter the comment period, we will take as
4 much time as necessary to accommodate everyone who wants
5 to make a comment tonight. But I think what would be
6 really helpful also is that, if you make your comment as
7 specific as possible, either in written or in spoken form,
8 we have to be specific in our response. And so what could
9 help us, if you like something, if you don't like
10 something, if you want to talk about any of those four
11 alternatives, they're all open for comment. But please do
12 feel free to make your comment as specific as possible.

13 So I'll give it to Roxi. She's going to be
14 walking through all the comment cards that she's received
15 so far. If you have a desire to make a comment, please
16 hand it to one of our staff, and we'll get it to her so
17 you can speak.

18 Thank you.

19 Ms. Reeves: So we'll start our public comments now.
20 Each speaker will be given two minutes to make his or her
21 comment. There will be a clock on the screen for your
22 reference.

23 Your comments are being recorded this evening by
24 a court reporter. So please be sure to start by stating
25 your name, speaking clearly and into the microphone so

Page 17

091006 P09765

24

||

1 that the court reporter can accurately transcribe your
2 comments.

3 Our first speaker this evening is Damien Goodmon
4 followed by Gregory Freeman.

5 Damien Goodmon: Good evening. My name is Damien
6 Goodmon, and I'm the coordinator of the Citizens' Campaign
7 to Fix the Expo Rail Line.

8 I want to begin by commending you for including
9 options on this line that we're building, underground
10 options, which we need more of.

38.A

11 Our concern as an organization, as Save Leimert
12 and some of the other organizations, pertains to the
13 absence of an underground option between 48th and 59th
14 where there's only an at-grade option and nothing else.
15 I've been to these meetings over these past few years, and
16 it's astonishing to me that you have any option for at
17 grade because people have continually said keep it
18 underground on Crenshaw.

19 Now, what you have not told us is that everything
20 north of the 10 Freeway on this line has to be
21 underground. So I'm going to tell you, if everything
22 north of the 10 Freeway has to be underground, so should
23 everything south of the 10 Freeway.

24 We are sick and tired in South L.A. of being told
25 that we should accept less than. If this line has to be

25

||

1 underground in Wilshire's Park Mile, it needs to be
2 underground in Crenshaw's Park Mesa. If it has to be
3 underground in Wilshire's Hancock Park, it needs to be
4 underground in Leimert Park.

38.B

5 And give us a station at Leimert Park Village.
6 Denying us a station at Leimert Park Village would be like
7 building the Washington Metro and not putting a station on
8 U Street. Or building the New York City subway and not
9 putting a station at 125 Street. You have the money. We

Page 18



091006 P09765

10 are all paying taxes for the 6 to 9 billion. We're
11 talking about 1.3 billion here. But 6 to 9 billion
12 dollars on the Wilshire subway.

13 Don't talk to me about money. Tell me why my
14 community should have children walk across those tracks
15 where Crenshaw High School is in View Park (inaudible)
16 when those children on Wilshire will not.

17 We are not second-class citizens just because we
18 live in the second supervisorial district. We pay taxes.
19 We want an equitable line to that underground line. And
20 if you do that, we will support you. We're going to be at
21 that MTA Board meeting demanding the same thing:
22 Underground on Crenshaw.

23 Thank you.

24 Ms. Reeves: Following Gregory we have Barbara
25 Lottholland.

26

||

1 Gregory Freeman: Hi, my name is Greg Freeman, and I'm
2 a member of the Bus Riders Union. And also I use public
3 transit, and I'm a life-long resident of South L.A.

39.A

4 And I'm here today to voice support for a system
5 of bus-only lanes on Crenshaw Boulevard and voice
6 opposition to the construction of a light rail.

7 We are proud of the efforts of the MTA and
8 Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas to focus on the transit
9 needs of the people of South Los Angeles and at the same
10 time to bring jobs to the community.

11 Supervisor Ridley-Thomas says that he supports
12 light rail on Crenshaw because it will create more jobs
13 than a bus rapid transit project. Absolutely, South L.A.
14 needs job. But construction jobs to build light rail are
15 short-term jobs that will be gone in a couple of years,
16 and we all know from past experience that guaranteeing
17 these jobs will go to local residents will be an uphill
18 battle.

