



# WESTSIDE EXTENSION TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY

Project No. PS-4350-2000

## Task 3.3 Project Scoping Report (19b)

*Prepared for:*



*Prepared by:*

**PB**

**444 South Flower Street**

**Suite 3700**

**Los Angeles, California 90071**

Review Copy		
Version	Date	Initials
Draft	01-11-08	TR
Review	01-14-08	TLJ
Revised	02-04-08	TLJ

February 4, 2008



## **Table of Contents**

**1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... 1-1**

**2.0 INTRODUCTION ..... 2-1**

2.1 Study Background ..... 2-1

2.2 Study Area ..... 2-1

2.3 Purpose of Report ..... 2-3

2.4 Early Scoping Process ..... 2-3

2.5 Overall Project Development Process ..... 2-3

**3.0 EARLY SCOPING PROCESS ..... 3-1**

3.1 Initiation of Scoping ..... 3-1

3.2 Early Scoping Meetings with Agencies & Jurisdictions ..... 3-1

3.3 Public Scoping Meeting Stakeholder Identification ..... 3-2

3.4 Public Notices and Distribution ..... 3-2

3.5 Media and Blog Outreach ..... 3-3

3.6 Community Group and Agency Follow-Up ..... 3-4

3.7 Agency Scoping Meeting ..... 3-4

3.8 Public Scoping Meetings ..... 3-5

3.9 Other Community Meetings during Early Scoping Period ..... 3-7

**4.0 SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS ..... 4-1**

4.1 Summary of Substantive Comment ..... 4-1

4.1.1 Comments Related to Purpose and Need ..... 4-1

4.1.2 Comments Related to Alternatives ..... 4-6

4.1.3 Comments Related to Evaluation Criteria ..... 4-8

4.1.4 Comments Related to Scope of the Analysis ..... 4-8

4.2 Applicability of the Comments to the Alternatives Analysis ..... 4-10

## List of Appendices

APPENDIX A	EARLY SCOPING NOTICE
APPENDIX B	PROJECT WEB SITE
APPENDIX C	SCOPING INFORMATION
APPENDIX D	MAILING LISTS
APPENDIX E	PUBLIC NOTICES
APPENDIX F	PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING MATERIALS
APPENDIX G	PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS
APPENDIX H	SUBMITTED LETTERS
APPENDIX I	DIGITAL AUDIO/VIDEO FILE COMMENTS
APPENDIX J	DIGITAL FILE COMMENTS
APPENDIX K	BLOG ENTRIES

## List of Tables

Table 1.1	Summary of all Comments from the Early Scoping Process .....	1-2
Table 3.1	Special Group/Association Meetings .....	3-7
Table 4.1	Summary of Comments of 134 Speakers at Five Public Scoping Meetings.....	4-2
Table 4.2	Summary of 82 Written Scoping Meeting Comments .....	4-3
Table 4.3	Summary of 152 Email Submissions .....	4-4
Table 4.4	Summary of 108 Written Letters and Comments .....	4-5

## List of Figures

Figure 2.1	Westside Extension Transit Corridor Study Area.....	2-2
------------	---	-----



## **1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) has initiated an Alternatives Analysis (AA) Study for the Westside Extension Transit Corridor. The successful completion of the Westside AA will allow Metro to evaluate a range of alternative transit improvements for the Westside Extension Transit Corridor and to select a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) that can best accommodate population growth and transit demand and be compatible with land use and future development opportunities. Because of the potentially high costs of this project, Metro is preparing the AA to be eligible for federal funding under the Section 5309 New Starts Program and other local and state funding programs. This will require the successful completion of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requirements for the New Starts Program.

Consistent with FTA requirements for AA it is important for all agency participants to use a public scoping process to help define the appropriate range of issues and the depth of analysis to be addressed. The process known as ‘Early Scoping’ is used when a LPA decision is anticipated in advance of formal environmental documentation of alternatives. Formal public scoping will be conducted again at the start of the environmental work after an LPA decision is reached. This report documents the early public scoping process and results for the Westside Extension Transit Corridor in support of the Westside AA.

The early scoping process followed for the Westside Extension Transit Corridor study included both early identification of prospective participants and early notification for all meetings. The intention was to both inform and solicit feedback on what transit improvements should be studied and how transit improvements should be evaluated. The official notification process began with an early scoping notice published in Federal Register Volume 72 No. 189 on Monday October 1, 2007 (Appendix A). The official scoping comment period was initially scheduled to extend until November 1, 2007, but was extended until November 7, 2007, at the request of several stakeholders. The general public and agency representatives were given opportunities to attend public meetings and provide verbal plus written comments. In addition those wishing to provide comments could view project information on Metro’s website and respond in writing or by email. Screenshots of the content of Metro’s website can be found in Appendix B.

A summary of the substantive comments are provided in Table 1.1 below. As indicated, comments were provided through a variety of means including verbal, by letter, from email and from the Metro Information line. The early scoping outreach process resulted in many useful comments. Participants were briefed regarding the Westside study area transit needs, a range of transit modes for consideration and two historical alignments that had been studied in previous corridor studies: Wilshire Boulevard and Santa Monica Boulevard. Commenter’s addressed transit mode, transit alignment, potential stations, evaluation criteria to use and general issues about the study.



Table 1.1 - Summary of all Comments from the Early Scoping Process

	Subway		Aerial/Monorail		LRT		BRT		Other	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		
<b>Mode</b>	262	8	22	1	18	8	14	22	At-grade Auto expressway under Wilshire Boulevard High Speed Rail Increase DASH service (1) Increase local service (2) Just Bus (1) More Buses (8) Moving sidewalks Street Car (2) Underground BRT	
<b>Stations</b>	Century City (31) UCLA (21) Connection to Expo (14) Beverly Hills (13) North/South (12) Beverly Center (11) Santa Monica (11) Santa Monica Boulevard (11) West Hollywood (10) Beverly Center/Cedars-Sinai (9) Wilshire/Westwood (8) Avenue of the Stars (7) Constellation (7) Crenshaw (7) La Brea (7) LAX (7) Westwood (7) Beverly Triangle (6) VA (6) 3rd Street (5) Beverly Drive (5) Burbank Airport (5) Fairfax (5) Grove/Farmers Market (5) La Cienega (5) Sunset/Fairfax (5) Bundy (4) San Vicente (4)				Wilshire/Fairfax (4) 405 (3) Santa Monica/ San Vicente (3) The Grove (3) Hollywood Bowl (2) Hospitals (2) Lincoln Boulevard (2) Rodeo (2) San Fernando Valley (2) Sunset/Fairfax, not (2) Westwood/LeConte (2) 17th-20th Streets (1) 20th St (1) 20th/Santa Monica Boulevard (1) 3rd/Fairfax (1) 4th Street (1) Beverly Glen (1) Century City Mall (1) Crenshaw, not (1) Crescent Heights (1) Dodger Stadium (1) Downtown (1) Echo Park (1) Fairfax, not (1) Hollywood (1) Irving, not (1) La Brea, not (1) LaBrea/Fairfax (1) LaBrea/Santa Monica (1) Le Conte (1)				Museum Row (1) Pacific Coast Highway (1) Pico/Fairfax (1) Red line (1) Robertson (1) Rodeo/Beverly (1) Santa Monica Community College (1) Santa Monica Pier (1) Santa Monica/Fairfax (1) Sepulveda Boulevard (1) Sunset (1) UCLA Campus (1) West of 405 (1) Western (1) Wilshire/Doheny (1) Wilshire/Gayley/Lot 32 (1) Wilshire/La Cienega (1) Wilshire/Santa Monica (1) Wilshire/Veteran (1) Wilshire/Westholm (1) Plummer Park (1) Windsor, Not (1)	



