In response to the comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR (2001), two design options to the original LPA Downtown Los Angeles segment alignment were evaluated in the Final EIS/EIR: Hill Street Couplet Design Option and Flower Street Design Option. Metro staff has recommended to the Metro Board the adoption of the Flower Street Design Option because it constitutes a shorter, more direct alignment that will serve a denser area, and will have an average travel time of up to four minutes faster than with the Hill Street Couplet Design Option. (Further discussion refer to Section 2.7 Locally Preferred Alternative as Identified by Metro Staff” on page 2.7-1 of the Final EIS/EIR).

The Flower Street Design Option will, however, he more costly because of the construction of the grade separated USC/Exposition Park Undercrossing Design Option that is entailed. The benefits of the undercrossing would include reduced traffic impacts that would not otherwise be present with the construction of the Hill Street Couplet Design Option.

Comments are noted and support of the Project is appreciated.
RESPONSES

E2-1 Comments are noted and support of the Project is appreciated.

E2-2 Metro staff has recommended to the Metro Board the adoption of the Flower Street Design Option, which would include the construction of one of the USC/Exposition Park Undercrossing Options (Further discussion refer to Section “2.7 Locally Preferred Alternative as Identified by Metro Staff” on page 2.7-1 of the Final EIS/EIR). This would include a below grade separation at Flower Street/Exposition Boulevard/Figueroa Street. The additional funding required to implement this Design Option is available within the Project budget approved by the Metro Board in April 2005. This budget, however, requires funding from the City of Los Angeles and the University of Southern California. If these funds are not forthcoming, the Hill Street Couplet Design Option may be the only viable alternative. The Mid-City/Exposition LRT Project does not propose any changes to the existing Metro Blue Line route, which is a separate project. Metro will continue to make efforts in connecting existing and planned transit lines as funding and support is available.
E3

Dave Monska

From: Lou Anthony [lou.anthony@metrolink.net]
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2005 12:05 PM
To: ques@woodberggroup.com
Cc: E3-1
Subject: Comments & Responses to the Final EIR/EIS - Mid-City/Exposition LRT Project

---Original Message---
From: Mike Burlington [Mike.burlington@williammiller.com]
Sent: Friday, October 14, 2005 2:40 PM
To: Lou Anthony

Hi Anthony,

I am in receipt of the latest document. I would appreciate it if you could email me a copy of this letter. I am interested in the project. Thank you.

Best Regards,

Mike Burlington

---Reply---

E3-1

Comment is noted.
E-4

E-4-1 One of the Project's objectives is to aid in reducing local freeway traffic traveling from the West Los Angeles/Culver City area to Downtown Los Angeles primarily on the I-10 Freeway. Once construction of the Project is completed and the Mid-City/Exposition LRT is in operation (after 2010), the benefits on regional traffic problems will become evident. Section "1.1 Transit" (page 3.1-6) of the Final EIS/EIR discusses benefits to the region the Project will induce due to increased public transportation use in the region. Daily transit trips, transit boardings, and bus boardings are expected to increase as a result of the Project as compared with "No Action." With this and the expected 43,600 daily fixed guideway boardings of the Mid-City/Exposition LRT itself, vehicle traffic in the region will likely improve. Any traffic impacts determined to be significant as a result of the Project were discussed in Section "1.2 Traffic" in the Final EIS/EIR. Mitigation measures proposed in this section will act to reduce all possible significant traffic impacts of the Project.

E-4-2 The Metro Red Line is a separate project from the Mid-City/Exposition LRT Project. Extension of the Metro Red Line would be contingent on funds and support.
The Project will include the Exposition Transit Parkway which will focus on improved landscape design throughout the corridor. The goals of this landscaping plan include: (1) creating a distinct and positive to the neighborhoods along the alignment; (2) to provide a sustainable alignment; (3) to be reasonable to maintain; and (4) to be economical to build. During the Final Design phase of the Project, Metro will encourage community input into the process of finalizing the landscape plans as well as the Public Art elements of the Parkway (“Visual Quality” mitigation measures page 4.4-47 of Final EIS/EIR). Avoiding (and mitigating if necessary) potential disturbances to native animal and plant life along the corridor during construction of the LRT alignment will be of high priority to Metro and the design/build contractor.
E6

Dave Monks
Forwarding Conversations

Subject: E6-1, E6-2

Dear Rail Committee,

I strongly support the extension of the light rail system. I have one major concern – that all crossing of the light rail lines over roads and streets should be at grade or below the rail to prevent any possible collision between cars at intersections and the light rail lines. This design would also allow greater speeds for the trains.