39.B

19 The BRU Clean Air and Economic Justice Plan will
20 create thousands of jobs. Not just short-term



091006 P09765
21 construction jobs, but also permanent unionized jobs for
22 MTA; like drivers, mechanics, maintenance workers, and so
23 forth, most of whom as we know could be taken by people of
24 color. The kind of permanent employment -- this kind of
25 permanent employment is critical for economic recovery in

27

1 South L.A. But just as critical is a first-class bus
2 system that gets thousands of low-income bus riders to
3 their jobs on time and as thousands of unemployed bus
4 riders in South L.A. look for and take jobs anywhere in
5 the county.

6 The proposed project on Crenshaw would provide
7 little help to people along Crenshaw and even less to
8 people on short lines like on Century and Imperial and
9 Slauson. It might even be an excuse for MTA to further
10 reduce our regular bus service, including longer wait
11 times for these short lines.

12 Thank you.

13 Ms. Reeves: After Barbara we have Clint Simmons.

14 Barbara Lottholland: Good evening. My name is
15 Barbara Lottholland. I am a long resident of Los Angeles,
16 in particular the Crenshaw Corridor, as well as the
17 co-chair of the Bus Riders Union. Today I'm representing
18 over 3,000 dues-paying members of that union.

40.A

19 As a public transit user, I am here to support
20 bus-only lanes down Wilshire of the Crenshaw Corridor
21 which was not mentioned very much today.

22 Given the long history of the sub-standard bus
23 service in South Central L.A., the Bus Riders Union
24 applauds the MTA and Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas's
25 interest in transit in this community. Thank you very

28

1 much.

2 However, the more we learn about this project,
3 the more we believe this plan, either the light rail or
4 the bus rapid transit currently formed, is really ill

Page 20



091006 P09765

40.B

5 advised. Ever since the MTA began building rails in L.A.
6 over 20 years ago, bus riders have had the short end of
7 the stick. Billions of dollars have been spent on rail
8 that provides very little support for the transit
9 dependent.

10 MTA's long-range transit plan calls for 30 years
11 of fare increases, service cuts for bus riders, while it
12 plans to spend hundreds of millions of dollars, of our
13 tax-payer dollars, for light rail and highways.

14 As we look at this plan, there's very little use
15 for the people on the Crenshaw corridor. Those of us that
16 live and use this corridor, we're only using it from
17 Exposition to just before Florence. That is not the
18 Crenshaw Corridor.

19 Also that's why the Bus Riders Union is
20 supporting and would like to support the bus-only lane
21 going down Crenshaw. We do not want to be standing at the
22 bus stop as the train is passing us by.

23 Thank you.

24 Ms. Reeves: Following Clint we have Masa Alkire.

25 Clint Simmons: I think you could speed it up if you

29

||

1 call three at a time and have them line up that way. That
2 might be better.

3 My name is Clint Simmons, and I'm with Expo
4 Community United. And all we have to do is look at the
5 Expo Line to see how it has completely destroyed South
6 Central Los Angeles. We do not have north-south crossings
7 as we should have. There are too many streets that have
8 closed. They have run right by two schools that are right
9 on the tracks; that's Foshay and Dorsey High School. And
10 how could anyone who is sane support that type of rail
11 system?

41.A

12 And we have the same thing now on the Crenshaw
13 Line. We want to start at grade and then go elevated or
14 go under. If we're going to have a line on the Crenshaw
15 area, we want the same thing they have on Wilshire.

Page 21



16 Either put it underground or we don't need it at all; that
17 is my opinion.

18 We have suffered too much from second-class or
19 third-class type rail systems. There is not enough grade
20 separation. All you have to do now is try to cross
21 Crenshaw, Vermont, Western, La Brea, some of those streets
22 north and south. Those are the ones that are open. The
23 ones that are closed we can't get across at all with the
24 Expo Line. Let's learn from that.

25 we cannot rely on our politicians; this is

30

||

1 something we must do ourselves. And the only way we can
2 do it is by getting actively involved as we are now. But
3 don't let this be the last time we be here. Let's go to
4 the MTA Board when they must vote and make these decisions
5 so we can try to get something that we can use.