Alignments	Wilshire		Santa Monica		Both		Other	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		
	107	3	49	1	52	9	3rd St Promenade connection to Expo 405 (2) Burbank Airport to LAX via Hollywood Burton Way Don't zig-zag H&H follow red car diagonal to Santa Monica H&H to La Brea to Santa Monica Highland (2) Hollywood/Highland (1) Hollywood/Vine to Sunset to La Cienega La Brea to LAX (1) Lincoln Boulevard (1) Must go to the Sea (4) N/S H&H to Expo (2) N/S Route to Valley & LAX N/S Service Connections (3) Not all the way to Santa Monica Olympic Boulevard (3) Provide for express trains Rapid Bus on Olympic San Vicente (1) Santa Monica Blvd Straight to Downtown Los Angeles Sunset (3) Under LA County Club Wilshire to Expo via Water Garden	
<b>Issues</b>	Noise and Vibration (16) Joint development can help pay (8) Tunneling under historic homes, vibration (7) Increase taxes/Fees (6) System connectivity (6) Bike access and amenities (5) Need N/S Connections (5) Parking at stations (5) Traffic Diversion associated w/ BRT (5) Need Local Connectors/Shuttles (4) Service availability (3) Speak w/ one voice in Washington (3) Affect on green house gasses (2) Economic Development opportunities (2) Safety at stations (2) Shadows and visual impacts associated with elevated trains (2) Sunset/Fairfax station location is a business (2) Accidents on 6 <sup>th</sup> Street (1) Additional congestion to streets near stations (1) Area serviced (1) Articulated buses cause congestion (1)				Need nighttime service (4) Signage and wayfinding (4) Additional land use opportunities (3) Drilling in methane area (3) Expand community outreach outside study area, different formats, wider demographics(3) Incorporate bicycles in planning (3) Segment project to address funding (3) Bus Lanes (1) Concerned about noise and vibration at the Spaulding and Sunset Squares, and Sunset Flats (1) Congestion caused by buses (1) Connection to LAX (1) Connection with employment centers (1) Consider parallel arterial capacity (1) Don't let funding drive schedule (1) Don't complete in phases (1) Earthquake safety (1) Ease of transfer (1) Environmental factors addition people on the road, train and		Power Station Exhaust(1) Express service (1) External costs of driving accidents, health(1) Fire/life/safety access what happens if a fire truck is caught at a crossing gate?(1) General Congestion (1) GPS Tracking (1) If Purple to sea, Expo on Venice (1) Impacts to geologic and water table (1) Include Olympic/Pico one-way (1) Land use (1) Line naming (1) Park/Ride options (1) Preserve pedestrian amenities on Wilshire (1) Property values (1) Questions ridership and user demographics (1) Repair curb lanes used by buses (1) Station amenities (1) Study benefits of electric vehicles (1) System connectivity (1) Timeliness of service (1) Traffic light synchronization (1) Underground utilities (1) Use of solar power (1)	



<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	Ability to absorb growth, accommodate pedestrians, affect on green house gases, ability to generate riders on other systems Additional congestion to streets near stations Additional land use opportunities (3) Area serviced Benefits to community, including young people Bicycle Safety, Travel Speed (2), Ability to Serve Job Centers, Overall Capacity Construction Safety in earthquake zones, System improvements Density at stations Economic development opportunities Environmental concerns Environmental factors (addition people on the road, train and power station exhaust) Express and rush hour services Fire/life/safety access (what happens if a fire truck is caught at a crossing gate?) Impacts to geologic and water table Land use Noise and Vibration (9) Noise and vibration under sunset/Spaulding square Station accessibility for bikes, strollers, and ADA Station power System connectivity Tunneling through residential neighborhoods (3) Underground utilities
----------------------------	---

The overwhelming majority of comments received supported the need for a transit improvement in the Westside Extension Transit Corridor. The Wilshire subway alignment was the most favored route and mode. A number of commenters favored the Santa Monica route but many also said that Metro should consider a project that would include both the Wilshire and Santa Monica Boulevards routes in a single project. In many cases, where the public supported both the Wilshire and the Santa Monica alignments, most thought that the Wilshire alignment should take precedence. Limited support was voiced for aerial/monorail, light rail or bus rapid transit modes, with opposition to each of these modes expressed as well.

These comments provide useful input to the definition of alternatives and their subsequent evaluation and will be incorporated as the Westside AA progresses.



## **2.0 INTRODUCTION**

Metro has initiated an Alternatives Analysis Study (AA) for the Westside Extension Transit Corridor. The project has been organized into two phases or stages. Stage 1 consists of the AA, including conceptual engineering. Stage 2 consists of the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) and preliminary engineering. The project will be conducted in accordance with the most recent FTA guidelines for project development and Section 5309 New Starts. This is a program managed by the Federal Transit Administration which provides the bulk of federal funding grants for fixed guideway transit corridor projects.

This report provides documentation of the early scoping process utilized, the public scoping meetings held and comments received as input to the development of preliminary alternatives for further study. This chapter provides an overview of the Westside Corridor along with a description of key aspects of the early scoping process.

### **2.1 Study Background**

In response to growing needs for transit service because of ever increasing population growth, employment growth and traffic congestion, extensive planning studies for the Westside Extension of the original Metro Red Line have been conducted by Metro since the early 1980's. Such studies led in 1994 to a Full Funding Grant Agreement with the federal government for a 2.3 mile extension of the Metro Red Line from Wilshire/Western to Pico/San Vicente. In 1998, due to funding constraints, Metro suspended the project and focused attention on other, lower cost bus and light rail transit options for the Westside. These efforts led to the adoption of the Exposition Light Rail Transit project, the implementation of the Metro Rapid Bus program and additional efforts to develop enhanced Metro Rapid Bus improvements along Wilshire Blvd. The continuation of traffic congestion and growth in recent years, however, has led to the need to once again consider a heavy rail extension to the Westside.