Thank you,

Paul Deane
318-181-1899

11/14/2009

RESPONSES

E6-1

Comment is noted and support is appreciated.

E6-2

Funding is not available for the costly endeavor of constructing the Mid-City/Exposition LRT alignment without at-grade crossings. The project proposes aerial grade-separations at both La Brea and La Cienega stations. Metro staff has recommended to the Metro Board the adoption of the Flower Street Design Option, which would include the construction of one of the USC Exposition Park Undercrossing Options (Further discussion refer to Section “2.7 Locally Preferred Alternative as Identified by Metro Staff” on page 2.7-1 of the Final EIS/EIR). This would include a below-grade separation at Flower Street/Exposition Boulevard/Figueroa Street. The safety of drivers and pedestrians crossing the LRT route at at-grade crossings along the proposed alignment is of great significance to Metro staff. Three mitigation measures in Section “4.12 Safety and Security” are proposed to enhance the safety of at-grade crossings along the alignment. In addition, several types of warning devices will be used to warn pedestrians and motorists of the approaching LRT train at at-grade crossings.
E7-1 Comment is noted and support is appreciated.

E7-2 Comment/recommendation is noted.

E7-3 Comment/recommendation is noted.

E7-4 Comment is noted and support is appreciated.

E7-5 Comment/recommendation is noted.
E8

Dave Monika

From:  last.anthony3.loca@metro.net
Sent:  Thursday, October 24, 2002 6:56 PM
To:  ViewMessage@metro.net
Cc:  trent@hendersonnvius.com
Subject:  FR comment on EIR for Exposition Light Rail project

Original Message:
From:  anthony.last@metro.net [mailto:anthony.last@metro.net]
Sent:  Thursday, October 24, 2002 6:56 PM
To:  anthony.last@metro.net
Subject:  comment on EIR for Exposition Light Rail project

As a Los Angeles County resident and transit rider, I wish to express my full support for the building of the Exposition Light Rail project. I would like E8 to suggest that the planned extension to Santa Monica be constructed as soon as possible, and that possibilities for extending the line north to Westwood or Century City also be explored. Thank you very much.

Yours Truly,
David Levison
Los Angeles
Dear Culver City Council:

I'm very disappointed to hear the Metro will run the light rail train, at-grade through our homes and schools. I'm equally concerned that this will be a safety concern and a monetary concern for the Culver City community. If emergency services will be severely impeded and Metro starts running its trains. This will result in lower property values for Culver City, as we will be cut off from the network.

Metro has a history of putting on their "day and done" shows for the community. They promise to be concerned about community input, as if they're actually doing what they say. What does Metro answer to? Metro cannot be regulated. We all know that Metro would say yes and do costs as an excuse. They have always said this to the past.

The last option would be to stop the light rail at the intersection of Washington and National. Metro has the ability to run the rail properly (grade separated) through Culver City. I trust that you all do want to right and protect the right Culver City community from Metro's unnecessary proposal. Let's be the one city that finally stands up to Metro

Larry Harry
city of Culver City

E9-1 The possibility of the Mid-City Exposition LRT running at-grade at the intersection of National and Washington Boulevards was omitted in the Final EIS/EIR in response to concerns voiced by the City of Culver City and residents during the Draft EIS/EIR public review period in 2003 (Final EIS/EIR, page 55). Metro staff has recommended that the Metro Board adopt the Venice/Robertson Design Option - ROW (interim) Station with the intent on building the Venice/Robertson Design Option - Aerial Station in the future contingent upon the availability of adequate funding.

E9-2 Metro will continue to encourage community input into the transit planning process as well as implementing projects that benefit the community and the region.

E9-3 Comment noted. Refer to previous responses.
RESPONSES

E10-1

Comment is noted.

E10-2

As Section "4.6 Noise and Vibration" of the Final EIS/EIR (page 4.6-1) discusses, all noise impacts of the Mid-City/Exposition LRT project will be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Several Mitigation Measures will be implemented to reduce noise and vibration impacts (page 4.6-32). Those Mitigation Measures include: constructing sound walls, sound absorption treatment and insulation, dBA reductions in audible warning signal (bells), relocation of crossover locations and/or use of spring-rail frogs, use of ballast mats and resilient fasteners (for vibration impacts) and conducting site-specific noise impact assessments. Implementation of these measures will reduce all severe noise and vibration impacts to comply with FTA standards.