6 We have too many schools within a half a mile of
7 this line where kids will be crossing. And I can assure
8 you kids will be playing chicken and things of that
9 nature. Let's put it underground. If we're going to have
10 it, let's have rail, rail, rail underground.

11 Thank you.

12 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

13 Following Masa we have Andrea Canty and then Alan
14 Hevens.

15 Masa Alkire: Hi, I'm Masa Alkire from the City of El
16 Segundo's Planning Department.

17 One of the components of this project is an
18 option for a maintenance facility within the city of El
19 Segundo. And it's a 4.8 acre site that's called out in
20 the project. The City is concerned about having an
21 accurate environmental review of this site.

42.A

22 The document identifies the area as a 4.8 acre
23 site; but, when you look at the appendices, the proposed
24 bus terminal facility or rail facility appears much larger
25 and covers a larger area. So the city is concerned that

31

||



091006 P09765

1 this be accurately represented throughout the document.
2 Because the assumptions that are made off of that are
3 going to affect what sort of traffic impacts the facility
4 has and what sort of other impacts on the El Segundo
5 community.

6 Also, there are certain parts of the document
7 that aren't analyzed such as additional intersections that
8 will be placed in El Segundo to service this facility. So
9 we'd like to see all that stuff accurately reviewed.

10 Thank you.

11 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

12 Andrea Canty: Good evening. My name is Andrea Canty,
13 and I'm a member of the 8th District community as well as
14 a member of the Dorsey Alumni Association.

15 And I just want to first mention that I'm very
16 disappointed in the MTA's decision with the Expo rail
17 project, especially as it passes Dorsey High School and
18 Foshay that there is no grade separation on the plans.
19 That just goes to show that there is no deep concern for
20 the students and their safety, being a parent myself and a
21 LAUSD employee.

43.A

22 As far as the Crenshaw Line is concerned, I would
23 like to see this line go underground along Crenshaw
24 Boulevard in totality. And I'd like you to also take into
25 consideration that Crenshaw Boulevard is home for this

32

□

1 community, where we establish a lot of cultural activities
2 and a lot of family events, and this is home to us.

3 For example, just coming up in another week or so
4 is A Taste of Soul event. And that event goes from Rodeo
5 Drive all the way down to King Boulevard and, if there is
6 no train going with a grade separation, then that is going
7 to impede on our community festivities. And we don't want
8 our quality of life diminished because of this rail
9 project when we know we have resources to create a safe
10 rail and a good rail and enhance our transit line with



091006 P09765

11 maintaining our quality of life.

12 Additionally, we do the Martin Luther King parade
13 on Crenshaw Boulevard as well. And so these are some
14 things that belong to us as culture. We don't have a lot
15 of culture here as African Americans, but the little that
16 we do, we want to preserve. So, please, take that into
17 consideration.

43.B

18 I'm all for this rail line down Crenshaw, but I
19 want it totally grade separated; and, additionally, to
20 mitigate the traffic flow as you look at the traffic going
21 east and westbound. And, if the train is at-grade, then
22 that will be impeding as well.

23 Thank you.

24 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

25 Following Alan we have Linda Ricks and Juliet

33

||

1 Boyd-Benton.

2 Is Alan still here?

3 Alan Havens: My name is Alan Havens.

4 Before retiring I spent about 22 years at
5 (inaudible) on transit projects. I'm strongly in favor of
6 a Crenshaw light rail line.

44.A

7 I notice the station put at 48th Street could
8 gain access to Leimert Plaza cultural area. Some years
9 ago I suggested a branch which would run partly on Leimert
10 on the surface and partly a tunnel off Exposition that was
11 to have a fast shorter link from Crenshaw to USC and
12 downtown L.A. (inaudible) in airport service. However, I
13 believed then and still believe that the best route is
14 indeed north past the Crenshaw Plaza mall; that should
15 have priority.

16 on the current plan I notice on the map a
17 possible map going past midtown center, following partly
18 San Vicente off La Brea up to the Purple Line. A Crenshaw
19 Line stop at Exposition would allow a walking track and
20 maintenance link to the Blue, Gold, and Expo Light Rail
21 system. An extension north of that would also provide the
22 walking link to the east-west subway system.

