



WESTSIDE SUBWAY EXTENSION

Project No. PS-4350-2000

Scoping Report

Task 13.02.7

Prepared for:



Prepared by:

The Robert Group
3108 Los Feliz Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90039

and:

Parsons Brinckerhoff
444 South Flower Street, Suite 3700
Los Angeles, California 90071

Document Tracking History

Version	Date	Initials
Draft	April 19, 2009	SLK
Draft	June 1, 2009	CAF
Draft-Final	June 22, 2009	CJR

June 30, 2009



This page intentionally left blank.



Table of Contents

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1	Background to Study	1-1
1.2	Study Area	1-3
1.3	Summary of Purpose and Need.....	1-3
1.4	Alternatives Recommended in the Alternatives Analysis (AA)	1-4
1.5	Project Participants.....	1-6
1.6	Purpose of Report.....	1-6
2.0	SCOPING PROCESS	2-1
2.1	Early Scoping Activities	2-2
2.2	Draft EIS/EIR Scoping Activities.....	2-3
	A. Public Participation Plan	2-3
2.3	Initiation of Scoping (Notice of Intent/Notice of Preparation)	2-4
	A. Notice of Preparation Mailings	2-4
2.4	Agency Scoping	2-5
	A. 23 CFR Part 771.107 Definitions. (h) Participating Agency.....	2-5
	B. Participating Agency Invitations	2-5
	C. Participating and Cooperating Agencies	2-5
	D. Agency Scoping Meeting.....	2-6
2.5	Public Scoping	2-7
	A. Notification Database.....	2-7
	B. Public Notification Activities.....	2-7
	C. Elected Official Briefing Meeting.....	2-10
	D. Public Scoping Meetings.....	2-11
	E. Meeting Format	2-12
2.6	Public Comments Received	2-14
3.0	SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS	3-1
3.1	Summary of Substantive Comments	3-1
	A. Comments Related to Purpose and Need	3-1
	B. Comments Related to Alternatives	3-2
	C. Comments Related to Scope of the Environmental Analysis.....	3-4
4.0	APPENDICES	A
	A. Public Participation Plan	A
	B. Notice of Intent	A
	C. Notice of Preparation.....	A
	D. Public Notices of the NOI/NOP and Scoping.....	A
	E. Notice of Preparation Mailing List.....	A
	F. Participating Agency Invitations	A
	G. Agency Scoping Sign-ins/Presentation	A
	H. Direct Mailer	A
	I. Take-Ones.....	A
	J. E-mail Blast	A
	K. Newspaper Ads	A
	L. Project Fact Sheet.....	A
	M. Public Scoping Meeting Invitation Flyer.....	A



N. Public Scoping Meeting – April 13, 2009 A
O. Public Scoping Meeting – April 14, 2009 A
P. Public Scoping Meeting – April 16, 2009 A
Q. Public Scoping Meeting – April 20, 2009 A
R. Public Scoping Meeting – April 22, 2009 A
S. Public Scoping Meeting – April 23, 2009 A
T. Public Scoping Meeting Materials A
U. Scoping Comments Received..... A
V. Public Comments Tracker A

List of Figures

Figure 1-1: Study Area 1-3

Figure 1-2: Wilshire Boulevard HRT Subway 1-4

Figure 1-3: Wilshire/Santa Monica Boulevard HRT Subway 1-5



1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) has initiated the preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Westside Extension Transit Corridor. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is serving as the lead agency for purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Metro is serving as the lead agency for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) environmental clearance. The project will be conducted in accordance with the most recent FTA guidelines for project development and Section 5309 New Starts, and all environmental documentation prepared will satisfy the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.

1.1 Background to Study

Metro is planning transit improvements in the Westside Extension Transit Corridor and is conducting a Draft EIS/EIR – Advanced Conceptual Engineering (ACE) to determine what types of improvements are needed. This effort is a continuation and re-evaluation of previous planning studies, including the Mid-City/Westside Transit Corridor Major Investment Study (MIS), which was completed in 2000, and the Mid-City/Westside Transit Corridor Draft EIS/EIR, which was completed in 2001. At the time of Metro Board Certification, this Mid-City/Westside Transit Corridor Draft EIS/EIR provided the impetus to formally separate the future study of the Wilshire and Exposition Corridors.

Since then, Metro has implemented several new Rapid Bus routes within the Wilshire Transit Corridor to supplement local bus service by providing new options for travel in both north-south and east-west directions. This new service has helped to accommodate some of the demand for improved transit, but additional transit improvements are needed as bus service within the corridor continues to operate at or over capacity conditions. In addition, the Exposition Construction Authority (Authority) has also completed the design and started construction of Phase I of the Exposition Line. Additionally, the Authority is completing the environmental clearance of Phase II, which is expected to be completed in FY10. The completion of both Phase I and Phase II of the Exposition Line, however, is not expected to lessen the need for a major transit investment in the Westside Extension Transit Corridor.

There has also been recent renewed interest in extending the Metro Purple Line from the current terminus at Wilshire Boulevard and Western Avenue to downtown Santa Monica along the Wilshire alignment. In addition to a Wilshire alignment, Metro also explored alternative options extending the Metro Red Line westward from Hollywood/Highland along Santa Monica Boulevard to West Los Angeles.

In October 2005, the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) conducted the review of Wilshire Corridor tunneling which concluded that the latest advances in tunneling technology would make excavating a possibility that is no more risky than any other subway system in the U.S. As a result, Congress repealed its federal prohibition on funding subway construction along Wilshire Boulevard. The new legislation permits this study to consider an underground subway connection to the Wilshire/Western branch of the Metro Purple Line.

Since the transit corridor would connect to Downtown Los Angeles via the existing Wilshire/Western branch of the Metro Purple Line, the study may require an assessment



of potential transit operational impacts in the Downtown area and evaluation of the local transit service needs between and within the corridor cities of Los Angeles, West Hollywood, Beverly Hills and Santa Monica.

In January 2009, the Alternative Analysis (AA) phase of the study for the Westside Extension Transit Corridor was completed and adopted by the Metro Board of Directors. The AA screened various potential routes, modes, and configurations for the Westside Extension Transit Corridor and identified two heavy rail subway Build alternatives, a Transportation System Management (TSM) alternative, and a No Build or Baseline Alternative. In addition, four Minimum Operable Segments (MOSS) were identified in the AA.

The successful completion of the Draft EIS/EIR-ACE will allow Metro to evaluate in greater depth the four alternatives that were identified in the AA for the Westside Extension Transit Corridor. The ACE design work under the Draft EIS/EIR will be conducted at a sufficient level of detail to support the adoption of a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) by the Metro Board of Directors and to request entry into the Preliminary Engineering (PE) phase of project development from the FTA. An LPA will be selected that can best accommodate population growth and transit demand, and be compatible with land use and future development opportunities.