E10-3

Comments are noted. Metro will continue to encourage community input into the transit planning process as well as implementing projects that benefit the community and the region.
The Mid-City/Exposition LRT Project includes extensive bikeway plans and bicycle facilities (Final EIS/EIR page 22). Class II, on-street bike lanes will run from the Vermont station to Ballona Creek for a distance of approximately five miles. The bike lanes will then transition into a Class I, off-street bike path from Ballona Creek to Washington Boulevard for a distance of approximately 0.6 miles. The bike path will then transition towards the Venice/Roberson station via a Class III bike route at Washington Boulevard. Bicycle racks will be provided at every station along the alignment with the exceptions of the 7th Street/metro Center station.

Comment noted. Metro considers the safety of cyclists along the alignment of great importance.
E12-1

One of the Project’s objectives is to aid in reducing local freeway traffic traveling from the West Los Angeles/Culver City area to Downtown Los Angeles primarily on the I-10 Freeway. Once construction of the Project is completed and the Mid-City/Exposition LRT is in operation (after 2010), the benefits on regional traffic problems will become evident. Section “1.1 Transit” (page 3.1-6) of the Final EIS/EIR discusses benefits to the region the Project will induce due to increased public transportation use in the region. Daily transit trips, transit boardings, and bus boardings are expected to increase as a result of the Project as compared with “No Action.” With this and the expected 43,600 daily fixed guideway boardings of the Mid-City/Exposition LRT itself, vehicle traffic in the region will likely improve. Any traffic impacts determined to be significant as a result of the Project were discussed in Section “1.2 Traffic” in the Final EIS/EIR. Mitigation measures proposed in this section will act to reduce all possible significant traffic impacts of the Project.

E12-2

Comment is noted. No response is necessary.

E12-3

Comment is noted. Metro has commissioned a Lead Artist for the Mid-City/Exposition LRT Project. The Lead Artist will help to develop and weave the landscaping plans with the Public Art elements of the Project. Landscaping and Public Art plans and designs will be finalized during the Final Design phase of the Project to implement designs that reflect the environmental and cultural contexts of each individual station.
Light rail vehicles are powered by an overhead electric line, and therefore, provide a cleaner and more energy-efficient form of transportation than automobiles. Light rail transit is also known for being quieter than conventional rail systems. Light rail transit, operating in a protected trackway (Exposition right-of-way), offers a transportation alternative that helps to reduce traffic congestion of local freeways and can shorten commute times substantially for riders. As a result of extensive transit studies conducted over the last several years in the Exposition and Wilshire Corridors, Metro determined that light rail transit was the most feasible and effective use of the Metro owned right-of-way.
Mixed-used and transit-oriented developments are likely to be constructed in the near future as a result of the Mid-City/Exposition LRT Project. It is likely that these types of development would be constructed along the alignment to provide services, entertainment, housing, or shopping opportunities to LRT riders, and others.
E15

E15-1 Comment is noted.

E15-2 Comment and recommendation is noted.

E15-3 Comment is noted.
E16

Dave Moska

To: Lead, Anthony (Anthony.Lead@metro.net)
Cc: Anthony.Lead@metro.net

Sent: Thursday, November 16, 2006 6:45 PM

Subject: Mid-City/Exposition LRT Project Final EIS/EIR

--- Original Message ---

From: Guy Smith@Americas(Delores@yahoo.com)
Sent: Thursday, November 16, 2006 1:45 PM

To: Lead, Anthony

Subject: E16-1

Please please please get this ball started as soon as possible, and while you're at it get straight to Santa Monica.

It can take 1 1/2 hours to get from Santa Monica to downtown in rush hour ... and at least an hour to get from Santa Monica to Beverly Hills during same.

Whatever you can do to expediate this line — do it! Get the Gold Line crew who brought in their project on time and budget.

It is absolutely impossible to get access to these two areas to west anymore. We need the Expo line yesterday.

Sincerely,

Guy Smith

[Email signature]

Yahoo! FastClick - Search multiple search sites in one click.

11/16/2006

RESPONSES

E16  Comments are noted. Metro recognizes the expressed support of the Project. Possible future extension of the LRT to Santa Monica would be considered a separate project and would be contingent on adequate funding and environmental clearance.
E17-1

As Section “4.6 Noise and Vibration” of the Final EIS/EIR (page 4.6-1) discusses, all noise impacts of the Mid-City/Exposition LRT project will be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Several Mitigation Measures will be implemented to reduce noise and vibration impacts (page 4.6-32). Those Mitigation Measures include: constructing sound walls, sound absorption treatment and insulation, dBA reductions in audible warning signal (bells), relocation of crossover locations and/or use of spring-rail frogs, use of ballast mats and resilient fasteners (for vibration impacts) and conducting site-specific noise impact assessments. Implementation of these measures will reduce all severe noise and vibration impacts to comply with FTA standards.

