





LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (METRO)

EASTSIDE TRANSIT CORRIDOR PHASE 2

OUTREACH REPORT FROM NOVEMBER 2007 EARLY SCOPING MEETINGS

FINAL REPORT

SUBMITTED BY:

 _____
ARELLANO ~ ASSOCIATES
_____ 

MARCH 31, 2008



LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (METRO)

EASTSIDE TRANSIT CORRIDOR PHASE 2

OUTREACH REPORT FROM NOVEMBER
2007 EARLY SCOPING MEETINGS

FINAL REPORT

SUBMITTED BY:



MARCH 31, 2008



EASTSIDE TRANSIT CORRIDOR PHASE 2 PROJECT

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 1 |
| II. INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| III. EARLY SCOPING NOTIFICATION AND COMMUNICATION..... | 4 |
| ELECTED AND CITY BRIEFINGS | 5 |
| NOTICE OF PREPARATION | 6 |
| DIRECT MAIL..... | 6 |
| ELECTRONIC NOTIFICATION | 7 |
| WEBSITE | 7 |
| MEDIA | 8 |
| ROADSIDE BANNERS..... | 9 |
| PROJECT HELPLINE | 9 |
| IV. EARLY SCOPING DOCUMENTATION | 10 |
| SIGNAGE | 10 |
| FORMAT | 10 |
| ATTENDANCE | 10 |
| EARLY SCOPING MEETING MATERIALS | 11 |
| PHOTOGRAPHY | 12 |
| V. EARLY SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS | 12 |
| VIDEO SUMMARY | 12 |
| SUMMARY OF COMMENTS..... | 13 |
| AGENCY EARLY SCOPING MEETING..... | 13 |
| WHITTIER EARLY SCOPING MEETING..... | 13 |
| MONTEBELLO EARLY SCOPING MEETING..... | 14 |
| ROSEMEAD EARLY SCOPING MEETING | 15 |
| PICO RIVERA EARLY SCOPING MEETING | 16 |
| OTHER COMMENTS..... | 16 |
| TOTAL SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | 17 |
| VI. CONCLUSIONS..... | 18 |
| GENERAL IMPRESSIONS..... | 18 |
| SPECIFIC IMPRESSIONS | 19 |
| GENERAL REMARKS | 19 |

APPENDICES

EARLY SCOPING NOTIFICATION AND COMMUNICATION

| | |
|------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| APPENDIX A | STUDY AREA MAP |
| APPENDIX B | STAKEHOLDER DATABASE & MAILING TARGET AREA MAP |
| APPENDIX C | EARLY SCOPING MEETING NOTICE |
| APPENDIX D | EARLY SCOPING NOTICE OF PUBLICATION (NOP) |
| APPENDIX E..... | E-VITE COPY TEXT & E-MAIL LIST |
| APPENDIX F..... | WEBPOSTINGS |
| APPENDIX G | PROOF OF PUBLICATION IN LOCAL NEWSPAPERS |
| APPENDIX H..... | PRESS RELEASE |
| APPENDIX I..... | NEWSPAPER ARTICLES AND PUBLICATIONS |
| APPENDIX J..... | BANNERS |
| APPENDIX K..... | PROJECT AREA AGENCY BRIEFING MATRIX & SUMMARIES |
| APPENDIX L..... | HELPLINE |

EARLY SCOPING DOCUMENTATION

| | |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| APPENDIX M | DIRECTIONAL SIGNS |
| APPENDIX N | SIGN-IN SHEETS |
| APPENDIX O | EARLY SCOPING MEETING HANDOUTS <i>(PROJECT MAP, DIRECT MAIL PIECE, SPEAKER CARDS, TRANSLATION REQUEST SHEET, COMMENT SHEETS, EASTSIDE EXTENSION BROCHURE)</i> |
| APPENDIX P..... | POWERPOINT PRESENTATIONS (ENGLISH/SPANISH) |
| APPENDIX Q..... | EARLY SCOPING DISPLAY BOARDS |
| APPENDIX R..... | MEETING PHOTOGRAPHY |

EARLY SCOPING COMMENTS

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| APPENDIX S..... | EARLY SCOPING MEETING SUMMARY OF COMMENTS VIDEO |
| APPENDIX T..... | RESOURCE AGENCY MEETING NOVEMBER 8, 2007 <i>(SIGN IN SHEETS)</i> |
| APPENDIX U | WHITTIER EARLY SCOPING MEETING NOVEMBER 8, 2007 <i>(COURT REPORTER TRANSCRIPTS, SPEAKER CARDS, COMMENT SHEETS)</i> |
| APPENDIX V..... | MONTEBELLO EARLY SCOPING MEETING NOVEMBER 10, 2007 <i>(COURT REPORTER TRANSCRIPTS, SPEAKER CARDS, COMMENT SHEETS)</i> |
| APPENDIX W | ROSEMEAD EARLY SCOPING MEETING NOVEMBER 14, 2007 <i>(COURT REPORTER TRANSCRIPTS, SPEAKER CARDS, COMMENT SHEETS)</i> |
| APPENDIX X..... | PICO RIVERA EARLY SCOPING MEETING NOVEMBER 15, 2007 <i>(COURT REPORTER TRANSCRIPTS, SPEAKER CARDS, COMMENT SHEETS)</i> |
| APPENDIX Y..... | E-MAILS |
| APPENDIX Z | MAILED COMMENTS |
| APPENDIX AA | HELPLINE LOG |

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes the outreach activities and public input received for the Metro Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 early scoping period from November 1 – 30, 2007. This project considers transit alternatives that could connect cities located east of Los Angeles with the terminus of the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase 1 project currently under construction. The project study area extends east from Union Station in downtown Los Angeles to approximately three miles east of the State Route 605 freeway. The northern boundary is Interstate 10 and Interstate 5 is to the south. The project area is comprised of 14 jurisdictions including unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County, and the cities of Bell, Commerce, Downey, El Monte, South El Monte, Industry, Los Angeles, Montebello, Monterey Park, Pico Rivera, Rosemead, Santa Fe Springs and Whittier.

