

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 03/04/18 | Project Email | Are you planning to charge people to use Express Lanes on the 405 between the 10 and the 101? |
| 04/20/18 | Project Email | I just did the survey online that I got in my email. The last question asked me about which community I use the 405 corridor to reach, and I assumed I could enter more than one choice, but after clicking on one response option it kicked me to the end. The 405 corridor, for myself and for a lot of other people I know who live in the Valley, is sometimes used sporadically, not as a regular commute option, so therefore sometimes I go to LAX and sometimes to a professional meeting, and sometimes to Century City and other times to Santa Monica. Therefore I found it difficult to answer some of the questions! Can I send the survey to other people who I know use the 405 or is it only for people who have subscribed to Metro emails? |
| 04/20/18 | Project Email | Please consider extending the Sepulveda transit project further north to the north end of the San Fernando Valley along Sepulveda and/or the 405. I know about the east valley line planned for Van Nuts Blvd. But we need something down the middle of the San Fernando Valley, and the 405/Sepulveda street is the dividing line. It also intersects the 118 and the 101, which is perfect for park and ride. At 6am, the 405 in the valley is already a parking lot. |
| 04/20/18 | Project Email | There is more than just the problem of traffic across the Sepulveda Pass. There is the fact that those of us who reside in the Granada Hills, Porter Ranch and other areas such as these in LA north-west have no way of going to LAX, Santa Monica, the Beach Cities, Downtown or anywhere on week-ends simply because MTA has reduced, rather than increased Rapid service. Case in point: for us, during the week, we have three choices only: (1) ever so slow Yellow buses westward toward the Orange Line, (2) getting to Reseda & Devonshire to catch the Rapid 744 that will take us to the Orange line to connect to the Red line, or to the 750 on Ventura also heading to the Red line, or (3) all the way eastward to Sepulveda to get to Rapid 734 to the Orange Line or Ventura, and eventually Westwood and down to Pico to the Expo Line for the beach - note: even on week days that is our ONLY route to Santa Monica!! On week-ends, when people do move, or wished they could move, you force them inside: (1) the westward service to the Orange Line is much reduced, (2) the 744 down Reseda does not run any longer since Jan 2018, (3) the eastward service to Sepulveda and the 734 is much reduced, and so is the 734. Bottom line: those of us who live in what has now become known as the Second Encino, I mean Granada Hills & Porter Ranch, are second rate LA citizens with respect to MTA: we have a shadow of a service on week days, which becomes nearly inexistent on week-ends. We have no dash service (the Northridge dash could easily be extended to serve Porter Ranch & Granada Hills), we have only 2 Rapid lines down to the Orange Line, Ventura Blvd and the Red Line, one of which does not run on week-ends, and we have only one means of crossing the Sepulveda Pass - Rapid 734. When, I ask, will MTA will consider the fact that for us, residents of the north-west of the city, there is a problem just as gargantuan as the Sepulveda Pass: namely, our daily movement in & through town, particularly on week-ends - we should not be made to stay prisoners in our own home, if, by choice or by force of health reasons, we must depend on MTA. Please consider the needs of your fellow residents between Rinaldi and Sesnon, and Topanga and Woodley, lest we continue to live as outcasts of the LA metro & bus system. |
| 04/25/18 | Project Email | I hope you are well. Our team is designing an apartment complex on Sepulveda Blvd, and it is vital to our project to know what type of transportation system Metro is planning for the Sepulveda project. Whether it is a bus or light rail, we would appreciate any details about the plan. Also, we need the specific location where the transit system will begin in the valley. This information will only be shared with the City of Los Angeles so that we are eligible for transit oriented project incentives. |
| 04/27/18 | Project Email | I use it to visit my son and his family. I clicked LAX because on a rare occasion I do use it for that. |
| 04/28/18 | Project Email | How about a rail line right down the middle of the 405? Should have been done when widening the 45, but will get people out of their cars. |
| 04/28/18 | Project Email | Why has there not been priority give to rail over/through the corridor. It is a nightmare and getting worse. |
| 04/30/18 | Project Email | A project for transit to be completed in 2035!?? That's about as backwards as continuing to build freeways was- and is- in Los Angeles. We can't even fully know what transportation will look like in almost twenty years. I would neither vote for this, nor support it financially. |
| 04/30/18 | Project Email | How many billions of dollars were wasted widening the 405? What did it accomplish? Traveling on as I do I see NO change what so ever. There was NO improvement yet billion were spent. Now you're going to send billions more. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 04/30/18 | Project Email | Not to sound too goofy, but you might get better buy in from the Mayor of Los Angeles by seriously considering an elevated rail project (e.g. a monorail down the 405). Plus I'm sure tourists would appreciate being able to get a good view on their ride. |
| 05/01/18 | Project Email | I just ask that you and Metro please do not forget about bicycles when planning the Sepulveda pass. There are currently 0 ways to get to the valley. Although I know the argument that it is not a heavily used path, but first, that is because there is no path, and second, shouldn't there be a path option of greater than 0? I counted 200 north / south roads from Santa Monica to Downtown LA, but zero bike lanes except for a few disconnected spots, but even those are shockingly absent. I am a proponent of the "Bicycle 405: from Torrance to the Valley". Imagine if we had a commuter option along the 405 or Sepulveda. It is doable. I looked into it and have support from the Bel Air Beverly Crest Homeowners Association and have discussed it with Paul Koretz via his sustainability officer and he liked the idea as well. My message is simple and I know you agree, it's one thing to say there is not enough demand, but until there is at least 1 option, this is not a valid reason not to do it. Any progress on a North / South bikeway would be a step forward for West Los Angeles. |
| 05/01/18 | Project Email | In addition to connecting to other Metro lines, this should also connect to Metrolink (and Amtrak), so that it can be reached from the Santa Clarita Valley, the Antelope Valleys, and Ventura County. One way to do this would be to make this new line and the proposed line that will run on Van Nuys Blvd (East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor) into a single line, which would run all the way from LAX to the San Fernando-Sylmar Metrolink station (with a connection to Amtrak at the Van Nuys train station). Or you might to have it stop at the Burbank Airport train stations, so that it can serve both airports (Lax and Burbank). Also, consider moving the Van Nuys FlyAway terminal (currently at Saticoy and Woodley) to wherever the new line will be, so that passengers can use the new line in one direction and the FlyAway bus in the other direction. |
| 05/03/18 | Project Email | Please add my name to your email list for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project study. |
| 05/05/18 | Project Email | I am a Westside resident and read your announcement seeking public input on the above project. I noticed that you are only seeking input on our travel habits. I believe, as your employers, funders and constituents who will be using and living with the project, the citizens of Los Angeles must be involved in the selection of the final project as well. As such, I would like to know how the selection process will be handled and what the scheme for public involvement in the selection will be. Thank you, for all the work you are doing on this enormous and sorely needed project. |
| 05/06/18 | Project Email | I grew up in LA (Valley). I now live in OC, but remain connected to LA with family and friends, and an attachment to my hometown. There is no doubt that tunneling through the pass will be an expensive project. There is probably only going to be one chance in 100 years to do it, so it's best to get the maximum benefit. And it seems to me that the maximum benefit would be a four track tunnel - two supporting heavy rail and two supporting conventional rail (overhead). The heavy rail need is obvious the purple line (or a branch) should turn north at Westwood to provide a single seat ride from the central/west Valley to Century City, Beverly Hills and on to Downtown. This line should go through the pass, stop at Ventura/Sepulveda and then make its way up either Van Nuys or Sepulveda. They key to this though is seamless (one seat) connection to Purple Line. The extra conventional rail tracks would be the "revolutionary" extra step. This would be for high speed commuter rail all the way to LAX. Think of an electrified Metrolink like up the 405, connected at minimum to the Moorpark line for NW Valley/ Ventura County commuters and airport customers. Now imagine that line branching east to connect to Palmdale line at Burbank Airport. Perhaps eventually even allowing the HSR if it's ever built to connect to LAX. This line could stop at Van Nuys (orange line) Westwood (Purple Line), West LA (expo line) and move on to LAX |
| 05/07/18 | Project Email | You really should think about not having that new subway route stop at the VA hospital. Continue tunneling so that the train can at reach the Galleria by the 101 Hollywood Freeway. Perhaps have a stop at the Getty and even Brentwood. I hate going to the valley during rush hour. |
| 05/10/18 | Project Email | When is the next schedule community meeting for the Sepulveda Pass Transit Project? Me and my entire family would like to attend, and we'd like to really press for this to be a subway and not a bus. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 05/16/18 | Project Email | I lived in the Valley most of my life and driven the 405 consistently throughout. In particular, I drove the 405 consistently between 2001 and 2003 attending Santa Monica College and between 2012 and 2014 for a job in Hawthorne. Traffic has consistently gotten worse even with the opening of the carpool lane connection around 2013 traffic is just as bad. In 2014 I moved to Koreatown while working in Hawthorne. I regularly took the Green line to the 110 Silver line bus to the Red line. I believe Metro Express Lanes with a bus line that connects to the Green Line, Expo Line, eventually the Purple Line and possibly to the San Fernando Metrolink is the way to go. Express Lane tolls are effective at regulating carpool lane users and the freeway bus line had much fewer stops than the Blue line (faster transit time). I'm not the biggest fan of tolls, but my wife and I carpooled from Koreatown to the South Bay to specifically avoid the Express Lane tolls and it made our commute much more manageable and allowed us to live very close to Downtown LA. |
| 05/21/18 | Project Email | I am sure you get a lot of emails like this- which makes one hesitant to suggest it. I'm a resistant of West Los Angeles area, and use transit quite a bit, and defiantly would like this to exist. I know the proposed idea is to build a light rail train from the valley to the west side through the Sepulveda pass-the obvious suggestion is on the 405, and this tricky. The major problem I understand is grade-its to high a grade to climb over the top of the pass at Mulholland Blvd- that's a problem- a secondary problem is that this is going to probably temporary close large sections of the freeway-probably not totally, but this not manageable-it is the major route and the Sepulveda Street can't take it. The solution would be to dig a tunnel at least Mulholland area, but that would get real awkward real fast-I suspect that's the solution your thinking about However I propose an alternative. Moraga canyon is about 1 mile east of Sepulveda. it starts its to narrow to do much of anything-for about 6 miles it , no houses no business, not much of anything. I believe most of the land is public property, or if not never developed. For About half the distance of the mountain range it just sits there between ledges. And while it does loose elevation from the valley it is well within acceptable margins for a train. My suggestion is this: The main rise of the pass starts is around the equivalent longitude of Castlewood St. have the train go along the 405 main route until about here- then dig a subway tunnel through this, underneath in a south east line underneath American University and Mulholland to Moraga. This is equivalent to about 3/4 of a mile, which is a long tunnel for light rail.(it would be nice to build a station at American University-and probably that's in some plan-I am not sure the feasibility of this-but you could do this as a proper subway station-though it would be about 400 feet from grade) But doable-and any kind of project along the line is going to involve a certain amount of tunneling. You then continue along the canyon for about 5 miles-miles that are probably easier and cheaper to build then along the 405 by quite long shot, especially considering transit delay issues . this continues until you reach the habitat portion of this. There are two options at this point:1 Continue along the canyon until it reaches the west side and joins 405 just before Sunset. Or 2. Cut an other tunnel through the hill back to the Sepulveda pass-this actually could be quite a bit shorter probably around 400 feet. 1 is obviously the easier and cheaper version, from a technical stand point-but it also goes through an area with several homes. Not that many actual homes in the scheme of things-less then 25 -but also very expensive homes and mansions. And while its probably possible to avoid most of the homes, but plenty The cost to buy them and pressure not to is something worth considering. It should be noted that most of these homes burned down in the recent wild fires last year-and if this got of the ground before rebuilding, would be a perfect opportunity- but this is not likely to actually happen in the long time frame of this project It would be a kicker to rebuild the homes then tear them down. But option 2 is not I think unfeasible. About a quarter mile before the home the ridge line separating the pass thins considerably-not for a particularly long section-bute enough to build a train under Getty view park. You can then continue down the 405 to where ever you terminus. (I also I suppose a 3rd option is to tunnel underneath the street of Moraga-but this seems extravagant) This is expensive-but this entire project is obviously quite so. But a tunnel is to a degree a tunnel-what I am proposing is a system similar to the Muni in San Francisco or the gold line in East LA. I do think it would be cheaper then building it down the actual 405, and from the stand point of a light rail, feasible. |
| 05/21/18 | Project Email | Of all these upcoming meetings, I will decide which one to attend. |
| 05/28/18 | Project Email | I really do think it's time that a metro link between the Valley and LAX/Westside should be constructed to help those of us in the Valley get to the airport in a timely matter. Also, my wife works in Beverly Hills, so she would be able to take this line as well. This would definitely ease traffic around the airport as well if more people used the metro. This would create a better image of the city when visitors from around the world come to visit this great city and not have to be stuck in traffic. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 05/29/18 | Project Email | For the planned improvements and additions to transit through the Sepulveda Pass: All for a light rail or subway line through the pass. Northbound I would hope the rail line extends all the way to Sylmar to allow transfers to Metro Link trains heading further north to the Antelope Valley. Southbound I also hope the rail line will extend to LAX as soon as possible. I would also hope the rail line will stop in Westwood near UCLA/ Regan Medical Center, connect with the Expo Line and have a stop in/near Playa Vista. In the valley I would hope the rail line would stop at the Sherman Oaks Galleria. I see there is funding to add express lanes to the 405. NO NO NO to this idea! I do not want my tax dollars to pay for lanes I would then have to pay to use. Even using them as a car pool would not be free (service fee on the transmitter) and that is not acceptable. I would prefer Metro studied changing the double yellow stripe to a single white stripe separating the HOV lanes from other traffic. Eliminating the in and out windows from the HOV lanes along the freeway will help reduce the congestion around these points and spread out the ingress and egress from these lanes. Also, I would like to see the bottle neck where the 405 south crosses under the 101 eliminated. |
