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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. STUDY BACKGROUND

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) have initiated a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) / Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the South Bay Metro Green Line Extension (Metro Green Line Extension). The Draft EIS/EIR is being prepared with the FTA as the Lead Agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Metro as the Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The Metro Harbor Subdivision Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis (AA) Study, which serves as a precursor to this Draft EIS/EIR, studied a large number of transit alternatives along the 26-mile Metro-owned Harbor Subdivision railroad Right-of-Way (ROW) between downtown Los Angeles, Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) and the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. The AA Study, which was approved by Metro's Board of Directors, recommended a Phased Implementation Strategy with the Metro Green Line Extension identified as the highest-priority project.

The Study Area for the Metro Green Line Extension follows the Harbor Subdivision ROW along an 8.7-mile long corridor from the intersection of Century and Aviation Boulevards in the LAX area to the proposed Torrance Regional Transit Center (RTC). The Study Area includes the Cities of Inglewood, Los Angeles, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Lawndale, Redondo Beach and Torrance, along with the Lennox and Del Aire areas of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The Harbor Subdivision, which was purchased by Metro from the BNSF Railway in the early 1990s, currently carries limited freight traffic through the Study Area.

Four alternatives are being studied as part of the Draft EIS/EIR to provide transit service between the LAX area and Torrance:

- **No Build Alternative** – Represents existing conditions in the Study Area including transportation projects currently under construction or funded for construction and operation by the year 2035. This alternative includes projects funded in Measure R and specified in the financially constrained element of Metro’s 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

- **Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative** – Lower cost capital and operational improvements to roadways including restriping, signal synchronization, minor widening and enhanced bus service designed to improve bus speeds along existing roadways from Century/Aviation to the proposed Torrance RTC.

- **Light Rail Alternative** – Extension of existing light rail transit (LRT) service along the Harbor Subdivision ROW from the Metro Green Line’s current terminus at the Redondo Beach station to the proposed Torrance RTC utilizing LRT vehicle technology and infrastructure. The extension is 4.6 miles long with approximately four new stations.
• **Freight Track Alternative** – New rail service on upgraded Harbor Subdivision railroad tracks from the proposed Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor station at Century and Aviation Boulevards to the proposed Torrance RTC utilizing Self-Propelled Railcar (SPR) or Commuter Rail Transit (CRT) vehicle technology and associated infrastructure. The alternative is 8.7 miles long with approximately four stations.

An overview of the Metro Green Line Extension Study Area and Alternatives is shown in Figure 1.1.

1.2. **SUMMARY OF PURPOSE AND NEED**

The purpose of the project is to improve mobility in southwestern Los Angeles County by introducing reliable, high-frequency transit service options. These transit service options aim to enhance the regional transit network by providing direct connections to regional destinations and an alternative mode of transportation for commuters who currently use the congested I-405 Corridor. The project strives to improve accessibility for residents and communities in the South Bay area and encourage a mode shift to transit, reducing air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.

Considerations that support the need for the proposed project include:

- **Major Activity Centers**: The Study Area includes major activity centers such as LAX, the El Segundo employment center, the South Bay Galleria, etc, which are significant traffic generators.

- **Heavy Traffic Congestion**: In the Study Area and much of the rest of Los Angeles County, increases in travel demand have outpaced highway and roadway capacity; traffic congestion is projected to worsen on the I-405 and Study Area arterials.

- **Poor Transit Times and Schedule Reliability**: Transit times for riders traversing the Study Area can be lengthy due to long headways and required transfers; with arterial and freeway performance expected to deteriorate in the future, transit travel times and reliability will only worsen.

- **Poor Transit Connections**: With the large number of transit hubs and different operators in the Study Area, schedule and fare coordination issues make transferring between different services a challenge; riders often experience long wait times to connect to various municipalities’ local bus routes, which are not well-suited for regional trips.

1.3. **PROJECT PARTICIPANTS**

The project participants include FTA, Metro, Metro’s consultants and local jurisdictions. Metro’s consultants include the Prime Contractor (STV Incorporated), Environmental Consultant (AECOM) and Public Outreach Consultant (The Robert Group), in addition to the Prime Contractor’s sub-consultants.
Figure 1.1. South Bay Metro Green Line Extension Transit Corridor Project – Overview

Source: STV, AE LLC, 2010
1.4. REPORT PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

According to the Council on Environmental Quality’s NEPA Regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part 1500 et seq.) and the state CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations, Sections 15082-15083), federal and state lead agencies should engage in the 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.

Section 2 of this report first provides a recap of the outreach activities completed during the previous phase of study – the Metro Harbor Subdivision Transit Corridor AA Study. This section highlights the governing Public Participation Plan and previous held public and stakeholder meetings. Section 3 then reviews the Scoping activities for the Metro Green Line Extension Draft EIS/EIR. Section 3.1 outlines Coordination activities, such as the development of the Coordination Plan and the scheduling of meetings with corridor cities. Section 3.2 describes the initiation of the Scoping process, with the publication/posting of the NOI/NOP. Section 3.3 and 3.4 review the Scoping process for interested agencies and the general public. These sections describe the five Scoping meetings that were held throughout April and May 2010. Section 3.5 provides a summary of comments received during the designated Scoping period. Finally, Section 3.6 discusses how these comments will be addressed through the environmental process.

2. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

The Harbor Subdivision AA Study featured an extensive outreach program to both stakeholder agencies and the general public to disseminate information and obtain feedback on the study alternatives. A Community Outreach and Public Involvement Plan was developed early in the study, which identified stakeholders, communications protocols, a proposed schedule for interfacing with the public and a method of tracking public input received.

Each element of the outreach plan helped facilitate 26 public and stakeholder meetings throughout the AA process. While Early Scoping and public meetings were organized primarily to reach the public (in addition to some stakeholder agencies), the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was formed to obtain feedback from key technical stakeholders. These meetings are described in greater detail below.

2.1. PUBLIC MEETINGS

Fifteen public meetings were held throughout the AA study. Early Scoping meetings were held in September and October 2008 to inform stakeholders and the public about the Metro Harbor Subdivision Transit Corridor Project and solicit feedback on what transit improvements should be studied and how the alternatives should be evaluated. Metro returned to the community in April and May 2009 to provide updates on a refined set of alternatives, including alignment configurations, screening criteria and next steps. A final
round of public meetings was held in October 2009 to present the results of the AA study and solicit final comments on project recommendations. All meeting locations were selected based on equitable geographic coverage, proximity to public transportation and minimal overlap with other meetings scheduled in the Study Area. Public meetings held throughout the AA are shown in Figure 2.1.

Comments received throughout the public outreach process generally expressed support for transit improvements in the South Bay and Harbor areas. A South Bay alignment could help provide transit options to residents and improve mobility for commuters along the I-405 and I-110; existing transit options were perceived as inadequate.

Of the modes presented, light rail consistently received the largest amount of support due to its ease of integration with the current rail system and its perceived environmental benefits (lower emissions, quieter operations, etc). Of the alignment options presented, there was support for an extension of Metro Green Line service south, so that a transfer would not be necessary to reach Torrance or Long Beach. There was also support for a regional, Metrolink-type of service due to its ability to link workers with job centers in downtown Los Angeles, San Pedro and LAX, and its ability to be implemented in a relatively short time frame because it would upgrade existing infrastructure.

Of the concerns received, the public indicted that potential environmental impacts including air quality and noise and vibration were of utmost importance. Safety concerns were also significant, especially near grade crossings. Many participants indicated they wanted above-grade street crossings, which would reduce safety concerns and traffic impacts.

2.2. TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

During the AA study, Metro consulted regularly with the Harbor Subdivision TAC, which consisted of representatives from stakeholder agencies with technical experience relevant to the project. The purpose of the TAC was to solicit feedback and recommendations from stakeholders at key milestones during the AA Study.

The TAC was briefed at four meetings held in August 2008, November 2008, March 2009 and October 2009. Some members of the TAC also sponsored workshops that focused discussion on specific technical issues. Two sets of workshops were organized – one to discuss off-corridor alignments in January 2009 and another to discuss urban design concepts in July and August 2009.

2.3. INCORPORATION OF PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS

Public and stakeholder comments were considered when developing the project purpose and need, alternatives, and evaluation criteria and identifying special environmental concerns. Public and stakeholder acceptability was one of four evaluation criterion used to prioritize the alternatives investigated throughout the AA study.
Figure 2.1. Scoping / Public Meeting Locations – Harbor Subdivision AA Study

Source: Metro, STV, 2009
3. DRAFT EIS/EIR SCOPING PROCESS

This section documents the Scoping activities completed as part of the South Bay Metro Green Line Extension Draft EIS/EIR. These Scoping activities primarily included the following:

- Developing and implementing the Coordination Plan
- Scheduling coordination meetings with corridor cities
- Preparing the Notice of Intent (NOI) and Notice of Preparation (NOP) consistent with NEPA and CEQA requirements
- Publishing the NOI in the Federal Register to initiate the NEPA scoping process
- Posting the NOP with the State Clearinghouse and the County Clerk/Recorder of Los Angeles County to initiate the CEQA scoping process
- Mailing Request to Cooperate/Participate letters (in addition to the Scoping Packet and NOI) to potential participating and cooperating agencies
- Holding five Scoping Meetings (one agency and four public)
- Logging all Scoping comments into a database and summarizing public input

Comments and issues raised at the Scoping Meetings and during the Scoping process will be used to further refine project alternatives and to conduct the technical analyses of the alternatives in the Draft EIS/EIR.

3.1. COORDINATION MEETINGS

Coordination activities were conducted to determine the community outreach efforts needed to successfully guide the preparation of the Metro Green Line Extension Draft EIS/EIR.

3.1.1. Coordination Plan

Section 6002 of SAFETEA-LU established an environmental review process for transit projects that has now been included in Section 139 of Title 23 of the US Code. Section 139 directs agencies to prepare a plan for public and agency participation and comments during the environmental review process. The Coordination Plan identifies the level of collaboration that Metro will undertake with local, state, federal and tribal government agencies during the NEPA process to ensure effective and organized agency input. The document provides a schedule to facilitate federal review and approval of key documents, and will be updated periodically to reflect changes to the project schedule and any other items that have changed over the course of the project. The Coordination Plan has been made available to the participating agencies and the public in order for them to review and comment on potential issues of concern.

Key elements of the Coordination Plan include a project overview, the definition of roles and responsibilities for involved agencies, an agency invitation list, agency coordination objectives and structure, an issue resolution process, goals and objectives of the public participation...
strategy and a description of public participation activities and outreach to traditionally underserved groups. The Coordination Plan is included in Appendix A.

