

MEETING SUMMARY

Project Name: Metro Regional Connector Transit Corridor Project

Organization: Little Tokyo Working Group

Date/Time: September 17, 2009; 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

Meeting Location: Japanese American Community and Cultural Center, Garden Room
244 S San Pedro St, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Project Team: Dolores Roybal Saltarelli, Ann Kerman, Ray Sosa, Clarissa Filgioun,
Ginny Brideau, Min Cheung, Yojo Kikuchi, Robin Akashi

Attendees:

Bill Watanabe	Mike Okamoto	Evelyn Yoshimura
Kene Kubo	Nao Gunji	Joanne Kumamoto
Craig Ishii	Chris Aihara	Chris Komai
Ron Fong	Lisa Suiki	Satoru Uyeda
June Berk	Andrew Lin	Alan Kumamoto

Summary:

This was the inaugural meeting of the Little Tokyo Working Group (LTWG), a subcommittee of the Little Tokyo Community Council's Planning and Cultural Preservation Committee (PCPC). The LTWG was convened to discuss issues pertinent to the Little Tokyo community as it relates to Metro's Regional Connector Transit Corridor project.

Prior to the start of the meeting, Metro made the at-grade and below grade emphasis models available for the LTWG members to view and informally discuss with staff and consultants. Members of the LTWG had questions about the tunnel surfacing north-east of 2nd Street and Central Avenue, and were interested in receiving more information about landscaping opportunities that would mask the visual impacts of the tunnel and portal at 1st and Alameda Streets. There was also a question about whether a parking garage could feasibly be constructed around the tunnel.

Alan Kumamoto began the meeting with introductions of LTWG members and Metro representatives. Mr. Kumamoto explained the structure and purpose of the LTWG which is intended to address Regional Connector project-related issues specific to Little Tokyo. The LTWG and Metro will work collaboratively to propose mitigation measures that address possible project impacts in this community.

Ann Kerman reminded the LTWG that the Regional Connector is still in its early stages of environmental analysis, there is much work left to be done and emphasized that Metro has not made any decisions regarding this project. It is critical for the LTWG to first review the

results from the technical studies and community feedback in order to be able to fully consider the alternatives.

She added that comments received during the public scoping period have been incorporated into a Scoping Report which will be released during Fall 2009. Metro continues to receive project related comments; these subsequent comments will be addressed and incorporated into the DEIS/R.

Ann then briefly introduced the “Mitigations Matrix,” which will be used throughout the effort to track issues and potential mitigations in comparison with each of the four alternatives under consideration. She invited the LTWG to review the categories prior to the October 1 meeting and to provide any changes/additions which will be incorporated at that time.

Dolores Roybal Saltarelli and Ray Sosa then made a detailed presentation about a number of topics. Ms. Saltarelli explained how the four project alternatives were identified as part of the Alternatives Analysis process. Mr. Sosa then followed with an overview of the construction process and clarified various key points, such as refinements to the project since the close of the scoping period. Metro received a number of follow-up comments asking about the size of property needed to construct the portal. After further investigation, Metro believes that it would need to purchase the land under the Office Depot and Señor Fish, and not the other businesses that front Central Avenue if the underground alternative is selected. Businesses along Central Avenue would be able to stay open during the construction of the Regional Connector.

Several questions from the LTWG arose regarding the results of the scoping meeting. Metro clarified that comments submitted during the scoping process are still under review at this time. As additional questions and comments come in, information will be passed along to the technical team for resolution. However, questions and comments received after the close of the scoping period will not appear in the Scoping Report, but will appear in the DEIS/R for the community to review when it is released next summer.

Specific questions surrounding the property bounded by 1st, 2nd and Alameda Streets and Central Avenue focused on the tunnel transitioning from below grade to at-grade as the tracks cross 1st and Alameda Streets. The LTWG requested additional information regarding the construction process, including traffic impacts to Central Avenue and traffic control. Additionally, information regarding the aesthetic treatment of the tunnel walls was also requested.