Metro can choose to fund any proposed high capacity transit improvement in the corridor with Section 5309 New Starts funds and also with other federal, state and local sources. Should Metro pursue Section 5309 New Starts funds for the Westside Extension Transit Corridor, a successful completion of the FTA requirements for the New Starts program and approval of the LPA by FTA must be made prior to entry into PE. Both the Draft and Final EIS/EIR and PE will be prepared at the same time after the adoption of the LPA by the Metro Board and approval into PE by the FTA.



1.2 Study Area

The study area is generally defined as extending 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 (Figure 1-1). The proposed heavy rail transit project 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 in California.

A Westside Subway Extension would extend the Metro Rail heavy rail technology from the terminus of the Metro Purple Line at the Wilshire/Western station and a combined alternative that would also extend the Metro Red Line at the Hollywood/Highland station in Los Angeles to the Westside of Los Angeles and Santa Monica.



Figure 1-1: Study Area

1.3 Summary of Purpose and Need

The purpose of the project is to address the mobility needs of residents, workers, and visitors traveling to, from, and within the highly congested Westside Extension Transit Corridor study area by providing faster and more reliable high-capacity public transportation than existing services, which currently operate in mixed-flow traffic. A proposed subway improvement will bring about a significant increase in east-west capacity and improvement in person mobility by reducing transit travel time. The project will strengthen regional transit access by connecting Metro bus, Metro rail, and other transit networks to high-capacity transit serving the study area.

The overall goal of the project is to improve mobility in the Westside Extension Transit Corridor study area by extending the benefits of Metro’s existing Red and Purple Rail Lines and bus service beyond their current termini near Western Avenue or Highland Avenue in Los Angeles to Ocean Avenue in Santa Monica.



curves south and then west to meet the Wilshire Boulevard alignment. The second option follows La Cienega Boulevard from Santa Monica Boulevard, past the Beverly Center, and curves west at Wilshire Boulevard.



Figure 1-3: Wilshire/Santa Monica Boulevard HRT Subway

Minimum Operable Segments: A total of four Minimum Operable Segment (MOS) Alternatives will be included for analysis including the following: (1) Wilshire Boulevard HRT Subway from Wilshire/Western to Fairfax (3 miles); (2) Wilshire Boulevard HRT Subway from Wilshire/Western to Century City (6.5 miles); (3) Wilshire Boulevard HRT Subway from Wilshire/Western to Westwood/UCLA vicinity (8 to 9.5 miles); and (4) MOS #3 plus Metro Red Line HRT Subway from Hollywood/Highland via Santa Monica Boulevard (12.5 to 14 miles).

No Build Alternative: The Draft EIS/EIR will also consider a No Build Alternative that includes all existing highway and transit services and facilities, and the committed highway and transit projects in the current Metro Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the current 2008 Southern California Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). No new infrastructure would be built within the study area, aside from projects currently under construction, or funded for construction and operation by 2030 by the recently approved Measure R and identified in the Metro LRTP.

Proposed major highway improvements affecting the Westside Extension Transit Corridor by 2030 include completing missing segments of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes on Interstate 405 (I-405) Freeway. From a rail transit perspective, the No Build Alternative includes the Metro Purple and Metro Red Lines along the eastern and northeastern edges of the study area. This alternative also includes the planned Wilshire Bus Lane and a rich network of local, express and Metro Rapid bus routes that will continue to be provided, with both bus route additions and modifications proposed.

Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative: The Draft EIS/EIR will also consider the TSM Alternative, which enhances the No Build Alternative and improves upon the existing Metro Rapid Bus service and local bus service in the study area. This alternative emphasizes more frequent service, and low cost capital and operations improvements to reduce delay and enhance mobility. Although the frequency of service is already very good, this alternative considers improved bus services during peak periods on selected routes.



In addition to the alternatives described above, other transit alternatives not previously considered in the AA and brought forward during the public and agency scoping process will be evaluated for potential inclusion in the Draft EIS/EIR.

1.5 Project Participants

The project participants consist of the FTA, the project team, and other project participants, such as the five local jurisdictions. The project team consists of Metro and its contractors, the Community Participation Program Contractor, The Robert Group (TRG) and its subcontractors, and the Environmental (AA/EIS/EIR) Contractor, PB Americas, Inc. (PB), and its subcontractors.

In addition to the project team, other project participants include federal, state, and local participating agencies under SAFETEA-LU 6002.

1.6 Purpose of Report

According to the Council on Environmental Quality's NEPA Regulations (40 CFR part 1500 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations, Sections 15082-15083), federal and state lead agencies should use a public scoping process to help define the appropriate range of issues and the depth and breadth of analysis to be addressed in a major environmental document. This report documents the lead agencies' compliance with the scoping requirements of NEPA and CEQA. For access to the complete record of all meeting notices, public information materials, presentation boards, comments received, mailing lists, newspaper advertisements, meeting attendees and other outreach materials contained in the appendices, please contact the Project Information Line at 213-922-6934 and email WestsideExtension@metro.net



2.0 SCOPING PROCESS

This section of the report documents the activities completed during the scoping process for the Draft EIS/EIR phase of the Westside Extension Transit Corridor project.

Comments and issues raised at the scoping meetings will be used to define a range of alternatives and to conduct the technical analyses of alternatives that will be evaluated in the Draft EIS/EIR.

The activities included the following:

- Developing and implementing a Public Participation Plan (PPP)
- Publishing a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register to meet NEPA requirements
- Posting the Notice of Preparation (NOP) with the State Clearinghouse to formally initiate the CEQA process of the Office of Planning and Research (OPR)
- Placing NOP notices in newspapers of general circulation
- Mailing the NOP to potentially affected government agencies, residents, and businesses to advise them of project initiation and to invite participation in scoping meetings
- Mailing and/or emailing scoping meeting notices to the project database
- Placement of meeting information on bus and rail lines within, but also feeding into, the study area
- Publishing meeting notices in local mainstream, ethnic, and grassroots newspapers
- Maintaining a multi-lingual project Information Line
- Developing and implementing the project website to further facilitate the transmittal of information
- Distributing a press release with meeting information to print, broadcast and online media outlets
- Utilizing “new media” to widely disseminate meeting information to a wider audience
- Posting meeting information on project group page on Facebook and distributing meeting information to all group members



- Holding meetings with potentially affected and/or interested parties in the project study area
- Recording comments that were received at, and subsequent to, the scoping meetings

2.1 Early Scoping Activities

The Metro Westside Extension study enjoyed considerable stakeholder interest and support over the approximately 15-month Alternatives Analysis study. The community outreach effort successfully raised awareness about the study, engaged stakeholders on an ongoing basis and, most importantly, garnered public input at key decision points that demonstrated widespread consensus about the study recommendations that required Metro Board approval in order to move forward into the environmental process.