| 05/31/18 | Project Email | I hear The Boring company is doing a test tunnel between the Green line and the Santa Monica line! That sounds like a fantastic idea! |
| 06/01/18 | Project Email | The Culver City bus email has June 12 as a Wednesday for the proud bird. They need to send out a corrected email. |
| 06/03/18 | Project Email | 1. Your survey is faulted and will produce biased results. By providing a limited preselected list of destinations for participants you have created a survey that will have skewed results. Even though you have the "other" option at the bottom a majority of people will just select one of your predefined options instead of go through the trouble of manually entering their specific destination. 2. Not taking away from the need for a mass transit line addressing congestion on the 405 through the Sepulveda Pass, I definitely think there is a valid need there. However I don't think this route addresses the needs of those that travel over the arteries (cold water canyon and laurel canyon). People that travel those arteries are trying to get to destinations in West Hollywood or the South East Valley, neither the Red Line or this proposed 405 line solve for these people's needs. If the extension of the Crenshaw line to West Hollywood is ever approved an extension of it under Laurel Canyon to the Orange Line in the valley would be something that starts to address the needs of the commuters of these canyon arteries. |
| 06/04/18 | Project Email | I just completed your survey. I commute from Reseda to Manhattan Beach daily. I do this on a motorcycle. You need to include that as an option on question 5. There are a lot of us out there. And if there were more, there would be less need for this exercise. |
| 06/05/18 | Project Email | Thank you for the follow up (finally: first in 10 years of my reaching out about this set of issues). If I understand correctly, between studies and construction, the timeline projects servicing us in about two decades (2035) - great! Until then, please consider a stop-gap emergency measure to service Angelenos in the Rinaldi and Sesnon, and Topanga and Woodley area with a couple of strategic Dash services linking them to the Orange Line, the 734 and the 744. That will be especially helpful to the 65+ years old population & the handicapped, who routinely must rely on MTA. |
| 06/06/18 | Project Email | I am a Westside resident and read your announcement seeking public input on the above project. noticed that you are only seeking input on our travel habits. I believe, as your employers, funders and constituents who will be using and living with the project, the citizens of Los Angeles must be involved in the selection of the final project as well. As such, I would like to know how the selection process will be handled and what the scheme for public involvement in the selection will be. |
| 06/06/18 | Project Email | When is the next schedule community meeting for the Sepulveda Pass Transit Project? Me and my entire family would like to attend, and we'd like to really press for this to be a subway and not a bus. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|---|
| 06/07/18 | Project Email | I think its really good news you are finally starting to study this metro link through the Sepulveda Pass but I am astonished at how long its taken to get to this beginning phase. Its decades overdue. Going through the freeway expansion my only thought was 'why are they not putting a rail system in here?' Coming from London whose complex system started in the early 19th century (nearly 200 years ago guys!!) I have always imagined what sort of a system would work in Los Angeles. My original concept was for two Ring systems (similar to London's Circle Line), one in the Valley and one stretching around Santa Monica - LAX-Long Beach-Downtown, linked through the Sepulveda and Cahuenga Passes and Laurel Canyon. This would create a system that connects destinations that people want to / need to connect with for work, recreation and tourism. I am very happy that the city is finally breaking free of the tyranny of the automobile. It will take a while and will also necessitate a fresh look at residential infrastructure, so PLEASE don't let this languish in interminable committees. This is beyond urgent. |
| 06/07/18 | Project Email | The study area needs to be extended to include the entire corridor from the Antelope Valley Metrolink on the north to Del Amo on the South. This is one corridor and needs to be served by one line. (Yes I know that the Board has approved a separate project for the San Fernando Valley, but this needs to be reopened and consolidated into this study). This project needs to serve both Metrolink lines, Van Nuys Civic Center, Sherman Oaks Galleria, UCLA Campus, Westwood Village/Purple Line, Westside Pavilion, Westfield Culver City, LAXCTA, South Bay employment center, and Del Amo. This project must use technology that is fast enough to compete with cars and high capacity enough to accommodate very high ridership. A LRT trolley running at 35 mph between red lights down the middle of the street is too slow to be of no use to anyone who has other options. Only a 100% grade separated heavy rail line (such as a subway) can serve major high-density activity centers with the speed, convenience and capacity to have an effect on reducing congestion and greenhouse gas emissions. |
| 06/07/18 | Project Email | You are not concentrating on the 405 freeway itself, which is the real traffic issue, how cars enter and make exits connected to bad traffic lights & street layouts, that causes the la traffic. If you are going to concentrate on different rail systems, make sure you build bridges over streets, people keep getting hurt. Learn from how japan builds their rail systems. |
| 06/07/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Bring more Metro Rapid Buses to ease traffic on the Sepulveda corridor. |
| 06/07/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Heavy rail Purple Line extension to and from WSAB. Metro Green Line extension from Torrance. Heavy rail Purple Line extensions to and from Artesia. |
| 06/07/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | I would want to see a station at Sherman Oaks Galleria, Westfield Pavilions, Westfield/Culver City, and LAX. |
| 06/07/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | It looks like a very good idea but I prefer light rail or the Metro bus transit system. Light rail transit is indeed my very first choice, because I live in the Carson area and I work part-time in the Torrance Area. As of right now, I'm giving you these samples for those proposed Metro bus and light rail transit connections to help me even better, including I go to a major Catholic church every Sunday with the help of Metro Blue Line, Metro Expo Line and Santa Monica Big Blue Bus Line 18- Round trip. Thank you all so very much |
| 06/07/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Of the 6 proposed concepts, 1, 3, 6, were my preferred alternatives. 1 is the best for long term if ESFV ever came up for discussion. 3 is the best for a one seat ride. 6 is great for a one seat ride from DTLA but suffers from a well of potential confusion for end route destination. I think the possible four stations should be for current and potential shopping and cultural areas, with mixed use. |
| 06/07/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Please pursue a full underground route with one point of access in the valley. I think if there are two points of access, the train will fill up at the first one and the people transferring from the Orange Line won't fit at rush hour. Also, please do not split trains on the two routes. Just use one route because the separate trains on Red and Purple lines are a pain and not well marked. Thank you for doing this! |
| 06/07/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Select HRT or LRT technology. However only prefer HRT because 1) faster train speed 2) grade separation. Also why was Linear Induction motor Technology never explored? This is the technology Vancouver Sky Train mostly uses. It can climb steeper grades and the train profile is smaller than LRT/HRT trains allowing for smaller tunnels costing less money to build. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 06/07/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Something for the real north - Santa Clarita/Palmdale areas as people move out for cheaper housing they need to go south for work. |
| 06/07/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Suggestions: seems like a heavy rail line along Sepulveda would be better for West and North valley residents and also better to handle future ridership and continue to LAX. I realize tunnel depth might be an issue but there is lots of traffic where Mulholland connects to the 405 in Sherman Oaks. A Skirball center or even a Getty Center station would help a lot to service all these people. |
| 06/07/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Yes, Please accelerate the project. I like the idea of the Purple line extension, heading north from the VA and South to the Bundy/Expo station. If that implies heavy rail/subway to the airport, that's fine. I would guess ridership would support it, especially if there were connections at LMU/Playa Vista I'm fine with LRT as well, although it would need to be completely grade separated. I don't have a preference of connection point in the valley. |
| 06/08/18 | Project Email | <p>You need to study an LRT/HRT Hybrid of Concept 4 and Concept 6. Hybrid part of concept 4 is: Branched LRT service from the Orange Line Sepulveda and Van Nuys Stations (and future Van Nuys LRT line), Service to UCLA and Wilshire /Westwood (potentially to expo, but my below detailed hybrid of concept 6 would cover the connection to expo) 10 trains per hour on each LRT branch, so Twenty trains per hour through the Sepulveda pass or a capacity of about 8000 people per hour, each direction, equivalent to four new lanes of traffic (each direction). That would be 24,000 people each 180 minute rush hour period, daily, each direction. With only 3 car LRT, higher capacity possible if 4 car LRT, but the Van Nuys LRT cannot be built with 4 car platforms, so 4 cars are out. That would provide a single seat service from Sylmar to the purple line. that would mean that commuters coming from Lancaster could access west LA with a single transfer from Metro Link to the Van Nuys line. And commuters coming from Ventura or even Santa Barbara could access west LA with a single transfer from metro link to the Van Nuys line. Access to LAX, Brentwood, and Century City would be furnished by a second transfer to the purple line at Wilshire Westwood. That creates a lot of transit alternatives for commuters that simply does not exist right now as there is virtually no transit service, Since MANY MANY of the commuters using the 405 are coming from the north and the west, the single seat ride on the Van Nuys line gives them many, many options and could seriously decrease car traffic on the 405. My Hybrid part of concept 6 is: Purple line extension from the VA to LAX. This would entail purple line stations at Wilshire / Barrington Santa Monica / Bundy Expo line Bundy station (Pico and Olympic) This would cover what metro's proposed phase one of the Sepulveda Pass project covers, This is how I would have my hybrid of concept 6 extend for Sepulveda pass phase 2 to LAX Centinela / Venice-Washington Centinela / Jefferson Sepulveda / Howard Hughes LAX!!! @ Aviation / 96th Century City / Prairie (Hollywood Park, new Inglewood stadium, the Forum) Note, Both the Sepulveda Tunnel between Westwood and the Orange Line, and my proposed purple line extension to LAX should be built in the style of San Jose BART extension and Barcelona line 9: As a Single Bore, 43 foot diameter tunnel. Both train tracks fit in the single tunnel, and the station platform fits in the tunnel too. The tunnel happens at a depth of 60 feet, which is below most building footings, and below all utilities, stations are excavated on street corners, not under the street, with construction impacts very similar to building the footing for a skyscraper (minimal street closures, no utility relocation). That means we could build the next subway extension without ever having to coordinate six agencies over four years to relocate utilities through an extremely complicated built out West LA, the federal and LWA complications of utilities around LAX, or the even more subterraneanly complicated UCLA campus. A single bore tunnel will be below all that nonsense. Additionally, A rail tunnel under Bel Aire is going to be opposed by the billionaires that live in bel Aire. Why? Because every 500 feet in traditional dual bore construction, there has to be an Emergency cross passage constructed. That means jet grouting has to stabilize the soil every 500 feet for dual bore construction. That means tons of construction equipment up in the billionaires business for four years. That means building enormously expensive road access built through the unbuilt canyons so that heavy construction equipment can be moved in to do jet grouting every 500 feet. And all that disruption means massive environmental impacts from the construction, and environmental lawsuits to stop it. And ALL of that is avoided by going single bore because the tunnel is large enough for emergency accessways, so there is no need</p> |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Can the approval process be sped up? Can you describe the possible future extension to LAX? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Are there plans to extend to LAX? The 405 handles 400,000 commuters per day. How much of this does Metro hope to accommodate? |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|----------------------|----------------------------|---|
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Would heavy rail, concept 2 interfere with Elon Musk's proposed "Boring" project in West LA? Why couldn't the light rail concept run along the 405 median? Could you make a heavier engine? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Are you prepared for success? Paris' RER line is staggering under a load which was never anticipated 50 years ago. Are you planning for future capacity? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Are you still considering converting the Orange Line from buses to light rail? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Can a monorail system be considered along Van Nuys Blvd transit corridor? If not, why? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Can light rail platforms be built to be longer to support 6 car trains or 2,3 car trains like San Francisco's market street subway (Muni). For option 6, if heavy rail is a must, would it be possible to put the connection between Wilshire/Westwood and Century City rather than west of Wilshire/VA? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Can you provide any preliminary relative cost estimates so that we can use that to decide which plan is more viable? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Concept 6 seems very similar to Concept 1/2. What are the differences? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Could Metro please evaluate the light rail options with six car platforms so we can have a clear comparison with heavy rail? Could Metro open a portal to Federal Ave at the Westwood/VA station so Valley riders will have access to Brentwood? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Every Sepulveda Pass project has been at capacity when it's completed. What is Metro doing to ensure this rail project will not be like Expo where you meet your 20 year budget in a few months. |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Fix the horrible traffic issues sooner than later! |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Have you considered the historic situation on the Cahuenga Pass Downtown Red line corridor? Many drivers won't leave the freeway once they're already in traffic. This shows the need to greatly expand parking at Sylmar and have a single mode all the way from North Valley to LAX. |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Have you looked at the cars coming from Santa Clarita/Lancaster/Palmdale through the Valley to Westside? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | How closely does the survey data match the measured travel pattern data? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | How does the billion dollar 405 Carmageddon project affect future 405 transit projects? They put up walls against the mountain which seems to limit expansion. |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | How will you coordinate with Elon Musk's people-mover that the Boring Company is planning to build along the Sepulveda corridor? Do you think there are redundancies, and if so, are they desirable? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | How would a Sepulveda aerial alignment pass under the 101 freeway? What is cost difference between HRT and LRT underground? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | I need to express my concern/disapproval of any project that incorporates private/public partnerships. These concepts are designed to make profits for the private enterprises which means that people who can afford privileged access will gain priority over the rest of us. No express lanes. No private tunnels! |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | I see empty buses or 1-2 people on buses especially at night 8pm and after. Will this operate 24 hr or only certain times? I worry about the disruption of the earth. I look at Orville dam, can you provide updates on how and why a tunnel will be okay? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | If either light rail or HRT were selected as the preferred option now, would that choice effect the Westside to LAX portion of the route? |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|---|