Andrew Lin, a Savoy resident, stated that he had not received the project and meeting notifications Metro has distributed and asked what outreach to the Savoy had been conducted. He is also seeking additional information regarding the purpose and need for the project. He would like to review the projected ridership, and better understand the need for connecting at the Little Tokyo/Arts District Gold Line station.

Metro responded by promising to present a summary regarding outreach activities at both the Savoy Homeowners Association and next LTWG meeting.

The LTWG will review the at-grade emphasis alternative at the October 1, 2009 meeting. There will be a breakout session dedicated to discussing impacts and potential mitigating activities.

Items to discuss at future meetings:

- Discuss traffic control during construction, focused on Temple/Alameda, 1st/Alameda, 2nd/Alameda, and routing at 2nd/San Pedro (at Kyoto Grand Hotel)
- Overall traffic impact of the project and during construction
- Construction timing and process, with particular attention to the Alameda underpass
- Go For Broke: Impacts with the at-grade emphasis alternative
- Outreach approach during AA and DEIS/R process (how meetings were advertised, outreach to Savoy and Little Tokyo)
- Current and future project need, including justification of ridership and station capacity and 2035 transportation needs

Subject: Re: LTWG materials for distribution

Date: Friday, October 9, 2009 12:53 AM

From: Andy Lin <seavu8@yahoo.com>

To: <ltccjb@aol.com>, <ltccjb@aol.com>, Ginny Brideau <ginny@therobertgroup.com>

Cc: Chris Aihara <aihara@jaccc.org>, <wktakashi@aol.com>, <wktakashi@aol.com>, Clarissa Filgioun <Clarissa@TheRobertGroup.com>, Kerman <KERMANA@metro.net>, <lcollmann@savoyhoa.com>

Hello, Ginny,

I just received email from June Berk, and I found the minutes from Sep. 17, 2009 meeting regarding my comments during the meeting. I found what you have written in the minutes regarding my comments misleading, and does not reflect what actually took place. You must remember that I was a little agitated during the meeting because I have only learned of the Regional Connector project in our front yard, about 150 feet, only about two weeks before this meeting, all the time Metro has been doing the study in the past three years. Please make the correction to the minutes regarding my comments. The following is a more correct description of what took place.

Andrew Lin, a Savoy resident, protested during the meeting and said that he did not receive any notification regarding the Regional Connector Project by mail, nor over 300 residents of Savoy owners for the past three years while the Regional Connector Project was under study. "How can this happen?", he questioned. He stated that the "overwhelming majority of comments received supported the project" as stated in Executive Summary Final dated Dec. 2008 was based on 88 people's responses, and questioned how can this happen without notifying the Savoy residents by mails, while he has received Public Hearing Notices by mails to nearby residents within 500 feet radius in the past. He also questioned how can the Executive Summary arrive at the conclusion that Regional Connector is needed without mentioning any ridership from present or past years, and instead used projected figures from year 2030, figures 21 years in the future, to justify it. "The study is not a scientific study", he said.

Dolores Saltarelli stated that she is in contact with Lynne Collmann at Savoy. To which, Andrew Lin replied that he has spoken to Lynne regarding notification by mail, and both confirmed to each other that they have never received any notification by mail from Metro in past three years.

MEETING SUMMARY

Project Name: Metro Regional Connector Transit Corridor Project

Organization: Little Tokyo Working Group

Date/Time: October 1, 2009; 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

Meeting Location: Japanese American Community and Cultural Center, Garden Room
244 S San Pedro St, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Project Team: Dolores Roybal Saltarelli, Ann Kerman, Henry Gonzales, Gerald Alvares, Eric Carlson, Ray Sosa, Monica Villalobos, Yara Jasso, Helene Kornblatt, Clarissa Filgioun, Ginny Brideau

Attendees:

Ron Fong	Victor Lazo	Evelyn Yoshimura
Chris Aihara	Chris Komai	Goro Endo
Satoru Uyeda	Mary Graybill	Tom Kamei
Kei Nagao	Wilbur Takashima	Alan Nishio
Susie Tae	Bobby Garza	Paul Yeh
Eric Kurimura	Joanne Kumamoto	Alan Kumamoto

*Update: Others who attended, with names not appearing on sign in sheet:
Andrew Lim*

Summary:

This was the second meeting of the Little Tokyo Working Group (LTWG), a subcommittee of the Little Tokyo Community Council's Planning and Cultural Preservation Committee (PCPC). The LTWG was convened to discuss issues pertinent to the Little Tokyo community as it relates to Metro's Regional Connector Transit Corridor project.