Recognizing the size and diversity of the study area, Metro employed a thorough yet creative approach to ensuring an inclusive and transparent outreach effort. Elements of this outreach program included though were not limited to:

- Public meetings, including one series of early public and agency scoping meetings, and three series of public update meetings (17 meetings in total) at key study milestones
- Targeted stakeholder meetings to address specialized issues and localized concerns
- Multi-lingual outreach to include Korean, Russian and Spanish-speaking stakeholders
- Multi-tiered meeting notifications including direct mail and email, print and broadcast media, advertisements, internet based distribution and on board Metro buses and trains
- Employment of new media tools such as blogs, social networks and other internet or web-based tools to involve a wider audience in the decision-making process

In order to define the appropriate range of issues and depth of analysis, Metro utilized an early public scoping process that was consistent with the FTA's requirements for an AA. This "early scoping" process was designed to solicit from stakeholders the variety of possibilities regarding the modes of transportation, potential alignments and station locations prior to their further analysis in the AA.

The official notification for the Westside Extension early scoping process began with a notice published in Federal Register Volume 72 No. 189 on Monday October 1, 2007. The official scoping comment period was initially scheduled to continue until November 1, 2007, but was extended until November 7, 2007 at the request of several stakeholders. The early scoping process included one (1) agency scoping meeting and five (5) public scoping meetings where agency representatives and the general public were given the opportunity to provide verbal and written comments. In addition, those wishing to



provide comments could view project information on Metro's website and respond in writing or by email.

At the early scoping meetings, participants received information about the Westside Extension Transit Corridor Study area, the region's transit needs, the range of transit modes considered, and information about the two previously studied historical alignments (Wilshire Boulevard and Santa Monica Boulevard). During the early scoping process, stakeholders were invited to comment on transit modes, transit alignments, potential station locations, evaluation criteria and other general issues about the study. Nearly 400 comments were received as part of the early scoping outreach process.

Through the early scoping process, the project team learned that the overwhelming majority of stakeholders supported the need for transit improvements in the Westside Extension Transit Corridor study area, with a Wilshire Boulevard subway identified as the most favored route and mode. While the Santa Monica alignment also received noticeable support, many stakeholders suggested that Metro consider a project that would include both a Wilshire Boulevard and a Santa Monica Boulevard alignment. In many cases, where the public was in favor of both these alignments, most thought that the Wilshire alternative should take precedence. Limited backing was voiced for aerial/monorail, light rail or bus rapid transit modes.

After completion of the early scoping meetings, Metro conducted three subsequent series of community meetings to keep stakeholders informed of the project's progress at each decision-making milestone. At these subsequent public update meetings, Metro consistently heard from stakeholders that their preferred mode of transit is a heavy rail subway, with over 90% of comments received favoring a Wilshire alignment.

The collateral material that accompanied the public participation process (public notices, lists of locations where posters were displayed, media contacted for study, blog entries, list of community organizations, notices sent to the Federal Register, etc.) can be found in the Public Participation Plan for the Westside Extension Transit Corridor.

2.2 Draft EIS/EIR Scoping Activities

In January 2009, Metro's Board of Directors approved the Westside Extension Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis study and authorized staff to proceed with the Draft Environmental Impact Study (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Advanced Conceptual Engineering (ACE) phase of the study. This next phase of the Westside Extension project will continue a transparent and inclusive community outreach process that not only builds upon, but also enhances, the public engagement efforts implemented during the Alternatives Analysis phase of the project.

A. Public Participation Plan

In order to ensure that the public remains informed on an ongoing basis and is provided with opportunities to comment at key milestones during the Draft EIS/EIR process, a detailed Community Outreach and Public Participation Plan (PPP) was developed at the inception of this phase of the project. The plan addresses outreach during the entire Draft EIS/EIR process, including scoping and post-scoping activities.

The PPP for the Draft EIS/EIR phase enhances those successful elements from the AA such as stakeholder identification, communications protocols, public input tracking, a



proposed schedule for interfacing with the public and recommendations for how meetings should be conducted at various milestones during the study. Additional recommendations for key stakeholder briefings, inter-agency coordination, topic specific and other meetings are also included in the Plan. Additionally, it incorporates recommendations for generating publicity for public meetings, and information dissemination via the web and “new” media opportunities to engage the public. It is significant to note that, while this PPP is a very useful guide for all outreach activities, it is also flexible enough to accommodate changing circumstances and enhanced approaches on a complex project such as the Westside Subway Extension Project.

The PPP includes outreach to not only study area stakeholders, but also current and potential subway riders, and a wider population of transit users in Los Angeles County. This effort also re-engages with stakeholders targeted as a part of outreach efforts during the Alternatives Analysis. At the same time, it identifies and involves potential newly interested stakeholders who may have a special interest in this project. PPP recommendations are based on Metro’s experience during the AA, including lessons learned and identification of potential opportunity areas as well as the requirements of Metro’s outreach process.

A PPP was developed identifying outreach efforts for the Westside Extension Transit Corridor EIS/EIR. The plan covers all phases of the project, including: scoping activities, post-scoping activities, and the Draft EIS/EIR. A copy of the Public Participation Plan can be found in Appendix A.

2.3 Initiation of Scoping (Notice of Intent/Notice of Preparation)

The NEPA scoping period for the Westside Extension Transit Corridor Draft EIS/EIR commenced with FTA’s approval of the Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The NOI was published in the Federal Register on March 24, 2009 (FR 13507, Vol. 74, No. 58). The NEPA scoping period closed on May 7, 2009.

The NOI announced the FTA’s intent to prepare an EIS in accordance with NEPA. This provided formal notice of the opportunity to comment in writing and/or at the public scoping meetings. The NOI also included information on the project background, study area, potential alternatives, and probable effects to be studied. FTA procedures, relevant scoping meeting information, and contact information were also provided. A copy of the NOI is contained in Appendix B.

Metro sent a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to the State Clearinghouse on March 24, 2009. A copy of the NOP is contained in Appendix C. The NOP announced Metro’s intent to prepare an EIR pursuant to CEQA. Like the NOI, it provided formal notice of the opportunity to comment in writing and/or at the public scoping meetings and commenced the CEQA scoping period. The NOP advised California agencies of their obligation to comment on the proposed project within 30 days. Public notices of the NOI/NOP and scoping meetings, which were printed in local newspapers, can be found in Appendix D.

A. Notice of Preparation Mailings

The NOP was distributed to agencies and organizations within the study corridor and to jurisdictions with an interest in the proposed project. The NOP was distributed via a



traceable delivery service (USPS, Confirmed Delivery) on March 24, 2009. NOP packages were sent to:

- 25 Federal agencies
- 48 state agencies
- 7 regional agencies
- 98 local agencies

Of the 98 NOP packages sent to local agencies, 4 were sent to school districts and 94 to study area cities. Of the 7 NOP packages sent to regional agencies, 3 were sent to utility providers.