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | I've heard that the monorail option is being proposed by BYD. Are you really considering foreign technology? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Metro needs to have enough space at each station to accommodate a growing amount of bicycle parking. This is lacking along the Expo line and the subway, except at the valley stations. Bicycling is an important way to capture more transit riders for each station. There could potentially be hundreds if not thousands of bicycles parked at each station if Metro has the space to make enough parking to accommodate them. |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Must have parking at stations. Regarding the future: the project really needs to go to Santa Clarita. Each new station needs a lot of parking for people to use it. This infrastructure has prevented people from using Metro. |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | I feel that option 5 would devalue the properties along Burbank Blvd. These are beautiful condos and apartments along Burbank Blvd vs the underused street of Oxnard, just one street north of us. Aerial trams would be ugly and noisy when there are other streets to consider. It would also take longer from Burbank which is filled to capacity already. |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Please make sure there is sufficient parking near the stations. The Purple Line is inconvenient to get to. |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Rather than longer trains, could you make them more often? More trains (like NYC, London, Paris). |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Really great presentation, very professional, very informative and good location. Thanks! |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | I support the heavy rail concept #2. The Sepulveda Pass Rail Transit should go underground from the Sepulveda/Ventura intersection and connect to both the VA and/or UCLA and then to the Expo Line. Ideally, a light rail along the 405 Median would be a preferable option but one alongside the mountain would work also. I don't support a monorail or bus or expansion/toll use lanes. Carmageddon was a disaster and only led to more cars. I support private sponsorship to expedite the tunneling option to finish before 2028. I do use the Orange Line but save the allotted money and use it for this project. |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | The general public prefers HRT over other options. Put a station in at UCLA. |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | The parking at the North Hollywood and Lankershim stations maxed out year ago. It would have been prudent to dig down and build up a parking structure when building the subway stations. How will you make sure this inadequate parking doesn't reoccur? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | There is a lot of traffic coming from Santa Clarita/Lancaster/Palmdale down the 405 to the Westside. These cars are looking for the quickest way to get to their destination, adding to the non-freeway traffic. We've been told that no consideration has been given to deal with this. There needs to be rail from these areas. Even if this is not part of the current plan, it needs to be considered in the planning. By doing so will actually preclude some of the proposed options. You can't connect to Santa Clarita by going through Van Nuys Blvd. |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Travel patterns - how are they determined? Westside has no park and ride lots? Westside needs both Westwood and VA stops. How do you decide on the number of people employed? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | We (PCWC Land Use Committee) favor a "one seat ride" from the northern terminus of the NE SFV corridor to LAX. Therefore we strongly support Concept 3. We understand this ultimate goal must be reached in a stepwise fashion, however, we implore you to consider the Encino route holistically. Just because Valley people usually do not travel the valley to LAX trip by public transit does not mean they wouldn't do it if the infrastructure was right. |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | We strongly implore you to consider a single seat rider between the NE SFV Transit Corridor and the terminus of the Sepulveda transit corridor. This means light rail, and this means a Sepulveda tunnel. |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | What are the additional support costs between the options i.e. many crew, cross support, different facilities, and tax implications to find engaging operations? |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|---|
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | What is the decision process? When will we have cost and time to implement information? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | What plan do you have to connect the transit through the Sepulveda pass to Pico and or Olympic? The Valley is full of people who commute to Fox, the Purple and Expo lines won't get them there. They will still drive. You also need to connect to Sony. |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | When considering option 6, will this Purple Line alignment prevent the subway from ever reaching the sea? Also, what do you think the average distance between stations in urban areas would be, considering the subway HRT option? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | When dealing with Elon Musk tunnels, make sure he builds to the dimensions of a subway tunnel, so they can be repurposed at a later or for a subway. |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Why is there no connection to Van Nuys Metrolink on Northern Heavy Rail options? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Why not add lots of buses instead of building a new transit mode? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Will a stop on Ventura Blvd be considered for any of these options? What would the construction timeline be like for LRT/HRT options? IS there a possible connection to Van Nuys Airport? |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Will there be more railing on the new system? I banged a rib on the railing trying to reach the next Expo line rail. I also saw a stroller almost tip over. There is nothing to hang onto by the doors, unlike the Red Line. |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Will there be a provision to provide local access to the new stations? Most folks would need to drive to the stations so would need parking. |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | With so many people having moved up to the Santa Clarita Valley, are there plans to extend to there? I am concerned that this isn't being considered. |
| 06/09/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | I am worried about earthquakes - what is the best choice for earthquake safety? Please plan for parking, I live by the Bundy/Expo station and there is not enough parking and I live a little too far to walk. Please advertise where parking is. Why are the study times so long? 2020 for future environmental study? |
| 06/10/18 | Project Email | Regarding the Sepulveda pass and the 405 congestion: A suspended monorail system would be the quickest system to build and the most efficient system to operate. This system would not require tunneling and the issues associated with drilling. Suspend the monorail system along the freeway shoulder and possibly the center divider similar to the Bay Area Rapid Transit (B.A.R.T.) in the bay area. |
| 06/12/18 | Project Email | Expedite this project. It's vital to the local economy. |
| 06/12/18 | Project Email | I am an active supporter of the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project, and was wondering: Do you accept public comment (via email) at this time? If so, should I just email my suggestions directly to you? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | An included bikeway with this project is a great idea, even if it's part of the future. What would it take to be included? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Are two surface routes less expensive than a tunnel through the mountains? I like the sound of monorail through the pass. |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Are you able to secure land around the stations for high density transit oriented developments that will finance the transit corridor? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | As a rider of the metro trains and buses, my primary concern is passenger safety and human needs. I have been a victim of severe theft on a metro bus over 3 decades ago when someone stole my wallet while I boarded a metro bus trying to take the baby items I had bought for my daughter home. We as patrons and riders are experiencing and witnessing several dangerous incidents and need proper safety. We also need self cleaning restrooms on all train platforms, similar to the ones at the El Monte and Gateway stations. I am also continuing to propose to name one of the platforms of the new Crenshaw/ LAX metro train after my father's military group, The Tuskegee Airmen. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|---|
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | As there is a desperate need for relief west of the 405, has Metro considered just extending the Purple Line to Bundy (then LAX) with the Sepulveda Line being light rail all the way to the northern valley? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Can there be a bike highway along the 405/Westside? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Connect to Culver City or La Cienega/Jefferson. |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Could there be an opportunity to accelerate the environmental review process like other projects? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Do you allow folk to bring dogs or cats in bags? I'm interested in this project because I travel around that area. My suggestion is that this project is absolutely necessary and urgent. I recently traveled via Amtrak from LAX to San Diego and from there I took a trolley and it was so safe, huge, and economical. I've also traveled to San Francisco and I have come across people in trains that also travel with bikes around California but transportation to LAX is disappointing. I just want it to be fast, economical, and with parking for coaches and bicycles. All the while, the trolley in San Diego you pay one fare and travel the entire day. Also, in Mexico City we have a similar system to Metro's that allows us to be transported across the entire city. We need something like that (efficient transportation). A single payment per day should be considered to travel like the trolley in San Diego. |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | How is Metro coordinating this project with the Boring Company? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | How long will it take to go from the Valley to the Westside when done? Which concept is the fastest? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | How much additional distance would a monorail over the pass require vs rail under the pass? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | How realistic is the possibility of service in time for the Olympics? Doesn't seem to be realistic. |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | How will the new stations and urban developments around them impact the existing neighborhood commercial districts? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | How would the gas tax repeal affect this project? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | I am extremely concerned that concepts 3 and 4 (limitations on trains to ESFV and branching), 5 (will require two forced transfers to connect between Valley/Westside) and 6 (needless T--junction) needlessly degrade train frequencies and trip times between typical Valley and Westside points. Can you outline expected trip times between Van Nuys and the Expo Line for the concepts at off-peak hours, including train frequencies? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | I arrived by transit bus (Culver City 6) from the Green Line. But there is no apparent southbound transit stop at the meeting place (Proud Bird) southbound. Poor inept choice of location only accessible by transit northbound. Who picks so poorly? One MTA meeting venue was in a building with a large loud drum band in the same building. |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | I feel like it's time to implement the monorail option as it concerns the Sepulveda Pass. Obviously it can take the grade and because it's above ground it allows the possibility to have stations at places such as Getty Center. It will be cost effective in that tunneling would not be necessary. It's time for metro to step into the future! |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | If it is as I believe, MTA owns the right away for carpool lanes on the 405 FWY. Why not do away with the HOV and put a rail system from Sylmar to the South Bay. Carpool does not work. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | I'm really proud as a native Angeleno to see all that Metro is engaged in making our city more interconnected via transit. My wife, from the East Coast says we are way behind in having "direct" connections to "where people are going" (i.e.: Downtown to LAX, Valley to LAX, major landmarks, new NFL stadium, etc.) Is it possible to consider a spur from LAX/Crenshaw line to the NFL stadium in Inglewood? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Is there going to be free parking at all the stations? What will fares be like? In the future is there going to be more connections? Will the transit be accessible for bikes? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Is there any particular reason why the proposed heavy rail line cannot continue into the San Fernando Valley region as HRT? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Is there any prospect of accelerating the Westside- LAX portion of the corridor before 2058? It's not included in the 20x28 plan. |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Is there funding for this project to be done in time for the Olympics? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Isn't Elon Musk already building something here? Why not just let him build so we don't cost taxpayers any more money? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Not a question but I feel it's good idea to have a station and a stop at the Sepulveda station where the Orange line is at. I also feel there should be a line on Sepulveda Blvd since the street is very wide. |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Not directly related to Sepulveda corridor but is there any plan/project established to connect Metro to the Rams/Chargers stadium in development? (I.e. a spur from the LAX/Crenshaw Lines Inglewood station?) |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Of the 6 concepts, which is projected to cost the most? The least? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | There is experience tunneling with the Red Line and known challenges. What are some of the challenges with monorail? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | West LA and Brentwood need more transit options. The EXPO line helps, unfortunately the VA Hospital stop on the Purple Line is highly disappointing - not easily walkable from anywhere. Of all the options presented - a transfer station at EXPO/Bundy is critical. Expo/Sepulveda doesn't cut it as those west of the 405 are not served. The entire project needs to be looked at a whole - not 2 separate items. They can be built separately but planned together. |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | What is the projected traffic on the 405 by the time the rail opens? |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | While I know that alignments are still preliminary, one seat travel options between the Valley and LAX should be of concern when approaching this project. Additionally, this project should address bus connections at stations. With the Expo line you really have a station that has good connectivity to frequent bus service, while the others have long waits for your connection. |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Why did it take so long to have a 405 corridor project? That is why the 405 corridor project is not being connected when the blue, red, and purple lines were built. |