Prior to the start of the meeting, Metro made the at-grade and below grade emphasis models available for the LTWG members to view and informally discuss with staff and consultants.

Chris Aihara and Wilbur Takashima chaired the meeting and led introductions. The meeting notes from the previous meeting were not available at the meeting, but are attached to this report.

Ann Kerman, of Metro, was asked to present information regarding outreach activities that have taken place from the initiation of the Alternatives Analysis study to date. A copy of the memo is attached to this report.

Dolores Roybal Saltarelli briefed the working group on the purpose and need for the Regional Connector. As Metro continues to expand their Light Rail Transit (LRT) system, the 7th/Metro Center and Union Stations will begin to reach capacity. The best way to address station capacity issues, lack of connectivity between the lines is to remove the need to transfer at both stations. By removing the need to transfer and by providing through service through Downtown Los Angeles, the LRT system can serve more transit riders and stations.

The working group then broke into 5 groups to discuss challenges, opportunities, and potential mitigations regarding the at-grade emphasis alternative. The result of this exercise is attached to this report. Each small group presented their findings of their discussion to the working group.

The LTWG will continue their review the at-grade emphasis alternative, and begin the review of the below-grade alternatives at the October 15, 2009 meeting. There will be a breakout session dedicated to discussing impacts and potential mitigating activities.

Items to discuss at future meetings:

- Discuss traffic control during construction, focused on Temple/Alameda, 1st/Alameda, 2nd/Alameda, and routing at 2nd/San Petro (at Kyoto Grand Hotel)
- Overall traffic impact of the project and during construction
- Construction timing and process, with particular attention to the Alameda underpass
- Current and future project need, including justification of ridership and station capacity and 2035 transportation needs

MEETING SUMMARY

Project Name: Metro Regional Connector Transit Corridor Project

Organization: Little Tokyo Working Group

Date/Time: October 15, 2009; 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

Meeting Location: Japanese American Community and Cultural Center, 2nd Floor
244 S San Pedro St, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Project Team: Dolores Roybal Saltarelli, Ann Kerman, Henry Gonzales, Gerald Alvarez, Eric Carlson, Ray Sosa, Monica Villalobos, Yara Jasso, Helene Kornblatt, Virginia Jackson, Clarissa Filgioun, Ginny Brideau

Attendees:

In addition to those listed below, 6 people were heard on the tape, but did not sign in

Chris Aihara

Victor Lazo

Evelyn Yoshimura

Kristin Fukushima

Kei Nagao

Alan Kumamoto

James Okazaki

Joanne Kumamoto

Susie Tae

Chris Komai

Wilbur Takashima

Summary:

This was the third meeting of the Little Tokyo Working Group (LTWG), a subcommittee of the Little Tokyo Community Council's Planning and Cultural Preservation Committee (PCPC). The LTWG was convened to discuss issues pertinent to the Little Tokyo community as it relates to Metro's Regional Connector Transit Corridor project.

Prior to the start of the meeting, Metro made the at-grade and underground emphasis models available for the LTWG members to view. Several members of the Working Group viewed the models and had questions answered by members of the Metro project staff and consultant team.

Wilbur Takashima and Chris Aihara chaired the meeting and led introductions. The written summary from the previous meeting (the At-Grade Emphasis alternative) was briefly reviewed as the meeting began. Wilbur asked whether the LTWG wanted to proceed with discussing the underground emphasis alternative. The LTWG agreed that many questions remained both about the at-grade alternative and also about details related to potential project mitigation activities.