The successful completion of the Westside AA will allow Metro to evaluate a range of alternative transit improvements for the Westside Extension Transit Corridor and to select a LPA that can best accommodate population growth and transit demand and be compatible with land use and future development opportunities. Because of the potentially high cost of this project, Metro is preparing the AA to be eligible for federal funding under the Section 5309 New Starts Program and other local and state funding programs. This will require the successful completion of the FTA requirements for the New Starts Program.

### **2.2 Study Area**

The Westside Extension Transit Corridor Study Area is in western Los Angeles County and encompasses approximately 38 square miles (Figure 2.1). The Study Area is east-west oriented and includes portions of five jurisdictions: the Cities of Los Angeles, West Hollywood, Beverly Hills, Santa Monica, as well as portions of unincorporated Los





Angeles County. The boundaries of the Study Area generally extend north to the base of the Santa Monica Mountains along Hollywood, Sunset and San Vicente Boulevards, east to the Metro Rail stations at Hollywood/ Highland and Wilshire/Western, south to Pico Boulevard, and west to the Pacific Ocean.

### **2.3 Purpose of Report**

FTA guidelines require that a public scoping process be conducted to help define the appropriate range of issues and the depth of analysis to be addressed. The process known as ‘Early Scoping’ is used when a LPA decision is anticipated in advance of formal environmental documentation of alternatives. Formal public scoping will be conducted again at the start of the environmental work after an LPA decision is reached. This report documents the early public scoping process and results for the Westside Extension Transit Corridor in support of the Westside Alternatives Analysis.

### **2.4 Early Scoping Process**

The early scoping process followed for the Westside Transit Extension Corridor study included both early identification of prospective participants and early notification for all meetings. The intention was to both inform and solicit feedback on what transit improvements should be studied and how transit improvements should be evaluated. The official notification process began with an early scoping notice published in Federal Register Volume 72 No. 189 on Monday October 1, 2007. The official scoping comment period was initially scheduled to extend until November 1, 2007, but was extended until November 7, 2007, at the request of several stakeholders. The general public and agency representatives were given opportunities to attend public meetings and provide verbal plus written comments. In addition those wishing to provide comments could view project information on Metro’s website and respond in writing or by email. All means of public notification, meeting schedules and feedback that were made available are provided as part of this report. Chapter 3 provides the substantive comments received.

### **2.5 Overall Project Development Process**

The Westside Extension Corridor Study is the first step in a multi-step process to implement a major transit improvement for this part of the Los Angeles region. This first step, also known as Alternatives Analysis, is being conducted following strict guidelines established by the FTA. The basic steps being followed include:

- Alternatives Analysis
- EIS/EIR and Preliminary Engineering
- Final Engineering
- Construction
- Revenue Service



## **3.0 EARLY SCOPING PROCESS**

This chapter documents the activities completed to make the community aware and provide opportunities for participation in the early scoping for the Westside Transit Extension Corridor AA. These notification and outreach activities included:

- Publishing the early scoping notice in the Federal Register
- Conducting early scoping meetings with agencies & jurisdictions
- Identifying public scoping meeting stakeholders
- Preparing and distributing public notices of meetings
- Performing media and blog outreach
- Conducting follow-up with community groups and agencies
- Hosting Agency scoping meetings
- Hosting public scoping meetings
- Hosting other community meetings

Comments and issues raised at the scoping meetings were used to define a range of alternatives for further technical analysis beginning with alternatives screening as part of the AA.

### **3.1 Initiation of Scoping**

The official notification process began with an early scoping notice published in Federal Register Volume 72 No. 189 on Monday October 1, 2007. An official scoping comment period of 30 days ended on November 1, 2007, but was extended until November 7, 2007 at the request of several stakeholders. Both the general public and agency representatives were notified of opportunities to attend public meetings and provide verbal plus written comments through this Federal Register notice.

### **3.2 Early Scoping Meetings with Agencies & Jurisdictions**

A series of meetings with stakeholders and elected officials were held prior to the public scoping and agency meetings conducted in October 2007. The meetings included:

- Meeting with Metro Board Deputies – August 30, 2007
- Meeting with Metro Chief Planning Officer and Westside Consultants’ team – September 4, 2007
- Meeting with City of Los Angeles Mayor’s office to brief representatives – September 6, 2007
- Meeting with elected officials at West Hollywood City Hall – September 10, 2007

These meetings provided useful input from as well as advanced notification and education about the Westside AA to these Stakeholders and Elected Officials.



### **3.3 Public Scoping Meeting Stakeholder Identification**

A comprehensive stakeholder identification process was initiated to coincide with the Early Scoping process. Recognizing the 38 square mile study area, a radius mail was not recommended as optimal to publicize the Early Scoping Meetings. Rather, recognizing the study area’s demographics, the intent was to develop a comprehensive study database throughout the study area for the purposes of a targeted email and direct mail that would include:

- Elected officials on the local, state and federal level
- Neighborhood Councils and other elected groups
- Homeowners Associations and Neighborhood Organizations
- Chambers of Commerce and business leaders
- Community based and civic organizations
- Key destinations and employers
- Transportation advocates and interest groups
- Print and broadcast Media, including community-based publications and blogs
- Other interested groups and persons

This database was cross-referenced with information from the 2000 Mid-City/Westside Transit Corridor Study. Elected representatives were also requested to provide contact information for community and business organizations in their districts, which led to about 120 contacts being added to the database. In addition, the study team contacted many of these stakeholders requesting that where their contact lists were proprietary, they would conduct outreach to their memberships on Metro’s behalf; many of these stakeholders were responsive to this request.

For the purposes of the outreach related to the Early Scoping meetings, the stakeholder list contained 1180 entries. A copy of the database is included in Appendix D.

The database is updated on an ongoing basis, including via requests to the information line, on the website, and written requests; the current list now includes all those individuals who signed in at the Early Scoping Meetings.

### **3.4 Public Notices and Distribution**

In addition to the Early Scoping Notice, a Public Notice was developed to notify the public about the Study, its associated Early Scoping Meetings as well as other opportunities for stakeholders to provide their input prior to the November 7, 2007 comment deadline. A copy of this Public Notice may be viewed in Appendix A.

The Public Notices were distributed a number of ways:

- Via **email** to those with email addresses in the study database, and to those organizations distributing the Notice on Metro’s behalf where their lists were



proprietary. It is estimated that an additional 3100 individuals were contacted through these proprietary lists. Approximately 798 individuals with email addresses are included in the stakeholder database. Emails notices were sent out on September 27, 2007, with follow-up reminders sent again on October 2, 2007. A final reminder to the community to submit comments was delivered on October 30, 2007.