3.1.2. Coordination Meetings with Corridor Cities

Five coordination meetings were held with corridor cities in April 2010 to reintroduce the Metro Green Line Extension Project, inform the cities of the upcoming Scoping Meetings and gain initial feedback regarding key project features such as alignments and station locations. The meetings also allowed Metro to elicit information about ongoing city plans and projects.

These coordination meetings included city managers, public works and/or planning directors and elected officials from the Cities of El Segundo, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Redondo Beach and Torrance. Meeting dates, times and locations are provided below.

- **Torrance**
  - **Date:** Tuesday, April 6, 2010
  - **Location:** Torrance City Hall

- **Redondo Beach**
  - **Date:** Wednesday, April 7, 2010
  - **Location:** Redondo Beach City Hall

- **Hawthorne**
  - **Date:** Wednesday, April 14, 2010
  - **Location:** Hawthorne City Hall

- **Lawndale**
  - **Date and Time:** Wednesday, April 14, 2010
  - **Location:** Lawndale City Hall

- **El Segundo**
  - **Date and Time:** Thursday, April 22, 2010
  - **Location:** El Segundo City Hall

3.1.3. Elected Official Briefing

A briefing was held with elected officials and/or their staff prior to the Scoping Meetings to serve as a sounding board for the project team in regards to the presentation and visual materials, and provide the officials with notification about the upcoming meetings as well as preliminary information about the status of the project. Meeting details are listed below:

- **Date and Time:** Wednesday April 21, 2010, 2:00 PM
- **Location:** Torrance Cultural Arts Center, Garden Room B, 3330 Civic Center Drive, Torrance, CA 90503
- **Attendees:** Representatives from the following offices attended:
  - **US Senator Diane Feinstein**
  - **Congresswoman Jane Harman**
  - **California State Senator Jenny Oropeza**
○ California Assemblymember Warren Furutani
○ California State Assemblymember Bonnie Lowenthal
○ City of Torrance
○ South Bay Cities Council of Governments

3.2. **Initiation of Scoping (Notice of Intent / Notice of Preparation)**


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, purpose and need, potential alternatives and probable effects to be studied. FTA procedures, relevant scoping meeting information, such as meeting dates, times and locations, and contact information were also provided. A copy of the NOI is included in Appendix B1.

In compliance with CEQA requirements, the NOP for an EIR was published at the State Clearinghouse on April 13, 2010. The NOP also was posted at the Los Angeles County Clerks’ Office on April 12, 2010. The NOP announced Metro’s intent to prepare an EIR pursuant to CEQA. Similar to the NOI, the NOP 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. A copy of the NOP can be found in Appendix B2. Publications of the legal notices were also featured in La Opinion and the Daily Breeze. Copies of these legal notices are included in Appendix B3.

3.3. **Agency Scoping**

3.3.1. **Notice of Intent Mailings**

The NOI was distributed to agencies and organizations along the Study Area corridor and to jurisdictions with a potential interest in the South Bay Metro Green Line Extension Project. The NOI was mailed to 229 agencies and organizations on April 21, 2010. The mailings were distributed with trackable delivery service via US Postal Service. In some instances, the NOI packages were sent to several individuals within an agency or office to ensure that all responsible and trustee agencies were properly notified. The complete list of agencies and contacts that received an NOI mailing, including the recipient name, organization and address is included in Appendix B4.

Participating or coordinating agency invitations and scoping packets were mailed with the NOI. These materials are discussed in greater depth in the following sections.
3.3.2. Participating Agency Invitations

Participating agencies can be federal, state, tribal, regional, and local government agencies that may have an interest in the project. In accordance with SAFETEA-LU Section 6002 requirements, Metro, in coordination with the FTA, prepared and mailed participating agency invitation letters to 227 agencies on April 21, 2010. The list of agencies identified throughout the AA was used as a starting point to identify potential participating agencies in the environmental analysis phase.

The responsibilities of these agencies include, but are not limited to:

- Participating in the NEPA/CEQA process starting at the earliest possible time, especially with regards to the development of the purpose and need statement, range of alternatives, methodologies and the level of detail for the analysis of alternatives;
- Participating in the scoping process;
- Identifying, as early as practicable, any issues of concern regarding potential environmental or socioeconomic impacts of the project;
- Participating in the issue resolution process;
- Providing meaningful and timely input on unresolved issues; and
- Commenting on the Draft EIS/EIR.

Accepting the designation as a participating agency does not indicate project support and does not provide the agency with increased oversight or approval authority beyond its statutory limits. Participating agencies for the project are listed in Appendix D5. They include federal agencies that did not affirmatively decline the invitation to become a participating agency, and regional, state and local agencies that affirmatively accepted the invitation to become a participating agency. Agencies were given approximately 30 days from the date of the letter (April 20, 2010) to respond. Agencies also may request to be added as a participating agency at any time during the environmental process.