A brief conversation about the at-grade emphasis focused on traffic operations and control after construction specific to the Alameda undercrossing. The LTWG would like to ensure that businesses along Temple, Los Angeles and 2nd Streets are included in the identified impacted area. James Okazaki would also like Metro to identify the impacts to City Hall, the Caltrans building and the new

police station. There were questions regarding construction staging locations and how the street would be “decked” to allow for free-flowing traffic unimpeded by construction activities taking place underground. The LTWG asked for more information about what kind of turn restrictions could be expected along Judge Aiso, Temple, Alameda, 1st and 2nd Streets, and Central Avenue. The Working Group also asked for more information about maintaining freeway access, and which local streets would experience increased traffic as a result of the project.

A discussion about potential mitigation measures, including the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, then followed. There were questions about how this plan would be developed and enforced. Additionally, the Working Group wanted to know if there is a mechanism in place, besides federal monitoring, to ensure that Metro will actually implement the mitigations identified and agreed upon with the community, and what the consequences would be if the mitigation plan were not followed. The LTCC requested a clear written statement identifying the mitigation activities and how monitoring will take place.

Chris Komai was especially concerned that “mitigation” implies only monetary reimbursement when many of the impacts, such as cultural and historical resources, may not be able to be mitigated by money. James Okazaki felt that money could be an “equalizer” and that Metro would need to set aside funding to mitigate impacts. The LTWG agreed that it is important to discuss and identify intangibles (e.g. “sense of community”) during the environmental process, and wants to set aside time at a later meeting to identify and discuss such intangibles.

Alan Kumamoto wanted to know whether monetary reimbursements were considered as a part of the mitigation efforts and what would the threshold be for small businesses to access the funding. It was further clarified that while there is a restriction on utilizing federal funds to provide monetary compensation, however there is not such restriction for local funds e.g. through CRA/LA or another City agency.

Metro explained that a mitigation plan would identify the construction activities, when specific construction activities would take place, and the specific mitigating activities to take place in coordination with those construction activities. Metro is required to develop a mitigation monitoring plan with associated milestones for the Draft EIR/S, which will be reviewed with the community for input. The mitigation measures, as they appear in the Draft EIR/S, will become a contractual agreement between Metro and the community.

The LTWG would like examples of how the mitigation plans are developed, approved, and enforced. The LTWG requested an example of a mitigation monitoring program, and Metro will provide this information at the next meeting.

Kei Nagao of the LTWG raised concerns that the Working Group does not have the expertise to make decisions that are based on technical information provided by Metro. The lack of understanding of the overall process and the process to identify mitigations is unsettling to the community. She requested that Metro consider hiring a consultant with expertise in the environmental process to work directly with the group to discuss both the mitigations effort and environmental process. She

would also like Metro to consider scheduling site visits with the community. The LTWG agreed that a consultant to assist the group with understanding the process, and identifying potential impacts and mitigations would be preferable.

June Berk asked to go on record to be sure that none of the project alternatives would impact the "Go For Broke" monument; specifically, she opposes any alternative that would impact the monument. She stressed the cultural and historical importance of the monument is not just to Little Tokyo in Los Angeles, but to every Japanese American who was interned or in military service during World War II. She is sincerely and deeply concerned that Little Tokyo has been forced to give up property for government buildings, and would like to prevent this from happening in the future. She wants to protect the cultural viability of Little Tokyo, and feels like the overall situation is dire. Mr. Takashima acknowledged that this is an emotional issue, and reiterated that the community needs to be educated so it can ask the hard questions.

Metro then proceeded with a presentation of information about the underground emphasis alternative. A member of the LTWG felt that the nomenclature of this alternative was misleading because it implies that it is all below ground.

Metro provided background about the selection of the Build Alternatives. During the earlier Alternatives Analysis portion of the study, several underground alternatives were identified, but were eliminated for a number of reasons. These included uncertainty about future use of the Mangrove property (the City of Los Angeles was still in the Request for Proposals (RFP) process for that project), the Little Tokyo/Arts District station was under construction, and assurances were made to the Buddhist Temple that their property would not further impacted. Since that time, the Mangrove property use has been resolved and is now known as the Nikkei Center development.