Page 24



091006 P09765

23 I would suggest initially the Crenshaw Line up to
24 Exposition ought to have at least one of the, say, six to
25 eight trains per direction per hour go east on Expo to go
34

□

1 toward downtown L.A. to provide that direct subway link
2 and other service would be able to serve these LRT and
3 subway stations as noted previously.

4 So that's about it.

5 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

6 Linda Ricks: I'm Linda Ricks with Park Mesa Heights
7 Community Council and Friends of the Hyde Park Library.

45.A

8 My concern is the station at West Boulevard and
9 Florence. The station at West Boulevard and Florence has
10 no connections to any major bus lines, and it's a station
11 that would be right there at the cemetery. I don't think
12 that would be a good place for a station. I don't see its
13 use there. That is my concern.

14 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

15 Following Juliet we have Addie Arbor and
16 Catherine Walker.

17 Juliet Boyd-Benton: First of all, my name is Juliet
18 Benton -- Boyd-Benton, and I am a resident in -- I have
19 been a resident in this area for well over 40 years on
20 11th Avenue, which is one block east of Crenshaw. I live
21 across the street from Crenshaw High School between 48th
22 and 50th.

23 I am -- first of all, let me say I'm not opposed
24 to progress. I'm very happy to see progress. I'm very
25 happy to see jobs and businesses in our community. We

35

46.A □

1 desperately need that. However, I don't want to see it at
2 the expense of our children, of their safety.

3 In the area between Leimert Park running down,
4 heading south on Crenshaw between Leimert Park and
5 Florence, I can see, I can envision at least four schools.



091006 P09765
6 quite possibly there may even be more than that. And that
7 takes us to the issue of the safety of our children. And,
8 yes, they should all know how to cross the street and
9 follow the signs and all of those kinds of things, but
10 they're children; that's why we take care of that. And
11 they don't always do what they're supposed to do. And we
12 don't want to see them lose their lives or be maimed or
13 injured as a result of it.

14 And, even though it is secondary, a very critical
15 issue to those of us who live one block east of Crenshaw
16 is to live behind the train tracks. Each of these -- the
17 brochure that was sent to my home and all the maps and the
18 information that I've seen since I've been here, only
19 indicate to me that in the area along Crenshaw directly
20 behind my home, the only alternative, the only option for
21 light rail is to have a train track above ground.

46.B

22 Now, I've spoken to several people here who have
23 said things to me about how this increases property value
24 and how wonderful it is to communities that it's been in.
25 But I'm having a very hard time being convinced that

36

ii

1 having a train track running behind my home that I won't
2 be able to hear it and that this does anything for my
3 property values.

4 Thank you.

5 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

6 Catherine Walker: Good afternoon. I'm Catherine
7 Walker. I'm from Crenshaw High School. I live right in
8 front of the school. My house is the drive with the turn
9 around for the children. And it's a shame that we don't
10 have no transportation for the kids.

47.A

11 traffic, red buses, yellow buses all day long.
12 Different shifts going different places. And I'm for all
13 the way underground like Wilshire and Western. And it
14 will help us to cut down all the night cruising.

15 We have so much and can't take care of the
16 property and public service and take care of the parking
17 downtown. If we had the right kind of action, we wouldn't

Page 26



091006 P09765

18 have to go downtown and pay all that parking and then come
19 back and may not find your car. We need this for our
20 kids.

21 I've been in this area since 1970; 40 years. And
22 I've been come from the good to the bad. And some gone
23 bad, but it's time of us to straighten up and fly right
24 and do something for our kids. Because our day is gone,
25 but the children have to have somewhere to live.

37

||

1 Thank you.

2 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

3 Following Addie we have Jerard Wright and Gary
4 Gless.

5 Addie Arbor: I'm Addie Arbor, and I live in the view
6 Park community. And I've always been so thrilled with
7 this Crenshaw area, and so I call it our Beverly Hills.
8 Say it again: I call the Crenshaw area our Beverly Hills.