Appendix B5 contains two sample invitation letters; one that was sent to federal agencies and tribes and one that was sent to state, regional and local agencies. The Scoping Information Packet was included with each participating agency invitation letter, and is included in Appendix B6. Appendix D3 and D4 include the agency responses to the invitation received via email and regular mail.
3.3.3. Cooperating Agency Invitations

Cooperating agencies are, by definition in 40 CFR 1508.5, federal agencies with jurisdiction, by law or special expertise, with respect to any environmental impact involved in the proposed project. A state or local agency of similar qualifications may, by agreement with the lead agency, also become a cooperating agency. The cooperating agencies are by definition participating agencies as well, and while the roles and responsibilities of both are similar, the cooperating agencies have a slightly greater degree of authority, responsibility and involvement in the environmental review process.

In accordance with SAFETEA-LU Section 6002 requirements, Metro, in coordination with the FTA, prepared and mailed cooperating agency invitation letters to two agencies with a potential interest in the project in preparation for project scoping: the Federal Aviation Administration and the Federal Railroad Administration. Sample invitation letters are included in Appendix B5 and the Scoping Information Packet, which was also included with each coordinating agency invitation letter, is included in Appendix B6.

3.3.4. Agency Scoping Meeting

One Agency Scoping Meeting, as listed below, was held to solicit comments from agencies invited to participate in the Metro Green Line Extension project. Meeting details are as follows:

- **Time:** Tuesday, May 4, 2010, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
- **Location:** Metro, Gateway Headquarters Building, 3rd Floor, Gateway Plaza Conference Room, Los Angeles, CA
- **Attendees:** 23 signed in
- **Commenters:** 7 (7 verbal, 0 written)

The meeting included an open house, presentation board display and a PowerPoint presentation similar to that shown at the public Scoping Meetings, which are described in Section 3.4.6. Twenty-three people attended the meeting. A sign-in sheet from the Agency Scoping Meeting is provided in Appendix D1.

3.3.5. Agency Scoping Meeting Comments

Seven commenters provided verbal feedback at the meeting. (There were no written comments.) Comments received were generally structured as questions, involving a variety of issues including but not limited to maintenance and operations facility options, ridership and parking forecasts, local job market health and the region’s housing stock, etc. A full transcript of the Agency Scoping Meeting proceedings is provided in Appendix D2. An additional 21 commenters provided feedback outside of the Agency Scoping Meeting in the form of letters (19) and emails (2). In total, 28 agency commenters provided feedback during the Scoping period.
3.4. PUBLIC SCOPING

Notification of the public Scoping Meetings was completed via several forms of media, as described further in this section. This outreach was in addition to the official notices (NOI and NOP) published in the Federal Register and posted with the State Clearinghouse. In addition to the Agency Scoping Meeting, four public Scoping Meetings were held, which are described in Section 3.4.6.

3.4.1. Notification Database

The stakeholder database created throughout the AA to track interested individuals and groups, their areas of interest and other pertinent information was used to notify interested stakeholders of the environmental scoping process. To the extent possible, Metro includes mailing addresses as well as email contact information in the database. The project database will be used throughout the environmental phase of study to communicate with stakeholders such as:

- Elected officials on the local, state and federal level;
- Neighborhood councils and other elected groups;
- Homeowners associations and neighborhood organizations;
- Chambers of commerce and business leaders;
- Community-based and civic organizations;
- Key employment centers and cultural/entertainment destinations;
- Transportation advocates and interest groups;
- Print, broadcast and electronic media, including community-based publications and blogs; and
- Local business improvement districts.

For the purposes of notifying the appropriate individuals and groups about the Metro Green Line Extension Scoping Meetings, the existing AA database was updated to include contact information for new neighborhood council members or civic organizations that were identified as having interest in the project. At the time of the Scoping Meetings, 628 entries were listed on the Metro Green Line Extension database.

3.4.2. Project Information Telephone Line

In addition to the typical forms of communication made available to the public, such as email, postal mail and the internet, a project telephone information line was created for public use. This telephone line is available to English- and Spanish-speaking callers and is checked twice a week. Calls and requests are returned promptly upon receiving a message. A log, which includes the subject of the calls and responses to the callers, is maintained. The project line phone number is (213) 922-4004.
3.4.3. **Project Email**

A project email address has been established at [southbayextension@metro.net](mailto:southbayextension@metro.net). Stakeholders can request to be put on the project mailing list or request information via this address. Metro staff reviews the inquiries and forwards them to appropriate staff for follow up.

3.4.4. **Fact Sheets**

Two fact sheets were developed for distribution during the Scoping period – a project fact sheet to provide a general overview of the Metro Green Line Extension and a fact sheet detailing the environmental process and how members of the public can get involved and provide input during each stage of the study. Both documents were printed in English and Spanish, and are included in Appendix B7.

3.4.5. **Noticing**

A variety of methods were employed to notify the public about the Scoping Meetings. The Scoping Meetings were publicized via notices placed on Metro buses and trains serving the Study Area; canvassing; direct delivery and mailings; electronic notices to the project database; display advertisements in multi-lingual publications (English and Spanish); postings on Metro’s website; a press release which was sent to local, regional, ethnic and multilingual publications as well as blogs; postings on Facebook; and through partnerships with local municipalities.

3.4.5.1. **Take Ones**

Preceding the public Scoping Meetings, “Take One” brochures inviting transit users to the Scoping Meetings were placed on Metro buses and rail lines in or adjacent to the Study Area. Brochures were printed in English and Spanish and distributed to Bus Divisions Five and Six, as well as the Metro Blue, Silver, Red, Gold and Green Lines for a total distribution of 21,475 brochures.