In total, 178 NOP packages were distributed; in some instances NOPs were sent to several offices within an agency to ensure that all responsible and trustee agencies were properly notified. The complete mailing list of those individuals, who received a NOP package, including the recipient name, organization, and address, is included in Appendix E.

2.4 Agency Scoping

The agency scoping meeting was held to provide an opportunity for those agencies potentially interested in the project, or having relevant expertise pertaining to the project, to have input at an early stage.

A. 23 CFR Part 771.107 Definitions. (h) Participating Agency

The Code of Federal Regulations defines a participating agency as the following:

A Federal, State, local, or federally-recognized Indian tribal governmental unit that may have an interest in the proposed project and has accepted an invitation to be a participating agency, or, in the case of a Federal agency, has not declined the invitation in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 139(d)(3).

B. Participating Agency Invitations

Appendix F is the Participating Agency Letters of Invitation.

C. Participating and Cooperating Agencies

According to CEQ (40 CFR 1508.5), “cooperating agency” means any Federal agency, other than a lead agency, that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposed project or project alternative. A State or local agency of similar qualifications also becomes a Cooperating Agency.

Participating agencies are those with an interest in the project. The standard for Participating Agency status is more encompassing than the standard for Cooperating agency status described above. Therefore, Cooperating Agencies are, by definition, Participating Agencies, but not all Participating Agencies are Cooperating Agencies.



D. Agency Scoping Meeting

The Agency Scoping Meeting was held on Monday, April 13, 2009 at 10:00 AM at Metro, 1 Gateway Plaza in Los Angeles. In attendance were 24 individuals representing a variety of local, state and federal agencies and other organizations. The following agencies were represented at the meeting:

- The U.S. General Services Administration
- University of California Los Angeles
- The City of Los Angeles Planning Department
- The City of Los Angeles Recreation and Parks Department
- The City of Los Angeles Police Department
- The County of Los Angeles Planning Department, Fire Department and Community and Senior Services Department
- The City of Culver City Police Department
- The Federal Transit Administration
- The Southern California Association of Governments
- The City of Beverly Hills Transportation
- The City of Santa Monica Fire Department
- The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- The Exposition Construction Authority
- The California Department of Transportation
- OSHA California Tunneling Unit

The agency representatives were very engaged in the presentation and discussion related to the Westside Subway Extension. Approximately 5 agencies submitted formal written comments during the scoping period. The comments submitted stressed the need for the subway and particular station locations, such as UCLA's desire for a stop near their campus. Additional comments discussed the necessary coordination with the various cities' planning, police and fire departments if and when construction begins.

The sign-in sheet, PowerPoint presentation, and transcripts from the Interagency Scoping meeting are provided in Appendix G.



2.5 Public Scoping

A. Notification Database

For the Draft EIS/EIR phase, Metro maintains and updates the stakeholder database that was initially developed during the AA study to track involved individuals and groups, their areas of interest, communication, and other pertinent information for the duration of the project. The database currently includes:

- Elected officials on the local, state and federal level
- Neighborhood Councils and other elected groups
- Homeowners Associations and Neighborhood Organizations
- Chambers of Commerce, local Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) and business leaders
- Property management firms
- Community-based and civic organizations
- Social service providers
- Stakeholders at key destinations and employers
- Transportation advocates and interest groups
- Print, broadcast and electronic media, including community-based publications, blogs and other “new” media
- Stakeholders who attended any AA meeting or provided comment
- Other interested groups and persons

A list of stakeholders, elected officials and key organizations and businesses in the project study area were included in the project database during the AA stage. Adding to that database, Metro notified stakeholders about the six (6) public scoping meetings via email to approximately 1,080 individuals and via postal mail to approximately 470 individuals. In addition, meeting notifications were posted to the Westside Subway Extension Facebook Group with approximately 1,657 members.

B. Public Notification Activities

A variety of methods were employed to notify stakeholders about the Public Scoping meetings. These meetings were publicized via direct mail notices to the study database, emails to the project database, postings on Metro’s website, posting on the Facebook group page and sending a message to all group members, display advertisements in multi-lingual publications (English, Spanish, and Korean), and notices placed on Metro



buses and trains serving the project area. A media release was distributed to 83 local, regional, ethnic and multi-lingual publications as well as broadcast media, blogs and other online news and information outlets. Noticing was conducted in English, Spanish, and Korean.

2.5.B.1 Direct Mail

The project team developed a public scoping meeting invitation flyer for postal distribution within the study area. The public scoping meeting invitation flyer was mailed to approximately 470 addresses in the project database. A copy of the flyer can be found in Appendix H. These meeting notices arrived in recipients' mailboxes two weeks in advance of the first scoping meetings.

2.5.B.2 "Take Ones"

Metro buses and trains serve as an effective way to reach out to an existing pool of transit riders. Preceding the Public Scoping meetings, "Take One" brochures inviting transit users to the Scoping Meetings were placed on Metro buses in or adjacent to the project area and on Metro Red and Purple Line trains. The Take Ones were identical in content to the Direct Mail notices described in Section 2.5.2.1 and are included in the Appendix I.

2.5.B.3 Email Blasts

The project team disseminated email blasts, or electronic mailings, to all stakeholders in the database with email addresses, including elected officials, neighborhood councils, community-based organizations and individual stakeholders. These groups then were asked to forward these email blasts to their constituents and/or members. Email blasts are typically used to distribute the scoping meeting announcements and other project information instantly and to large numbers of people. A copy of the eblast can be found in Appendix J.

Electronic distribution of the meeting notice took place on March 19 and April 9, 2009. Notices were sent to 1,032 email addresses within the existing project database. A copy of the email can also be found in Appendix J. In addition, an email was sent to the database on April 30, 2009 as a reminder for stakeholders to submit their comments prior to the comment deadline on May 7, 2009.

2.5.B.4 Newspaper Advertisements

Display advertisements for the Scoping Meetings were placed in seven (7) print and one (1) online newspaper within the study area. These were selected based on their geographic focus, language needs and audited circulation numbers. These newspaper advertisements are included in the Appendix K.

The advertisements announced the scoping meeting times and locations, and also provided contact information for persons wishing to gain additional information on the project.

Newspapers that carried scoping meeting advertisements included:

- Korean Times (Korean language)
- Beverly Press/Park La Brea News



- Los Angeles Independent (Hollywood and West Hollywood Editions)
- UCLA Daily Bruin (Online)
- Jewish Journal
- Beverly Hills Courier
- Santa Monica Daily Press
- Hoy (Spanish Language)

2.5.B.5 Project Webpage

The project website serves as a central point where stakeholders can obtain information about the project. The project website (located at www.metro.net/westside) was initially used for the AA phase and was updated for the purposes of the Draft EIS/EIR phase, including publicizing the Public Scoping meetings. Website content for the Westside Extension includes a project overview, information about meetings and collateral materials including Fact Sheets, presentations made at the public meetings and other information of interest to the public from both the current and previous project phases. The website will continue to be updated at key study milestones.