E17-2

Section “4.12 Safety & Security” addresses the possible safety impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Mid-City/Exposition LRT Project. All stations and parking facilities will be monitored by Metro security personnel on a regular basis. Also, a security plan for the entire LRT line will be implemented with input from local law enforcement agencies such as the Los Angeles police Department, LA County Sheriff’s Department, and the Culver City Police Department. Adequate lighting and visibility at all stations and parking facilities will be implemented as well according to local standards.

E17-3

As a result of the grade separations at both the La Brea and La Cienega stations and the implementation of Mitigation Measures (Final EIS/EIR page 3.2-60 through 3.2-63), traffic impacts will be at a minimum at those locations. Because the LRT alignment and stations will be above-grade, vehicular and pedestrian traffic will not be significantly impacted or changed after mitigation (except possibly during the construction phase of the Project, which may result in a temporary significant impact on traffic). Neighborhood traffic control measures will be implemented along the entire alignment to assess and reduce traffic impacts on residential areas.

E17-4

Comment is noted. As more funding becomes available, Metro may consider implementing rail projects in other areas in need of reliable transportation.
E18

Comment 18-1 Endorse the light rail Mid-City/Exposition Project.

From: Betty Davis [Sentinel 12-18-2020 11:23 AM]

Subject: Endorse the light rail Mid-City/Exposition Project

Dear [Name],

I am endorsing the light rail Mid-City/Exposition Project.

As an [your role] for the past years I am looking forward to a connection between [your location] and [other location]. I am glad that the light rail will provide an alternative for the daily commute. I hope this project will connect to the

RESPONSES

E18-1 Comment is noted.
E18

Comment #22:  Support the Light Rail - Mid-City/Exposition Project

From Betty Jones, December 13, 2005

Date: December 13, 2005

To: Mid-City/Exposition Project

Subject: Support the Light Rail - Mid-City/Exposition Project

My name is Betty Jones, and I am writing in support of the Mid-City/Exposition Light Rail Project. I have been a resident of Los Angeles for over 30 years, and I am excited about the potential benefits this project will bring to our community. I believe that the implementation of the Light Rail system will provide improved public transportation options, reduce traffic congestion, and enhance the quality of life for all residents. I urge you to support this project and consider its positive implications for our community's growth and development.

E18-2

Comment in support of the Project is noted.

E18-2

Comment in support of the Project is noted.

E18-2

Comment in support of the Project is noted.

E18-2

Comment in support of the Project is noted.
E19-1 Comment is noted. Metro will continue to assess the transit needs of Los Angeles County and explore possible improvements and extensions various transit lines.
E20

Dave Monks

Email: Lulu.Anthony[J.UL.A@mta.gov]

Email: Lulu.Anthony[J.UL.A@mta.gov]

Subject: PM 08-11-09

E20-1 A discussion of ridership can be found in Section 3.1 Transit of the Final EIS/EIR (pg 3-1.6, 3-1.7). Daily boardings of the LRT are expected to be approximately 43,600 by year 2020.

E20-2 A discussion of seismicity and faults can be found in Section 4.7 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity of the Final EIS/EIR (pg 4.7-1). Faults discussed include the Hollywood-Santa Monica Fault Zone, the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone & the Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazard Zone.

E20-3 As discussed in Section “3.1 Transit” of the Final EIS/EIR, with implementation of the Project, metro will coordinate with the City of Culver City to ensure that Culver City municipal buses have stops at or near the Venice/Robertson station and transit center. The LRT will run along the east-west running Metro-owned Exposition right-of-way to help reduce vehicular traffic that is a current problem on the east-west running I-10 Freeway.

E20-4 Constructing the entire Mid-City/Exposition LRT above-grade would be very costly and beyond the current approved Metro budget for the Project. It may be possible with additional funds from private organizations/stakeholders with interest in the Project (e.g., USC, Exposition Park museums, etc.). The Project’s possible impacts to emergency response times have been reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measures. Metro will coordinate with local municipalities and emergency services for finalizing the changes to signal timing at traffic intersections along with the timing specifications of the daily operations of the LRT.

E20-5 The Venice/Robertson station at Wesley Street would be an interim station with the future goal and intent on constructing the Venice/Robertson Aerial Station contingent with availability of adequate funding. Parking lots and facilities, and a transit center would (eventually) be included with the implementation of the Venice/Robertson interim station. Also, the parking facility proposed for the La Cienega station would aid in supplying parking spaces to all riders in the Culver City area. Sound walls and landscaping would be used as buffers to reduce noise impacts on Culver City residents who reside adjacent to the LRT route.

E20-6 Public comments and Metro’s responses to those comments will be included in the Record of Decision for NEPA clearance of the Project.
E21-1 Comment noted.