| 06/12/18 | Round 1 Community Meetings | Will there be a bike car on these light rail trains? |
| 06/13/18 | Project Email | I'd like to show my support for heavy rail rather than light rail for this project. How can I go about making my voice heard? |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 06/14/18 | Project Email | <p>For the Sepulveda Corridor Project I favor Concept 3, a light rail line south from Van Nuys to the Expo Line with stations at Burbank Boulevard, Ventura Boulevard, UCLA, the Purple Line at Wilshire Boulevard, Santa Monica Boulevard, Pico Boulevard and the Expo Line. If a light rail line is selected for the East Valley Transit Project, Concept 3 will allow for a seamless, uninterrupted ride from Sylmar ultimately to LAX without having to change modes at the Orange Line station. While Concept 1 with a fast, high capacity heavy rail train is the ideal, it would require riders to change from a future light rail line for the East Valley Project to a heavy rail line at the Orange Line station, with additional time and inconvenience added to a trip. I do not favor Concept 2 because development along Sepulveda Boulevard is not as intense and pedestrian oriented as along Van Nuys Boulevard and connecting to the East Valley rail line via Victory or Sherman Way would add more length and cost for the heavy rail line. If a route to serve the dense development at Ventura/ Sepulveda is desired, there should be diagonal connection underground between Ventura/ Sepulveda and the Orange Line station at Van Nuys Blvd. A heavy rail line should not extend north of Oxnard Street, I do not favor Concept 4, a variation on Concept 3, because the one mile extension west to Sepulveda would be an unnecessary expense when the Orange Line can already be used to get to Sepulveda. I do not favor Concept 5, a monorail or bus along I-405. This route further west goes out of its way and does not offer as direct a connection from the Orange Line station at Van Nuys Blvd. to the Purple Line at Wilshire/ Westwood, The areal structures in the Valley would be a visual blight. A monorail is not a standard mode used for transit in Los Angeles and does not allow for switching from one set of rails to another as with heavy rail or light rail. I do not favor Concept 6 because its turning the Purple Line north or south at a future Brentwood station would make it more difficult and complicated to later extend the Purple Line all the way to Santa Monica. The Purple Line should go in just one direction, west, with north/south travel handled by the Sepulveda Corridor Line envisioned in Concepts 1-4</p> |
| 06/14/18 | Project Email | <p>I reviewed the presentation materials for your public meetings in June 2018 regarding Sepulveda transit options. I also took the survey on the website. The survey did not offer the opportunity to express preference of options, so I would like to state that I prefer the HEAVY RAIL option for the Sepulveda pass.</p> |
| 06/14/18 | Project Email | <p>In reviewing the options for the Valley end of the line, it appears that most concepts assume no stations south of Victory Blvd. I would like to advocate for a station in Sherman Oaks at Sepulveda/Ventura or Van Nuys/Ventura prior to transiting the Pass. My perception is that there is a significant number of jobs, entertainment options, and high-density residential along the Ventura Blvd. corridor in Sherman Oaks and that a stop in near this area would be help provide access to a key employment/housing/entertainment area within the Valley.</p> |
| 06/16/18 | Project Email | <p>I am a transportation planner who happens to live in Beverly Glen canyon – under which four of the six concept alignments for the Sepulveda Pass line run, based on the concept maps published by Metro. I have also been highly enthusiastic for this potential project for many years. I would love to get involved in community outreach for the project. I hope we can get the neighborhood of Beverly Glen on board and address any community concerns about the idea of an underground transit line beneath our canyon. Residents would support any project that could address the I-405 spillover traffic onto Beverly Glen Blvd, the only access road to the neighborhood.</p> |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 06/17/18 | Project Email | <p>I'd like to begin by thanking Metro for the thoughtful and well-organized presentation on potential designs for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor that I attended on June 12 in Westchester. As a native Angeleno and Metro rider living car-free on the Westside, and with ample experience relying on Metro for travel between the Valley and Westside, I strongly urge Metro to pursue concept 1: heavy rail through the Sepulveda Pass, with an alignment from Van Nuys to a Purple Line connection at Westwood/UCLA. In doing so, Metro must allow for compatibility with a future heavy rail extension up Van Nuys Blvd and so the form of the East San Fernando Valley corridor should (like the Orange Line) be chosen and built to facilitate eventual conversion to heavy rail. Heavy rail through the Sepulveda Pass is critical due to its high passenger capacity: the pass sees huge traffic volumes (400,000 vehicles per day), represents a critical chokepoint for access between the Valley and the Westside, and continues to experience rising travel demands as Los Angeles grows and densifies. Looking at cities like London, Paris, and New York City, it's apparent that whatever design chosen today (and associated capacity, and engineering or route tradeoffs) will in all likelihood be serving the city 50 or even 100 years from now. Under-sizing and underscoping this corridor for the sake of meeting a (in the end, fairly arbitrary) 2028 deadline will handicap Metro's ability to serve Angelenos' transit needs for decades to come. Metro Rail too-often in practice seems to overlook that it must be building a network that covers LA – one that can be utilized as part of convenient door-to-door travel between a number of frequent origin and destination areas – rather than a series of politically driven one-off lines (see: Green Line, Gold Line to Montclair). When Metro Rail fails to ask: does a new route provides any new benefits for travelers (e.g., does this service entirely duplicate an existing Metrolink line?) does a new line makes sense even for the riders Metro imagines it wants to serve (is the typical park-and-ride Gold Line passenger from Glendora to DTLA supposed to be someone who is already a car owner, who will drive to the park-and-ride, transfer to the Gold Line, ride the Gold Line for an hour, then disembark and transfer trains at Union Station for 7th St/Metro? That route will take 90 minutes door-to-door while driving is 45 minutes) does allowed land use within the vicinity of the station permanently limit ridership and mandate a hostile rider experience (see: Westwood/Rancho Park, every freeway median station on the 105, 110, and 210, and the upcoming Westwood/VA station)? does total door-to-door trip time (including forced transfers and poorly signed 10-minute walks across Union Station, or random doglegs for a Crenshaw Line extension to placate West Hollywood) matter? Does off-peak, weekend, and holiday service matter, or is the goal simply to serve weekday commuting trips largely because those are the most predictable and easiest to measure? does it matter if a line is unreliable (see Blue Line) and/or is by design mired in automobile traffic that will always make it a slower and less convenient alternative to driving (see: Orange Line, most infuriatingly Expo and Blue Lines south of Pico Station, and the Staff Recommended at-grade East SFV light rail option)? it bakes bad decisions into concrete and steel at ruinous public expense and permanently undermines Metro's mission and public support. It makes it clear that Metro, too, is content with providing second-class transport for second-class citizens, and that Metro is blithely unconcerned with a moral hierarchy where one driver's time is codified into law as sacrosanct but delays for 200 transit riders are meaningless (e.g. Expo Line between Pico and LATTC).</p> |
| 06/21/18 | Project Email | <p>I enjoyed reviewing the "Next stop: exploring alternatives to the 405" presentation. I have a question: Has anyone ever considered how much money could be saved by running much of the track along the floor of Moraga Canyon? Environmental concerns could be addressed by digging a trench and placing a roof over track. It is a big completely empty canyon that runs immediately east of Sepulveda canyon, and I always have thought that using that canyon would make construction much less expensive. The canyon has been for sale on and off over the years, and to date no one has yet developed it.</p> |
| 06/21/18 | Project Email | <p>Is there an option to extend the new line to the northern Bay area?</p> |
| 06/26/18 | Project Email | <p>My wife and I drive the 405 every day. The traffic is horrendous. If we had any option other than driving a car we would take it. The bus is not viable since it takes over twice as long to take from our home in Woodland Hills, and has to engage with the same traffic as everything else. BRT also wouldn't be our go-to since it wouldn't be as fast as an underground train, wouldn't be as protective against earthquakes as an underground train, and its capacity would easily be eclipsed by demand. We would love to drive to a park-and-ride in Sherman Oaks and take the train into Santa Monica, Westwood, or Century City (the three places we frequent most). Light rail or heavy rail PLEASE!!!! From us and our extended family.</p> |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 06/29/18 | Project Email | Please do not use ANY at grade crossings for any of these potential solutions. for the LAX /Valley lines. And, please do not place any additional at grade crossings for any of the connecting metro stations. To assist with mobility, please replace at grade crossings for the Expo line at Westwood, Overland and Barrington. |
| 07/02/18 | Project Email | Please add me to any mailing list you're keeping on the Sepulveda Transit Corridor project. |
| 07/05/18 | Project Email | Thank you for passing along my feedback about the Sepulveda project. I have some more feedback for the project team. There needs to be a stop at Sepulveda and Ventura. I want to recommend wider and longer platforms for stations, especially transfer stations. 7th Street Metro Center is gross and very claustrophobic at times. Poor design. We need to be using automated trains like they use in Europe. No more felt seats. They are gross. Seating on trains should be more like NYC Metro trains to allow for more space for passengers, bikes, and wheel chairs. Look at the new trains NYC has ordered. They look great. We also need to be using glass screen doors. I lived in South Korea for a few years, and these were standard. Trains need to have multiple TV screens advertising the next stop as well as maybe paid advertising. A revenue source. Better automated voice. A female voice. Open gangways. |
| 07/09/18 | Project Email | I was out of town when the public meetings were held, so I was unable to give comments in person. Option 4 with the LRT branch to Sepulveda/Oxnard is the best choice. This provides a 1-seat ride for those north of the Orange Line, provides additional capacity south of it that will very likely be needed, and provides convenient park-and-ride access for those traveling on the 405 (which doesn't seem to be over capacity north of the 101), enabling better use of the parking there. Some reconfiguration of vehicle access between the freeway and parking lot may be desirable, including direct access ramps to/from the north. I also ask that Westwood/Rancho Park station be included as the potential Expo Line transfer station. Even if it's not politically viable (likely given the neighborhood's reaction to modest upzoning along Pico), you should include it if it's technically viable. Eliminating Westwood station from consideration also removes Overland Ave as a corridor for phase 2, something that should not be done lightly given the high residential density in Palms, plus destinations like Sony Studios and West LA College. Overland is, at the very least, not an obviously inferior choice to Centinela or Sepulveda, given the much lower residential density in Mar Vista and Sepulveda being close enough to the 405 that a lot of the station walksheds will be taken up by the freeway. Some say that heavy rail is needed on this corridor for capacity reasons, but I am unconvinced. The Orange Line and the bus routes on Burbank/Magnolia/Ventura don't seem like they can move enough people to overflow a train every 6 minutes, and park-and-ride will be a fraction of that. The southern segment shouldn't be very busy given current ridership on the Culver City 6/R6; I think it's likely we would want to short-turn half the trains at the Expo Line or possibly Venice Boulevard. If possible, it would be nice to build the tunnels to fit heavy rail vehicles, if the current LRT tunnel diameter is different from the HRT one. Then we wouldn't need to re-bore through the mountains if we decide to reconfigure things at each end in the far future. With regards to running trains longer than 3 cars, if we're going to do it I wouldn't bother with 4 cars and would skip right to 5, since if my math is correct that's the same length as the existing 6-car trains on Red/Purple. |
| 07/10/18 | Project Email | I would like to express my support for option 3. LRT makes the most sense, especially in that it can seamlessly continue north to Sylmar and south to Torrance. I would also advocate for a station on the UCLA campus. At the north end, I think that it could run at grade north of Chandler where the ROW is wider. I look forward to seeing the options for the south portion. |
| 07/11/18 | Project Email | There was no space on the survey to provide input. I am wondering if the above ground train like on the 105 freeway is being considered rather than a costly tunnel. It seems like above ground in the middle the 405 freeway is the least expensive and straightforward way of installing transportation. Buses don't work well for the masses. I take both the redline and expo line quite often but there is no parking for the expo line so it makes using the expo line difficult. |
| 07/14/18 | Project Email | The Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association submits the attached letter which provides our comments and questions concerning the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project. Please let me know if you have any questions. I would be pleased to talk with anyone at Metro about our comments. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 07/20/18 | Project Email | <p>I just submitted my comments through an online form, but I really wanted to make sure I was being heard, so writing here as well. I have a drivers license but I don't own a car, so that I may save money. I usually take bus or metro but occasionally I rent a vehicle for work. I know the westside really needs more rail and more space for cars, and it's only going get worse. I think it's a good idea to put in a rail from SANTA CLARITA through NORTHRIDGE through SHERMAN OAKS down to WEST SIDE to LAX. Here is the problem: If you put public transit there you still need a way for people to get TO and FROM the major rail stops. I'm lucky because I live a block and half from Hollywood and Western stop. If you live within a half mile of a metro stop, you can walk. But anything more then that and people are more inclined to drive. BECAUSE how can they take Metro rail, when they can't get to it??? Sometimes it takes 10 minutes by car just to weave out of their own neighborhood.</p> <p>Soooo perhaps you can make big parking structures along the corridors where people can park cars and take the rail the rest of the way. And I mean BIG because right now the North Hollywood and Universal lots are ALWAYS FULL and we still expect an increase in readership. So I'm talking 6 floors plus parking GARAGES at each stop for students, workers, medical professionals, and your grandmother and for them to take all their THINGS to be able to park and ride rail. Also.. you should increase valley bus service. As someone who lives in Hollywood but often takes Metro bus in the Valley due to work, the service is DREADFUL. the busses arrive once every hour and connections between busses take FOREVER. To go from A to B in a car can be 5-10 minutes and in a bus is ONE HOUR. So if you increase bus route frequency, especially in the EAST WEST routes, you can connect more people from BUS to RAIL. I'm happy to provide more input. Feel free to contact me.</p> |
| 07/23/18 | Project Email | <p>On June 14th, the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association submitted 30 comments on the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project. Since then, based on input from our board and members, we have updated ten of our original comments and added eleven new comments on the project, as detailed in the attached revision to our letter. Thank you for your consideration, and I would be pleased to discuss any of our comments with you or your staff.</p> |