In addition, “Take Ones” were dropped at the following locations:

- El Segundo Chamber of Commerce;
- City of El Segundo Joslyn Center;
- El Segundo Public Library;
- Lawndale Public Library;
- Lawndale Senior Center;
- Lawndale City Hall;
- Redondo Beach Public Library;
- North Redondo Senior Center, Perry Park;
- Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce;
• Beach Cities Health District;
• Torrance Public Library;
• Torrance Transit Center;
• City of Torrance, Herma Tillim Senior Center;
• Los Angeles County Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas Inglewood Field Office; and
• Los Angeles County Supervisor Don Knabe Torrance Field Office.

A copy of a “Take One” is included in Appendix B8.

3.4.5.2. Canvassing

The Walking Man distributed 40,000 “Take One” notices to households and businesses along the corridor. Canvassers distributed the fliers within a quarter-mile radius of the corridor.

3.4.5.3. Direct Mailing

The “Take Ones” were also mailed to 450 addresses in the notification database on April 12, 2010.

3.4.5.4. Email Notice

The electronic distribution of the meeting notice occurred on April 19, 2010. The project team disseminated electronic mailings to all individuals, groups and organizations in the project database with email addresses, including elected officials, neighborhood groups, business organizations and community-based organizations. A follow-up email was sent to solicit additional comments on May 21, 2010.

Similar to prior Metro corridor studies, stakeholders were asked to forward these e-mails to their constituents and/or members. E-mail blasts are an especially important type of media as they distribute meeting announcements and other project information to a large number of people instantly. Notices were sent to 358 email addresses within the existing project database. A copy of the email is included in Appendix B9.

3.4.5.5. Newspaper Advertisements

Display advertisements for the Scoping Meetings were placed in five newspapers within the Study Area that were selected based on their geographic focus, language needs and audited circulation numbers. A sample newspaper advertisement is included in Appendix B10. Newspaper advertisement details are listed below.

• **Beach Reporter** (English)
  ○ Date: April 15-21, 2010
  ○ Circulation: 55,000
• **Daily Breeze** (English)
  - Date: April 13-15, 2010
  - Circulation: 66,400

• **El Clasificado** (Spanish)
  - Date: April 14-20, 2010
  - Circulation:
    - Zone 6: 12,000
    - Zone 14:10,500

• **Lawndale News** (English)
  - Date: April 16-22, 2010
  - Circulation: 15,000

• **El Segundo Herald** (English)
  - Date: April 16-22, 2010
  - Circulation: 15,000

3.4.5.6. **Project Website**

The project website, located at [www.metro.net/soutbayextension](http://www.metro.net/soutbayextension), serves as a central clearinghouse where the public can obtain all project-related information. Information posted includes a project overview as well as information relating to the Scoping process including meeting dates, locations and times. In addition, the Scoping presentation and display boards (described further in Section 3.4.6.2) have been posted in both English and Spanish. The website will continue to be updated at key project milestones.

3.4.5.7. **Media Release**

Metro distributed a media release on April 15, 2010. A copy of this media release is included in Appendix B11.

3.4.5.8. **Facebook**

With the advent of the Draft EIS/EIR phase of study, the Facebook group page assumed the new project name and previous members of the Harbor Subdivision Transit Corridor page were carried forward. The project description was rewritten to reflect the revised Study Area and project alternatives. The Facebook group page is monitored daily by the project team, and all comments left on the discussion board and group’s wall are captured in a tracking matrix. (A PDF of the tracking matrix is included in Appendix C10.)

Scoping meeting information including dates, times and locations was posted on the group page as well as messaged to all members on April 5, 2010. On May 11, 2010, a follow-up message was posted on the group page as well as sent to all group members reminding them of the deadline to submit scoping comments.
3.4.5.9. Additional Outreach

In order to maximize the coverage of the outreach effort for the Scoping Meetings, Metro undertook some creative approaches to engage the public as follows:

- Coordinated with the Cities of El Segundo, Lawndale, Redondo Beach and Torrance to post information about the Scoping Meetings in their respective cities and on their official websites;
- Coordinated with the Cities of El Segundo, Lawndale, Redondo Beach and Torrance to post Scoping Meeting dates on their respective cable channels;
- Requested Scoping Meeting information be posted on local calendars of rotary clubs, chambers of commerce, etc;
- Coordinated with the City of Lawndale to place “Take One” notices on the Lawndale Beat bus lines;
- Coordinated with City of Lawndale for the posting of Scoping Meeting information via the municipal electronic marquee;
- Distributed meeting notices to offices of elected officials, libraries and senior and community centers in the Study Area; and
- Sent an additional notification letter to the Ruxton Ridge Neighborhood in Redondo Beach.

3.4.6. Public Scoping Meetings

Four public Scoping Meetings were scheduled along the corridor and conducted in compliance with NEPA and CEQA guidelines. The meeting locations were selected based on geographic location and recommendations from local elected officials in addition to Americans with Disability Act (ADA) and public transit accessibility considerations.