A total of five early scoping meetings were held between November 8 – 15, 2007, to inform the public and garner input for the Alternatives Analysis Study. Meetings were held at Metro and in the cities of Whittier, Montebello, Rosemead and Pico Rivera. Arellano Associates assisted Metro in the outreach activities needed to conduct and document the scoping meetings and public comments. The following activities were undertaken in preparation of the Early Scoping meetings:

- Compilation of a project database
- Briefings for elected officials and study area city briefings
- Early Scoping meeting notification, including:
 - Placement of legal notice in Federal Register
 - Mailing of invite brochures to 66,148 addresses
 - Emailing e-vite to 178 stakeholders
 - Placement of media advertisements in 17 publications
 - Coordination of webpage links with 14 corridor jurisdictions
 - Placement of five roadside banners along heavily traveled corridors
 - Creation of project helpline
- Preparation of meeting materials (English/Spanish), including:
 - Signage near meeting location directing participants to parking and meeting rooms
 - Development and preparation of meeting handouts:
 - Project map
 - Invitation brochure
 - Speaker cards
 - Comment cards
 - Phase I project brochure
 - Project display boards
 - PowerPoint presentation
- Preparation of video and photographic summary of meetings

The Early Scoping meetings yielded the following results:

- 224 participants attended five Early Scoping meetings
- 159 comments received, including 80 verbal and 79 written

- Comments received vastly support the project goals and provide strong direction for alignment considerations, including:
 - Whittier Boulevard as the preferred alignment with grade separation considerations due to limited right-of-way availability
 - SR-60 freeway and Washington Boulevard listed as strong secondary alternatives for consideration
 - Beverly Boulevard is the most noted street to avoid due to narrow right-of-way, established trees lining the boulevard and proximity to residents and small businesses
 - Light rail technology is the preferred transit mode
 - Grade separation is a significant issue on local streets due to high traffic volumes
 - Parking, safety, property values and congestion were the most discussed issues of concern

II. INTRODUCTION

In July 2007, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) initiated an Alternatives Analysis (AA) for the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2. This is one of five corridor studies that Metro is conducting in Los Angeles County. The goal of the Eastside Phase 2 project is to improve mobility by connecting the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension (Phase 1 under construction) to cities farther east of Los Angeles. The AA is the first step required in Federal New Starts funding process and will identify and narrow the possible alternatives, transit modes, and design criteria for the selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA).

The project study area extends east from Union Station in downtown Los Angeles to approximately three miles east of the State Route 605 freeway. The northern boundary is Interstate 10 and Interstate 5 is to the south (See Appendix A for project map). The project area is comprised of 14 jurisdictions including unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. The table below lists all of the corridor cities which are at least partially located within the project area.

Table 1 – Eastside Phase 2 Study Area Cities and Jurisdictions

| Cities/Jurisdictions |
|--------------------------|
| County of Los Angeles |
| City of Bell |
| City of Commerce |
| City of Downey |
| City of El Monte |
| City of South El Monte |
| City of Industry |
| City of Los Angeles |
| City of Montebello |
| City of Monterey Park |
| City of Pico Rivera |
| City of Rosemead |
| City of Santa Fe Springs |
| City of Whittier |

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) both allow for and encourage public participation during the environmental evaluation phase of any transit project. Therefore, early scoping meetings held for the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Project followed established federal and state standards.

The Federal Transit Authority (FTA) gave Metro approval to conduct Early Scoping meetings which initiated the 30 day public comment period from November 1 through November 30, 2007. One agency and four community Early Scoping meetings were conducted in November 2007. The following is a list of Early Scoping meetings:

Table 2 – Early Scoping Meetings

| Date | City | Location |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Thursday, Nov. 8, 2007 | Downtown Los Angeles | Metro Headquarters 1 Gateway Plaza Los Angeles, CA |
| Thursday, Nov. 8, 2007 | City of Whittier | Palm Park 5703 Palm Ave. Whittier, CA |
| Saturday, Nov. 10, 2007 | City of Montebello | Senior Center at City Park 115 South Taylor Ave. Montebello, CA |
| Wednesday, Nov. 14, 2007 | City of Rosemead | Potrero Heights Elementary School 8026 East Hill Dr. Rosemead, CA |
| Thursday, Nov. 15, 2007 | City of Pico Rivera | North Park Middle School 4450 Durfee Ave. Pico Rivera, CA |

These Early Scoping meetings provided the community an opportunity to review and comment on the scope of the AA study and proposed alternatives. Public input received will help refine alternatives that will be evaluated further in the formal scoping period, tentatively scheduled for Fall 2008.