| 07/25/18 | Project Email | <p>SO glad you are looking at options for improving the commuting experience through the Sepulveda Pass. I did your survey, but I had a couple additional notes that I wanted to add. Please bring mass transit to the corridor!! I commute through the pass rarely (mostly to avoid the traffic at all times of the day), but have to for one client. For a 9:00 am meeting in Brentwood I literally have to leave my house no later than 7:00 to get their on time. It's 12 miles! I would definitely use mass transit if it was available. I use the red line on a regular basis. In addition, given the roadway will still be there, perhaps you should create a secure lane for motorcycle riders? Or make it part of Sepulveda Blvd. Would encourage more motorcycle use and keep the riders safe.</p> |
| 08/01/18 | Project Email | <p>I am a resident of West Hollywood who attended the community forum in Westwood in June regarding the Sepulveda Transit Corridor. Of the six concepts presented at the meeting, I believe Concept 6: Purple Line Extension would provide the most benefit to LA County. However, the main disadvantage of this alternative is the lack of a station on the UCLA campus. This alone could result in lower ridership when compared to the alternatives that pass directly through UCLA. Is there any possibility that Concept 6 could be revised to include a station at UCLA? I understand that the junction between the original Purple Line, the branch to Van Nuys, and the branch to Expo/Bundy would need to be moved from the VA Hospital area to the location shown in red below. I understand that a junction in this area may be more expensive than a junction at the VA, but I believe the access to UCLA would make up for it through higher ridership, especially during the Olympics and other sporting events. Older visitors, for example, will be unlikely to walk a mile from Wilshire/Westwood to UCLA's sports venues. Will you consider this modification to Concept 6?</p> |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 08/09/18 | Project Email | Thanks for the June, 2018 informative meetings presenting the Sepulveda Transit Corridor options. Here are my suggestions, in order from highest to lowest priority: 1. The Northern terminus must be at the Amtrak/Metrolink station. Transit is all about connectivity and minimizing transfers. Transfers reduce ridership. As Metrolink approaches hourly or more frequent service from Ventura County and beyond, the need increases for a fast route to the west side that short-cuts having to go through downtown. 2. Concept 6 - is the preferred alternative - Purple Line extension. Again, this meshes best with the existing system and minimizes transfers and maximizes connectivity. Considering the distance under the Santa Monica Mountains, speed is also important.3. An eventual heavy-rail extension south to LAX would go a long way towards alleviating the currently missing North-South transit connectivity on the west side and should be included in the design for the Purple Line station at the V.A. Alignments along either Sepulveda or Bundy should be studied.4. High Speed rail will eventually build into the San Fernando Valley, most likely with a station near the Burbank Airport. An extension of the Purple Line, possibly along the Metrolink right of way from Van Nuys to the HSR Burbank Airport should be on the list of projects for the future. |
| 09/14/18 | Project Email | How close to Roscomare Road any of your choices? WRAC Mobility Chair (11 NC's and 3 CC's) |
| 09/20/18 | Project Email | I was just wondering why is the ETA for the completion of the Sepulveda transit corridor so far in to the future at 2057 opening date? |
| 09/21/18 | Project Email | I can see this is going to be on of the biggest projects metro has done since the creation of the red line. But it is one that should have been finished already. We all know how the 101/405 can be. To be truly useful, since this is mostly a north and south run, it needs to intersect the purple and expo lines. I think a connecting station at UCLA would be ideal. Obviously it would have to connect with the orange line, I guess in the van Nuys area. But the orange line its self, should be converted from a bus line to a light rail line similar to the expo line. For me, if this and orange line were up and running as light rail, I would instantly leave my car in the west valley and use it to get to the Bundy station near my work. |
| 10/03/18 | Project Email | How can I stay current with your steps towards this project. I only learned of your actions recently so I missed any/all public presentations. |
| 10/03/18 | Project Email | I believe heavy rail is the best way to go. It moves more people and shows a more serious investment which can entice and give confidence to potential riders who are considering using it for their commutes. I also believe that having a mass transit network that is fully integrated is crucial. Much like freeways have connection to other freeways, rail lines should have that too. Obviously you can't connect heavy rail to light rail however if heavy rail is chosen having direct track connections to the purple line is a must. This could allow for trains to start in downtown and end in the valley using different tracks. That's what a 'real' mass transit system should have. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 10/03/18 | Project Email | <p>The Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council recommends that the Sepulveda Pass Project be implemented with Heavy Rail. Following are our reasons. Sherman Oaks is the site of the biggest regularly scheduled traffic congestion in the United States. Congestion begins shortly after 6:00 AM on week days and continues to varying degrees throughout the day until the evening hours. The congestion is centered at the intersections of the #405 and #101 Freeways and Sepulveda and Ventura Blvd. It then extends through the Sepulveda Pass and radiates through alternate canyon roads; Beverly Glen, Woodcliff/Roscomare, Benedict Canyon, Deep Canyon, and Coldwater Canyon. There are differing accounts as to the total number of vehicles, but all accounts conclude that there are several hundred thousand vehicles involved each day. It is important to have capacity to serve and to grow built into the system. Heavy rail is the only alternative that provides the capacity that will be needed for the future. Our fear is that if light rail were used and the project started operation next week, it would be operating at capacity immediately, with little room for growth. Subway systems all over the world become an integral part of the local transportation system and many have lasted decades and notably those in New York and London are over a century old. This system should be planned to serve both the population of the present and the future; built to serve them well and to last a century. Anything less would have to be replaced with a larger system later and be a waste of public funds. The Red Line carries more than 160,000 riders a day. From the point of view of the Valley, the Sepulveda Pass Project has the potential to match or exceed that volume. But at the other end of the projected line is Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) which serves more than 41,000,000 passengers a year. The passenger load at the airport has grown 5-10% annually for the past few years. In addition about 59,000 people are directly employed at LAX and thousands more pass through the facility daily. The Sepulveda Pass Project should be built to serve the thousands traveling in and out of the airport daily. Only heavy rail can provide the capacity needed for those traveling to and from LAX now and in the future. Recommendation #2 The Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council recommends that the Sepulveda Pass Project be constructed underground for its full length from the Valley to LAX. Following are our reasons. Only heavy rail can provide the capacity needed in the Sepulveda Pass Project. It will have to pass under the Santa Monica Mountains. The portion of the rail line that originates in the Valley should be underground too. If the project operates above ground, it will compete for street space with autos, buses, pedestrians, bicycles, and other transportation. If it were at ground level the conflicts between these modes will result in slowed trains and snarled traffic. The worst possible results would be achieved if the project operated as a surface line and passed through the busiest crossroads of the country at the intersections of the #405 and #101 and Sepulveda Blvd and Ventura Blvd. The same difficulties exist south of the mountains to LAX. The best possible configuration is underground throughout the length of the line. Request by the Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council The Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council voted to request Metro to release a list of all prospective sites being considered for station locations in the Valley for the Sepulveda Pass Project. If a written request is required in order to have this list of sites released to the Council, please consider this letter as a written Public Records Request.</p> |
| 10/03/18 | Project Email | <p>We are writing to formally notify Metro that the Plan Review Board has taken a preliminary position on the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project. The Board unanimously voted to support heavy rail. One of the major issues that the Board deals with is traffic. Good public transportation is essential in combatting the congestion experienced by our Valley residents. With a population of over 1.8 million people, it is crucial that a system be put into place that will handle the largest number of passengers and that is a heavy rail transportation system.</p> |
| 10/11/18 | Project Email | <p>Please add me to your email list.</p> |
| 10/12/18 | Project Email | <p>My neighborhood council has been trying to obtain information on the proposed sites. When will that be made public?</p> |
| 10/12/18 | Project Email | <p>Please let me know when your next presentation / updates are on this project connecting Sherman Oaks to Westwood. I live on Sepulveda South of Valley Vista - and this project will directly affect my home and home value (just as the Bridge Widening project nightmare I lived through for three years did).</p> |
| 10/15/18 | Project Email | <p>Good morning, I would like to receive from you the latest status & the latest information on the Sepulveda Transit Corridor including the latest map on the alternatives that are being looked at. I would greatly appreciate to hear back from you in regards to this project.</p> |
| 10/18/18 | Project Email | <p>Are there any up coming events?</p> |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 10/18/18 | Project Email | I am a bit perplexed. Why do you want to spend \$9B for a tunnel when you can run trains down the middle of the 405, elevated, like the Air Train in NY? I checked the costs. Air Train cost \$2.3B in 1990s' dollars. If we double that for purposes of inflation and our discussion, you could run the trains right down the 405, elevated, pre-fab concrete columns, stations at key streets, selling off the air rights to developers to build on and over the stations, get near existing light rail lines, or even veer off to close by stations and into LAX, never mind all the way to OC? The problem I see, being an Easterner, is to get people off the freeways. Moving around LA is not such a bigger issue for most. Why not take my car when more accessible to places I want to go? It would be nice to take a subway to Dodger Stadium or even Staples Center or the new football stadium, but I have to walk almost 2 miles to get to the Expo Line. Heck, I can be there by then. Getting commuters off the roads, saving them time and hassle, driving the ungodly hours they must, just to get to work, should be more of a consideration than I think you place with all the city lines picking up where the old Red Cars ran, don't you think? And one last question: Why did the Subway to the Sea end, stopping at the VA? Really? Wilshire Blvd is the backbone of our city. |
| 10/25/18 | Project Email | Can you add me to your list? |
| 01/08/19 | Project Email | Please double check the times on the Feb 2nd meeting in Van Nuys. I'm assuming this is AM? Not PM? |
| 01/10/19 | Project Email | Hi Metro, I'm sure you all have been very busy for several years now mapping the new lines. However, I really feel that ridership would increase if you create mini-hubs or major connections within the system. The Sepulveda line, to really useful and take traffic off the 405, should connect to the Purple Line Extension, The Expo Line, and the Crenshaw line! That would help folks travel to/from the Valley to mid-Wilshire, DTLA, Century City, Culver City and Inglewood LAX! I'm sure this is expensive, but it's worth the investment and should be seriously prioritized and considered. |
| 01/10/19 | Project Email | I won't be able to make the upcoming public meetings on the exciting Sepulveda corridor transit study. However, I'd like to provide some creative concepts based upon the original ones put forward last year. I am particularly interested in the heavy rail concept and believe that I have come up with a couple of ways that it would be feasible to implement without having to divert away from UCLA (as was shown in the HRT concept Metro graphic), which I believe is an indispensable station that needs to be included in this project. I have attached 2 maps outlining my concepts plus a potential operating plan for an expanded heavy rail Metro network (Red+Purple+Sepulveda). Although I believe light rail to have insufficient capacity for this project, I've included a light rail alternative via Bundy. A Bundy alignment would serve more destinations (Brentwood, Santa Monica College-Bundy Campus, Mar Vista, and Playa Vista) and likely have higher ridership than one on Sepulveda. I hope my concepts can positively inform the process for selecting the best route and mode for this critically important project. I am available to contact if needed as well. |
| 01/10/19 | Project Email | I'm a Culver City resident and a big transit aficionado. I love reading up on all the new Metro projects and proposals and I'm thrilled to see the amazing things you're doing! Please keep up the good work. As I was reading about the Sepulveda Pass alternatives, I read the following article in Urbanize LA. https://urbanize.la/post/metro-doesn-t-need-tunnel-through-Sepulveda-pass I was surprised that no LRT options along 405 were among those proposed. Could you please consider a 5.5% grade LRT or heavy rail route along 405, potentially saving taxpayers like me hundreds of millions or even billions of dollars? Perhaps the savings could even go toward accelerating the extension of the line to LAX. If the entire line were LRT, I could envision a 1-seat ride from Sylmar through LAX all the way to Torrance on the green line extension. It could transform westside commutes along a significant portion of the 405! |
| 01/22/19 | Source post | My solution is the Purple Line after the VA stop is to turn north to Van Nuys. It should terminate at the Van Nuys junction of the east/west Orange Line (assuming its converted to light rail at some point) and the light rail heading north /south from Van Nuys to Sylmar. Visualize these 3 lines feeding the subway. Make sure the junction/transfer point is well designed. Also by making this as an extension of the Purple, you would not necessarily need another subway yard and that would save a lot of money. |
| 01/22/19 | Source post | There is only one choice. Heavy Metro Rail as the Red and Purple lines from Sylmar to LAX via Van Nuys, Studio City, Westwood, Culver City, Westchester and LAX. Heavy Rail is necessary to handle the needed capacity that will be required. |
| 01/22/19 | Source post | Will the presentation material be made available here for those that cannot attend the meetings? |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 01/24/19 | Source post | People need to stop forcing this being any sort of Purple Line Extension when it's going to be Slower than the LAX Flyaway outside of rush hour and the Red Line already goes to the Valley, which is what should be getting an extension further into the valley. Let's just stick to having the Purple Line going to Santa Monica as was initially sold and voted for. If this becomes any sort of Extension of the Purple Line I will never vote yes on another ballot measure for Transit again. I voted for Purple Line Extension to Santa Monica and a separate rail extension that goes north and south only. That's what I expect to get in return. |
| 01/24/19 | Source post | Yet, at least between Van Nuys and Sylmar (and possibly Santa Clarita in the future), Light rail has been chosen. I understand the reason for having Heavy Rail but I personally have 2 issues with this being heavy rail now: Forced transfer and insisting this be a Purple Line Extension. |
| 01/25/19 | Source post | A logical recommendation would have the Sepulveda pass portion north to Sylmar be light rail. End this line at Wilshire/Westwood and extend the Purple Line from the VA to LAX. |