In order to provide the greatest opportunity for community participation, meetings were scheduled in the early evening on weekdays, and one meeting was scheduled on a Saturday morning. The dates and locations of the meetings in addition to the number of attendees and commenters at the meetings are listed below:

- **Torrance**
  - **Date and Time:** Monday, April 26, 2010; 6 to 8 PM
  - **Location:** George Nakano Theater, 3330 Civic Center Drive, Torrance, CA
  - **Number of Attendees:** 42
  - **Commenters:** 15 (13 verbal, 2 written)

- **Redondo Beach**
  - **Date and Time:** Wednesday, April 28, 2010; 6 to 8 PM
  - **Location:** Perry Park Senior Center, 2308 Rockefeller Lane, Redondo Beach, CA
  - **Number of Attendees:** 41
  - **Commenters:** 22 (16 verbal, 6 written)
• **Lawndale**
  ▪ **Date and Time:** Saturday, May 1, 2010; 10 AM to 12 PM
  ▪ **Location:** Lawndale City Hall, 14717 Burin Avenue, Lawndale, CA
  ▪ **Number of Attendees:** 41
  ▪ **Commenters:** 21 (19 verbal, 2 written)

• **El Segundo**
  ▪ **Date and Time:** Wednesday, May 5, 2010; 6 to 8 PM
  ▪ **Location:** The Automobile Driving Museum, 610 Lairport Street, El Segundo, CA
  ▪ **Number of Attendees:** 46
  ▪ **Commenters:** 24 (21 verbal, 3 written)

According to meeting sign-in sheets, 170 members of the public attended the four public Scoping Meetings. Eighty-two commenters submitted verbal (69) and written (13) comments at these public meetings. Ninety-nine public commenters submitted additional comments outside of the meetings through letters (5), email (55), the telephone line (20) and Facebook (19). A total of 181 public commenters provided feedback during the Scoping period.

### 3.4.6.1. Scoping Meeting Format

The meeting format was as follows:

- **30 minutes:** Open House
- **30 minutes:** Presentation
- **60 minutes:** Public Comment

The Scoping Meetings began with an open house format to provide attendees with an opportunity to review the project information prior to the start of the presentation and subsequent comment period. Project team members were present near the display boards and available to generally discuss the project with attendees. Spanish translators were available at each meeting.

Following the open house period, a PowerPoint presentation was shown to provide attendees with information regarding the purpose of the scoping process in addition to project history, purpose and need, alternatives, evaluation criteria, environmental issues, etc. Emphasis was placed on the importance of the community providing comments before the comment deadline, through verbal or written comments at public meetings or via email, fax, postal mail, telephone or Facebook.

Following the PowerPoint presentation, attendees who completed speaker cards gave their public comment, which was recorded by a transcriber. Comments were restricted to two minutes. After the public comment portion of the meeting, the project team again was available at the informational display boards. Written comments were accepted throughout each meeting’s duration.
3.4.6.2. Public Meeting Materials

The presentation materials utilized to communicate project information at the Scoping Meetings included: display boards, a PowerPoint presentation and comment forms.

Display Boards

Open house display boards were used to provide project information under the following headings:
- 5 Stages of Project Development
- Development of Phased Implementation Strategy, Harbor Subdivision Alternative Analysis
- EIR/EIS Purpose and Process
- Evaluation Criteria and Environmental Topics
- Project Need and Objectives
- Existing Conditions – North Study Area
- Existing Conditions – South Study Area
- Grade Crossings
- No Build and Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternatives
- Build Alternatives
- Potential Vehicle Technologies
- Comments

The open house display boards were also available in Spanish, with both English and Spanish versions of the boards posted to the Metro website. A copy of the display boards is included in Appendix C1.

PowerPoint Presentation

A PowerPoint presentation was used to provide information at the public Scoping Meetings. The PowerPoint presentation was made available in both English and Spanish languages on the project website. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is included in Appendix C2.

3.4.7. Speaker Cards and Comment Sheets

Speaker cards were available for attendees that wished to speak publicly and comment sheets were available for those who preferred to submit a written comment. Comment sheets submitted at each Scoping Meeting are included in Appendix C.
3.4.8. Public Meeting Comments

Sign-in sheets and full transcripts of the public Scoping Meeting proceedings are provided in Appendix C.

3.5. SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS

Metro accepted comments throughout the Scoping period, from April 14, 2010 until May 28, 2010. All commenters and comments were recorded and categorized in an electronic database. The database contains information documenting the name and affiliation (if any) of the commenters, the date the comments were received, the method by which the comments were received, the topics addressed in the comments and a brief summary of the comments, if appropriate. The database is included in Appendix E.

Of 193 total meeting attendees, 89 commenters submitted either verbal (76) or written (13) comments at the five Scoping Meetings. An additional 120 commenters, both from the general public and various agencies, submitted feedback outside of the meetings. Fifty-seven commenters submitted comments through email, 20 commenters delivered comments via the project telephone line, 24 commenters submitted comments via postal mail and 19 commenters submitted comments through Facebook after the Scoping Meetings. (The postal mail comments include a petition with 120 signatures.) Throughout the Scoping process, a total of 209 commenters submitted feedback. Commenters were diverse and included agencies, community organizations, elected officials and members of the general public. Agency and public comments are described in more detail in the following sections.

3.5.1. Summary of Agency Comments

Fifteen agencies invited to participate in the environmental process submitted comments during the Scoping period. Some agency letters included requests to ensure compliance with government-mandated policies, while some responding agencies have regulatory authority over the design and construction of the project. The agency comments are included in Appendices D3 and D4. (A transcript of the questions asked during the Agency Scoping Meeting is also provided in Appendix D2.) The concerns of all the agencies will be addressed both through the Draft EIS/EIR and through on-going coordination with Metro.