The purpose of this report is to summarize and document the public outreach activities and input received for the Early Scoping period. This report is organized into four main sections, including:

- Early Scoping Notification and Communication
- Early Scoping Documentation
- Early Scoping Meeting Comments
- Conclusions

III. EARLY SCOPING NOTIFICATION AND COMMUNICATION

To encourage participation in the early scoping meetings, Metro utilized every opportunity and communication tool available to notify the public, including:

- Elected official and city briefings
- Legal notices
- Direct mail
- Electronic communication
- Media
- Roadside banners
- Project helpline

The following is a detailed account of the notification efforts made in support of the early scoping meetings:

Elected Official and City Briefings

Project briefings were held with elected officials and cities that represent the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 project area. Briefings were held with decision makers and key staff members to inform them of the purpose of the study, project background, scope and schedule as well as the dates for the Early Scoping meetings. A presentation was also made to provide an overview of the Alternatives Analysis Process, Federal New Start process and possibilities of alternatives including modes, alignment, configuration and station locations. In addition, participants were encouraged to attend the agency Early Scoping meeting and provide comments.

Discussions also took place regarding planned developments that should be considered in the AA study and the cities provided technical data needed to support the analysis.

The briefings also provided an opportunity for Metro to discuss the best approach for outreach in each jurisdiction. Suggestions were made for improving meeting notification such as advertising in local newspapers, needed translation services, roadside banners and connecting the cities website to the project website. The following table identifies all of the briefings held during and after the early scoping period (See Appendix B for detailed meeting record and summaries):

Table 3 – Early Scoping Elected Officials and City Briefings

| Meeting Date | Agency |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Wednesday, October 10, 2007 | Metro Board of Director’s staff - Claudette Moody for Board Chair Pam O’Connor |
| Wednesday, October 10, 2007 | Federal/State – Offices of US Senator Barbara Boxer, Offices of Congresswomen Grace Napolitano, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Hilda Solis and Office of Jose Huizar |
| Tuesday, October 16, 2007 | City of Downey - Gerald Caton, City Manager |
| Wednesday, October 17, 2007 | City of Commerce - Linda Kay Olivari, Acting City Manager, Bob Zarilli, Community Development Director, Danilo Baston, Planning Services Manager |
| Thursday, October 18, 2007 | City of Montebello - Randy Narramore, City Manager , Steve Huson, Fire Chief |
| Thursday, October 18, 2007 | City of Rosemead - Rey Alfonso, City Engineer, Matt Everling, Planning Services Manager, Chris Marcarello, Administrative Services Manager |

Table 3 – Early Scoping Elected Officials and City Briefings (Cont'd)

| Meeting Date | Agency |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Thursday, October 18, 2007 | City of Whittier - Nancy Mendez, Assistant City Manager, Fran Schields, Director of Community Services, Martin Brown, Management Analyst |
| Monday, October 22, 2007 | City of South El Monte - Anthony Ybarra, City Manager, Ron Kenny, Director of Community Services |
| Tuesday, October 23, 2007 | City of El Monte - James W. Mussenden, City Manager, Dante G. Hall, Assistant City Manager, Eugene Moy, Redevelopment Director, Deborah Moraza, Transportation Services Manager, Kev Tcharkhoutian, City Manager |
| Wednesday, October 24, 2007 | Office of Congresswoman Linda T. Sanchez - Patrick Rodriguez |
| Wednesday, October 24, 2007 | Montebello City Council |
| Friday, October 26, 2007 | City of Pico Rivera - Julia Gonzalez, Sr. Planner, Bob Spencer, Sr. Public Information Officer, Raymond Chavez, Sr. Coordinator |
| Monday, October 29, 2007 | City of Bell - Annette Peretz, Director of Community Services, Diana Maroquin, Supervisor of Education and Events, Luis Ramirez, Deputy City Engineer |
| Monday, October 29, 2007 | Office of Los Angeles County Supervisor Gloria Molina, First Supervisorial District – Nicole Englund, Sr. Transportation and Planning Deputy |
| Friday, November 2, 2007 | City of Monterey Park – Tung Nguyen, Transportation Manager, Michael Ho, Assistant City Engineer |
| Tuesday, November 6, 2007 | City of Santa Fe Springs - Don Jensen, Director of Public Works, Tom Lopez, Assistant Director of Public Works, Al Fuentes, Planning Consultant |
| December 5, 2007 | Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Quarterly Review Meeting– Carol Inge |
| Tuesday, December 11, 2007 | Gateway Council of Governments – Richard Powers, Executive Director, Karen Helt, Deputy Director for Bonnie Lowenthal |
| Monday, December 17, 2007 | Office of Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa – Jaime De La Vega, Deputy Mayor |

Notice of Preparation

Prior to engaging the public, Metro placed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) in the Federal Register on October 31, 2007 (See Appendix C). During this time, the NOP was also distributed to resource agencies and was available to the general public notifying them that an AA is being prepared along with the early scoping meeting locations, dates, times and where to send comments.

Direct Mail

A significant part of the notification of Early Scoping meetings was an invite brochure mailed to a large cross section of stakeholders. Metro developed a bilingual English/Spanish, full color tri-fold invitation brochure containing a project map, brief project background, meeting dates, times and locations for hard copy distribution (See Appendix D).

A total of 66,148 early scoping meeting invitation brochures were mailed the week of October 21, 2007. The mailing included elected officials, government agencies and cities, resource agencies, chambers of commerce, residents, businesses, churches, community based organizations, previous meeting attendees and project briefing attendees.

A list of 65,281 addresses was purchased by Metro and used to mail notices to residents and businesses located ¼ mile from the following corridors: State Route 60, Beverly Boulevard, Whittier Boulevard, Olympic Boulevard and Washington Boulevard; the entire area between Beverly Boulevard and Whittier Boulevard received a meeting notice. The following table summarizes the distribution of the invitation brochure (See Appendix E for detailed record of mailing databases):

Table 4 – Direct Mail Notification Summary

| Distribution Date | Source | # Records |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| Week of October 21, 2007 | Direct Mailer (USPS) | 65,281 |
| Week of October 21, 2007 | Stakeholder Database - Metro | 611 |
| Week of October 21, 2007 | Interested Party list -Metro | 174 |
| Week of October 21, 2007 | Resource Agency list - Metro | 82 |
| | Total Records | 66,148 |

In addition to the hard copy direct mail distribution, a stack of invitation brochures was distributed to project area cities for public counters and other distribution channels.