E21-2 The discussion and representations of the design of the Project in the Final EIS/EIR are not necessarily considered to the final design. During the Final Design phase of the Project, before construction, construction specifications and designs will be finalized and more detailed engineering drawings will be completed. In completion of the final design of the Project, the Lead Artist, design/build contractor, and adjacent communities will be consulted. Metro recognizes the importance of the Project in the region and will continue to thoroughly assess the operations and effectiveness of the LRT line.
E21-3 Comments and recommendations are noted.
E22-1 Comment is noted.

E22-2 Metro staff has recommended to the Metro Board the adoption of the Flower Street Design Option, which would include the construction of one of the USC/Exposition Park Undercrossing Options (Further discussion refer to Section 2.7 Locally Preferred Alternative as Identified by Metro Staff” on page 2.7-1 of the Final EIR/EIS). This would include a below-grade separation at Flower Street/Exposition Boulevard/Figueroa Street. The safety of drivers an pedestrians crossing the LRT route at at-grade crossings along the proposed alignment is of great significance to Metro staff. Three mitigation measures in Section “4.12 Safety and Security” are proposed to enhance the safety of at-grade crossings along the alignment. In addition, several types of warning devices will be used to warn pedestrians and motorists of the approaching LRT train at at-grade crossings.

E22-3 Comment noted.

E22-4 Comment noted. USC would make decisions on changes in pedestrian and vehicular access to the campus.

E22-5 Comment noted. Please see previous responses above to this comment.
E23-1 Metro may consider implementing peak hour other express service of the LRT at a later time or as LRT operations commence.

E23-2 Metro plans to implement the Venice/Robertson Design Option - Aerial Station with the future availability of adequate funding. In the meantime, the Venice/Robertson Design Option - ROW (interim) Station will be built on in Culver City at Wesley Street.

E23-3 Comment is noted. Specific design of station platforms and protection will be finalized during the Final Design phase of the Project.
E24-1 Comment is noted. Refer to response to comment L-13 (Expo Neighbors Association).
RESPONSES

E24-2 Metro will consider these suggestions as the Final Design phase begins and as landscaping plans/design guidelines are prepared. Also, refer to responses for letter L13.
E24

Response #28 - Provide comments on the construction of the light rail transit project.

Please refer to Response E24-2.
E25-1 Comment is noted.

E25-2 As Section "4.6 Noise and Vibration" of the Final EIS/EIR (page 4.6-1) discusses, all noise impacts of the Mid-City/Exposition LRT project will be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Several Mitigation Measures will be implemented to reduce noise and vibration impacts (page 4.6-32). Those Mitigation Measures include: constructing sound walls, sound absorption treatment and insulation, DBA reductions in audible warning signal (bells), relocation of crossover locations and/or use of spring-rail frogs, use of ballast mats and resilient fasteners (for vibration impacts) and conducting site-specific noise impact assessments. Implementation of these measures will reduce all severe noise and vibration impacts to comply with FTA standards.

E25-3 The Metro-owned right-of-way along Exposition Boulevard and the Exposition Corridor, was determined to be a corridor with many transit needs that could be supplied by the LRT line. Comments and suggestions from the communities in the Projects area have been encouraged by Metro throughout the duration of the environmental review process in the form of comments sheets, public and community meetings, and community open house workshops.

E25-4 LRT safety and the safety of the residences directly adjacent to the proposed route are of high importance to Metro. As discussed in Section "4.12 Safety & Security" of the Final EIS/EIR (page 4.12-7), a second traffic signal will be installed at the intersection of Buckingham Road and Exposition Place to aid in the control and safety of motorists and pedestrians. Also, pedestrian gates would be required at this location. With implementation of these and the other Mitigation Measures (page 4.12-19), collisions between the LRT and vehicles will be prevented.

E25-5 Comment is noted. Please refer to above responses.
E26

Dave Monks

From:  LAUL Attnary (LAUL@metro.net)
Sent:  Monday, November 26, 2000 8:59 PM
To:  Dave@megabytelab.com
Cc:  uami@megabytelab.com
Subject: FW GCA FEDER Comment

Forwarding Comment # 29

---Original Message---
From:  ...@megabytelab.com
Sent:  Monday, November 26, 2000 11:57 AM
To:  Joe Anthony
Subject: Exp FEDER Comment

Dear Mr. Anthony and WM staff,

Here are my comments on the Mid-City/Exposition LRT Project:

**E26-1**

- I support this project fully. This project will help to improve the transportation and employment access of Los Angeles. And personally, it will help me get from home in Long Beach to work in Santa Monica every day.

- I support Route II of this project to Santa Monica, as well as a downtown LRT connector, which would link the growing Metro Rail system together.