3.5.2. Summary of Public Comments

The substance of most public comments can be classified into one or more of four categories. These four categories include project purpose and need, the alternatives to be studied in the Draft EIS/EIR, environmental impacts and mitigation measures and other significant issues. The following sections contain summaries of the comments from each major category.
3.5.2.1. Comments Related to Purpose and Need

Fifty-one commenters discussed the purpose and need of the project. Fourteen commenters expressed that there was no need for the project, as current levels of mobility and accessibility throughout the South Bay Area are perceived as sufficient. Many of these commenters cited empty local buses and stated preference for the No Build or TSM Alternatives. As many as 34 commenters however, agreed that there was a need for the project. Some commenters discussed the high costs and safety issues associated with driving and expressed the need to ease traffic congestion (especially on I-405) and provide long-term solutions.

3.5.2.2. Comments Related to Alternatives

One hundred and nine commenters provided feedback relating to the project alternatives. Some commenters, expressed support for the No Build and TSM Alternative (and opposition to the Light Rail and Freight Track Alternatives), and some commenters expressed support for the Build Alternatives, with a preference for the Light Rail Alternative. Comments related to project alternatives are analyzed in more depth by each of the individual topics listed below.

Alignments/Routes

Forty-five comments were received in regards to preferred alignments and destinations. Twelve comments suggested that the project team evaluate an alignment on Hawthorne Boulevard. Several comments stated that operation on Hawthorne Boulevard north of 190th Street would avoid the Manhattan Beach Boulevard/Inglewood Avenue intersection and traffic congestion that would be caused by the at-grade crossings of those streets. Additionally, two comments suggested the use of the Alameda Corridor as an alternative to the current routes being studied. Eleven comments generally indicated the need to study additional alternatives.

Nine comments received expressed support for a direct connection to the LAX terminals. The remaining comments proposed extending the transit line to the Del Amo Fashion Center, Long Beach, San Pedro, Los Angeles Union Station, the San Fernando Valley and Santa Monica.

Vertical Profile

Twelve comments were received pertaining to the alternatives’ proposed vertical profiles. The comments suggested that both above- and below- grade options should be considered. Five comments showed support for an aerial alignment and seven comments suggested preference for an underground alignment. Many felt that the at-grade alignments would increase congestion and commute times resulting in a diminished quality of life. Some comments cited safety hazards related to the at-grade options; the comments argued that an alternative vertical profile would improve safety by eliminating the occurrence of at-grade accidents. The main takeaway related to vertical profiles is that the public would like to see grade separations at the Inglewood Avenue and Manhattan Beach Boulevard crossings to
avoid additional traffic congestion. Nineteen comments expressed concern for traffic at either Manhattan Beach Boulevard or Inglewood Avenue or both, or stated that they would like to see a grade separation at these crossings.

**No Build/TSM Alternative**

Approximately 31 comments were received regarding the No Build and TSM Alternatives. Only six comments expressed support for the No Build Alternative, while 25 comments expressed support for the TSM Alternative (and opposition to the Light Rail Alternative).

**Light Rail Alternative**

Twenty-one comments were received regarding the Light Rail Alternative. Comments were generally supportive, with a few proposals for an underground alignment or an aerial structure. Some comments cited specific locations/corridors where below- or above-grade alignments were viewed as preferable, such as near the Manhattan Beach Boulevard/Inglewood Avenue intersection.

Some comments suggested that the at-grade Light Rail Alternative would negatively impact the quality of life in the surrounding communities, by increasing traffic volumes and causing additional noise and vibration. Some comments cited that increased traffic congestion would have a negative effect on businesses and that the additional noise and vibration would adversely affect nearby residential neighborhoods. Other comments indicated that the alternative would bring crime into the residential neighborhoods located adjacent to the alignment and that at-grade crossings would lead to higher auto, pedestrian and train accidents. Several comments also discussed the Light Rail Alternative’s impacts on emergency vehicle access.

**Freight Track Alternative**

There were only six comments that supported the Freight Track Alternative. The comments showed preference for the CRT vehicle option and the ability to operate the Freight Track Alternative using existing infrastructure.

**Stations**

Six comments discussed the need to plan for fewer stations along the Corridor. The suggestions generally indicated that the stations proposed for Manhattan Beach Boulevard/Inglewood Avenue and Hawthorne Boulevard/190th Street are superfluous and should not be considered as options. Some comments showed much concern for traffic conditions at the Manhattan Beach Boulevard/Inglewood Avenue station, and ultimately suggested the removal of this station as an option or the consideration of an aerial station. Other comments expressed the benefits of both stations.
3.5.2.3. Comments Related to Potential Impacts

As many as 283 comments were received that pertained to potential environmental impacts. Comments discussed a wide range of impacts, though the majority touched upon traffic, real estate, noise and vibration and community and neighborhood impacts in addition to safety and security. The comments as related to each environmental impact are summarized in the following subsections.

Transportation Impacts – Traffic Circulation

Sixty-three comments were received regarding traffic circulation and potential transportation impacts. Most of the comments expressed general concern over traffic patterns and the potential for increased traffic congestion as a result of the construction and operation of at-grade light rail facilities. Comments included the following issues:

- Potential traffic congestion at the Manhattan Beach Boulevard/Inglewood Avenue intersection;
- Potential traffic congestion near 182nd Street;
- Potential traffic congestion getting on and off the I-405;
- Potential traffic congestion due to station demand and/or a lack of station area parking;
- Potential traffic congestion due to increased train traffic; and
- The need for sidewalks and bicycle lanes along the length of the alignment.