- Via **US mail** or direct mail where no email contacts were available. Over 600 notices were mailed to residents, agencies, and organizations in the study area; in West Hollywood, the City distributed a notice to neighborhood organizations, and to those sitting on City Commissions and Committees, or approximately 200 individuals. Meeting notices were mailed on Meeting notices were mailed on September 27, 2007.
- Notices were posted online at [www.metro.net/westside](http://www.metro.net/westside).
- Poster sized versions of the flyer were distributed to 43 locations throughout the study area, including Metro Service Centers, offices of local elected officials, and at community, recreation and senior centers. A complete listing of locations where posters were displayed is located in Appendix E.

### **3.5 Media and Blog Outreach**

A detailed list of 83 media outlets specific to the study area was developed which included mainstream, community-based and ethnic/foreign language print and broadcast outlets. A complete list of the media contacted for this study is included in Appendix D.

A press release, developed in coordination with Metro staff, was distributed to all 83 outlets; for the community-based and ethnic print media, a specific request was made for inclusion of Scoping Meeting information in their community calendars.

In addition, display advertisements for the Scoping Meetings were placed in eight (8) newspapers in the study area and were selected based on their geographic focus, language needs and audited circulation numbers.

Newspaper advertisements for the Scoping Meetings were placed in the following newspapers:

- Beverly Hills Courier: advertisement ran 10/5; circulation 43,000
- Century City News: advertisement ran 10/5, circulation 10,000
- Jewish Journal: advertisement ran 10/5; circulation 50,000
- Korean Central Daily (Korean language): advertisement ran 10/5; circulation 100,000.
- La Opinion (Spanish language): advertisement ran 10/5, circulation 124,784
- Park La Brea/Beverly Press: advertisement ran 10/4, circulation 12,000
- Santa Monica Daily Press: advertisement ran 10/3; circulation 19,000
- The Wave (Los Angeles/West Hollywood Independent): advertisement ran 10/11; circulation 240,000



Scans of the tear sheets from these newspapers may be viewed in Appendix E, showing the date published as well as the copy.

To ensure that the study addressed the growing prevalence of “new” media in this region, outreach was also conducted to “blogs” which are best described as an online continual open conversation. The Southern California region is host to thousands of blogs, and after some research, 34 key websites were located that discuss transit, traffic, community development, and neighborhood issues.

All of the 34 bloggers identified were sent a copy of Metro’s press release and the Public Notice — for the purposes of this study, bloggers were treated as if they were a typical media outlet. As far as we know, this is the first time that blogs have been considered as a part of the media outreach for a transit corridor study of this magnitude. A complete list of these blogs is included in Appendix D.

Many of these blogs posted comments about the study, and lively on-line “conversations” were initiated. Although it is difficult to ascertain how many “hits” each blog received about the study, the online conversation did contribute to raising awareness about the project and to generating turnout at the community meeting. However, articles and comments posted on the blogs provided the study team with additional insight into public sentiment about the study. Many of the blog entries are located in Appendix K.

### **3.6 Community Group and Agency Follow-Up**

As noted previously, all those on the study database either received two (2) email notices about the Scoping Meetings i.e., an initial notice followed by a reminder, or one (1) piece of direct mail. The offices of elected officials representing portions of the project study area were also contacted and alerted about the meetings. A complete list of elected officials who were contacted is located in Appendix D.

Multiple organizations were contacted requesting that they forward invitations to the Scoping Meetings to their memberships or constituents. These organizations included transportation advocacy groups, neighborhood and business organizations, civic groups, and academic institutions. A complete list of contacted organizations is listed in Appendix D.

Follow-up calls were also made to agencies inviting them to attend the Agency Scoping Meeting. Calls were made to approximately 70 agencies between October 5 and 10, 2007.

### **3.7 Agency Scoping Meeting**

One Public Agency Scoping Meeting was scheduled as follows:

Thursday, October 10, 2007; 3:00 - 4:30 p.m.  
Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Substation Briefing Room  
720 N. San Vicente Boulevard, West Hollywood



In attendance were 18 individuals, including the following agencies:

- City of Beverly Hills
- California Public Utilities Commission
- Federal Transit Agency
- City of Los Angeles
- University of California, Los Angeles
- City of West Hollywood
- City of Los Angeles: Bureau of Street Lighting
- City of Los Angeles: Community Redevelopment Agency
- City of Santa Monica: Police Department
- City of Santa Monica: Big Blue Bus
- City of Beverly Hills: Fire Department
- City of Culver City: Fire Department
- City of Culver City: Community Development
- Los Angeles County: Sheriff's Department
- City of West Hollywood: Transportation Department

Notes from this meeting appear in Appendix G.

### **3.8 Public Scoping Meetings**

A series of five (5) Early Scoping Meetings was scheduled for October 2007, ahead of the November 1 deadline for receipt of public comment. Locations were selected to reflect equitable geographic coverage, proximity to public transportation and to minimize overlap with other meetings scheduled in the study area.

The meeting format was as follows:

6:00 – 6:30 p.m.	Open House
6:30 – 7:00 p.m.	Presentation
7:00 – 8:00 p.m.	Public Comment

The public comment period was moderated, and speakers were asked to limit their comment to 2 minutes.

The Early Public Scoping Meetings were scheduled as follows:

- Scoping Meeting #1: Century City/Westwood area  
Tuesday, October 9, 2007; 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.  
Emerson Middle School  
1650 Selby Avenue, Los Angeles



77 people signed in at this meeting, and 21 individuals elected to speak. Metro received 16 written comments at the end of this meeting.

Please view Appendix G for a list of attendees, comments received, and speakers as well as detailed meetings notes and a CD of the meeting proceedings.

- **Scoping Meeting #2: West Hollywood, Hollywood and Fairfax District areas**  
Thursday, October 11, 2007; 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.  
Pan Pacific Park Recreation Center  
7600 Beverly Boulevard, Los Angeles

58 people signed in at this meeting, and 18 individuals elected to speak. Metro received 19 written comments at the end of this meeting.

Please view Appendix G for a list of attendees, comments received, and speakers as well as detailed meetings notes and a CD of the meeting proceedings.

- **Public Scoping Meeting #3: Mid-Wilshire, Wilshire Center, Koreatown and Hancock Park/Windsor Square areas**  
Tuesday, October 16, 2007; 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.  
Wilshire United Methodist Church  
4350 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles

73 people signed in at this meeting, and 17 individuals elected to speak. Metro received 10 written comments at the end of this meeting.

Please view Appendix G for a list of attendees, comments received, and speakers as well as detailed meetings notes and a CD of the meeting proceedings.