- I support the Flores Street Alignment, because the expanding Alvarado Corridor needs improved transit service.

- I support an elevated terminus in Culver City, due to the unique opportunities at the intersection of 50th Street. The line will remain if the Metro line will remain at-grade. Thus, the station should be built above … the plan to continue the line to Santa Monica which I support.

- I support the USC/Exposition Park Undercrossing Design Alternative over the Metro Center Rehabilitation Alternative, because this would allow construction of the optional USC/Exposition Park Station.

---

**E26-2**

- It states that only the Modified Alternative would provide a USC station, and therefore the Modified Alternative would allow the USC station to be built.

Please include these comments in the PESR/B... that SRA.

Joe O’Donnell

Systems Analyst, DRS Final Questions

11/30/2000

RESPONSES

E26-1

Comments and recommendations are noted.

E26-2

The exact location of the optional USC/Exposition Park Station will depend on which of the three USC/Exposition Park Undercrossing Options are adopted. The optional station would not be constructed if either the USC/Exposition Park Modified or Extended Undercrossing Options were adopted. The optional station would be included though if the USC/Exposition Park Undercrossing Option was adopted (also depending on what the Metro Board specifically adopts). However, if the USC/Exposition Park Undercrossing Option were adopted, the Metro board could still decide not to adopt the optional station.
Comments & Responses to the Final EIR/EIS

E27-1

Comments and recommendations are noted.

E27-2

Metro plans to implement the Venice/Robertson Design Option - Aerial Station with the future availability of adequate funding. In the meantime, the Venice/Robertson Design Option - ROW (interim) Station will be built on in Culver City at Wesley Street.

E27-3

The Project's possible extension to Santa Monica (westside) would be considered a separate project and would require adequate finding and environmental clearance. Metro will continue to consider this extension, but there is no finalized timeline for when (or if) the environmental documentation for the possible extension will commence.
E28-1 Comment is noted.

E28-2 As Section “4.6 Noise and Vibration” of the Final EIS/EIR (page 4.6-1) discusses, all noise impacts of the Mid-City/Exposition LRT project will be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Several Mitigation Measures will be implemented to reduce noise and vibration impacts (page 4.6-32). These Mitigation Measures include: constructing sound walls, sound absorption treatment and insulation, dBA reductions in audible warning signal (bells), relocation of crossover locations and/or use of spring-rail frogs, use of ballast mats and resilient fasteners (for vibration impacts) and conducting site-specific noise impact assessments. Implementation of these measures will reduce all severe noise and vibration impacts to comply with FTA standards.
E29-1 The Flower Street Alignment (and Flower Street Design Option including the USC/Exposition Park Undercrossing Option) and the Venice/Robertson Design Option - Aerial Station are all in consideration by Metro and the Metro Board and will likely be implemented.

E29-1 A below-grade station at USC/Exposition Park is not under consideration.
E30-1 Comment is support of the project is noted.

E30-2 Comments and recommendations are noted. Metro will continue to assess public transportation needs in Los Angeles County and strives to create connections between transit lines and centers of offices, retail, services, and entertainment.
Comments & Responses to the Final EIR/EIS

E31-1 
Comment is noted.

E31-2 
The Flower Street Alignment and Design Options will likely be implemented over the Hill Street Couplet Design Option. The Flower Street Alignment constitutes a shorter travel time, a more direct route, and will result in less losses of on-street parking than the Hill Street Couplet Design Option (Final EIS/EIR page 2.7-1).

E31-3 
Metro plans to implement the Venice/Robertson Design Option - Aerial Station with the future availability of adequate funding. In the meantime, the Venice/Robertson Design Option - ROW (interim) Station will be built on in Culver City at Wesley Street.

E31-4 
Metro staff has recommended to the Metro Board the adoption of the Flower Street Design Option, which would include the construction of one of the USC/Exposition Park Undercrossing Options (Further discussion refer to Section 2.7 Locally Preferred Alternative as Identified by Metro Staff” on page 2.7-1 of the Final EIR/EIR). This would include a below-grade separation at Flower Street/Exposition Boulevard/Figueroa Street. The USC/Exposition Park Station is an optional station whose implementation will be determined by the Metro Board.

E31-5 
The Mid-City/Exposition LRT Project includes extensive bikeway plans and bicycle facilities (Final EIS/EIR page 22). Class II on-street bike lanes will run from the Vermont station to Ballona Creek for a distance of approximately five miles. The bike lanes will then transition into a Class I, off-street bike path from Ballona Creek to Washington Boulevard for a distance of approximately 0.6 miles. The bike path will then transition towards the Venice/Robertson station via a Class III bike route at Washington Boulevard. Bicycle racks will be provided at every station along the alignment with the exceptions of the 7th Street/metro Center station.
RESPONSES

E32-1 Comment is noted.