As previously mentioned, 19 comments were received that expressed concern for traffic impacts due to an at-grade crossing at Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Inglewood Avenue; a large portion of these comments requested a grade separation at this location. Eight additional comments generally requested grade separations throughout the corridor.

Real Estate and Acquisitions

Forty-three comments were received regarding real estate and acquisitions. Most of these comments focused on the potential devaluation of residential properties located within close proximity to proposed stations and alignments. Other comments expressed concern over property acquisitions. Some reoccurring comments included:

- Concern over resale values and the ability to rent properties at a fair market rate;
- General acquisition concerns, including the locations of potential acquisitions; and
- Potential structural impacts to properties.

Community and Neighborhood Impacts

Twenty-one comments were received concerning community and neighborhood impacts. The comments generally addressed the potential deterioration of quality of life for the surrounding neighborhoods and communities after the project is constructed. Some comments stated
that the impacts would be the most significant for those residencies within closest proximity to the railroad ROW.

**Noise and Vibration**

Sixty-eight comments concerning noise and vibration impacts were received. The issues addressed in these comments primarily included general noise concerns and potential noise impacts from trains operating in close proximity to residential neighborhoods adjacent to the ROW. Specific issues addressed in these comments included:

- Potential noise and vibration impacts caused by frequent train travel;
- Potential noise and vibration impacts near the 182nd Street and 186th Street residential neighborhoods;
- Potential structural impacts to properties; and
- Need for soundwalls or other mitigations.

**Safety and Security**

Fifty-five comments related to safety (prevention of accidents) and security (prevention of crime) were received. These comments touched upon potential safety issues at grade crossings, security issues related to potential increases in crime and emergency service access. Specific issues addressed in these comments included:

- Potential safety impacts for schools and school-age children around at-grade crossings;
- Current and frequent use of greenbelt along ROW in Lawndale by residents;
- Potential security impacts related to crime rate increases around proposed stations; and
- Potential security impacts related to crime rate increases in the adjacent residential neighborhoods.

**Air Quality**

There were 10 comments related to air quality. Concerns regarding air quality included the potential for dust and particulate matter to arise during the construction and operation of the project and increased congestion and related automobile emissions, especially at the locations of at-grade crossings. Some comments voiced concern of diesel emissions associated with the non-electric modal options.

**Other Comments**

A lesser number of comments touched upon land use and development (two), visual and aesthetic impacts (four), ecosystems and biological resources (two), geotechnical and subsurface impacts (four), water resources (two), historical and archeological resources (two), parks and community facilities (one), construction impacts (four), environmental
justice (one) and cumulative impacts (one). These comments were recorded and can be
viewed in the comment database featured in Appendix E.

In addition, there were several comments received during the Scoping period that did not
apply to any of the aforementioned categories. For instance, there were some questions
raised regarding the potential cost of the Metro Green Line fare. There were also some
related concerns regarding the overall benefit provided by the transit infrastructure compared
to the high cost.

3.6. INCORPORATION OF SCOPING COMMENTS IN DRAFT EIS/EIR

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 identify
issues that should be evaluated in the Draft EIS/EIR. Therefore, all comments that fall within
the scope of the NEPA/CEQA process will be addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR. Metro will also
continue to work closely with agencies and stakeholder groups to address issues identified
through the Scoping process.

3.6.1. Comments Related to Purpose and Need

As previously mentioned, some purpose and need comments indicated that residents are
satisfied with the current levels of mobility in the southwestern region of Los Angeles County.
Some residents believe there is no need for a high-frequency transit service along the South
Bay Metro Green Line Transit Corridor because the I-405 provides an adequate level of service
in the South Bay during peak hours. On the other hand, there were a large number of
comments that supported public transit and the stated purpose of the project. The Draft
EIS/EIR will expand and clarify the purpose and need statement in response to these
comments.

3.6.2. Comments Related to Alternatives

Most comments related to alternatives expressed a preference for either the No Build or TSM
Alternative or the Light Rail Alternative. Some comments expressed a preference for the
analysis of additional alternatives and alignments not currently proposed for consideration in
the Draft EIS/EIR. It is important to note that the Harbor Subdivision AA already examined
and screened out some of these suggested alternatives, such as Hawthorne Boulevard.
Please refer to the AA Report for further detail in terms of the identification, screening and
selection of project alternatives examined in the Draft EIS/EIR. The Draft EIS/EIR will briefly
summarize the alternatives previously considered and eliminated in the Harbor Subdivision
AA, as necessary. Other alternatives that are not reasonable or which do not meet the project
purpose and need will not be evaluated further. Alternatives proposed during the Scoping
process that do have merit will be analyzed further in the Draft EIS/EIR.
3.6.3. Comments Related to Potential Impacts

The majority of comments received regarding potential impacts were related to traffic congestion and circulation, community and neighborhood impacts, noise and vibration and safety and security. These potential impacts will be analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR. Insights into how a particular alternative may affect traffic, accessibility and mobility, neighborhoods and safety throughout the project corridor are a valuable result of the Scoping process. Specific comments on each potential impact will be used to guide the analysis of the alternatives.
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