2.5.B.6 Facebook

The Westside Subway Extension Facebook group has become an enormously helpful tool in educating the public about the project and in particular getting a younger demographic interested in the project. It is also an efficient way to disseminate information and updates on the project to stakeholders. To date, 1,702 people have joined the Westside Subway Extension Facebook Group.

Messages sent via Facebook were distributed March 19 and April 9, 2009 to group members. A reminder was distributed to members on April 30, 2009, to encourage any last minute comments from the community. Links to media coverage, comments about the alternatives, overall support for the project are available at the group page. The page was last updated on June 16, 2009.

2.5.B.7 Fact Sheet

In order to provide stakeholders with an overview of the project and to provide them with background about the Westside Extension Draft EIS/EIR process, a fact sheet was developed. The fact sheet also provided information about funding for the subway project, the alternatives being further studied and the schedule for the project. The fact sheet is also posted to the project website at www.metro.net/westside. A copy of the fact sheet is located in Appendix L.

2.5.B.8 Media

The project team reached out to media in anticipation of the public scoping meetings, and held a media briefing via a web-based conference system for newspapers, blogs, and local radio and television stations. At least 5 media groups participated in the media briefing. This provided another opportunity to provide a project update, information



about the scoping meetings, and how to provide input. Other media groups, who were unable to participate in the briefing and expressed interest, were briefed individually.

C. Elected Official Briefing Meeting

Two meetings were held with elected officials and/or their staff prior to the Public Scoping meetings. Typically, the briefing serves as a sounding board for the project team about the presentation, and provides these offices notification about the upcoming meetings as well as preliminary information about the status of the project.

The first meeting was held April 6, 2009 at Los Angeles City Hall. 21 people, representing the following 12 offices attended the following meeting:

- Office City of Los Angeles: Department of City Planning
- City of Los Angeles: Office of Councilman Jack Weiss (District 5)
- City of Los Angeles: Office of Councilman Bill Rosendahl (District 11)
- City of Los Angeles: Office of Councilman Herb Wesson (District 10)
- City of Los Angeles: Office of Councilman Tom LaBonge (District 4)
- City of Los Angeles: Office of Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa
- City of Santa Monica
- Office of Assemblyman Mike Feuer
- Office of Assemblyman Ted Lieu
- Office of Los Angeles County Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
- Office of State Senator Fran Pavley
- Office of U.S. Congresswoman Diane Watson



The second meeting was held April 7, 2009 at Beverly Hills City Hall. 12 people, representing 8 offices attended the meeting:

- City of Beverly Hills
- City of Beverly Hills: Traffic and Parking Commission
- City of Los Angeles: Office of Councilman Jack Weiss (District 5)
- City of Los Angeles: Office of Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa
- City of West Hollywood
- Office of State Assembly Speaker Karen Bass
- Office of U.S. Congressman Henry Waxman
- Office of U.S. Senator Diane Feinstein

The purpose of the briefing was to provide a preview of the visual presentation that would be delivered to the community at the public scoping meetings. The information was well-received, as area elected officials are supportive of the project, and would like to identify opportunities to “fast-track” and identify additional funds for the project. There was interest in how the Minimum Operating Segments (MOSs) were developed and the anticipated completion date for each segment. There were questions about the UCLA and Crenshaw stations, and the alignment between Century City and UCLA.

Finally, there were questions about construction planning and mitigation. Metro responded by noting the Draft EIS/EIR would need to identify construction impacts and mitigation.

D. Public Scoping Meetings

Six (6) public scoping meetings were scheduled in the corridor and conducted in compliance with NEPA and CEQA guidelines. The meeting locations were selected based on geographic location, recommendations from local elected officials and with Americans with Disability Act (ADA) and public transit accessibility considerations. For the convenience of all attendees, bus lines to and from the meeting sites were printed on the public scoping meeting invitation flyers which can be found in Appendix M. In order to provide the greatest opportunity for community participation, meetings were scheduled in the early evening on weekdays.

Public scoping meetings to accept comments on the scope of the EIS/EIR were held on the following dates:

- Monday, April 13, 2009, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Location: LACMA - West, 5905 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90036
Number of Attendees: 72



- Tuesday, April 14, 2009, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Location: Plummer Park, 7377 Santa Monica Boulevard, West Hollywood, CA 90046
Number of Attendees: 44
- Thursday, April 16, 2009, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Location: Beverly Hills Public Library, 444 N. Rexford Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210
Number of Attendees: 43
- Monday, April 20, 2009, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Location: Westwood Presbyterian Church, 10822 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90024
Number of Attendees: 65
- Wednesday, April 22, 2009, from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
Location: Wilshire United Methodist Church, 4350 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles 90028
Number of Attendees: 40
- Thursday, April 23, 2009, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Location: Santa Monica Public Library, 601 Santa Monica Boulevard, Santa Monica, CA 90401
Number of Attendees: 78

The transcripts for each of the six public scoping meetings can be found in Appendix N for the April 13 meeting, Appendix O for the April 14 meeting, Appendix P for the April 16 meeting, Appendix Q for the April 20 meeting, Appendix R for the April 22 meeting, and Appendix S for the April 23 meeting

E. Meeting Format

The scoping meetings began with an open house format to provide attendees with an opportunity to preview the project information prior to the start of the presentation and subsequent comment period. Project team members were present at the project display boards to answer questions related to the technical aspects of the project. Spanish and Korean language translators were made available, as appropriate. One attendee required Korean translation. In addition, close captioning was provided at two meetings for one hearing impaired attendee.

Following the open house period, a visual presentation was made to provide attendees with information regarding the purpose of “scoping” and other information involving the project background, study area, project goals, alternatives, and alignment modes and/or issues. Emphasis was placed on the importance of the community to provide comments to Metro about what they would like to be studied in the Draft EIS/EIR before the comment deadline, through public meetings or via email, fax, postal mail, or telephone.

Following the presentation, attendees who completed speaker cards provided their public comment, which was recorded by a court reporter/transcriber. After the public comment portion of the meeting, the project team again was available at the informational display boards to answer technical questions.



Table 2-1 identifies the number of verbal and written comments received at each of the public scoping meetings.

Table 2-1: Number of Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

Meeting Location	Verbal Comments	Written Comments
Los Angeles County Museum of Art	15	4
Plummer Park, West Hollywood	14	6
Beverly Hills Public Library	14	3
Westwood Presbyterian Church	13	7
Wilshire United Methodist Church	12	3
Santa Monica Public Library	23	8
TOTALS	91	31

2.5.E.1 Meeting Materials

The presentation materials utilized to communicate information about the project at the scoping meetings included: display boards, a visual presentation, the fact sheet and frequently asked questions. All public scoping meeting materials can be found in Appendix T.