E32-2 The Project's possible extension to Santa Monica would be considered a separate project and would require adequate finding and environmental clearance. Metro will continue to consider this extension, but there is no finalized timeline for when (or if) the environmental documentation for the possible extension will commence.

E32-3 Recommendation is noted. The Project will include aerial grade-separations at the La Brea, La Cienega, and possibly Venice/Robertson stations.

E32-4 The Mid-City/Exposition LRT Project includes extensive bikeway plans and bicycle facilities (Final EIS/EIR page 22). Class II, on-street bike lanes will run from the Vermont station to Ballona Creek for a distance of approximately five miles. The bike lanes will then transition into a Class 1, off-street bike path from Ballona Creek to Washington Boulevard for a distance of approximately 0.6 miles. The bike path will then transition towards the Venice/Roberson station via a Class III bike route at Washington Boulevard. Bicycle racks will be provided at every station along the alignment with the exceptions of the 7th Street/Metro Center station. To elevate all bike paths in the Project to Class I bike paths, may increase the number of parcels that metro would have to acquire in order to widen the Exposition right-of-way. This may include the need to acquire parcels that consist of residences, which metro considers unacceptable. As a part of the Project, Metro will have to acquire full parcels and parts of parcels that consist of commercial uses (or vacant).

E32-5 The Crenshaw, La Cienega, and Venice/Roberson stations will be accompanied by parking facilities and transit centers. Drop-off locations will be considered and/or configured during the Final Design phase of the Project.

E32-6 Comment is noted. The Flower Street Design Option is likely to be implemented.
E32-7 Comment is noted.

E32-8 The Metro-owned right-of-way east of the I-110 Freeway was considered as a part of the Project in the Draft EIS/EIR in 2001 to be used as a non-revenue connector track to allow LRT vehicles access to maintenance facilities. This section of the right-of-way and the non-revenue connector track concept for the section was omitted from the Project and is not evaluated in the Final EIS/EIR.

E32-9 Please refer to response E32-2 above.
## Mid-City/Exposition LRT Project Final EIS/EIR

**Comments & Responses to the Final EIR/EIS**

### E33

**Due Dates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 20</td>
<td>Lani Anthony</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LRT530@nec.ustrans.dot.gov">LRT530@nec.ustrans.dot.gov</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:LRT530@nec.ustrans.dot.gov">LRT530@nec.ustrans.dot.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments are noted.**

**E33-1**

The existing Metro Blue Line is a separate project from the Mid-City/Exposition LRT Project.

**E33-2**

The current tunnel structure commented on is not a part of the Mid-City/Exposition LRT Project. Beautification/landscaping plans will be finalized during the Final Design phase of the Project. Also, all expected noise and vibration impact will be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measures including: constructing sound walls, sound absorption treatment and insulation, dBA reductions in audible warning signal (bells), relocation of crossover locations and/or use of spring-rail frogs, use of ballast mats and resilient fasteners (for vibration impacts) and conducting site-specific noise impact assessments. Implementation of these measures will reduce all severe noise and vibration impacts to comply with FTA standards.

**E33-3**

Along the proposed LRT route in the Downtown Los Angeles Connection segment will be lit to comply with local lighting standards. Also, Section 4.12 Safety & Security of the Final EIS/EIR (page 4.12-19) proposes Mitigation Measures to ensure adequate lighting at all station and parking facilities. Blocking pedestrian traffic between 11th and 12 Streets along Flower Street is not in consideration as part of the Project.
E33

RESPONSES

E33-5 Current noise impacts as a result of the operation of the existing Metro Blue Line were evaluated in separate environmental documentation. The Final EIS/EIR for the Mid-City Exposition LRT Project stated that all noise impacts of the Project would be reduced after implementation of Mitigation Measures. However, noise assessments may be considered as determined by Metro during Final Design or after the construction/opening day of the Mid-City Exposition LRT.

E33-6 Section “4.12 Safety & Security” of the Final EIS/EIR (page 4.12-1) evaluated all impacts of the Project on pedestrians and proposed Mitigation Measures that reduce all significant safety impacts to less-than-significant levels. However, Metro will continually be conscious of possibly future changes in the safety of pedestrians as a result of the Project.

E33-7 The Final EIS/EIR for the Mid-City Exposition LRT Project (Section “4.4 Noise & Vibration”) stated that all noise impacts of the Project would be reduced to less-than-significant levels (per FTA standards) after implementation of Mitigation Measures. However, noise assessments may be considered as determined by Metro during Final Design or after the construction/opening day of the Mid-City Exposition LRT.

