



## Fact Sheet #2: Summary of Public Comment from Early Scoping Meetings

### Public Meetings

Public comment for the Regional Connector Transit Corridor Study commenced on October 31, 2007 with the publication of the Early Scoping Notice in the Federal Register. As part of this Early Scoping process for the Study, Metro conducted two community meetings as follows:

- Tuesday, November 6, 2007; 11:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.  
Los Angeles Central Public Library
- Wednesday, November 7, 2007; 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.  
Japanese American National Museum

Metro received public comments at the Early Scoping meetings, through email, US mail, the information phone line, and the project website. The formal public comment period for the Early Scoping period closed on November 30, 2007.

### Summary of Public Comments

The overwhelming majority of comments received supported the need for a Regional Connector to enhance the efficiency of the current and future rail system by providing through service between the Metro Blue Line, Gold Line, Gold Line Eastside Extension and Expo Line, and serve to link these rail corridors directly to Union Station. Most providing comment supported either a Grand Avenue or 7<sup>th</sup> Street alignment below grade (i.e. subway), and utilizing Light Rail Transit (LRT) technology. Several potential stations received wide support including Little Tokyo, 7<sup>th</sup> Street/Metro, Bunker Hill, Union Station, Main/1<sup>st</sup> and Civic Center.

No comments were received opposing the Regional Connector. Many commentators specifically pointed out the need to develop a transit system that connects multiple lines, as well as expanding the 7<sup>th</sup> Street/Metro station to accommodate enhanced service and upgrading various operational systems. Of those providing feedback about the evaluation criteria, most thought that access was paramount. Public comment generally concentrated on the following:

#### *Mode*

All public comments received showed tremendous support for LRT technology as the preferred mode for the Regional Connector. There was some support for looking at streetcars, but negligible interest in considering Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Personal Rapid Transit (PRT) or monorail technology.

#### *Grade*

Almost all the comments received by speakers at the early scoping meetings were in favor of subway, i.e. a below-grade system.

### ***Alignment***

Comments from these early scoping meetings indicate a nearly even preference for a Grand Avenue alignment or a 1<sup>st</sup> Street alignment. Also receiving some degree of support was a 2<sup>nd</sup> Street alignment, as well as an extension of the Blue Line. Limited preference was expressed for other routes such as 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and Flower, with even less interest expressed in other potential alignments.

### ***Station Locations***

Several potential stations received wide popularity, and were somewhat reflective of those preferring the 1<sup>st</sup> Street route or a Grand Avenue option. In order of the level of support were stations at: Little Tokyo, which was seen as the entree of the Regional Connector into the study area; the 7<sup>th</sup> Street/Metro station, which is regarded as a key hub; Bunker Hill; Union Station; Main/1<sup>st</sup>; and, Civic Center.

### ***Operational Issues***

Those stakeholders providing their comments felt strongly about the need for the Regional Connector to provide a link with Metro's other rail transit lines. Those providing input also noted that building this project would eventually require upgrades to power distribution, signals and controls systems, and would likely entail an expansion of and upgrades to the 7<sup>th</sup> Street/Metro station. Other issues raised included the potential need to add rail cars, improve station maintenance, look at increased safety for both stations and the lines, and to consider implementing the technology used to construct the Gold Line tunnels.

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

There were only a few comments submitted that related to evaluation criteria. These included a request that evaluation criteria should include pedestrian, stroller and ADA access.

### ***Connectivity***

Of the general comments received, most expressed overall support for the project, and emphasized the need for connections to even more transit lines. Others thought that completing the Regional Connector would ensure access to the Westside from all around the region. In addition, some felt that local funding for building the Regional Connector should be sought, and that paying for the project should not come from raising fares.

### **Next Steps**

Early Scoping Notice	October 2007
Community Scoping Meetings	October-November 2007
Initial Screening of Alternatives	December 2007
Draft Alternatives Analysis Report	January 2008
Community Update Meetings & Initial Alternatives Definition	February 2008
Community Update Meetings & Completion of AA Study Report Recommendation to Board of Locally Preferred Alternative(s) (LPA)	Early Summer 2008

For more information, please visit our project website at [www.metro.net/regionalconnector](http://www.metro.net/regionalconnector) or call the project information line at 213.922.7277. Information is also available in Spanish and Japanese.