| 01/25/19 | Source post | Whichever mode, LRT or HRT, there ought to be connector tracks at all intersections with other compatible lines for maximum future service flexibility plus added ease of moving train cars around the system for storage or maintenance. With LRT, this would mean trains from any direction can theoretically go any direction once at the orange line / van Nuys Blvd. junction. Connector tracks to the expo line in some manner would also be wise. Chatsworth to LAX, Sylmar to North Hollywood (or further depending on how the NoHo – Pasadena line is configured) etc. are examples of alternate possible service patterns if desired. At least the supporting infrastructure should be there already, were such service patterns deemed feasible at a later time. Same for HRT which in this case would allow up to 3 possible service patterns (or more if purple is ever extended to Santa Monica); Sherman Oaks – LAX, Sherman Oaks – Downtown LA, LAX to Downtown LA. A new UCLA campus station would probably require the junction to be east of VA station to avoid awkward track geometry. If no such station is built (though it should be), than the junction would simply be just west of VA station. It would be nice if a red line extension from north Hollywood to Chatsworth was being considered as an orange line replacement, which could still cross at-grade, much like the busy LIRR system does in suburban Long Island and that uses third rail level crossings without issues. That way, we could simplify the decision of what mode is best with the fewest transfers for the Sepulveda line. There would be a guaranteed one seat ride from Chatsworth to DTLA and a guaranteed one seat ride from Sylmar to LAX or other destinations if a junction with expo is built. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | A tunnel under Beverly Glen would get you from Ventura Blvd to Westwood Blvd in 8 minutes. It would much slower to go OVER. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | An obvious solution for 2050. In the meanwhile, build a bus lane. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | An overhead monorail system can be built offsite impacting the area in a minimal way while also speeding up the install time. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Anything public transport is fine that will connect the Valley with the Westside and LAX. Close a freeway lane and use that for the train and make them run every 5 minutes. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | As long as a rail isn't built by areas that are often affected by fires. I find that living in the Valley, I drive to the Westside more often and a rail would be nice. I also think it would help tourism and lighten the traffic problem around the 405. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | As long as they beef up policing. Van Nuys Blvd is notorious for having homeless people who are not on meds harassing people. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Definitely. Driving has become unsafe |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Depends how much tax payer money u guys waste. Will we see it in our lifetime or our grandkids? |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Disneyland-type monorails are not the answer...nor are they practical. The weight of 300 people would probably topple the pillars holding it above the 405. The Sepulveda Pass project needs a heavy rail, under the SM mountains, minimal stop route, connecting the Orange Line Sepulveda or Van Nuys stop...to West LA's Purple or Expo Line stops...perhaps stops in Westwood and the VA. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Everything Musk has proposed is inferior the rail lines Metro is running right now. Car tunnels are a waste of money. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Here's what I think should happen. Portal in Sherman oaks, leading to lonnnng tunnel that portals by pacific design center and continues down the middle of San Vicente to where it can become the Crenshaw line. The Valley gets a new station or five, WeHo gets its station and all get a direct line to the airport transfer station. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | I assume that the short-trip vehicles do not run on gasoline. Anything to reduce the massive congestion on our streets is a welcome addition. Mayor Villaragosa spent a fortune on a traffic study, but neither the result nor the current mayor has figured out how to sequence the traffic lights to allow a free flow of traffic. I have voiced complaints to West Side for years about the signals going east on Sepulveda to no avail, and traffic going east on Wilshire and Santa Monica is congested Monday-Friday because the planners don't know squat about traffic flow. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | I honestly don't know anyone who enjoys putting up with the rampant behavior on the bus. The smell of urine wafting in the air and the sound of homeless people fighting or losing it because they forgot to take their meds. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | I recall the short sighted skeptics who said the blue line and green line would never be completed. Nobody will ever ride them, right? How wrong they were! Those skeptics keep sounding off. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | I would rather have a hard seat and not fabric! No more fabric seats!!! |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | I would rather take my car |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | I'd rather have safer transportation and a focus less crime before more lines |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | I'd rather take the rail that goes between the south San Gabriel Valley with a connection to all of those places. And this does not exist. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | I'd say the two biggest traffic problems produced on the 405 are due to the Getty, Santa Monica and LAX from tourists. If we can find a way to make it more appealing to take railways for tourism... and then push it to commuters, we'd see less congestion immediately. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | If the designers install solar cells along both sides of the rails they can not only power the system with electricity but also provide shelter areas for shade and the few times it rains here. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | If they allow new transit to be degraded like Redline, it will be a haven for homeless. It's filthy and unsafe. I took the redline for years starting in. 2001. Started working DTLA again. I feel unsafe. And DTLA has become unnavigable on foot. I'm not hopeful. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | It takes me less time to travel by car in rush hour traffic than by brand new the best Metro could build and call it Expo line. Facts. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | <p>I've just returned from the community/town hall meeting at the Presbyterian Church in Westwood. The meeting was well run and the information was presented thoroughly, efficiently and understandably. They mentioned that they would upload the slide presentation to the website- please do so, as I am interested in viewing it myself, as well as showing co-workers of mine who work with me on projects in the LAX-405 corridor. I am a community member who commutes daily down Sepulveda Blvd via the R6 Culver City bus from Westwood/Lindbrook down to the LAX bus station. This project would dramatically improve my day if come to fruition. As a rising architect and urban planning enthusiast I had a few comments on the proposals:1) I found the most effective proposal to be HRT-3, the Hard Rail option that departs Van Nuys station for Sherman Oaks, UCLA, and courses down straight down Sepulveda to eventual Crenshaw Line/LAX People Mover link. In the debate of constructing the phase 2 Westside-LAX extension down either Centinela or Sepulveda - I find Sepulveda to be the easy option. Either would be personally convenient for me, but Centinela traverses Mar Vista and more quiet, residential, bedroom communities just west of the 405. Sepulveda, as exists already as a major commercial thoroughfare, likely the single most significant north-south commercial thoroughfare west of the Baldwin Hills, is an economic no-brainer of a choice to host the eventual subway line, given how much further it could support existing and future businesses that line from Westwood down to LAX. Converting Centinela into such a thoroughfare would easily change the zoning of the more quiet, residential stretches near the Santa Monica airport, in favor of more populated, commercial infrastructures. I foresee the residents west of the 405 much more resistant to such change than the residents of Westchester, Culver City, Palms, and West LA, who I foresee much more welcoming of the improved transportation access upon the already existing, heavily-trafficked Sepulveda Blvd. The younger and middle class demographics of these neighborhoods just east of the 405 would provide better ridership and reception to a new subway line than the more established communities just west of the 405. 2) One weakness I see in the course design is at its southern terminus at the Crenshaw line. The proposed Sepulveda line comes just so close, but misses meeting the Green Line station just south of LAX, it provides an awkward gap in service, and perhaps an unnecessary additional transfer point, for commuters and riders traveling from between the Westside and South Bay. If the plan is ultimately to construct rail underground, it may be worth extending the line the extra mile south, concurrent and underneath the Crenshaw line, to the Green Line station. Thus it eliminates what would be that extra transfer point for North-South commuters, and provides transfer arrivals at LAX/Aviation station two line options to proceed to the LAX people mover.</p> |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | LA needs a comprehensive overhead monorail system and sub system... It's the only solution to traffic |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Mag lev down the middle of the 405 From a Sylmar to LAX to the south bay. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Mono rail is not practical as there are problems with switching tracks. Light rail is a better solution. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | No it's a waste of money! |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Not likely that this will ever be built. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Pacific Electric Railway once ran Trolleys and later, short freight trains in the middle median of Santa Monica Blvd until 1984. No one complained. NIMBYS tried to stop the Expo line. Thankfully they lost. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Please allow a rapid rail to go through the Sepulveda pass from the San Fernando down to the beach. Please don't allow the selfish wishes of a few to outweigh the desperate needs of the Millions. Please. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Please include a bike lane as well! |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Please! |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Put it next to or on top. Take Uber to my station. Long over due. Should have done it when the 405 was under it last on ramp updates. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Rail construction has torn up too many neighborhoods for too long. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Real rail, underground that travels fast. Better yet, give the money to Elon, he'll do better job. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Stop wasting money on inflexible fixed rail infrastructure. We need enough buses so the wait is less than 5 minutes for pickups and transfers. With frequent express buses. People will get out of their cars to avoid the hassle of parking and vehicle maintenance. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | That's a great idea and they could turn the other half of Sepulveda into a one-way depending upon traffic corridor, in the morning it could all be Southbound, and in the afternoon and evenings it could all be northbound. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | The rail is the way to go!!! |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | These community meetings are window dressing that our elected officials are 'listening' when in fact they hardly listen. I'm burnt out on these community meetings |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | This line will be one of the most heavily traveled lines in the country. Thank you. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Totally agree! |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Waste of money for the amount of people taking it. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | We absolutely need several subways in the valley!!! And one going from valley to Westside and LAX for sure! I used to live on the Westside and since I've been Valley side the last 11 years I have observed a noticeable discrepancy in where all the city funding is going. The Westside just keeps getting nicer and nicer and the valley has not changed much at all since I've lived here. We are getting massive apartment buildings over here but little else. Traffic is just going to continue to get worse as these apartment buildings pop up. The city trees are all dying over here. There are very few new ones being planted. Why doesn't the city seem to want to invest in the valley? There's a huge work force over here. The population is growing rapidly as Westsiders like myself keep moving here because it's too expensive for many to live on the Westside. We need a huge re-education program on TV for our city in all languages. Commercials promoting tree growth. The benefits. We could have solar over every parking lot in the valley providing shade for cars and people and power. We are going to need subways and we need the work to start now!!!! |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Why doesn't LA already have above ground rail by the 405? Many US cities have above ground rail. This should have been packaged into the Skirball widening project years ago and saved our commute time going forward... now we're going to have Carmageddon all over again. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Yes build it. The 405 expansion did nothing. Plus rail safer and faster than driving on the slow 05 |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Yes it's a great idea.... LAX traffic is a nightmare |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Yes totally agreed! I love the valley, lived here for 10 yrs. now. It's the only place could find a reasonable priced condo, anyway, your right, with all the new apartments and condos, being built, where is our transportation to go with it, would be wonderful to have a rail system going from North Ridge to Santa Monica. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Yes! |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Yes! As long as existing roads aren't traded off. SM took lanes away to add rail lines. Doesn't make sense. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Yes, Sepulveda Blvd should be a rail corridor from SFV to LAX. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | Yes, to avoid traffic. |