Metro announced that new options are being explored to determine if the underground-emphasis alternative can be modified to address community concerns at 1st/Alameda, potentially utilizing property below the Nikkei Center. No further details were available at the time of the meeting as this modification is currently being explored.

Metro representatives then explained the potential benefits of the Alameda underpass, including reducing truck traffic noise, as well as the possibility of extending the length of the underpass, which would create a larger pedestrian plaza. The LTWG was interested in the type of landscaping that could be utilized at the underpass and portal, with many in support of visually appealing landscaping cover.

The Working Group also asked for more information about permanent on-street parking restrictions, location of peak- and off-peak parking, and the identification of new parking opportunities. One opportunity may be to create additional off-site parking for Savoy residents and visitors.

Metro then explained the construction process for the underground emphasis option, starting with the cut and cover process, and how the tunnel boring machine (TBM) would be installed. Staging would take place where Señor Fish and the Office Depot buildings are currently located. Businesses

facing Central Avenue would be able to remain open during construction. Metro would ensure that traffic continues to flow as freely as possible during construction. Traffic control plans will be incorporated into the Draft EIR/S will be available for review by both the community and City of Los Angeles.

In regards to the tunneling, the LTWG asked about existing underground utilities, and what kind of utilities would need to be relocated as a part of the project. Metro explained that the large storm drain located under 2nd Street near Alameda Street would have to be relocated as part of project.

Several questions about the location and depth of the water table in the Little Tokyo area were asked. Members of the LTWG noted that during construction of JANM and the Little Tokyo/Arts District station, the water table was a consideration. If there was considerable water leakage, the tunnel would need to be sealed. This will be further evaluated in the Draft EIR/S.

James Okazaki asked if the project would be bid as a Design/Build contract. Metro explained that its policy is typically to bid the Design and Build contracts separately when a tunnel is involved.

Members of the LTWG wanted clarification of the project time line. Metro stated that the underpass for the Regional Connector would take up to two years to build, and could be the first or last construction element. There will be a staging presence for about four years. High impact construction activities would take place above ground over several weekends after which construction would continue underground with minimal impacts at the surface. It is possible to schedule construction activities to take place when the community would be least impacted. For example, construction in the predominately business area could take place at night and weekends, and in the residential areas during the weekday. The contractor would be required to recognize identified community events and cease operations during this time. This is an extremely important point for Nisei Week activities. A follow-up question was asked comparing the impacts if construction were to start at 1st/Alameda or 2nd/Hope; it was clarified that the latter is a difficult location technically and is close to sensitive residential uses as well as the Disney Hall.

June Berk asked when the Regional Connector's operational schedule would be available. There is concern about the volume of trains that would travel through Little Tokyo, and how off-schedule trains would impact safety. Metro explained that the schedule would not be prepared until after the project is constructed, i.e. close to opening. Modeling information is used to determine how many trains could be expected through the area, but this information is not a substitute for a passenger schedule.

Representatives from The Savoy wanted to understand how traffic on Alameda Street would operate with the Underground Emphasis alternative. Metro explained that automobiles traveling westbound could make a left turn on Alameda Street, but eastbound traffic would not. Vehicles seeking to make a left turn would need use Temple Street to make the turn.

There was a brief discussion about whether construction could compromise the older buildings in this neighborhood. Metro explained that soldier piles are installed prior to construction on the

perimeter of the cut and cover construction area. This strengthens the foundations and the street, and provides the structure for the concrete decks. Grouting is used only if there is settlement. Pre-construction surveys are conducted prior to any construction to determine the existing condition of the buildings. The survey involves taking photographs and making videos of the building foundations located along the alignment. This was the same process successfully used during the construction of the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension.

Alan Kumamoto asked if Metro was planning on reaching out to any of the international firms to solicit a peer review of the project. Dolores said she was open to this taking place.

Prior to the end of the meeting the LTWG restated their request for a technical consultant to be made available that would work on their behalf. They are seeking more information about typical mitigations that could be employed in Little Tokyo, and what kind of impacts they might expect during construction. Metro undertook to present examples of mitigation plans from other projects at the next meeting, though noted that these may not necessarily apply to Little Tokyo.

