
RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of scoping is to provide an opportunity for agencies and the public to comment on the purpose and need, the range of alternatives proposed for analysis, and to help the project proponent identify issues that should be evaluated in the DEIS/DEIR analysis. Therefore, all comments that fall within the scope of the NEPA/CEQA process will be addressed in the DEIS/DEIR. Metro will also continue to work closely with agencies and stakeholder groups to address issues identified through scoping.

4.2 Comments Related to Purpose and Need

There were no comments directly related to the stated purpose of the project. A number of comments did affirm many of the previously identified needs for the project. In addition, some commenters identified additional conditions or benefits that support the need for the project. The DEIS/DEIR will expand and clarify the purpose and need statement in response to these comments.

4.3 Comments Related to Alternatives

The Regional Connector project has completed an AA and conducted early scoping on the potential range of alternatives. The results of that report may be found in the Final AA Report (Metro 2009) and which is incorporated here by reference. The AA provides the reasoning for decisions regarding the identification and narrowing of the range of alternatives. The AA process identified an initial set of 36 conceptual alternatives that met the project purpose of improving connections within the light rail system through the central business district. These alternatives were screened against criteria related to constructability, right-of-way constraints, impacts of configurations, and operational concerns. This initial screening narrowed the range of alternatives to eight alternatives with a few variations on some of the alternatives. These eight alternatives were screened against the goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria established for the project. In addition, input from stakeholders, the public and agencies was solicited in the process of further narrowing the range of alternatives. The AA process resulted in four alternatives (two build alternatives, a No Build Alternative, and a TSM Alternative) that will be carried forward into the DEIS/DEIR.

Most commenters expressed a preference for one of the build alternatives. Comments that included reasons for a stated preference also provide insight into potential impacts or benefits of all of the alternatives. These insights into potential impacts are helpful in guiding the impact analysis of the DEIS/DEIR. Comments that provide this insight are also counted as a comment on a particular resource discipline and will be included in the analysis of potential impacts.

A few comments expressed a preference for an alternative that is not currently proposed for consideration in the DEIS/DEIR.

The DEIS/DEIR will summarize the alternatives previously considered and eliminated and the process used to do so. Other alternatives that do not meet the project purpose and need will not be evaluated further.

4.4 Comments Related to Potential Impacts

Potential impacts or benefits of alternatives identified by commenters will be analyzed in the DEIS/DEIR. Insights into how a particular alternative may affect traffic, neighborhoods, safety, or accessibility and mobility through the central business district are a valuable result of the scoping process. Specific comments on each potential impact will be used to guide the analysis of the alternatives.

Specific comments on potential impacts were related to traffic congestion, circulation, property access, mobility for segments of the ridership, safety, air quality, community and neighborhood, economic, historic resources, visual and aesthetic concerns, noise and vibration, land use and development, and construction activities.

4.5 Other Comments

A number of comments were received on matters related to Metro policies, operations, and other projects within the Metro system. These comments are beyond the scope of this DEIS/DEIR and have been relayed to Metro management for consideration in other, more appropriate forums.

REFERENCES CITED

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, 1993. *Blue Line Connection Draft Preliminary Planning Study*.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, 1993. *Pasadena – Los Angeles Light Rail Transit Project Environmental Impact Report*.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, 2004. *Regional Light Rail Connector Study*.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, 2009. *Final Alternatives Analysis Report*. Prepared by CDM for Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, 2008. *Final Project Early Scoping Report*. Prepared by CDM for Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

APPENDICES

- A: Maps of Alternatives
- B: Public Participation Plan
- C: Notice of Intent
- D: Notice of Preparation
- E: Newspaper Publications of Legal Notices
- F: Agency List
- G: Participating Agencies
- H: Invitation Letters
- I: Agency Sign In Sheet
- J: Agency Scoping Transcript
- K: Notification Database
- L: Direct Mail Scoping Letter
- M: “Take Ones”
- N: Electronic Meeting Notice
- O: Newspaper Advertisements
- P: Public Scoping Meeting #1 Sign In Sheet
- Q: Public Scoping Meeting #2 Sign In Sheet
- R: Public Scoping Meeting #3 Sign In Sheet
- S: Public Scoping Meeting #4 Sign In Sheet
- T: Boards Displayed & Meeting Handouts
- U: PowerPoint Presentation
- V: Summary of Public Comments, Comment Matrix & Transcripts

- W: Summary of Agency Comments