9 I think it's a wonderful thing, and it's very
10 good that we're working on transportation in the manner in
11 which we are. But I feel that in order to preserve the
12 beauty of our community and Crenshaw Boulevard that the
13 light rail would serve by putting it directly underground.
14 And I made a special note. You've heard this before:
15 Like Wilshire Boulevard.

48.A

16 North on Crenshaw, south on Crenshaw, all the
17 way. underground. No light rail -- if light rail can't
18 be underground, then we have to go back to riding the bus.

19 We love our community.

20 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

21 Jerard Wright: Wonderful. I'm here to support the
22 light rail project as proposed. I would like to see it go
23 up to Wilshire and eventually get up to Hollywood because
24 then it will really serve a great, great need not only for
25 this community but for the region in general. Because you

49.A

38

||

091006 P09765

1 can get folks to get to the airport, visitors to Leimert
2 Park village and actually see what a wonderful community
3 Leimert Park is, and get up to mid-wilshire and see the
4 museums and go up to Hollywood.

5 With that being said, Supervisor Ridley-Thomas
6 made an astute point of we have this \$1.5 billion for the
7 Crenshaw Corridor and how to manage those funds and invest
8 those funds; the key word is "invest".

9 I'm looking at the south end of the line right
10 where it's in that trench around the airport between 104th
11 and 111th. And I don't know what the cost estimate is on
12 that. It looks like it's pretty high because you have to
13 go pretty much below grade to mitigate the ILS or the
14 landings for the airport. You don't want 747's crashing
15 on the airport and making the evening news all the time.

49.B

16 So is there any possible way or at least seeing a
17 cost option for reducing the cost of that potential, of
18 that location, via, you know, just putting sandy walls
19 along the right-of-way and elevating 104th Street so that
20 we then have more funds to distribute on the northern part
21 of the corridor so we can improve it and provide those
22 mitigations the community has asked for?

23 Just find ways to look at those additional
24 options and find any and everywhere we possibly can to
25 make the most of our \$1.5 billion that we have for

39

||

1 Crenshaw Corridor. Because, like the supervisor said,
2 it's been a long time coming. It's been in studies since
3 actually earlier than the 80's; it's been in studies since
4 the early late 60's. So the Crenshaw Corridor has a place
5 in this transportation history, and we'd like to see that
6 built and become reality.

7 Thank you very much.

8 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

9 Following Gary we have Doug Barnett and Kevin
10 Fridlington.

11 Gary Gless: Hello there, I'm Gary Gless from
12 Citizen's Coalition for a Safe Community.

Page 28



091006 P09765

50.A

13 I'm here, basically, in support of the light
 14 rail. But the light rail needs to be underground.
 15 100 percent. The safety of the children, everybody
 16 commuting across, should be number one.
 17 And I feel that it should get the same respect --
 18 Leimert -- as every other community. And this connects
 19 the two. And as a resident of Windsor Hills, I don't want
 20 to go ahead and have to say the community next to me is
 21 getting a raw deal. I think all the communities, no
 22 matter who they are and where they are located, all should
 23 get the same respect and the transportation that they
 24 deserve.
 25 Thank you.

40

ii

1 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.
 2 Doug Barnett: My grandfather came here in 1880. I've
 3 lived in South Central for 20 years.
 4 When the Red Line opened in 1989, rail deaths in
 5 America doubled. It doubled because it clogged up every
 6 east-west artery between Western Avenue and Long Beach.
 7 You're going to see the same thing with the Red Line.
 8 Ten years ago I went to hearings and I said grade
 9 separation. We didn't get it. And we're going to kill
 10 people.
 11 We've doubled our taxes in the last 10 years in
 12 the Second Supervisorial District because a lot of houses
 13 that people have owned for most of their lifetimes have
 14 rolled over in the last five years. There's no reason why
 15 we don't have the money in the Second District to pay for
 16 real transportation.
 17 I ride that subway two or three times a week,
 18 maybe five or six times a week sometimes. By strange
 19 circumstance, I can use both ends of that Red Line. Very
 20 few people can. And it's very important that these kinds
 21 of systems come into this millennium. We're nowhere near
 22 this millennium.