The next LTWG meeting is scheduled to take place November 19, 2009 at the Japanese Community and Cultural Center. The agenda will include the continued discussion of the below underground emphasis alternative.

Items to discuss at future meetings:

- Continued discussion about the Underground Emphasis Alternative
- Possible technical consultant to support the LTWG
- Examples of mitigation and mitigation monitoring plans from similar type construction projects
- Discuss traffic control during construction, focused on Temple/Alameda, 1st/Alameda, 2nd/Alameda, and routing at 2nd/San Pedro (at Kyoto Grand Hotel)
- Overall traffic impact of the project and during construction
- Construction timing and process, with particular attention to the Alameda underpass
- Current and future project need, including justification of ridership and station capacity and 2035 transportation needs

MEETING SUMMARY

Project Name: Metro Regional Connector Transit Corridor Project

Organization: Little Tokyo Working Group

Date/Time: November 19, 2009; 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

Meeting Location: Japanese American Community and Cultural Center, 2nd Floor
244 S San Pedro St, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Project Team: Dolores Roybal Saltarelli, Ann Kerman, Arthur Henry, Laura Cornejo, Henry Gonzales, Gerald Alvarez, Eric Carlson, Ray Sosa, Helene Kornblatt, Virginia Jackson, Clarissa Filgioun, Ginny Brideau

Attendees:

Chris Aihara	Joanne Kumamoto	Wilbur Takashima
June Berk	Eric Kurimura	Satoru Uyeda
Ron Fong	Victor Lazo	Robert Volk
Kristin Fukushima	Andrew Lin	Sindey Wang
Bobby Garza	Kei Nagao	Bill Watanabe
Mary Graybill	Roy Nakahara	Steven Wechster
Marc Hentell	Setsuko Nakahara	Jerard Wright
Ernest Hida	Alan Nishio	Paul Yeh
Craig Ishii	Mike Okamoto	Evelyn Yoshimura
Tom Kamei	Johnnie Raines	
Alan Kumamoto	Susie Tae	

Summary:

This was the fourth meeting of the Little Tokyo Working Group (LTWG), a subcommittee of the Little Tokyo Community Council's Planning and Cultural Preservation Committee (PCPC). The LTWG was convened to discuss issues pertinent to the Little Tokyo community as it relates to Metro's Regional Connector Transit Corridor project.

Wilbur Takashima and Chris Aihara chaired the meeting and led introductions. The written summary from the previous meeting was briefly reviewed as the meeting began. Chris reminded the Working Group members to commit to attending as many meeting as possible in order to have consistency and continuity in the review of all of Metro's project alternatives.

Wilbur asked for clarification regarding the differences between Urban Design Working Group (UDWG) and the LTWG. Dolores Roybal Saltarelli explained that the purpose of the UDWG process was to focus on the urban design of the project as a whole, and noted that there had been a meeting of the group as a whole, as well as separate breakout discussions with

Financial District, Bunker Hill and Little Tokyo area stakeholders as part of that process. The UDWG was formed before the LTWG was convened, and has a different purpose from the LTWG, which has a far broader role in addressing numerous topics as it relates to Little Tokyo exclusively. Wilbur also asked how often Metro meets with individual stakeholders outside of the LTWG meetings. He referenced Metro's recent fact sheet, calling out the numerous groups Metro has met with during the Alternatives Analysis and Draft EIS/R process to date.

Ann Kerman presented a draft scope of work identifying the process for securing a consultant to assist the LTWG during the environmental process. A copy of this memo is attached to this document. Alan Nishio asked that the consultant should report to the LTCC, and not the LTWG. Ann further explained that the consultant would be the choice of the LTCC, but Metro is asking the LTCC to identify a person or firm who has understanding of and expertise in light rail operations, right-of-way requirements, construction impacts, transportation planning, economic and community development, the EIS/R process, urban design, and station area planning. The consultant would work with the LTWG/LTCC until the release of the Draft EIS/R.