- **Public Scoping Meeting #4: City of Beverly Hills**  
Wednesday, October 17, 2007; 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.  
City of Beverly Hills Public Library  
444 N Rexford Drive, Beverly Hills

69 people signed in at this meeting, and 17 individuals elected to speak. Metro received 13 written comments at the end of this meeting.

Please view Appendix G for a list of attendees, comments received, and speakers as well as detailed meetings notes and a CD of the meeting proceedings.

- **Public Scoping Meeting #5: City of Santa Monica**  
Thursday, October 18, 2007; 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.  
City of Santa Monica Public Library  
601 Santa Monica Boulevard, Santa Monica

81 people signed in at this meeting, and 29 individuals elected to speak. Metro received 15 written comments at the end of this meeting.

Please view Appendix G for a list of attendees, comments received, and speakers as well as detailed meetings notes and a CD of the meeting proceedings.



### 3.9 Other Community Meetings during Early Scoping Period

Several meetings were scheduled during the Early Scoping phase and before the official close of the public comment period where community input was accepted. These include:

- City of West Hollywood Supplemental Community Meeting  
Monday, October 29, 2007; 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.  
Plummer Park  
7377 Santa Monica Boulevard, West Hollywood

111 people signed in at this meeting, and 31 individuals elected to speak. Metro received 14 written comments at the end of this meeting.

Please view Appendix G for a list of attendees, comments received, and speakers as well as detailed meetings notes and a CD of the meeting proceedings.

During the public comment period, Metro also attended meetings as a part of the regular course of business or by request. These are summarized in Table 3.1.

Additional meetings will continue to take place at the study moves forward. At this juncture, it is anticipated that a series of three community meetings will be held in January 2008 to provide the public with an update on the study.

**Table 3.1 - Special Group/Association Meetings**

Organization	Meeting Details	Key Issues	Follow-Up
Beverly Hills and Greater Los Angeles Association of Realtors	Special Meeting: October 26 Attendance: 70	Support for system expansion along both alignments. Would like to review information regarding how transit availability impacts property values.	None required at this juncture
Century City Chamber of Commerce	Study Update: September 20 Attendance: 25	Employers in Century City want improved transit service after peak hours to assist with employee retention. Support subway and want a Century City station. Interested in building a coalition to support the subway extension.	None required at this juncture
Hollywood Chamber of Commerce Legislative Committee.	Study Update: September 13 Attendance: 15	Support subway expansion. Has provided positive impacts to Hollywood.	None required at this juncture
Metro Westside/Central Governance Council	Study Update: October 10 Attendance: 25	Interest in following study progress and outcomes.	Provide periodic updates.

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Meeting Details</b>	<b>Key Issues</b>	<b>Follow-Up</b>
Outpost Estates Homeowners Association	Study Update: October 30 Attendance: 69	Overwhelming support for subway extension, especially west from Hollywood & Highland. Some interest in LRT, but most preferred subway to avoid at-grade intersections. Little concern about cost as “politicians would find the money because this project has tremendous public support”. Explore developer fees to help cover cost.	Provide periodic updates..
Southern California Transit Advocates	Study Update: October 29 Attendance: 25	Support for system expansion, however, the group questioned why Santa Monica Boulevard was being considered as a potential alignment. Additional questions about the construction process, tunneling techniques, and impacts of each mode and alignment. The group did not have a final recommendation on mode, alignment, or stations.	None required at this juncture
Traffic Committee, West Los Angeles Community Police Advisory Board	Study Update: September 11 Attendance: 35	Interest in improving transportation and transit options on the Westside and opportunities to participate.	Provide periodic updates.
Westside Cities Council of Governments (COG) & COG Transportation Committee	August 9: Transportation Committee: Study update and like meeting schedule September 20: COG: Study update and upcoming meeting schedule October 11: Transportation Committee, Study update and meeting status November 15: Study update and report on meeting participation Attendance: Varies	Support subway extension west: it’s their second key priority after Exposition LRT.	Ongoing attendance at COG meetings.
Westside Transportation Partners	Study Update: August 28 Attendance: 30	Supportive of improved transit on the Westside. Key issues are connectivity to key business/employment centers. Also received presentation from Wilshire Monorail advocates.	Interested in periodic updates.



## **4.0 SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS**

The public comment period for the Westside Extension Transit Corridor Study commenced October 1, 2007 with the publication of the Early Scoping Notice and closed on November 1, 2007. At the request of several stakeholders, the comment period was extended until November 7, 2007. 452 comments received in five different ways were submitted prior to the close of the comment period:

- 105 Verbal comments at Public Scoping Meetings
- 82 Written comments at Public Scoping Meetings
- 152 Written comments and 1 digital audio comment via email
- 108 Written comments via US mail and hand delivered
- 4 Verbal comments on the Telephone Information Line

### **4.1 Summary of Substantive Comment**

This section of the Scoping Report summarizes the comments received in verbal testimony at the early scoping meetings, written comment forms turned in at the early scoping meetings, via emails, in letters mailed to Metro and received on the Telephone Information Line. Table 4.1 through Table 4.4 summarize the comments from each of these input sources. Finally, at the end of the chapter, a tabular listing of all of the comments is presented.

The overwhelming majority of comments received supported the need for a transit improvement in the Westside Extension Transit Corridor Study Area. The Wilshire subway alignment was the most favored route and mode, with nearly as many people advocating for subways on both the Wilshire and Santa Monica alignments. In many cases, where the public supported both the Wilshire and the Santa Monica alignments, most thought that the Wilshire alignment should take precedence. Limited support was voiced for aerial/monorail, light rail, or bus rapid transit modes, with opposition to each of these modes expressed as well.

The public input in the early scoping process strongly favors a subway extension along Wilshire Boulevard.