Electronic Notification

In addition to the direct mail notification, Metro produced a bilingual English/Spanish electronic “e-vite” notice detailing the meeting dates, times and locations as well as a brief project background. The electronic notice was e-mailed to database contacts that had previously provided their e-mail address to Metro. Coordination was also made with all project city chambers of commerce to distribute the e-vite to their member list. The following table details the date and number of e-vite notices sent by e-mail (See Appendix F for a copy of the e-vite and e-mail list):

Table 5 – E-vite Notification Summary

| Source | Distribution Date | # Records |
|--------|--------------------------|------------|
| E-vite | Week of October 31, 2007 | 178 |
| | Total Records | 178 |

Website (www.metro.net/eastsidephase2)

Consistent with other Metro corridor studies, Metro Marketing produced a project webpage that was linked to the main Metro website. The project webpage provides information on upcoming meetings and other project details. The webpage address was added to all early scoping meeting notices, collateral materials and media releases. Corridor cities were also contacted to provide a direct link to the Metro

project webpage from their city websites (See Appendix G for a sample of the Metro project webpage and city links).

Media

Because of the project area size and varied demographics, a variety of local and regional daily and weekly newspapers were chosen for placement of meeting advertisements and press releases. The following summarizes the media coverage for the Early Scoping period:

Newspaper Advertisements

Metro created an Early Scoping meeting notification ad to place in selected local publications. These publications were chosen based on their circulation, cultural representation and popularity. The following table lists the publications that ads were placed in and the publishing dates. (See Appendix H for detailed media information and proof of publication):

Table 6 – Newspaper Advertisement Summary

| Publish Date | Publication | Circulation | Ad Size |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|
| Wednesday, Oct. 31 | San Gabriel Valley Tribune Publication Group and San Gabriel Valley Tribune | 45,000 | Half Page |
| Wednesday, Oct. 31 | Whittier Daily News | 17,000 | Half Page |
| Wednesday, Oct. 31 | Pasadena Star | 37,000 | Half Page |
| Thursday, Nov. 1 | Quaker Campus, Whittier College | Campus wide | Full Page |
| Thursday, Nov. 1 | El Paisano, Rio Hondo College | Campus wide | Full Page |
| Thursday, Nov. 1 | Eastside Sun | 24,000 | Mini Page |
| Thursday, Nov. 1 | Northeast Sun | 18,500 | Mini Page |
| Thursday, Nov. 1 | Mexican American Sun | 16,00 | Mini Page |
| Thursday, Nov. 1 | Monterey Park Comet | 8,000 | Mini Page |
| Thursday, Nov. 1 | Montebello Comet | 16,000 | Mini Page |
| Thursday, Nov. 1 | City Terrace Comet | 3,000 | Mini Page |
| Thursday, Nov. 1 | ELA Brooklyn-Belvedere Comet | 3,000 | Mini Page |
| Thursday, Nov. 1 | Wyvernwood Chronicle | 2,000 | Mini Page |
| Thursday, Nov. 1 | Commerce Comet | 6,500 | Mini Page |
| Tuesday, Nov. 6 | Chinese Daily News | 66,000 | Half Page |
| Wednesday, Nov. 7 | El Clasificado | 235,000 | Full Page |
| Wednesday, Nov. 7 | Campus News, ELA College | Campus wide | Full Page |

Each of the ads listed the dates, times and locations of the four community meetings. Placement and timing of the ads varied based on the scoping meeting most directly connected to the papers circulation and frequency of the newspaper.

Earned Media

In addition to placing advertisements in local and regional newspapers, Metro sent a project press release to newspapers that cover the project area. As a result, a number of articles were published during the scoping period (Please see Appendix I).

Table 7 – Newspaper Articles and Other Media

| Publish Date | Publication |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| October 2007 | California Examiner |
| Monday, Oct. 29 | Impacto USA |
| Thursday, Nov. 1 | Downey/Norwalk/Paramount/Bellflower |
| Saturday, Nov. 3 | WhittierDailyNews.com |
| Monday, Nov. 5 | Whittier Daily News |
| Monday, Nov. 5 | Pasadena Star-News |
| Monday, Nov. 5 | San Gabriel Valley Tribune |
| November 2008 | SanGabrielTribune.com |
| Monday, Nov. 8 | Whittier Daily News |
| Friday, Nov. 9 | PasadenaStarNews.com |
| Tuesday, Nov.13 | San Diego Union Tribune |
| Saturday, Nov.17 | LA Opinion |
| Monday, Nov. 19 | Search DowntownLA.com |
| Wednesday, Nov. 28 | WhittierDailyNews.com |

Roadside Banners

To increase meeting awareness, Metro coordinated with project cities and placed five roadside banners along heavily traveled corridors within the project area. Below are the cities and street locations where the banners were placed (See Appendix J for photographs of banners):

- Los Angeles - Eastside Phase 1 Terminus (Atlantic/Pomona)
- Pico Rivera - Pico Park on Beverly Boulevard
- Los Angeles County – Offices for Supervisorial Districts 1 and 4
- Whittier - Uptown Whittier on Greenleaf Avenue
- Montebello – City Park on Whittier Boulevard

Project Helpline

Prior to the Early Scoping period, a project helpline was established at (213) 922-3012, to provide stakeholders with project information, meeting dates and the opportunity to ask questions or leave comments. (See Appendix K for helpline text).