Bill Watanabe requested that the consultant should well versed in the understanding and identification of mitigation measures. Alan Kumamoto wanted more clarification regarding the selection process. Kei Nagao requested that as-needed translation and interpretation services be available to support the consultant. Chris then asked about the timeline for bringing a consultant onboard. Ann undertook to come back to the LTWG with a final draft of the scope, which would be presented to the LTWG at its next meeting. Additional comments from the LTWG should be sent to Ann Kerman by December 1, 2009.

Dolores moved on to present the conceptual design for the 3rd Build Alternative, a new alternative that would pass entirely under the 1st/Alameda intersection. This alternative would include a station located at 2nd Street and Broadway, as well as a new shallow station at the Office Depot site; there would no longer be a station at 2nd and Los Angeles Streets. The alternative is similar to the current Underground-Emphasis alternative, with the exception that this alignment would continue to travel below-grade under 2nd Street to a new station under the Office Depot property, and continuing under the street at 1st/Alameda.

Other features of this new alternative include that the tracks would not surface at-grade until north of 1st Street and east of Hewitt Street, and there would be additional turn restrictions from Hewitt, 1st, and Alameda Streets. Further, there would not be an at-grade crossing or a pedestrian bridge at 1st and Alameda Streets, and Alameda would not change grade between Temple and 2nd Streets. In the initial operations of the Regional Connector, there would be north and south bound train service. The project would cost approximately \$200 million more than the Underground-Emphasis alternative.

The graphic showing the underground alternative is available for review at <http://thesource.metro.net>, Metro's transportation blog.

The construction of the new build alternative would involve tunneling under 2nd Street to Central Avenue. From 2nd/Central, Metro would use “cut and cover” construction, excavating to create space for the station, and placing the below-grade crossing at 1st/Alameda. Temporary track would need to be installed on the eastern side of Alameda in order to maintain Gold Line service to East Los Angeles. It is likely that additional property would need to be acquired from the Nikkei development and from an area west of the Nishii Temple in order to make space for both the tracks and 1st Street.

While there would be traffic impacts at 1st/Alameda, Metro is committed to working with both the City of Los Angeles and the community to ensure that impacts are mitigated. Ray and Dolores explained that they have not yet met with the Metro Board of Directors or LADOT about the new alternative, although a meeting is scheduled to take place in the near future.

Robert Volk sees this new alternative as a “real step forward”, however he is still concerned with construction impacts at 1st and Alameda Streets. Dolores explained that construction timing and sequencing would be developed with the community input. It is likely that once the intersection is decked, the surface traffic would flow as it does currently.

Robert also asked if John Kaji has been made aware of the additional property needed at the Nikkei development for this new alternative. James Okazaki wanted to know whether a portal could connect with the Nikkei development. Dolores explained that Metro has met with John Kaji, and will meet again with him in December once additional technical details for the new build alternative become available.

Andrew Lin asked about the number of LRT trains that would travel through the 1st/Alameda intersection daily. With the Underground Emphasis Alternative, he estimated 576 trains a day. Dolores noted that with the 100% grade-separated alternative, there would be no at-grade crossings at 1st and Alameda Streets, and because the trains would not travel at grade, there wouldn't be the associated noise impacts.

Chris asked about the tunnel boring process, how the Tunnel Boring Machine (TBM) would be dropped into the ground, and whether this would take place in Little Tokyo at 2nd/Central or at 2nd/Hope near Bunker Hill. Metro will evaluate the potential impacts of TBM placement in the Draft EIS/R. The LTWG's preference is that the TBM be inserted at 2nd/Hope and not at 2nd/Central.

There were questions about the possibility of abandoning the surface track at the Little Tokyo/Arts District station once the Regional Connector is constructed. Metro emphasized that the Gold Line Eastside Extension has only just opened, and that technical and ridership studies have not been completed for the new build alternative.

Evelyn Nishimura asked whether the addition of the 3rd Build alternative would impact the project schedule and Dolores confirmed that it would not. She explained that the next step for the project involves going to the Metro Board of Directors to receive their approval to