#### **4.1.1 Comments Related to Purpose and Need**

Public comments were provided by 105 speakers at the five early scoping meetings and summarized in Table 4.1. The types of comments made with regard to the Purpose and Need for transit improvements in the Westside Extension Transit Corridor Study Area focused on the difficulty associated with traveling by car or bus on the Westside due to extreme and often day-long congestion, and the growing recognition of the need for a mass transit alternative. There was also discussion of the need for local connections and shuttles to make the transit system more accessible to a wider range of residential and employment areas. The need for enhanced nighttime service, given the entertainment venues on the



Table 4.1 - Summary of Comments of 134 Speakers at Five Public Scoping Meetings

Mode	Subway		Aerial/Monorail		LRT		BRT		Other
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Mode	59	2	11	1	4	3	4	11	Underground BRT High Speed Rail At-grade
Stations	Le Conte/Westwood (2), Beverly Center/Cedars-Sinai (7), VA (2), Wilshire/Gayley/Lot 32, Center of Century City (4), LaBrea/Fairfax, LaBrea/Santa Monica, Santa Monica/Fairfax, San Vicente/Santa Monica, North/South Connections, Sunset/Fairfax (2), On UCLA Campus (1, The Grove (3), Plummer Park, Beverly Glen, La Cienega, Beverly Drive, Sunset./Highland, Rodeo Drive, West Hollywood, Santa Monica Pier, Bundy, 17th-20th Streets, No Station at Crenshaw or Irving or Windsor, No Station at Sunset/Fairfax								
Alignments	Wilshire		Santa Monica		Both <sup>1</sup>		Other		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No			
Alignments	23	2	14		19		Burton Way N-S Route to Valley & LAX Rapid Bus on Olympic N-S H&H to Expo (2) Santa Monica Blvd Straight to DT Must go to the Sea (4) Not all the way to Santa Monica Don't zig-zag H&H to La Brea to Santa Monica H&H follow red car diagonal to Santa Monica Hollywood/Vine to Sunset to La Cienega Under LA County Club Burbank Airport to LAX via Hollywood Provide for express trains 3rd St Promenade connection to Expo Wilshire to Expo via Water Garden		
Issues	Parking at stations (4) Consider parallel arterial capacity Tunneling under historic homes, vibration (7) Don't let funding drive schedule Connection to LAX Need Local Connectors/Shuttles (4) Need nighttime service (4) Traffic Diversion associated w/ BRT (5) If Purple to sea, Expo on Venice Repair curb lanes used by buses Articulated buses cause congestion Incorporate bicycles in planning (3) Joint development potential of Division (7) Expand community outreach (outside study area, different formats, wider demographics(3)					Include Olympic/Pico one-way Need N-S Connections (5) Drilling in methane area (3) Joint development can help pay Affect on green house gasses (2) Segment project to address funding (3) Speak w/ one voice in Washington (3) Questions ridership and user demographics Preserve pedestrian amenities on Wilshire Accidents on 6 <sup>th</sup> Street Study benefits of electric vehicles External costs of driving (accidents, health) Shadows and visual impacts associated with elevated trains (2) Earthquake safety Safety at stations (2)			
Evaluation Criteria	Benefits to community, including young people Ability to absorb growth, accommodate pedestrians, affect on green house gases, ability to generate riders on other systems Bicycle Safety, Travel Speed (2), Ability to Serve Job Centers, Overall Capacity Construction Safety in earthquake zones , System improvements								

<sup>1</sup> If they expressed support for both alignments, but also said "If only one can be built, I prefer X" they were counted under "Both" as well as under the corridor they supported if only one could be built.



Westside was also mentioned by several speakers. The need for north-south connections and improvements was also a common comment.

Comment forms were completed by 82 people and submitted at the early scoping meetings or returned to Metro after the meetings and summarized in Table 4.2. The types of comments made with regard to the Purpose and Need for transit improvements in the Westside Extension Transit Corridor Study Area focused on traffic congestion and extended travel times on existing bus transit routes including Rapid and Rapid Express lines.

**Table 4.2 - Summary of 82 Written Scoping Meeting Comments**

Mode	Subway		Aerial/Monorail		LRT		BRT		Other	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		
Mode	59	3	6	0	1	3	3	8	Increase local service	
Stations	Wilshire/Westholm (1) Connection to Expo (4) Santa Monica (6) Beverly Hills (5) Wilshire/Westwood (3) UCLA (6) Wilshire/Doheny (1) Grove/Farmers Market (1) Century City (7)		405 (2) Valley (1) Crenshaw (1) Wilshire/La Cienega (1) North/South (3) Downtown (1) San Vicente/Santa Monica (2) Wilshire/Santa Monica (1) Le Conte (1) West Hollywood (2)		Lincoln Boulevard (2) Rodeo/Beverly (1) Beverly Center (1) Wilshire/Fairfax (3) Hospitals (2) LAX and BUR (5) AVOID: La Brea Fairfax					
Alignments	Wilshire		Santa Monica		Both <sup>2</sup>		Other			
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No				
Alignments	22	0	8	0	17	0				
Issues	Bike access and amenities (3) Traffic light synchronization Property values Signage and wayfinding (3) Ease of transfer Congestion caused by buses Connection with employment centers GPS Tracking Parking at station, Park/Ride options Increase in taxes				Line naming Station amenities Use of solar power Don't complete in phases Concerned about noise and vibration at the Spaulding and Sunset Squares, and Sunset Flats					
Evaluation Criteria	Express and rush hour services Noise/Vibration during construction and use Tunneling through residential neighborhoods (3) Density at stations Economic development opportunities Station power Station accessibility for bikes, strollers, and ADA									

Misc: questions/concerns regarding Exposition Phase 2: 6

<sup>2</sup> If they expressed support for both alignments, but also said “If only one can be built, I prefer X” they were counted under “Both” as well as under the corridor they supported if only one could be built.



Email comments were received from 152 people during the early scoping period and summarized in Table 4.3. The types of comments made with regard to the Purpose and Need for transit improvements in the Westside Extension Transit Corridor Study Area focused on existing traffic congestion and the need for system connectivity.

**Table 4.3 - Summary of 152 Email Submissions**

Mode	Subway		Aerial/Monorail		LRT		BRT		Other
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Mode	73	3	1	0	10	2	5	3	Increase local bus service Increase DASH service Moving sidewalks Auto expressway under Wilshire Boulevard
Stations	VA hospital (2) Century City (5) UCLA (5) Cedar-Sinai Hospital West Hollywood (3) Hollywood (1) 20 <sup>th</sup> /Santa Monica Boulevard Veteran/Wilshire Connection with Expo Pico/Fairfax (1) Sunset/Fairfax (2) NOT Sunset/Fairfax (1)			Beverly Center (2) Grove/Farmers Market (2) Santa Monica (1) Santa Monica Community College (1) Pacific Coast Highway (1) LAX (2) Hollywood Bowl (1) Sepulveda Boulevard (1) 405 (1) Echo Park (1)			Westwood/Wilshire (5) Beverly Hills (4) 3 <sup>rd</sup> /Fairfax Wilshire/Fairfax		
Alignments	Wilshire		Santa Monica		Both <sup>3</sup>		Other		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No			
Alignments	34	1	15	1	8	9	La Brea to LAX (1) Olympic Boulevard (2) 405 (2) Hollywood/Highland (1) Connections to N/S Routes (3)		
Issues	Congestion Service availability (3) Noise and Vibration (8) Signage Sunset/Fairfax station location is a business (2) Economic Development opportunities (2) Timeliness of service System connectivity (6) Bike amenities (2) Express service Bus Lanes Increase taxes/Fees: 5								
Evaluation Criteria	Environmental concerns Noise and vibration under sunset/Spaulding square								

Misc: questions/concerns regarding Exposition Phase 2: 6

<sup>3</sup> If they expressed support for both alignments, but also said “If only one can be built, I prefer X” they were counted under “Both” as well as under the corridor they supported if only one could be built.