Telephone messages are retrieved twice daily and all calls are responded to within a 24-hour period. A matrix summarizing the helpline calls was prepared monthly, including the date and time of the telephone call, the name, address, telephone number and the message of the caller, the action or response taken and who acted upon the call. Comments received during the Early Scoping period were documented together with other comments received and are discussed below.

IV. EARLY SCOPING DOCUMENTATION

As shown in Table 2 a total of five Early Scoping meetings were held between November 8 and 15, along with an Agency meeting held November 8, 2007 from 10 a.m. to 12 p.m. at Metro headquarters in downtown Los Angeles. Meeting locations were selected near key corridors to maximize attendance and community input.

Signage

To encourage participation and facilitate meeting access, directional signs were placed in strategic areas at each meeting location to direct participants to parking areas and meeting rooms (See Appendix L).

Format

The format of the Early Scoping meetings was a combination of an open house session, followed by a presentation and comment period. During the open house session, participants had the opportunity to view project display boards and ask questions or raise concerns directly to project team members stationed around the room. After the open house session, a PowerPoint presentation was made by Metro Project Manager, Kimberly Yu and Outreach Project Manager, David Monks. The presentation provided a project overview and discussion of transit modes for consideration. Participants were then encouraged to make a public comment either verbally or in writing. People wanting to speak were asked to fill out a speaker card and were given two minutes to comment on the project. All verbal comments were documented by a certified court reporter as well as a videographer.

Court certified interpreters were available at the four meetings to provide Spanish simultaneous translation. A Chinese interpreter was also available at the Rosemead early scoping meeting. Participants wishing to listen to the proceedings in Spanish or Chinese were provided audio headsets.

Attendance

A total of 224 people signed in at the five meetings representing a good cross-section of the project area communities. Participation in verbal comments and dialogue was substantial. Many people were well versed with the issues and opportunities associated with the proposed Metro Gold Line Eastside Phase 2 project. The following table summarizes attendance at each meeting (See Appendix M for copies of sign-in sheets):

Table 8 – Early Scoping Meeting Attendance by City/Jurisdiction

| Meeting | Attendance |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Agency Meeting, November 8, 2007 – Metro Headquarters | 10 |
| Whittier Early Scoping Meeting - November 8, 2007 | 72 |
| Montebello Early Scoping Meeting - November 10, 2007 | 69 |
| Rosemead Early Scoping Meeting - November 14, 2007 | 13 |
| Pico Rivera Early Scoping Meeting - November 15, 2007 | 60 |
| Total | 224 |

Early Scoping Meeting Materials

A variety of materials were produced for the Early Scoping meetings, including:

Handouts

In an effort to provide clear, complete and concise project information that also educates the public on the purpose of the meeting, a comprehensive set of (English/Spanish) handout materials was provided to meeting attendees at sign-in. These materials included the following: (See Appendix N for samples of early scoping meeting materials):

- Project map - showing project area
- Invitation brochure – including times and locations of all early scoping meetings, brief project overview, project helpline number and project website
- Speaker cards – for individuals who wished to speak during the “formal” comment period
- Comment card – for individuals choosing to provide written comments
- Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase I brochure – Detailing project overview, station locations and technology

The PowerPoint presentation was also translated into Spanish and made available upon request. A Translation of Materials request form was also made available for participants who did not speak English and was translated into five other languages including: Spanish, Vietnamese, Mandarin Chinese, Cantonese Chinese and Armenian. This form provided a mechanism for non-English speaking participants to understand that project information and materials would be made available upon request.

Project Boards

Bilingual (English/Spanish) project display boards were presented at all scoping meetings. Display boards were helpful during the open house session and at the end of the meeting when participants were encouraged to wander around the room and engage Metro and consultant staff on issues and questions pertaining to them. The following boards were used: (See Appendix O for copy of display boards):

- Purpose of Meeting
- Project Background
- Project Process and Schedule
- Project Alternatives
- Technology Choices

PowerPoint Presentation

A comprehensive PowerPoint presentation was made at all early scoping meetings, providing Metro staff an opportunity to outline the project goals and explain the process to move a project through planning into funding. The presentation also provided an overview of the key elements of this Alternatives Analysis study, including (See Appendix P for copy of English/Spanish PowerPoint presentation):

- Project study area

- Phase 1 status
- Metro system map
- Project development process
- Alternatives Analysis process, schedule and milestones
- Project considerations
- Transit modes and configurations
- Public involvement

Photography

Metro took pictures at each of the five Early Scoping meetings to document the meetings candid moments at various stages of the meeting (See Appendix Q for a complete set of images).

V. EARLY SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

During the early scoping period for the Eastside Metro Gold Line Phase 2 project, which extended from November 1 – 30, 2007, Metro provided different options for the public to learn about the project and provide input. Cities, agencies, businesses and the general public were able to provide comments and input as follows:

- Verbal – Early scoping meeting attendees had the opportunity to provide verbal comments during the public comment session or by leaving a message on the project helpline.
- Written – Comment cards were provided at early scoping meetings for written comments and participants were encouraged to submit letters if they preferred subsequent to the meetings.
- E-mail – Collateral materials also encouraged the public to submit comments via e-mail to yuki@metro.net.

A total of 159 comments were received during the comment period that ended November 30, 2007. All public comments received were documented for review and are being considered by Metro and technical consultant staff to assist in the development of project alternatives that represent the interests of the general public.