2.5.E.2 Open House Display Boards/Handouts

Open house display boards/handouts were used to provide project information under the following headings:

- Welcome & Orientation
- Draft EIS/EIR Public Meeting Schedule
- No Build Alternative
- Transportation Systems Management (TSM)
- Alternative 1, Wilshire Subway
- Alternative 11, Wilshire/West Hollywood Combined Subway
- Minimum Operable Segments
- Examples of Environmental Issues to be Studied
- Metro Rail Construction Process
- Metro’s Recent Tunnel Construction
- How to Submit Your Comments



Open house handouts included the meeting agenda, information about how to submit comments and a fact sheet and frequently asked questions document. All items were available in English and Spanish.

2.5.E.3 PowerPoint Presentation

A visual presentation was used to provide information at the public scoping meetings. The presentation covered the following topics:

- Purpose of Scoping
- Project Background
- Subway Alternatives to be Studied, including No Build and TSM
- Minimum Operable Segments
- Environmental Issues to be Studied
- Ways for the Community to Provide their Input
- Overview of the Construction Process

2.6 Public Comments Received

In addition to the comments received at the public scoping meetings, comments were invited via postal mail, email, and telephone prior to and following the public scoping meetings. Comments were received by postal mail and email. Copies of all of the comments received are contained in Appendix U.



3.0 SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS

Prior to closure of the public scoping period for the Westside Subway Extension Draft EIS/EIR process on May 7, 2009, Metro received a total of 253 public comments. This included 93 verbal and 34 written comments at the six (6) public scoping meetings held, and 126 comments subsequently received via e-mail and US mail. Thirty-seven (37) comments were received from public agencies. No comments related to the scoping process were left on the project's dedicated phone information line.

The comments covered a variety of topics and were submitted by various parties including, but not limited to: government agencies, community organizations, elected officials and their staff, and the general public. All comments were documented and organized into an electronic database for analysis. This database identifies the name of the individuals who commented and/or commenting agency, the source of the comment, the content of the comment, the topic(s) discussed by the comment, and comment affiliations, if applicable.

This section summarizes all the verbal and written comments received at the public scoping meetings as well as the electronic mail comments submitted via Metro's project website (www.metro.net/westside) and the letters received. A copy of all public comments tracked can be found in Appendix V.

3.1 Summary of Substantive Comments

Echoing what was heard during the previous Alternatives Analysis phase, the overwhelming majority of comments received during public scoping for the Draft EIS/EIR support the need for major transit improvements in the Westside Extension Transit Corridor study area, and specifically for a heavy rail subway extension as a means for reducing Westside traffic congestion.

Of the 253 comments received, only four (4) stated opposition to the project. The vast majority of the comments received showed support for a subway mode, with most comments received supporting Alternative 11, the Combined Wilshire/Santa Monica alignment but agree that Wilshire must be built first. There was minimal support for the No Build, Transportation Systems Management (TSM) and monorail.

In general, comments reflected a variety of topics including potential station locations, phasing of the construction process, discussion about parking and the need for connectivity. Several comments also mentioned urban design preferences and urged that the system be "green" by utilizing innovative technologies and approaches. Various comments were also received addressing construction issues and possible mitigation measures.

A. Comments Related to Purpose and Need

Relatively few comments were received strictly addressing the Purpose and Need for the project. This is likely attributable to the large number of comments received in this regard during the Alternatives Analysis phase of the project, and the sense that Metro is well along in determining solutions through the Draft EIS/EIR process.



Of those comments received addressing the Purpose and Need for the project, an overwhelming majority agree that the Westside of Los Angeles is in great need of reliable, expanded and efficient transit services. Many of these comments specifically cite “day long” traffic congestion on the Westside as well as ever-lengthening commute times especially when traveling in an east-west direction. Some comments received also note that Los Angeles is lagging behind other “world-class” cities in terms of the quality of transit service, especially rail transit, and that the process should be expedited to the extent possible.

Comments further revealed an acute understanding that the Westside is an important jobs center, which along with development already underway in the study area, is further placing the burden for access to reliable rapid transit. Stakeholders worry that even with transportation improvements, the Westside continues to have a major concentration of activity centers and destinations for greater Los Angeles making it all the more urgent to address existing and worsening travel conditions.

While stakeholders were invited to provide input on various transit modes, there was overwhelming support for subway/HRT, as most cited it as the most efficient way of meeting the demand needs of the region. Additionally, even though stakeholders would like to eventually see north/south connections with other Metro rail service, a majority agrees that extending the current Metro Purple Line down Wilshire should be the first priority as east-west travel times continue to worsen. Furthermore, stakeholders expressed the need for an integrated Metro rail system where connections into the Westside subway from other transit lines would allow for greater countywide mobility.

B. Comments Related to Alternatives

During the public scoping meetings stakeholders were invited to provide their input into the four (4) alternatives recommended for further study in the Alternatives Analysis, specifically the No Build alternative, the TSM alternative as well as two subway Build alternatives.

As noted previously, the Westside Subway Extension received overwhelming support from all those providing Metro with their input during the public scoping process. While there was nominal support for the No Build and Transportation Systems Management (TSM) alternatives, the strength of the public support of the two Build alternatives reflects stakeholder sentiment that other alternatives would not adequately serve the growing transit needs of the region. There continue to be requests that Metro study monorail as an alternative.

In a noteworthy departure from what was heard in the Alternatives Analysis is a clear shift in momentum as public support is moving by a ratio of almost 5 to 1 towards the combined Wilshire/Santa Monica Alignment (Alternative 11) from support for the Wilshire alignment (Alternative 1) alone. Of those supporting Alternative 11, most wanted both alignments to be constructed, though many recognized that an extension of the Metro Purple Line from Wilshire Boulevard/Western Avenue along the Wilshire alignment would need to precede any connections from the Metro Red Line via Hollywood and West Hollywood. Many comments also urged Metro to find ways to “fast track” this project due to the urgent need for solutions to traffic congestion on the Westside.



In addition to support for the subway, comments received reflected an array of topics including potential station locations, phasing of the construction process, discussion about parking and the need for connectivity. Several comments also mentioned urban design preferences especially as it relates to the number of station portals and urged that the system be “green”. Various comments were also received addressing construction issues and possible mitigation measures. People were also interested in funding mechanisms for the project.