E33-8 Community participation an input is vital to the process of implementing and constructing the Project. As discussed in the Section “4.4 Visual Quality” Mitigation Measures of the Final EIS/EIR (page 4.4-47), community input will be encouraged during the Final Design phase in regards to the landscaping plans.

E33-9 Comment/recommendation is noted.
E34-1 Comment in support of the project is noted.
E35-1  Comment in support of the project is noted.

E35

E35-1

From: Harry Rosenthal
To: [redacted]@yahoo.com
Subject: Mid-City/Exposition LRT Project - Input
Date: November 23, 2003 7:52 PM

Hi, [redacted],

For the first time I heard about this project and checked out website. This is GREAT! I always thought something should sense the Exposition Bowl. I used to be there when they named it Santa Monica. Since I got out of the Army, I have lived in the area for 14 years and I have never felt as close to the area as I do now that I see the Bowl. I can't wait to see it take shape. The only thing I do not like is the name, I would have preferred a different name, but I understand this is not the only thing you can do.

Best regards,
Harry Rosenthal
310-515-9669

Yah! Pass the torch.

[Signature]
E36-1 Comment is noted.

E36-2 Light rail vehicles are powered by an overhead electric line, and therefore, provide a cleaner and more energy-efficient form of transportation than automobiles. Light rail transit is also known for being quieter than conventional rail systems. Light rail transit, operating in a protected trackway (Exposition right-of-way), offers a transportation alternative that helps to reduce traffic congestion of local freeways and can shorten commute times substantially for riders. As a result of extensive transit studies conducted over the last several years in the Exposition and Wilshire Corridors, Metro determined that light rail transit was the most feasible and effective use of the Metro owned right-of-way. Section “4.12 Safety & Security” of the Final EIS/EIR (page 4.12-1) evaluated all impacts of the Project on pedestrians and proposed Mitigation Measures that reduce all significant safety impacts to less-than-significant levels. However, Metro will continually be conscious of possibly future changes in the safety of pedestrians as a result of the Project.

E36-3 Comment/recommendation is noted.

---

E36

Dear Sirs and Madams,

I have been troubled, as no doubt you are, by the proposition of trains running in Los Angeles that is outdated and dangerous to the citizens of this city. The planners in the Metro Department seem to be stuck in their thinking and are using older “light-rail” design. Light rail is really a very heavy rail system, with cars that weigh in at hundreds of tons. When trains stop at intersections like pedestrian crossings, there is little hope for the poor pedestrian. Rail systems date back over 200 years, and the current proposal for the Exposition Line is just a modernized version of the same old train. The latest two-wheiy in the Los Angeles area is a slightly more creative solution, built with less from the problems of having to on the same elevators as cars, trucks and pedestrians.

I am preparing an alternative system, shown in the attached PDF file, which involves technology from elevators, railcars, and amusement parks. In one sense, it is a horizontal elevator, except that the lateral motion means that through traffic does not impede. Thus the number of sites that is a person is likely to have to move is greatly reduced, and therefore, the trip is much faster. It is similar to a monorail, except that it can change elevations - stations can be on the ground – and no expensive aerial platforms. This also utilizes the same electric propulsion, so the electric system is the same, and the overhead system is the same. The track is like amusement park track, thus there are employees already trained up to maintain it. The control systems are similar to elevators, and the software just needs to be modified, not created from scratch.

Another major advantage is that the system expandable. Cars can be added and added as the ridership increases. The upfront cost is spread out over several years, and expansion can be paid for by the fares it generates. I believe this is the mass transit system of the future. Los Angeles has experience and aircraft companies that are laying off talented engineers and test drivers who have the expertise to build this system. Instead of reducing our mass transit to other countries and other states, we could be employing our own people to build our mass transit. This makes so much more sense than tunneling underground of pumping rail transport in contact with our traffic. It would also be a lot more fun.

Regards,

Russel K. Johnson, Architect

11/25/2006
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E37-1 As discussed in the Final EIS/EIR, Metro will mitigate severe noise impacts in the Mid-Corridor subarea with six- to eight-foot sound walls. The design and visual qualities of the sound walls will be finalized during the Final Design phase of the Project before construction. Along with the implementation of other visual quality Mitigation Measures (discussed starting on page 4.4-47 of the Final EIS/EIR), Metro will be open for discussions on special visual quality mitigation for the sound wall in question. Special mitigation could include additional landscaping or other added attributes to add visual interest to the side of the sound wall facing the residence of concern.

E37-2 Metro will continue to show consideration for residents with special needs who are particularly impacted by a component of the Project.