51.A

23 Steel wheels and steel rails came on line in



091006 P09765
24 America in 1834. And we're still living with that crap.
25 we need it underground at least.

41

||

1 Let the Japanese build it.
2 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.
3 Following Kevin we have Steve Bagby and Alisia
4 Fajinimi.
5 Kevin Fridlington: Good evening. Kevin Fridlington.
6 I have two separate comments.

7 First is I am a member of the Neighborhood
8 Council of the Empowerment Congress West Area; that is
9 Culver City to Arlington, roughly Jefferson to Vernon.
10 And I'm also chair of the Planning, Land Use, and
11 Beautification Committee, speaking for that group. Our
12 group voted last night at our meeting. Looking at all of
13 the options that were laid out, the baseline, the
14 underground options, we made it very simple: Put it
15 underground. That was the vote of the Land Use Committee
16 of the Neighborhood Council Empowerment Congress West.
17 Put the line underground. That's direction that I was
18 given to give you.

52.A

19 We'll be taking that recommendation also to our
20 board, and they'll discuss it at their next meeting.
21 Speaking as an individual. I'm a resident of
22 Leimert Park. I'm a member of Save Leimert. And I have a
23 friend who was a planner with the City of Los Angeles once
24 and was talking about this, and the comment made to me was
25 public hearings are so hard and embarrassing for staff

42

||

1 because they really know what they're going to do before
2 the public hearing, and it really doesn't matter what's
3 said. I hope that's not the case. I really, really hope
4 that that's not the case, and you're listening to what's
5 being said here tonight.

6 I have been to the scoping meetings at
7 Transfiguration. I'm sorry, the scoping meetings at
Page 30



091006 P09765

8 Audubon, the alignment meetings here at Transfiguration.
9 I have listened, sat and listened, to all that
10 conversation. And I would say 95 percent or higher of the
11 comments suggest or state that this community wants light
12 rail placed underground.

13 But the options that we were presented doesn't --
14 it gives us the reflection, but not -- so please, light
15 rail underground.

16 Thank you.

17 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

18 Steve Bagby, Sr.: Good evening my name is Steve
19 Bagby, Sr. I'm a former deputy coordinator of
20 transportation and housing for the late Congresswoman
21 Juanita Millender-McDonald, and I'm an active member of
22 Dorsey High Alumni Association and the Coalition to Fix
23 the Expo Line.

24 For the gentleman who spoke earlier from Windsor
25 Hills, who said he would hate to see any of the bordering

43

ii

1 communities get a raw deal, the Expo Line is a case in
2 point that that's already in place. I think it's
3 unconscionable that La Brea, La Cienega, Robertson, and
4 Overland would have overpasses; but Crenshaw, Western and
5 Vermont would not.

53.A

6 When we talk about equity, minorities are
7 consumers extraordinaire. And a half a cent sales tax as
8 of July 1st goes for Measure R money. Minority
9 communities are not getting an equitable return on their
10 tax dollars.

11 When you talk about the Subway to the Sea going
12 from Fairfax and Wilshire to Santa Monica by way of UCLA
13 completely underground, and you can't safeguard the
14 students at Foshay Middle School or Dorsey High or in this
15 case Crenshaw, something is amiss.

16 I'm a sheer advocate for public transportation.
17 I've seen rail lines mitigated in the cities of Compton
18 and Lynwood through the Alameda Corridor being cut and

Page 31

091006 P09765
19 covered or trenched. It just doesn't have to be subway,
20 per se. But below grade is the way to go. And there
21 should be equity within Central Los Angeles commensurate
22 to what's being proposed for West L.A.

23 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

24 Following Alisia I have Charles Brister.

25 And that's the last speaker card that I have. So

44

□

1 if there's anyone else that would like to make a comment,
2 please grab a speaker card from Rochelle or Stephanie, and
3 they'll bring it up to me.

4 Alisia Fajinimi: Hi, my name is Alisia Fajinimi. I'm
5 from Dios International Missionary Church. I'm a youth
6 director and a community liaison officer.