Letters were received from 98 persons and/or agencies. Table 4.4 provides a summary of the letters and the complete set of letters is contained in Appendix H. The letters focused on the alternatives to be studied and issues of concern to the authors, with little comment on the Purpose and Need for the project. The fact that the majority of the letter writers supported one or more of the alignments and modes, however, indicates that they perceive a need to provide a transit improvement in the Westside Extension Transit Corridor study area.

**Table 4.4 - Summary of 108 Written Letters and Comments**

	Subway		Aerial/Monorail		LRT		BRT		Other	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		
<b>Mode</b>	71	0	4	0	3	0	2	0	More buses (8) Just bus (1) Circulator Street Car (2)	
<b>Stations</b>	Fairfax (5) La Brea (7) Western (1) Beverly Triangle (6) UCLA (10) Westwood (7) Constellation (7) Avenue of the Stars (7) Santa Monica Boulevard (11) Century City (19) 3 <sup>rd</sup> Street (5) 4 <sup>th</sup> Street (1) 20 <sup>th</sup> St (1)				Connection to Expo (9) Bundy (3) San Vicente (4) Grove/Farmers' Market (2) Crenshaw (6) Sunset (1) Santa Monica (4) LAX (4) Beverly Drive (4) La Cienega (4) Rodeo (1) North/South (8)			Beverly Hills (4) Museum Row (1) Century City Mall (1) Robertson (1) West Hollywood (4) Crescent Heights (1) San Fernando Valley (1) Dodger Stadium (1) Red line (1) Hollywood Bowl (1) VA (2) West of 405 (1)		
<b>Alignments</b>	Wilshire		Santa Monica		Both <sup>4</sup>		Other			
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No				
	28	0	12	0	8	0	San Vicente (1) Sunset (3) Highland (2) Lincoln Boulevard (1) Olympic Boulevard (1)			
<b>Issues</b>	Serving higher density Pedestrian access Congestion Crime Noise and Vibration (8) Service Century City after 5:30 p.m. (8)					Bike access and amenities (2) Express service Construction impacts (3) Street closures/impacts on community events (marathon, filming, parades) Parking				
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	Area serviced Noise and Vibration (8) Environmental factors (addition people on the road, train and power station exhaust) Additional congestion to streets near stations System connectivity					Land use Additional land use opportunities (3) Fire/life/safety access (what happens if a fire truck is caught at a crossing gate?) Underground utilities Impacts to geologic and water table				

<sup>4</sup> If they expressed support for both alignments, but also said "If only one can be built, I prefer X" they were counted under "Both" as well as under the corridor they supported if only one could be built.



Messages left on the Telephone information line did not reflect comments about the study's Purpose and Need.

#### **4.1.2 Comments Related to Alternatives**

Comments related to alternatives addressed preferred modes, potential station locations, and possible route alignments.

##### **4.1.2.1 Modes**

The comments provided by speakers at the early scoping meetings strongly supported the subway mode. Fifty speakers expressed a preference for the subway, with only two opposed. Eleven speakers spoke in favor of a potential monorail elevated alternative and one person was opposed to the monorail. Four people mentioned support for light rail transit and three were opposed to it, largely due to concerns about traffic congestion with an at-grade mode. Several of the people speaking in favor of either monorail or light rail indicated they felt these were less expensive alternatives and could therefore be built more quickly. Four people expressed a preference for additional bus rapid transit service, but ten people were opposed to dedicated bus lanes.

Comment forms submitted by meeting attendees indicated a strong preference for the subway mode. Of those who expressed a mode preference, 85% (59 people) supported the subway mode. Three people were opposed to the subway. Six expressed a preference for the aerial/monorail mode and one person suggested light rail and three supported bus rapid transit. Light rail was opposed by three people and bus rapid transit was opposed by eight.

Comments received via email were overwhelmingly in favor of the subway mode. Seventy-three people expressed support for the subway and only three were opposed to the subway mode. Support was expressed for light rail in 10 emails, with two people opposing light rail. The bus rapid transit mode (BRT) with dedicated lanes was supported in five and opposed in three emails. Only one person emailed in support of a monorail alternative.

Almost 90% of the letter writers who expressed a preference for a mode supported the subway alternative. Seventy-one letters supported the subway mode, with only four supporting aerial/monorail, three in favor of light rail and two advocating bus rapid transit. Letter writers did not offer opinions in opposition to modes, rather only support for their preferred mode, which was overwhelmingly subway.

##### **4.1.2.2 Stations**

People who spoke at the Early Scoping Meetings generally supported the potential station locations that were shown on the Potential Alignments and Stations board and on the PowerPoint presentation slide. However, some attendees suggested some additional stations as well. Five speakers suggested that a station near Cedars-Sinai Hospital and the Beverly Center was needed. Three people commented that the station in Century City should be south of Santa Monica Boulevard, closer to the center of Century City. There was support from two speakers for a station on the University of California Los Angeles



(UCLA) campus, or located close to campus at Westwood and LeConte. Two submitted comments supporting placement of a station by the I-405 overpass, or close to the Veterans' Administration Hospital. Two others supported a station located at The Grove/Farmers Market. There were also comments in favor of a station on Wilshire at Bundy and on Wilshire between 17<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Streets near the UCLA/Santa Monica Hospital. Opposition was also expressed by several speakers to a station on Wilshire at Crenshaw or elsewhere in the Park Mile area of Wilshire Boulevard.

The comment forms included a map on the reverse side of the form and suggested that commenter's sketch their preferred alignment and station locations. The comment forms can be viewed in Appendix G, grouped by meeting date/location. The station areas most frequently indicated on the comment forms included Century City (7), UCLA (6), Santa Monica (6) Beverly Hills (5), Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) or Burbank Airports (5), and a connection to the Expo light rail line (4). The only station area for which opposition was expressed was a station at Sunset/Fairfax.

Comments received via email mentioned many potential station locations. Those locations that were mentioned in more than one email included: Century City (5), UCLA (5), Westwood/Wilshire (5), Beverly Hills (4), West Hollywood (3), VA Hospital (2), Sunset/Fairfax (2), Beverly Center (2), The Grove/Farmers Market (2), and LAX (2). One email expressed opposition to a station at Sunset/Fairfax.

The station location most frequently mentioned in letters received by Metro was a Century City station. Nineteen letters mentioned the need for a station in Century City. The next most-mentioned station location was UCLA (10 comments), followed by the need for a connection to the Exposition Light Rail Transit (LRT) Corridor.