Station Locations:

Comments reflected the continued debate about the desirability of a station at Crenshaw/Wilshire. Those advocating for a Crenshaw/Wilshire station feel that it will provide important transit options for those living and working in the area, and that by omitting the station, it would leave a two-mile long gap between the existing Wilshire/Western station and a Wilshire/La Brea station and that this is not pedestrian friendly. Those opposing the station cited its potential for inducing growth and its incompatibility with the Park Mile Specific Plan, which is near the Wilshire/Crenshaw Station. Others were open to this station as long as it served east-west travel needs and did not serve as a transfer point for rail service to the south. The majority of comments received on this topic opposed a Crenshaw station due to ridership estimates and wanting more stations after La Brea.

There was also significant support for a station in the heart of Century City (at Constellation/Avenue of the Stars or at the Westfield Mall) as it would bring commuters and workers closest to their jobs. Fewer people supported a Santa Monica Boulevard station noting that this is on the northern edge of Century City. Some residents from Comstock Hills expressed concern about tunnel construction and subway operations under private property.

Comments received reflected discussion about the best site for a Westwood area station, as well as the location of a station west of the I-405 Freeway. While many comments received expressed the desirability of a station close to UCLA, many recognized that a station at Wilshire serving Westwood would be preferable. Some suggested that shuttles between UCLA and a Wilshire Boulevard station would better serve the area. There was also some support for Metro to consider the Veteran’s Administration (VA) site just west of the I-405 Freeway as a potential terminus station for MOS 3 of the subway system and to look at providing parking at this site. Other comments preferred that Metro consider Bundy or Barrington as the westernmost station of this phase of the project. One comment proposed a station at the Army Reserve property at the southwest corner of Wilshire and Federal. A few comments urged that Metro abandon Phase 2 of the Exposition LRT in favor of extending the Metro Purple Line to Santa Monica, while others urged Metro to link the subway with the Exposition LRT closer to the Westside or alternatively to ensure one terminus for both projects in Santa Monica.

There was also some debate about the stations in Alternative 11. There was more support for a station at Santa Monica/San Vicente Boulevards than there was for a Santa Monica/La Cienega Boulevard station. Many of these comments noted that Metro has an operation facility at Santa Monica/San Vicente that could be used for a future station. Support was also expressed for a station serving the activity and jobs center at the Beverly Center and Cedars Sinai Hospital.



Phasing:

The majority of comments received acknowledged that the project would have to be built in Minimum Operable Segments (MOSs). While the project currently is looking at 4 MOSs, many comments urged Metro to lengthen the MOS segments or even to scrap phasing and build the system all at once. For example, many comments urged Metro to terminate MOS1 further west than Fairfax Avenue, with some suggestions taking this segment to Beverly Hills, Century City, Westwood or even as far as the I-405.

Parking:

Parking was a topic, which received moderate interest from the public. Most of those commenting about parking advocated that parking should not be provided at any of the stations in the new system with the exception of a potential site west of the I-405, specifically at the VA site or at Wilshire Boulevard/Barrington Avenue, and for Alternative 11 at the Santa Monica Boulevard/San Vicente Avenue site in West Hollywood. Some comments related to parking in the West Hollywood area reflect a desire to stay pedestrian friendly and to avoid bringing more traffic into this already congested city. As it relates to parking at a station in the vicinity of the I-405, several comments noted that this station may ultimately serve as a terminus or termini, and that providing potential park-and-ride service would be appropriate.

Connectivity:

Many comments received stressed that the new subway stations should be located and built to provide connectivity not only to buses, which would help service the subway system, but also to future rail lines. Comments showed interest in future connectivity to the San Fernando Valley via the Sepulveda Pass, the South Bay, Burbank, with the Exposition LRT and potentially the Crenshaw line.

Urban Design and Transit Oriented Development:

Of those providing comment about urban design, most expressed a desire for multiple station portals where possible and for larger platforms. More station entrances would also assist with future Transit Oriented Development (TOD) as future station locations.

Funding:

Many stakeholders understand the funding constraints of this project even with contribution from New Starts and Measure R. There were suggestions from several people for Metro to explore public-private partnerships to help expedite this project.

C. Comments Related to Scope of the Environmental Analysis

Scoping offered an opportunity for input and review of the Purpose and Need and the Alternatives to be carried forward for further study in the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, scoping offered the opportunity for agencies and the public to weigh in on environmental issues that should be addressed in the technical analyses. All comments received during scoping were summarized and appear on the matrix in Appendix V. The Purpose and Need was developed and carried forward from the Alternatives Analysis. No comments were received on the



Purpose and Need. Based on the scoping review and further review by the project team with some data updates, the Purpose and Need remains valid for the Draft EIS/EIR.

Comments that focused on alternatives generally regarded preferences and/or new or reoccurring suggestions for options – alignments, modes, and stations. Some comments asked for further consideration of alternatives that were reviewed as part of the Alternatives Analysis and dismissed from further consideration. The team reviewed that screening process to affirm that the screening remained valid or the alternative would be reconsidered. Some of these will be screened out after additional consideration or will be carried forward for more detailed technical analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR.

These comments relating to environmental issues or other issues such as cost were forwarded to the technical team members in those fields for review and further consideration.

3.1.C.1 Accessibility for the Disabled

Two comments stressed the value of a rail transit system for mobility for the disabled.

3.1.C.2 Air Quality

One comment wanted to consider the impacts of pollution and potential air quality improvements.

3.1.C.3 Climate Change

One suggestion was made for Metro to look at a carbon-offset program. A second comment raised the desire to make all structures sustainable. The use of electric vehicles, in addition to bicycles, should also be considered, noted one comment, to reduce greenhouse gases.

3.1.C.4 Community and Neighborhoods

Comments pertaining to neighborhoods generally focused on disruption either by construction or changes in traffic. Comments were received from nine Comstock Hills residents concerned about the potential of the subway alignment to be underneath their homes. One of the comments related to the concern that there needs to be consideration needed to be made for the potential of decreased property values as a result.

Parking in general was noted by nineteen comments relative to alternatives, two comments expressed concern specifically about spill over parking in their neighborhoods. One comment noted the increase in safety for senior citizens as a result of the Project implementation.

Two comments requested a social impact analysis.

3.1.C.5 Community Facilities

Three comments were general comments on the water level, sewer, gas, electricity and so forth. There were several other comments that expressed concern over the potential response times of emergency services, especially during construction. One comment addressed that the Project would increase accessibility to the hospitals in the corridor.

3.1.C.6 Construction Impacts

Eighteen comments expressed concern over construction impacts. Many of the construction concerns dealt with traffic. Two traffic concerns include emergency vehicle response times, rerouting of general traffic and specific haul routes for excavated soil.



One comment noted to ensure that disruption to neighborhoods during construction was considered in the analysis.

One comment raised a concern about the simultaneous construction of the Project and other development projects. Another comment was raised to request concern for the location of construction staging sites and the haul routes. Another comment expressed concern for business disruption during construction.

3.1.C.7 Economic Development

Two comments focused on the need for redevelopment in their areas, which they anticipated would occur with implementation of the Project.