54.A

7 I would like to support the Light-Rail Transit
8 Alternative. I believe that we should have something at
9 all than nothing. I believe that once we start from
10 somewhere, later on things could expand. So let's all
11 support this project, and later on things can get better.

12 I went to Crenshaw High School; I graduated from
13 Crenshaw High School. Now I have a Bachelor's in
14 psychology. I understand feeling safe and all of that.
15 And it's important for the community to feel safe. So
16 let's support this light-rail transit, and later on things
17 can get better.

18 Thank you.

19 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

20 Charles Brister: Good evening, my name is Charles
21 Brister from 1-800 UNITE US.

22 One thing that concerns me about the construction
23 I've seen thus far on the Metro and other government
24 projects is the scarcity of African-American workers. And
25 also contracts; very, very few go to African Americans.

45

55.A □

1 we've got these projects right in our community.

2 There's a lot of people looking for work. And what I'd

Page 32



091006 P09765

3 like to know is what will be done to ensure that we're
4 properly represented on these contracts and jobs?

5 Thank you.

6 Ms. Reeves: Thank you.

7 Is there anyone else that would like to make a
8 verbal comment? That was my last speaker card.

9 Tony L. Clarke, Sr.: My name is Tony Clark, Sr., and
10 I just want to make this short and simple.

56.A

11 The light rail is the right thing to do, but
12 you've got to do the thing right. Okay? It's not about
13 just doing the right thing, it's about doing the right
14 thing right. And the right way is to put it underground.

15 Ms. Reeves: Okay. Thank you.

16 Well, we'd like to thank all of you for coming
17 out this evening and sharing your time with us and
18 providing us with your feedback.

19 You still have the opportunity to provide
20 feedback in written form. We have comment cards at the
21 front registration desk and that has information on how to
22 submit your comments. The deadline is October 26th, which
23 is a Monday, 5:00 p.m.

24 So please feel free to grab some extra comment
25 forms if you have a neighbor or a friend that you think

-46

||

1 would be interested.

2 And thank you very much for coming out.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13



14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

091006 P09765

47

Page 34

**Comment: 43-36. Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas.****Response to comment 43-36A.**

Comment noted. Metro appreciates the views and input from the commenter as it is an important part of the planning process. Metro acknowledges that the Light Rail Alternative would result in more construction jobs than the BRT Alternative. Please Refer to Master Response 6 regarding selection of the locally preferred alternative.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (DEIS/DEIR) estimated that approximately 7,800 jobs would be created by the Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit Project. This number reflects total jobs, which includes direct, indirect, and induced jobs. Direct jobs are the result of (1) expenditures on capital investment, which primarily occur during the construction phase of the project and (2) ongoing operations of a transportation system, which include train operations, maintenance activities, and administration. Indirect jobs occur through supporting industries, who supply goods and services to enable the direct spending and jobs. This includes workers in industries supplying engines and equipment needed for building vehicles, guideways and station facilities. Induced jobs are created through the re-spending of worker income on consumer goods and services which include food, clothing, shelter, recreation, and personal services.

The estimated jobs created by the construction of Crenshaw/LAX Transit Project would be 400 annual jobs over the five-year construction period. For comparative purposes, the 5.3-year construction period of the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension, a similar light rail transit project that was recently completed, generated 432 annual construction jobs (full time equivalent worker hours). The Gold Line Eastside Extension alignment is shorter than the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Project, and the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Project could be expected to produce 10 to 20 percent more jobs during construction than the Gold Line Eastside Extension. The 400 estimated annual jobs created during construction of the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Project represents a conservative estimate that is consistent with Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension construction data.

Comment: 43-37. Councilmember Bernard Parks.

Response to comment 43-37A.

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 Final EIS/EIR, 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. There has been an extensive public outreach process where alternatives have been formulated, evaluated and refined. The evaluation process has informed the affected residents of the relative impacts among options (alignment routes, vertical and horizontal alignments, station locations, etc.). The Metro Board of Directors, in selecting an LPA, considered the engineering and environmental documentation, as well as public comments and concerns. As the commenter stated, all comments received during the public circulation period have been responded to in the FEIS/FEIR. In instances where issues have arisen, design and alignment decisions have been revisited. In instances where adverse effects have been identified, design options and mitigation measures have been formulated to reduce or eliminate potential impacts on adjacent communities, and on adjacent minority or low-income communities. The City of Los Angeles agencies referred to by the commenter (CRA, Department of Transportation, and Planning Department) have been actively involved in the planning and development of the project.