Video Summary

A videographer attended each of the early scoping meetings to video tape the presentation and verbal comments. The video record of the meetings provides a good depiction of the emotional input from the participants that written or transcribed comments can not provide. The video recordings were edited to provide a summary of the meeting input (See Appendix R for a DVD copy of the video summary).

Summary of Comments

Agency Early Scoping Meeting Wednesday, November 8, 2007, 10:00 a.m.

Table 9 – Meeting Attendance and Comments

| Attendance | Agency Letters | Verbal Comments |
|------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 10 | 10 | 0 |

The agency early scoping meeting was attended by 10 staff members from various agencies representing the project area (See Appendix S). During the comment period, 10 agency letters were received from a variety of agencies, including cities, environmental groups and a hospital. The following table summarizes the input received from agencies:

Table 10 – Agency Comments Summary

| Routes | Modes | Stations/P&R | Configuration | Issues |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Whittier Yes – 1 Beverly Yes – 1 Washington Yes - 1 60 Fwy Yes - 7 Any route - 1 | None | Whittier Narrows – 3 South El Monte Transit Village – 1 El Monte Transit Station – 1 Any alternative - 1 | None | Safety – 1 Congestion – 1 Accidents - 1 |

There was unanimous support for the project from all agency letters received. In addition to offering their support, agencies included suggestions for routes and station locations. Most of the agencies preferred the State Route 60 freeway alignment for several reasons including access to Whittier Narrows (open-space), future development at South El Monte Transit Village and El Monte Transit Station. Other major arterials mentioned included Whittier, Beverly and Washington Boulevards. However, concern over increased congestion caused by the proposed transit improvement was also raised by the agencies.

Whittier Early Scoping Meeting Wednesday, November 8, 2007, 6:30 p.m.

Table 11 – Whittier Attendance and Comments

| Attendance | Comment Cards | Verbal Comments |
|------------|---------------|-----------------|
| 72 | 12 | 26 |

The Early Scoping meeting in Whittier was the best attended of the four community based meetings, approximately 72 people sign-in. A total of 38 comments were documented from the meeting, 26 verbal and 12 written. Overall sentiment from the meeting was very positive and supportive of the project extending into the City of Whittier. The following table summarizes the input received from the Whittier meeting participants (See Appendix T for court reporter transcripts, speaker cards and comments sheets):

Table 12 – Whittier Comment Summary

| Routes | Modes | Stations/P&R | Configuration | Issues |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| Lambert – 2 | LRT Yes – 13 | Whittier and Hadley – 2 | Subway – 4 | Property values – 3 |
| El Monte Busway – 1 | LRT No – 1 | Philadelphia and | Elevated – 1 | Graffiti – 1 |
| Garfield – 2 | BRT Yes - 1 | Greenleaf – 1 | | Crime – 1 |
| 605 Fwy - 3 | BRT No - 5 | Town Center – 1 | | Safety – 1 |
| Atlantic – 2 | Streetcar Yes – 1 | 605 FWY - 1 | | Noise – 3 |
| Whittier Yes - 19 | Metro Rapid bus - 1 | Presbyterian Hospital – 1 | | TOD – 2 |
| Whittier No – 6 | | Whittwood Town Ctr. – 1 | | Cost – 2 |
| Beverly Yes – 9 | | POP Mansion – 1 | | Trees on |
| Beverly No – 15 | | Fred C. Nellis (potential | | Beverly – 6 |
| 60 Fwy Yes - 1 | | transit center) – 1 | | Parking – 2 |
| 60 Fwy No - 3 | | Greenway trail – 1 | | Construction |
| UP ROW - 5 | | Beverly/Norwalk - 1 | | Impacts -1 |
| Washington Yes – 15 | | | | |
| Washington No - 1 | | | | |
| Olympic – 3 | | | | |

Most of the comments support additional transit services east of East Los Angeles. However, a number of participants were very adamant that Metro should avoid Beverly Boulevard in Whittier. The three most frequent comments were “Yes” to Whittier Boulevard, “No” to Beverly Boulevard and “Yes” to Washington Boulevard as an alternative to Whittier Boulevard. Participant at the Whittier meeting also had consensus in regards to station location and transit mode; an underground light rail train with a station at Uptown Whittier was consistently cited. Other station locations mentioned, included Presbyterian Hospital and Whittwood Town Center. The concern raised most often was protection of the large pine trees on Beverly Boulevard. Participants felt the trees have built a beautiful entryway to the City and want to protect that section of Beverly Boulevard. Other concerns mentioned were noise and the possible decrease of property values as a result of the project.

Montebello Early Scoping Meeting
 Saturday, November 12, 2007, 9:00 a.m.

Table 13 – Montebello Attendance and Comments

| Attendance | Comment Cards | Verbal Comments |
|------------|---------------|-----------------|
| 69 | 17 | 19 |

The early scoping meeting in Montebello was held on a Saturday, to allow families and members of the public with late work hours to attend a day-time weekend meeting. The meeting was well attended with approximately 69 participants signed-in. A total of 36 comments were received, 19 participants provided verbal comments and 17 submitted written comments. The following table summarizes the input received from the Montebello meeting participants (See Appendix U for court reporter transcripts, speaker cards and comments sheets):

Table 14 - Montebello Comments Summary

| Routes | Modes | Stations/P&R | Configuration | Issues |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5 Fwy - 1 Garfield - 1 Pomona to Paramount - 2 Atlantic - 1 Whittier Yes - 8 Whittier No - 9 Beverly No - 12 60 Fwy Yes - 18 60 Fwy No - 3 Washington Yes - 5 Olympic - 3 | LRT Yes - 4 LRT No - 1 BRT No - 1 Streetcar Yes - 2 Monorail - 2 Bus - 1 | Whittier Narrows - 1 Montebello Town Center - 5 Montebello Metrolink Station - 1 605 and Beverly - 1 Rio Hondo College - 1 Downtown Whittier - 1 | At grade - 1 Subway - 11 Elevated - 1 | Business impacts - 1 Parking - 2 Property values - 2 Crime - 1 Transients - 1 Congestion - 1 Graffiti - 2 Construction - 1 Incentives - 1 |