3.1.C.8 Energy

Two comments suggested that the Project consider more energy efficient vehicles.

3.1.C.9 Environmental Justice

One comment felt that the subway route on Wilshire would increase access and cultural diversity. Another comment expressed believes the Project would improve access to jobs West of the 405 for many families.

3.1.C.10 Geotechnical/Subsurface/Seismic/Hazardous Materials

General geologic concerns were raised. Three comments raised concerns about tunneling under the La Brea tar pits. Four comments were made that included concerns about “gases” and the potential for an explosion. Two other comments noted that there was a potential for seismic issues.

3.1.C.11 Historic, Archeological & Paleontological Impacts

One comment from the Crenshaw neighborhood said that it is a historic preservation overlay zone and that eighty-nine percent of the single-family residences in the area are historically significant.

3.1.C.12 Land Use and Development

Five comments related to land use discussed the relationship of density, livability and, in a few instances, economic viability. In many instances the comments (ten) on station preferences centered on land use considerations, particularly at Crenshaw. One comment touched on the implementation of Transit Oriented Development (TOD). In two instances, the comment noted proposed projects or projects already under construction relative to the potential station sites.

One comment asked if there were any issues with a subway under a cemetery,

3.1.C.13 Noise

A comment requested for a noise analysis as part of the EIS/EIR. Another asked for a vibration analysis for areas that would tunnel under houses.

3.1.C.14 Parking

Nine comments related to park and ride were received. Five suggested park-and-ride lots in the areas of certain stations, while four noted that such facilities were not desirable and/or suggested restrictions. In areas where park-and-ride lots were of concern, one comment suggested that well-thought-out bus service should reduce the need for such lots. One comment noted the potential loss of on-street parking.



3.1.C.15 Pedestrians

Two comments discussed pedestrian accessibility and the need for adequate pedestrian space.

3.1.C.16 Security

A comment was made regarding concern about crime in the area of stations.

3.1.C.17 Transportation

Traffic was a concern expressed by six comments – both existing conditions and then positive improvements or concerns over construction routes, as noted previously. One comment wanted to see current commuters who cut through neighborhoods use the subway and eliminate this impact. The analysis needs to consider trip production and reduction, especially through neighborhoods.

Five comments also noted ridership and the potential to increase or decrease. One comment noted the potential for travel time savings.

3.1.C.18 Visual & Aesthetic Impacts

One comment noted the importance of good design around the station entrances. Another comment also noted the importance of scale and compatibility around stations.



Alignments	<p>West Hollywood at San Vicente/Santa Monica (5) West Hollywood to Wilshire/La Cienega Avoid the La Brea Tar Pits Hollywood/Highland to Santa Monica Blvd to Beverly Hills (2)</p>	
Issues	<p>Address Westwood Issues (1) Avoid neighborhood disruptions (1) Benefits low-wage earners (1) Bike amenities (4) Connect with Exposition LRT (12) Create a SFV connection (11) Create more TOD (1) Do not put below grade (1) Do not travel under Comstock Hills (9) Does not want cut/cover used (1) Earthquake fears (3) Expedite project (11) Express service (2) Green House Gases (3) Impacts to water table (2)</p>	<p>Improve bus connections (3) Improve North/South connections (3) Increase park space (1) Increase pedestrian friendliness (2) Negative economic impact to businesses during construction (2) Provide parking (4) Provide senior and disabled access (2) Too expensive (1) Travel under Country Club (1) Tunnel concerns (6) Utility relocations (1) Utilize the Park Mile plan (1) Veterans Cemetery (1) Will bring increased congestion to project area (8)</p>
MOS	<p>Complete in multiple phases to Santa Monica (14) Complete in one phase to Santa Monica (2) MOS 1 to Century City (2) MOS 1 to Fairfax (1) MOS 3 (1) MOS to La Cienega (1) Use fewer MOS (6)</p>	
Other	<p>Plan now for a West Hollywood Extension (3) Turn Pico and Olympic Boulevards into one-way couplets (2) Support monorail (4) Does not support monorail (1) Use public/private partnerships (2)</p>	



Alternatives	Alt 1		Alt 11		Both		Project Support	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	18	0	45	0	43	0	19	4
Stations	Support						Does Not Support	
	@Hollywood Bowl (2) 3rd/Beverly (2) Cedar Sinai (4) Century City (2) Constellation/Avenue of the Stars (3) Hollywood/Highland (9) Olympic /Avenue of the Stars (1) Santa Monica/Robertson (1) Santa Monica @ Beverly Center (1) Santa Monica/ La Brea Santa Monica/20th (1) Santa Monica/Avenue of the Stars (3) Santa Monica/Beverly (3) Santa Monica/Doheny (1) Santa Monica/Fairfax (1) Santa Monica/La Cienega (2) Santa Monica/La Brea (2) Santa Monica/San Vicente (4) Sunset/La Cienega (1) UCLA (5) VA Hospital (3) West Hollywood (2)			Westfield Mall in Culver City (1) Westwood/Le Conte (4) Wilshire/16th(3) Wilshire/26th (1) Wilshire/3rd (2) Wilshire/4th (2) Wilshire/Barrington (4) Wilshire/Bundy (6) Wilshire/City of Santa Monica (1) Wilshire/Crenshaw (14) Wilshire/Fairfax (4) Wilshire/Federal (1) Wilshire/Galey (2) Wilshire/I-405 (7) Wilshire/La Cienega (3) Wilshire/La Brea (3) Wilshire/Manning (1) Wilshire/San Vicente/Barrington Wilshire/Sepulveda (5) Wilshire/Westwood (5)			Santa Monica/La Cienega (1) Wilshire/Crenshaw (14) Santa Monica/26th (1) Santa Monica/Westwood (1)	



This page intentionally left blank.



4.0 APPENDICES

- A. Public Participation Plan**
- B. Notice of Intent**
- C. Notice of Preparation**
- D. Public Notices of the NOI/NOP and Scoping**
- E. Notice of Preparation Mailing List**
- F. Participating Agency Invitations**
- G. Agency Scoping Sign-ins/Presentation**
- H. Direct Mailer**
- I. Take-Ones**
- J. E-mail Blast**
- K. Newspaper Ads**
- L. Project Fact Sheet**
- M. Public Scoping Meeting Invitation Flyer**
- N. Public Scoping Meeting – April 13, 2009**
- O. Public Scoping Meeting – April 14, 2009**
- P. Public Scoping Meeting – April 16, 2009**
- Q. Public Scoping Meeting – April 20, 2009**
- R. Public Scoping Meeting – April 22, 2009**
- S. Public Scoping Meeting – April 23, 2009**
- T. Public Scoping Meeting Materials**
- U. Scoping Comments Received**
- V. Public Comments Tracker**