Comment 43-38. Damien Goodmon.

Response to comment 43-38A.

Please Refer to Master Response 9 regarding grade separations and environmental justice.

Response to comment 43-38B.

Please Refer to Master Response 12 regarding a Crenshaw/Vernon Station.

Comment 43-39. Gregory Freeman.

Response to comment 43-39A.

Please Refer to Master Response 6 regarding selection of the locally preferred alternative.

Response to comment 43-39B.

Construction of the Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Transit Project would result in approximately 400 jobs per year over the five years that would be necessary to complete the project. In addition, approximately 128 annual jobs would be created during the operation of the project. Metro will be implementing a jobs program for all the Measure R construction projects. The jobs program will be designed to maximize employment opportunities for residents living in the construction area, provide for apprenticeship opportunities, and reduce unemployment for Los Angeles County residents.



Comment 43-40. Barbara Lottholland.

Response to comment 43-40A.

Comment noted. Bus service along Wilshire Boulevard is not part of the proposed project. Comments concerning bus service along Wilshire Boulevard should be directed towards the Metro Passenger relations Department.

Response to comment 43-40B.

Comment noted. Comments regarding the Metro Long Range Plan should be directed towards the long range planning process.

Comment 43-41. Clint Simmons.

Response to comment 43-41A.

Please Refer to Master Response 1 Regarding support for a below-grade alignment along Crenshaw Boulevard.



Comment 43-42. Masa Alkire.

Response to comment 43-42A.

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

Comment 43-43. Andrea Canty.

Response to comment 43-43A.

Comment noted. The large majority of community activities and events occur near Leimert Park or the Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plazas, both areas where the alignment is below grade and would not prohibit these events from occurring in the future. Should future events occur in an area where the Crenshaw/LAX Light Rail Line is operating at grade, either half of Crenshaw Boulevard could still be closed for a parade and the other side could maintain restricted traffic flow.

Response to comment 43-43B.

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

Please Refer to Master Response 5 regarding traffic methodology and analysis.

Comment 43-44. Alan Havens.

Response to comment 43-44A.

Comment noted. An Alternatives Analysis was completed during the preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR to identify the transit alignment to be evaluated in the Draft EIS/EIR. The results of the Alternatives Analysis are presented in Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered, of the Draft EIS/EIR. This analysis used criteria including but not limited to, regional connectivity, ridership, and cost-effectiveness to compare the different modes of transit and alignment options and determine which alternatives would be carried forward for further analysis into the Draft EIS/EIR. The Alternatives Analysis identified that one alignment be studied for further consideration based on the evaluation criteria. This alignment begins at the southwest corner of the study area at the Imperial/Aviation Green Line Station and travels along the Harbor Subdivision Railroad Right-of-Way until it reaches Crenshaw Boulevard, where it would travel in the median of Crenshaw Boulevard and connect with the Metro Exposition Line or Wilshire Boulevard. The two alternatives identified for further study in the Alternatives Analysis, along with a No Build Alternative and a Transportation Systems Management Alternative underwent a comprehensive environmental review in the Draft EIS/EIR.

The extension of the Crenshaw Light Rail Transit Line to Wilshire Boulevard and to the Hollywood/Highland Station is not part of the Locally Preferred Alternative selected by the Metro Board of Directors. Feasibility studies have been conducted by Metro that indicated that a future extension of light rail transit to Wilshire Boulevard is feasible. 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.

Comment 43-45. Linda Ricks.

Response to comment 43-45A.

A station community workshop took place to identify the community's interests, particularly in regards to the location of the West Boulevard Station. There were competing community interests regarding whether the station was located in the City of Inglewood, west of West Boulevard or in the City of Los Angeles, east of West Boulevard. The community participation was included as part of the final evaluation for station locations. The West Station will be located to the west of the Florence/West intersection, south of the BNSF Railroad tracks in the City of Inglewood.