Most of the comments reflect strong support for the project, however, some residents seem to be confused between light rail and heavy rail. Montebello participants strongly supported a light rail extension along the State Route 60 freeway with a station stop at the Montebello Town Center. However, for any alignment south of the freeway that traversed through the middle of Montebello, participants strongly recommended undergrounding the system to avoid the heavy congested arterials of Beverly, Whittier and Washington Boulevards. Concerns raised by the public included a wide range of issues from decreasing property values to businesses impacts on Beverly Boulevard.

Rosemead Early Scoping Meeting
Wednesday, November 14, 2007, 6:30 p.m.

Table 15 – Rosemead Attendance and Comments

| Attendance | Comment Cards | Verbal Comments |
|------------|---------------|-----------------|
| 13 | 2 | 5 |

The Rosemead early scoping meeting was lightly attended, with 13 members of the public signed-in. A total of seven comments were received including five verbal and two written comments. All the public comments received were in favor of the proposed project. The following table summarizes the input received from the Rosemead meeting participants (See Appendix V for court reporter transcripts, speaker cards and comments sheets):

Table 16 - Rosemead Comment Summary

| Routes | Modes | Stations/P&R | Configuration | Issues |
|----------------|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 60 Fwy Yes - 4 | LRT Yes - 3 | Same exits as 60 Fwy - 1 Whittier Narrows Rec area - 2 Future shopping area of 60 Fwy - 1 | Elevated - 1 | North/South connection - 1 Parking - 1 |

Preferences in the Rosemead community were a unanimous support for a light rail system along the State Route 60 freeway. There was also discussion of the Whittier

Narrows Recreation Area as a popular destination for a station stop, allowing communities to access open space.

Pico Rivera Early Scoping Meeting
Thursday, November 15, 2007, 6:30 p.m.

Table 17 –Pico Rivera Attendance and Comments

| Attendance | Comment Cards | Verbal Comments |
|------------|---------------|-----------------|
| 60 | 10 | 30 |

The early scoping meeting in Pico Rivera was held at North Park Middle School, on Beverly Boulevard. Approximately 60 members of the community attended the meeting and a total of 40 comments were received 30 verbal and 10 written. The comment period at the Pico Rivera meeting was followed by an impromptu question and answer period that was recorded by the court reporter, transcribed and is reflected here. The general consensus of the meeting was supportive. The following table summarizes the input received from the Pico Rivera meeting participants (See Appendix W for court reporter transcripts, speaker cards and comments sheets):

Table 18 – Pico Rivera Comment Summary

| Routes | Modes | Stations/P&R | Configuration | Issues |
|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| UP ROW – 1 | LRT Yes – 8 | Washington/Rosemead – 1 | Elevated – 5 | Safety – 4 |
| Atlantic – 2 | BRT No - 2 | Beverly/Rosemead – 1 | Subway – 3 | Congestion – 4 |
| Rosemead - 2 | Metro Rapid bus - 1 | Whittier/Rosemead – 1 | | TOD – 1 |
| Whittier Yes - 7 | Streetcar Yes – 1 | Santa Fe Springs - 2 | | Washington geo – 2 |
| Whittier No – 1 | Streetcar No – 1 | | | ROW acquisition – 1 |
| Beverly Yes – 2 | | | | Cost – 3 |
| Beverly No - 3 | | | | Decision process – 1 |
| 60 Fwy Yes – 5 | | | | Performance – 1 |
| 60 Fwy No - 1 | | | | Construction Impacts – 2 |
| Washington Yes - 5 | | | | Trees - 1 |
| Washington No – 2 | | | | |

The participant comments from the Pico Rivera meeting reflect strong support for Whittier Boulevard and Washington Boulevard alignments as well as consensus to protect Beverly Boulevard because of the proximity of residential communities and the large established pine trees fronting the street. The participants also voiced their support for an elevated light rail system, citing safety concerns along with increased traffic congestion and the high cost of the system.

Other Comments

E-mailed comments

A total of 26 comments were received via electronic mail, with an overwhelming majority supporting a light rail system extension (See Appendix X). The two most popular alignments mentioned were Whittier and Beverly Boulevards. General concerns mentioned include right-of-way impacts, financial impacts to the cities in project area and lane reduction impacts. Some of the e-mail comments submitted

were sent electronically to ensure they were added to the project database as well as to identify preferences. The table below summarizes the e-mail comments received:

Table 19 – E-mail Comment Summary

| Routes | Modes | Stations/P&R | Configuration | Issues |
|------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| Atlantic – 4 | LRT Yes – 4 | Atlantic and Beverly – 1 | | Trees – 1 |
| Whittier Yes - 6 | LRT No - 1 | Atlantic and Whittier – 2 | | Right-of-way – 1 |
| Whittier No – 1 | BRT Yes - 1 | Whittier and Garfield – 2 | | Displacements -1 |
| Beverly Yes – 5 | BRT No - 1 | Whittier and Montebello Blvd. – 2 | | Lane reduction – 1 |
| Beverly No – 4 | Streetcar - 1 | Whittier and Paramount – 2 | | |
| 60 Fwy No - 3 | | Whittier and Rosemead – 2 | | |
| Greenway - 3 | | Whittier and Norwalk – 2 | | |
| Washington – 2 | | Whittier and Hadley – 2 | | |
| Garfield - 1 | | Philadelphia and Greenleaf – 1 | | |
| | | Whittier Narrows – 1 | | |
| | | Beverly and 605 – 1 | | |
| | | Whittier and Gerhart – 1 | | |
| | | Commerce Center – 1 | | |

Mailed comments

All comments mailed to Metro are compiled with the appropriate meeting or agency category listed above (See Appendix Y).