#### **4.1.2.3 Alignments**

Speakers at the early scoping meetings generally favored the Wilshire alignment, many expressed support for the Santa Monica alignment or a combination of both Wilshire and Santa Monica alignments.

Speakers also suggested several north-south alignments. These included an alignment from the San Fernando Valley to LAX, a connection from Hollywood & Highland to the Exposition Corridor, and Burbank Airport to LAX via Hollywood & Highland. There were also comments suggesting an alignment under Burton Way, continuing east below Santa Monica Boulevard to Downtown, following Sunset Boulevard to La Cienega, and connections to the Exposition Line either via the Third Street Promenade or near the Water Garden on 26<sup>th</sup> Street in Santa Monica. A group of speakers from the community just east of Fairfax Avenue, between Hollywood and Sunset Boulevards, advocated an alignment under Fairfax as they were concerned potential tunneling would damage their 1920s era homes.

Persons who completed comment forms preferred the Wilshire alignment. Twenty-two comments supported Wilshire, but almost as many (17) expressed support for both the Wilshire and Santa Monica alignments. Eight comment cards indicated Santa Monica Boulevard as the preferred alignment. Some comments indicated the need for north-south connections.



The Wilshire Boulevard alignment was the preference of the majority of persons who commented by email. Thirty-four people expressed a preference for the Wilshire alignment and only one person was opposed to that alignment. Fifteen emails supported the Santa Monica Boulevard alignment and one opposed the Santa Monica alignment. Support was expressed for both alignments in eight emails and nine opposed building both. Several emails suggested the need for north-south connections, including an alignment on La Brea to serve LAX and in the I-405 corridor. Two emails suggested an alignment along Olympic Boulevard.

Letter writers strongly supported the Wilshire alignment as their first choice. Twenty-eight letters supported the Wilshire alignment. Twelve were received in support of studying the Santa Monica alignment. Eight letters suggested that both alignments were appropriate for inclusion in this alternatives analysis. Other corridors that were mentioned included an alignment under Sunset Boulevard, Highland Avenue, San Vicente Boulevard, Lincoln, and Olympic Boulevards.

#### **4.1.3 Comments Related to Evaluation Criteria**

There were not very many speakers at the early scoping meetings who addressed specific evaluation criteria that they felt should be used to assess the alternatives. Those that did mention evaluation criteria mentioned the need to assess community benefits, particularly for young people, the ability of the alternatives to absorb the growth from additional demand over time, accommodate pedestrians, affect on green house gas emissions, and the ability to generate ridership on other parts of the transit system. The overall capacity of the alternatives and the speed of the alternatives were also mentioned. The impacts of alternatives on bicycle safety were suggested as evaluation criteria, as was construction safety in earthquake zones.

Persons who completed comment cards suggested the need to evaluate noise and vibration of alternatives during construction and operations. Some also suggested that economic development opportunities and density around stations be considered.

Comments that were received in emails suggested that environmental concerns be key evaluation criteria. They also suggested that noise and vibration be considered in evaluating alternatives.

Evaluation criteria mentioned in letters included assessment of the area served by the alternative, noise and vibration (mentioned in eight letters), station area congestion, system connectivity, opportunities for additional land use.

#### **4.1.4 Comments Related to Scope of the Analysis**

Some of the issues that speakers at the scoping meetings said need to be addressed in the alternatives analysis included:

- The need for parking at stations
- Parallel arterials – their capacity and the affect of diverting traffic to them with dedicated bus lanes



- The affect of tunneling under homes, particularly older/historic homes
- Joint development potential and impacts of joint development
- Safety of drilling in the methane gas zones
- Evaluate segmentation that may be required due to funding constraints
- Consider the external costs (accidents, health) associated with the No Project Alternative
- Shadow and visual impacts associated with elevated structures
- Seismic safety

Some of the issues identified on comment forms as important to address in the alternatives analysis included:

- Bicycle access and amenities
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility
- Effects on property values
- Congestion caused by buses
- Parking at stations and park-and-ride lots
- Ease of transfers
- Power/energy requirements

Some of the issues identified in emails as important to address in the alternatives analysis included:

- Availability and timeliness of transit service
- Noise and vibration
- Economic development opportunities
- Need for system connectivity
- Need for bicycle amenities
- Potential for express service

The issues that were cited in letters included the following:

- Pedestrian and bicycle accessibility
- Affect on congestion, including around stations
- Crime (safety issues)
- Noise and vibration impacts
- Need for late night service
- Need for express service



- Construction impacts
- Street Closures and impacts on community events
- Parking supply and demand
- Impacts on geology and ground water
- Impacts on underground utilities

## 4.2 Applicability of the Comments to the Alternatives Analysis

The vast majority of the comments received during the early scoping period were ‘on message’ with regard to the Westside Extension Transit Corridor Study purpose and need, alternative alignments, modes, station locations, potential evaluation criteria and issues which the Alternatives Analysis will attempt to address. Participants expressed a high degree of knowledge with regard to the transportation needs in the study area and potential transit solutions.

From a transit mode perspective, it was clear that heavy rail transit (HRT) in subway is the overwhelming preference. At the same time there were comments regarding other technologies including LRT, BRT and monorail which will be addressed. Station locations also received considerable attention in all comments. In addition to support for the station locations suggested in the meeting presentations by Metro staff, a number of other activity centers both within and outside the study area were identified and documented for possible service. For the most part those station locations identified outside the study area were intended to suggest a need for connections to the regional system as a whole. From an alignment perspective, the suggested Wilshire alignment had considerable support but there was also positive support for a Santa Monica alignment and for a combination Wilshire and Santa Monica alignment. Besides those, people expressed interest in a series of north-south alignments which are intended to link the study area with the San Fernando Valley, the Exposition corridor, and LAX and Burbank airports. The desire to serve these north-south linkages was also echoed in the station location suggestions.

There was general agreement on the list potential evaluation criteria to be used to evaluate alternatives. Some comments indicated a desire to place special emphasis on air quality, system connectivity, safety, expandability user safety (especially for bicyclists and pedestrians) and construction safety in earthquake zones. None of the comments indicated anything beyond what is to be considered for the Alternatives Analysis. The same can be said for issues in general raised during the comment period about what should be studied. As previously highlighted, such issues are within the realm of the scope and intent of the Alternatives Analysis.

All comments will be considered in the subsequent analysis of alternatives. The alternatives for study in the next screening phase will include modes, alignments and stations consistent with the comments received. The potential alternatives will be evaluated with the criteria as presented with comments added and results presented taking full note of the issues raised. The public will also have the opportunity to review the screening results and then provide further comment.