Helpline Comments

Table 20 – Helpline Comments Summary

| Routes | Modes | Stations/P&R | Configuration | Issues |
|----------------|-------|------------------------|---------------|--------|
| Beverly No – 1 | None | Montebello Golf Course | None | None |
| 60 Fwy Yes – 1 | | | | |

A total of two comments were left as messages on the project helpline (See Appendix Z). The comments were very short, one of the callers supported the State Route 60 freeway with a station stop at the Montebello Golf Course and the second caller expressed their opposition to an alignment on Beverly Boulevard.

Table 21 – Total Summary of Comments

| Attendance | Comment /Letters | Verbal Comments |
|------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 224 | 159 | 80 |

Public participation during the early scoping period for the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 was very good. A total of 224 members of the public and agency representatives signed-in at one of the five early scoping meetings. During the scoping period, 159 comments were received, including 80 verbal comments and 79 written. A vast majority of the input indicated strong support for the project and the AA process. The following table summarizes all the input received during the early scoping period:

Table 22– Comments Summary Totals

| Routes | Modes | Stations/P&R | Configuration | Issues |
|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| Whittier Yes – 41 | LRT Yes – 32 | N/A | At grade – 1 | Parking – 5 |
| Whittier No – 6 | LRT No – 3 | | Subway – 18 | Safety - 5 |
| Beverly Yes – 17 | BRT Yes - 2 | | Elevated - 8 | Property values – 4 |
| Beverly No – 35 | BRT No - 9 | | | Trees on Beverly - 4 |
| 60 Fwy Yes - 31 | Streetcar Yes– 5 | | | Congestion – 4 |
| 60 Fwy No - 15 | Streetcar No - 1 | | | Graffiti – 3 |
| Washington Yes – 28 | Metro Rapid bus - 2 | | | TOD - 3 |
| Washington No - 3 | Monorail – 2 | | | Cost - 3 |
| Atlantic – 9 | Bus - 1 | | | Crime – 2 |
| UP ROW – 6 | | | | Washington geo – 2 |
| Garfield - 4 | | | | ROW takes – 1 |
| 605 Fwy - 4 | | | | Noise - 1 |
| Greenway – 3 | | | | Decision process – 1 |
| Olympic – 3 | | | | Performance – 1 |
| Pomona to Paramount - 2 | | | | North/South Connection – 1 |
| Rosemead - 2 | | | | Business impacts – 1 |
| Lambert – 2 | | | | Transients – 1 |
| El Monte Busway – 1 | | | | Construction – 1 |
| 5 Fwy – 1 | | | | Incentives – 1 |
| Any route - 1 | | | | |

The most suggested alignment was Whittier Boulevard, conversely, the most rejected alignment was Beverly Boulevard. Washington and SR-60 freeway also showed strong support as alternatives to Whittier Boulevard. Light rail was the preferred mode of transit; however, it was almost unanimously suggested a dedicated travel way to avoid congestion and improve system performance.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The five early scoping meetings for the Metro Gold Line Eastside Phase 2 project were very well received by the general public. Together with the input received from the elected officials and city briefings, Metro received numerous verbal and written comments that will be invaluable to the technical team for their use in determining an appropriate set of project alternatives. This evaluation of alternatives will continue, with more public input and refinement needed to reduce the alternatives into a smaller set or the selection of a single locally preferred alternative to take forward to the Metro Board later in 2008.

General Impressions

- Participants are generally very knowledgeable about the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension and the economic and mobility benefits a potential extension farther east could provide.
- The vast majority of participants are supportive of the AA process and the potential for connecting to the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase I project, which is under construction.
- Many of the residents cited proximity to downtown Los Angeles as a reason for moving into the project area, however, they also cited the problem of ever increasing congestion that continues to delay their commute.
- Many people suggested tours of the existing Gold Line to better understand light rail technology and how it is best incorporated into a community.

Specific Impressions

- The City of Whittier and specifically uptown Whittier are accepted as a desirable destination for a project terminus.
- Whittier Boulevard is the street most favored by participants for an extension east; however, it is also recognized as a highly traveled street that has limited right-of-way availability.
- A Beverly alignment through Whittier is opposed by residents who are concerned about historic pine trees that line the corridor.
- SR-60 and Washington are two strong secondary corridors identified by participants for consideration.
- Cities along SR-60 are very supportive of using the freeway corridor into South El Monte.
- The out of service UP right-of-way in the City of Whittier should be considered for use.
- Light rail technology is by far the mode of choice preferred by participants.
- Bus rapid transit was specifically pointed out as a technology that would not work due to the comparative slow travel times going east/west.
- A dedicated travel way was almost universally suggested by the participants to avoid congestion impacts and improve system performance.
- Subway was the most suggested configuration.
- Parking, safety, property values, trees on Beverly Boulevard and congestion were the most discussed issues regarding the potential Phase I extension east.

General Remarks

In general, the major east/west arterials that traverse through the project area present the only viable alternative corridors. Further technical analysis needs to be done to assess the viability of public input and preferences. Political support from corridor cities will also become increasingly important in future decisions on corridor alignments.