| 01/28/19 | Project Email | You guys have been collecting comments and information about this since 2010. If you can do one thing that helps LA traffic more than anything else, it would be add SOMETHING - ANYTHING to aid with transportation on the 405. Why are you still talking about this? I don't care if it's a clown car that plays Benny Hill music on repeat. YES! I'll take that. Do it. Do anything! |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 01/28/19 | Source post | I think we all want every major location in LA interconnected as soon as possible. But for now, we need to stick to what is most logical, direct, and possible with available funds, while also considering future needs and possibilities. That the new north-south line connecting the Valley with LAX should be heavy rail is a no-brainer, considering the large amount of daily riders it will generate. It would ideal if it started at the Metrolink/Amtrak station on Van Nuys Blvd., thus allowing West, North and East Valley commuters, as well as long-distance travelers, to have a direct route without further changes, to the West Side and LAX. Then, the new line should then go underground and stop at Valley City Hall on Van Nuys near Victory, to connect with the planned Van Nuys Blvd. Light Rail Line, which should be a separate entity. It should then proceed to the Orange Line's Sepulveda Station, where the large parking lot can handle a large number of cars from the surrounding area. Hopefully, the Orange Line will have been converted to Light Rail by then. The new line should then continue underground through the Sepulveda Pass, but I would hope they could build a stop with a large parking lot near the busy area encompassing Mulholland Drive, Skirball Center Drive and the Getty Center, using elevators and steep escalators to reach the station below. Following it's southward journey through the Pass, the new line should stop at UCLA in Westwood, but inter-connect with the Purple Line, which should eventually be completed as originally planned, to end in Santa Monica. The new N-S line would then continue southward to inter-connect with the Expo Line's Sepulveda Station, and on to LAX, with a stop possibly near Playa Vista to also serve the Marina, Fox Hills and Playa del Rey, and of course, one for Westchester, presumably at Sepulveda and Manchester. So, those are my humble suggestions for this exciting project, which I am eagerly awaiting no matter what form it finally takes. I am also looking forward to attending one of the upcoming community meetings later this week, to hear what the experts are proposing. This long-needed rail link from the Valley to LA's West Side and LAX will be our biggest reward for passing two sales tax increases to fund so many worthwhile transportation projects in and around Los Angeles. Good for us! |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | 15 minutes from Van Nuys to Sepulveda/Expo, no need for hyperloop here. |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | Also, looking closer at the Monorail proposal, the only reason to build that would have been to include the Getty Center as a stop. Since that no longer appears to be under consideration, there's no point in building a Monorail over a Subway. |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | Big mistake not including a stop between Purple and Expo Lines. |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | Can the future Aviation/96th street station be modified to have the station box pre-built to accommodate this line? |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | Disappointed that the light rail option is off the table to allow continuous operation from Sylmar to the Westside, however I trust that Metro's experts studied the potential for the Sepulveda Pass and HRT or even monorail is the best way forward. It's good that Van Nuys Boulevard will be a light rail line connecting to the future Sepulveda Pass subway. Some of the alternatives calls for the Van Nuys LRT & Sepulveda HRT/MRT shared at the Metrolink station & Orange Line station; it looks like these areas may become the next "North Hollywood transit hub". Seeing that the updated alternatives take LRT out of the equation, and with no tie-in to the Purple Line, I'd wonder where the maintenance facility & storage yard for this project will be; the Van Nuys LRT is slated to have a yard near the Metrolink station, but is there room to accommodate for a different rail technology? |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | Great concept and I hope to see it in my lifetime. Really doubt this will be up and running by 2028. Lets hope Metro proves me wrong. I'll vote for Bundy as the terminus instead of Sepulveda. Reaching west of the 405 will have a much more positive effect on ridership and the Bundy Station is busier than the Sepulveda Station today. |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | How about, instead of heading toward UCLA, this line heads toward San Vicente Blvd, and be a part of the northern expansion of the Crenshaw Line; which will, by necessity of this choice, itself choose the San Vicente Blvd route option. Then you have a one-seat ride from Torrance to Van Nuys, with direct stops at the airport, West Adams, busy but-freeway-far Westside places, and West Hollywood; and crosses the Expo, Green and Purple line. You'd have to go light rail to match Crenshaw's current design, but the idea of linking together most of the central LA areas heavy with places people want to go could be really appealing. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 01/29/19 | Source post | HRT 1 is obviously going to win this contest. Would there be any way to segment off and accelerate funding to build a shallow cut and cover box structure and utility relocation project (it's a really wide Blvd., it wouldn't need to be sidewalk to sidewalk, just center of the street excavation) for the overlapping section with the ESFV before the ESFV begins work on that section? This would allow for the two subway stations to be shallow, without gigantic full mezzanines for the those stops, which would also increase transfer speeds from Metrolink and the top of the box structure could be restored to be ready for the construction for the ESFV. This would mitigate the neighborhood impacts over the long run. I know cut and cover has a bad reputation, but it would allow for shallower stations and greatly reduced construction impacts for this neighborhood ultimately. The rest could be TBM bored tunnels. Since it is likely going to cross Westwood at parking lot 36 and proceed down veteran to expo (not cruciform under the askew and skyscraped Westwood intersection). As for the LAX portion, I'm hugely delighted to see a purple line extension under consideration! But why not do both? first, have the Bundy option selected for the Sepulveda/LAX line, then do a "regional connector" extension project for the purple line that extends the purple line from the VA to expo/Bundy. The purple line would then join up with and interline with the Sepulveda/LAX line, allowing for 2 minute headways on the section from Bundy to LAX. |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | HRT 1 is the most straight-forward, go with that. I would add a stop on Santa Monica Blvd. (either at Sepulveda or Bundy, but Sepulveda is my preference) That section of West LA is severely under-served by transit and grid-locked every day. It'll add a minute or two to the travel time but well worth it, in my opinion. |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | I agree that the light rail segment from Sylmar to Van Nuys be scrapped and the HRT 1 Sepulveda line be extended. This would allow for a one seat option to West LA or LAX by people coming in from the Antelope Valley. I would continue the Valley HRT to LAX rather than continuing the Purple line there. I would also think about a station either near the Getty or at Mulholland to allow access to the Skirball museum, the American Jewish University, and the other schools and churches at Mulholland and Sepulveda. |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | I noticed in the slides above that the monorail option appears to only be considering what we normally think of as a monorail (single center track with train on top), but has Metro considered a suspended monorail system, similar to what they have used to great effect in Japan? In Yokohama, the Shonan monorail had to overcome a similar grade as the Sepulveda Pass, and it seems to me like the suspended monorail system wouldn't have the same problems listed for a normal monorail (difficulty managing nature/stream crossings). It would also probably work better for the underground portion, as monorails generally have trouble with tunnels, but suspended monorails not as much. |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | I respectfully disagree with the UCLA station opinion. This station has to be south of the campus on Strathmore Pl. or Charles E. Young. Preferably, the station in between both streets with an exit tunnel on the north for passengers to the campus and Pauley Pavilion and the south to Ronald Reagan Hospital and the northern part of Westwood Village. A station at Sunset would leave passengers at an area of the campus near parking lots and sports fields. I understand the idea of the buses but with the Purple and Sepulveda fully built I don't see high ridership on those buses. |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | I'd rather see them scrap the east valley project, funnel the funds into this project and have a 1 seat HRT ride from Sylmar to LAX via Van Nuys Blvd. merging the two projects would allow for more funds, allowing it to be accelerate, possibly even to LAX by 2028? and built right instead of having 2 competing services in one area. |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | Need to get Elon Musk into the mix too. His hyperloop concept should be seriously considered too. |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | Please drop the 405 southern alignment. We've seen the damage pollution does to people so let's not concentrate public transit and the accompanying density near those fumes. |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | Should definitely be the Bundy/Centinela option otherwise you are in no man's land in the 405 fumes. Also should have a stop at Santa Monica/Bundy. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 01/29/19 | Source post | The HRT2 choice on the north collects ridership from the Light Rail, Amtrak and Metrolink from the Van Nuys Station. Any riders on the Light Rail can still continue down Van Nuys Blvd to the Orange Line (hopefully rail some day). Picking up a station over near Sepulveda is a good idea also on the south end, good to see a UCLA station on north side of campus- Sunset Blvd is still best as you can also have transfers to both Rapid and Local buses east /west on Sunset. You could also have any UCLA shuttles connect here as well. Still make the Purple Connection at Westwood Blvd, Expo at Sepulveda and have the line continue down Sepulveda , Culver City, Fox Hills area to LAX as on the 405 option. Maybe consider a stop at the LAX intermodal/remote check in stop first to allow transfers 1 stop closer to LAX, because I feel if you dump ALL the connecting passengers at 96th, you may overload that facility. That facility is going to have 3 light rail lines and all the city buses I believe. The connections at Westwood for the Purple and Sepulveda for Expo create “4 way” directional transfers (N/S/E/W)- best bang for the buck. The other option of Purple extending down Centinela is interesting, but I then would say just extent it past the VA down Wilshire to downtown Santa Monica and then just turn it down Lincoln to LAX instead. Adding this to the Sepulveda Line down to LAX would give roughly 2 north/south lines on the crowded westside. Couldn't hurt. |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | The Monorails should be considered the least feasible and eliminated early. There's no point of monorails. They have to fund an entirely new train technology with no commonality. If they are trying so hard to finish in time for the Olympics in 2028, wouldn't it be better to do the LAX to Purple Line connector first. Then complete the northern line later. Metrolink needs to be converted to Metro style trains, payment, and service frequency. Metrolink is actually the weak link. |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | These are decent options. I definitely think that primarily running down Sepulveda is better from a point of view of hitting major destinations / job centers and not doubling up on the LRT's line. However, this isn't great for anyone traveling on Van Nuys South of the Metrolink stop (essentially half the Valley), which creates an odd situation where travel times to the Westside are likely going to be shorter North of the train station than South of the train station (at least for a bit). I think HRT-3 makes the most sense *if* the Van Nuys LRT is reopened to continue down Van Nuys / Ventura to the Sepulveda/Ventura station (even if this happens at a later point – and even more so if some easy interchange with the Pass line is prepared – using an underground cross-platform interchange, for example).Elevated on Sepulveda definitely makes sense, especially if it allows an extra station to be built. Thankfully, modern elevated tracks aren't the ridiculously loud and leaky steel girder messes of the early 20th century anymore. |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | unsure if its ever going to be considered but omg cool I never even knew monorail could look like that! Imagine going through the pass everyday and seeing the view from above like that |
| 01/29/19 | Source post | While subway type trains are the chosen type of equipment why do they have to be underground for the part of the route along the 405? Building above ground is less expensive and can be achieved in less time. In fact Sepulveda is a very wide street and the trains could run elevated or below ground but not covered for far less money along that portion as well. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Can Metro study how much ridership the HRT 1 alignment could replace from the East SFV light rail line if we relocated the ESFV funds to extend HRT 1 to the Panorama City Mall/Roscoe Blvd, so we can implement protected bike lanes, bus lanes, complete streets, and save parking on Van Nuys Blvd? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Can Purple Line extension be rounded back to Sepulveda rather than down Centinela? Does the Purple Line extension have to go to existing expo line stations and locations or can they use new locations? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Can this be combined with the Valley LRT project? I favor HRT 1 and 2 (underground) and not monorail/ HRT 1 is favored but the question of freeway connections and parking must be answered. Work at Getty Center for monorail extension. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Can you provide us information pertaining to the geotechnical report by Wood? Will any of the four designs be running along any earthquake faults in the Sherman Oaks area? What steps have been taken to address concerns? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Could there be a stop between the Purple Line and Expo, not on Santa Monica? This area is important and should not be skipped. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Could there be any possibility of a stop at/near the Getty Center? We feel it would generate a lot of ridership between Getty employees and visitors as there are very limited options to arrive via public transit. Those using the Expo Line are extremely inconvenienced as the 734 connection at the Sepulveda station travels around UCLA before heading to the Getty, adding an additional 40+ minutes to the commute. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Given how many riders they will have, they do not factor in loss of parking as a determining factor in alignment. Please plan to integrate the Westwood/Wilshire transfer station as one coordinated, underground station box like the D.C. Metro. Change the Purple Line Phase III plans if necessary. If this opportunity passes, the transfer will be arduous forever after. As soon as the line opens, toll the 405. Congestion pricing is the only way to actually reduce congestion. Do not use a private partnership transit operations should not be used to make a company a profit. PPP's are seen as magic bullets but they are often too good to be true. Overall a great much needed project. Quite supportive. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Have Metro consider adding a stop at Santa Monica Blvd. It will likely be a big transfer point to Metro and local buses, in particular the Metro Rapid 704/Local 4. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Have you considered "triple-tracking" this corridor with heavy rail. This would allow for express service between longer travel distances of major junctions in the corridors. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Have you considered a revival of the 30/10 proposal to accelerate funding availability? Are you planning ahead for the day when Sepulveda line's Westwood station will become a hub for an extension of the Purple Line to the ocean? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Have you considered automating the HRT options? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Heavy rail/High speed, we are only going to have one shot to get this right! |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | How do you get property for parking at Venice/Sepulveda or Venice/Centinela for Westwood to LAX? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | How much of a factor does the fact there is a pre-existing orange line station at Van Nuys/Ventura in the final decision making process. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | HRT 3 is my first choice. HRT 1 is my second choice. HRT 2 is my third choice. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | HRT options - why not a stop at the Getty Center - tourism? West LA to LAX - why 24 years to complete. I want to see the connection before I die. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | I am strongly in favor of the HRT 1 option connecting Van Nuys/Ventura to Expo/Bundy. I am also strongly in favor of the Centinela alignment from Expo/Bundy to LAX. The Sepulveda/405 options are too close to the 405 to allow for walkable, dense, and healthy transit-oriented communities. I would like to see a station near Santa Monica/Barrington considered as well as a station near Centinela/Culver Blvd. I am concerned that the Purple Line extension would prevent the original PL extension to Santa Monica from occurring. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | I do not drive, and the Sepulveda pass project opens the valley to me. I would prefer a stations near Santa Monica Blvd despite and inopportune location. I will ride this and the Purple Line regularly and hope for the fastest possible completion. Monorail suits me well but heavy rail is likely the best option. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | I live in the valley and work in Westwood. It takes me 1.5-2 hours sometimes to get to work on the 405. What can be done now to cut down my commute time? The HOV lane is full. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | I question dropping concept 4 LRT for capacity reasons: 4 car trains times 100 people/car times 20 trains per hour. Existing SB I-405 equals 5 lanes times 1,500 people per hour. Surely equaling the freeway is enough plus providing the benefit of a one seat mode from Sylmar to LAX. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | I really liked the second and third proposals that go through the Sepulveda Pass section of the line. I also liked the proposal for the line to go down Sepulveda to connect to LAX much better than going down Centinela. Sepulveda is a top 5 major thoroughfare in LA and this can handle a subway to connect to LAX. Plus, any stops along this section will be used more as there is more to do in the vicinity of the four proposed stops. Overall, Centinela is a quieter thoroughfare in comparison. With the Sepulveda pass section, the second proposal will definitely provide less problems as its being built because the line would be underground and any unintended consequences in the future do to redevelopment or any else in Van Nuys wont be hindered by a subway. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | I strongly urge that you choose either HRT 1 or HRT 2. The monorail proposal should be a non-starter. Introducing yet another transit mode that is incompatible with a heavy rail, light rail, bus rapid transit, conventional bus transit, Metrolink would be very poor planning. Any talk of needing to complete this project for the 2028 Olympics is ridiculous. We are building this (with high capacity and speed) for the next 200-300 years, not for 3 weeks of the Olympic Games. Please do not underbuild this. Choose heavy rail, not monorail! |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | If this is built as a public private partnership will it connect to the Purple Line? If so will the Metro fare include a free transfer between the Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project and the Metro Purple Line subway? With a P3 does not the private company want a return? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Is there a chance that the Santa Monica Blvd Station in West LA could be added back? Why was it eliminated? How can Metro justify a routing along Sepulveda Blvd given the extreme pollution, unwalkable environment, and lack of useful land due to the 405. Are the Venice and Washington Stations, on the Centinela route to LAX meant to exist together? If so how is that justified? Where would the HRT maintenance facility be located? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Is there a way to seamlessly connect the valley line to the 405 down to LAX so that people can ride seamlessly from the valley to LAX? Is there a way to connect HRT to the Getty? Is it possible to extend Purple Line to Santa Monica, Pacific Palisades in Malibu? It would help to gather those people or for people going to the valley to West-LA/beaches area? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Is there consideration for a future link to the orange line by way of the old P.E. right of way? Congestion pricing to finance project? What is the physical situation at transfer to lines that are above ground/light rail/ BRT etc.? Upzoning in conjunction with plan? Will there be a park and ride? Will there be/are people looking for a spur down? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Metro already operates 3 modes (subway, light rail, bus) Has Metro considered the extra cost of adding a fourth (monorail) specially trained mechanics, custom parts, custom cars etc. as opposed to interchangeable cars and parts with the rest of the system? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | More info on Express Lanes - what does construction entail? Will there be more traffic during construction? Where are park and rides if connect with Purple Lines there is no parking for that line. Monorail - what impacts on property? Will take homes and where will there be noise in residential areas adjacent to lines? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | My preference is HRT 3, as this transit concept would allow maximum capacity to serve growth, while using a system compatible to current Metro rail systems (i.e. avoiding using monorail and a non-compatible system) Second choice would be HRT 2 as it also has fastest travel time but either HRT 1 or HRT 2 would be acceptable. E-W/Spur to Sepulveda station and LAX should be Culver Blvd or Washington Blvd, not Venice Blvd as Centinela already. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | North Hollywood station and universal parking lots are always full. We need more parking as usages at valley stations. It is very hard to get around the valley by bus. So to get train station you need to drive therefore there should be a big parking garage at the valley/westside transfer stop. Do not put rail underground. Expo plus Blue line has to compete with road traffic, bus, bike, people. Any project that is rail should have its own dedicated line. I do not think Purple Line should be extended south. It should be extended further west towards Santa Monica. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Please do HRT 1. We need fast, heavy rail so people will choose transit over cars. Slow and hellish metro does not work. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Put money into housing, so increase buses. I have a bus lane. No underground rail. Least obtrusive, save money and spend on affordable housing. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | This project is fantastic - cant wait. Please put a station at Santa Monica Blvd. It will be a heavily used transfer point, especially to the Metro Rapid 704/Local 4/Big Blue Bus 1 |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | This project is really exciting. Thank you for holding this meeting. I would like to see a station at Jefferson Rd. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Tunneling beneath Santa Monica Mountains specifically Bel Air. Residents are concerned about faults. Liquidfaction on Stone Canyon Rd that requires homes to have deep caissons and the 120 foot deep caissons that are installed by these gigamansions have in excess of 180 caissons on these projects. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | What impact will there be for neighborhoods in the areas of the tunneling during construction? How deep are the tunnels for both the HRT and MRT concepts? How will the construction of the monorail line impact the use of the 405 freeway and Sepulveda? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | What is the cost to the riders for a one way trip from Expo to Valley transfer point? What is the projected cost or estimated? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | What is the rationale for ultimately choosing a fall Sepulveda transit line over a purple line extension or vice versa? Any of the heavy rail alternatives are better for the Sepulveda Pass section primarily because time could be the main consideration, but considering Sepulveda/I-105 are very inhospitable to pedestrians, planning should try to avoid these routes. Additionally, while a Purple Line extension could make sense to single seat ride from DTLA to LAX. I believe the is extension could future considerations for Purple Line to Santa Monica. |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | What is the real difference in costs for each project - not in today's dollars but in future dollars. Which is a better investment? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | What percentage of the ridership will be switching from one mode of public transportation to the Sepulveda Transit Corridor versus private automobiles to the Sepulveda Transit Corridor? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | When will we know the exact route? How deep is the subway at Mulholland/Bellagio Rd? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Why do you need both the project and the Express Lanes? Can the Express Lanes money be reallocated to other projects or extending the Purple Line west? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Why is a station proposed at Centinela/Washington instead of Centinela/Culver? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Will the potential to extend the Sepulveda Corridor Line north to Sylmar be included in the evaluation? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Would construction cost savings from MRT make 2028 acceleration more likely? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Would it be possible to have both the valley/westside section and the Purple Line both extend south to LAX by interlining like the Red and Purple Line do Downtown LA? |
| 01/30/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Would prefer HRT because of its use of Sepulveda Orange Line stop. Sepulveda and Ventura is the main intersection in the valley more so than Van Nuys. Would support all HRT versions of the project to alleviate the 405 congestion and create a fast method of getting from the SFV to WLA. Would prefer a Westwood, VA, and Bundy stop to connect with the Purple Line and Expo Line. |
| 01/30/19 | Source post | All HRT concepts are great at this point and I can't wait to ride it in the future. I would say having the new HRT rail going to LAX via Centinela Ave because it can potentially merge with the proposed Lincoln Ave BRT line into one transit project. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 01/30/19 | Source post | As someone that commutes daily to the Getty, I am disappointed that none of these plans include a stop there. My growing frustration is that all buses from the expo line must first go to UCLA, which is more than adequately served (As all of these plans for Sepulveda Pass continue to do) adding unnecessary detours my commute. Between Sepulveda/Wilshire and Sepulveda/Ventura is a transit desert still with these plans. If there were something that went up Sepulveda from the Expo that served the Getty and the Skirball that would alleviate traffic. There are more that 1,000 employees and hundreds of visitors daily plus Skirball staff and visitors. There is **one** bus that serves these institutions, first winding its way through UCLA, and at least a dozen that connect UCLA to the rest of the county. (BBB 17, R12, 8, 1, 2, Culver City, 6, Rapid 6, Metro 734, 788, 302, 602, 720, 20 and campus commuters) Please consider this in your plans or consider changing the route of the 734 or 788 to include stops at these highly visited institutions. Thank you. |
| 01/30/19 | Source post | HRT all the way to Sylmar Metrolink would be cool, but would be really prohibitively expensive. |
| 01/30/19 | Source post | It seems that the monorail option is the least likely because of what would be major community opposition. These things are loud and Metro will just have a bunch of really pissed off neighbors, plus the Sepulveda Pass has pesky wildfires that could cause frequent service interruptions, and these problems will get worse as Metro seeks to extend the line south of the Expo. Another thought is that I'm not sure anyone really believes the VA will be the ultimate terminus of the Purple Line. In just a few years, the Expo already under-serves Santa Monica with the trains at capacity during the commute so eventually push will come to shove and the Purple Line will have to go further west, so the big turn that brings it south toward LAX doesn't make sense. I'm in favor of the most straightforward network possible – HRT 1 that eventually means a one-seat ride from Van Nuys to LAX, and it likely also means the fastest mode that covers the most amount of distance, which makes it outcompete cars and only then can we get people out of their cars. |
| 01/30/19 | Source post | Please consider an alternative where the Sepulveda Transit Corridor and Purple line interline between Wilshire/Westwood and Bundy/Expo via the VA. This line could continue down Centinela to LAX. This would create a one-seat ride between LAX and the valley (via Crenshaw Transit Corridor) and LAX and Downtown LA (via Purple Line). Also, you get one transfer point to the Expo Line at Bundy for both the Purple Line and the Sepulveda Transit Corridor without the unnecessary cost of building two parallel subway tunnels and two underground stations (Bundy and Sepulveda). Last, having to transfer twice from Expo to Sepulveda to Purple to get from Santa Monica to Downtown LA (as shown in H1-3 and M1) will increase travel times and hurt ridership. |
| 01/30/19 | Source post | There could still be a non revenue connector track much like what's on the blue to green line junction at Willowbrook. This would be the wise way to go so as to easily move train cars around, as a matter of fact, it would be extremely unwise not to do so as not having such a connector would mean metro would have two separate isolated HRT networks for no good reason. |
| 01/30/19 | Source post | Why isn't there a Mulholland stop? |
| 01/31/19 | Source post | Definitely heavy rail option 1, rather than 2, because it would be 1 station shorter for transfers from the orange line coming from the east versus the shorter commute and transfer traveling on the orange line from the west. It's also completely underground which is better for the environment. Probably more expensive but you get what you pay for. I really don't mind option 2. Option 3 would be cool but I doubt locals want an aerial HRT around, it would be nice though, have something like in NYC or CHI that have elevated HRT. Monorails? That's cute. |
| 01/31/19 | Source post | If a Sepulveda alignment is chosen, is there any potential for the Eastside San Fernando Valley Corridor to be extended down Van Nuys to Ventura and then be extended down Ventura either towards Sepulveda or towards Cahuenga in Studio City? I would have to imagine this would be a massively successful extension, as it would connect the central SFV with job centers along Ventura like the Sherman Oaks Galleria and the Encino office district and provide a second point of contact along the Sepulveda line if extended westward, or with job centers like CBS Television City, Universal Studios and Studio City itself if extended eastward. This would transform the way the valley commutes and develops, with a robust transit network and increased walkability in an area that already has great bones for urbanity. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 01/31/19 | Source post | You need to include at least one track connecting the Purple Line to the Sepulveda Line, probably in Westwood. It's important to be able to move trains between lines, when necessary. It would allow the lines to share a yard, and also be useful in emergencies. Longer term, I support connecting Sepulveda Phase 2 to Purple Phase 4 on the way to LAX. You have two "Centinela concepts" which could be combined to do just that. Basically, Sepulveda Phase 2 would continue to Expo/Sepulveda, and Purple Phase 4 would continue to Expo/Bundy. Then somewhere south of there they would join together. Now is the time to consider this, while the design of Purple Line Phase 3 in Westwood can still be modified, to include a breakout panel to allow a future connector tunnel. |
| 02/01/19 | Project Email | Of these coming meetings, if I miss them, will there be more meetings, or are these all? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Alternative 1 looks to be the most viable route that solves the Valley-West LA congestion. How much would be cost for this route and what will be the next step? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Any above ground will be going through high level pollution air due to the vehicle exhaust from the 405 freeway cars and trucks. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Are there any plans to extend any Metro service to the Santa Clarita Valley? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Are there plans to increase the ridership frequency for the Orange Line? As a valley Metro rider commuting to DTLA, driving to the Red Line still takes less time than riding the Orange Line to the Universal station. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | As a valley resident who has to commute to UCLA, I hope this project will make it easier for me and future commuters. In favor of HRT 1. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | As to the choice between having a station at either Centinela/Venice or Centinela/Washington. I would suggest Centinela/Washington for the following reason: This area is currently much less busy and congested than Centinela/Venice. There will be a large food hall constructed at Centinela/Washington which would be conducive to a subway shop. Culver City is allowing a great deal of density increases along Washington Blvd. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Can you include maintenance costs and new support system for the MRT? How backed up will cars get off freeway if station is on Sepulveda? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Have you considered buying light rail/heavy rail combo cars for the Van Nuys line and connecting the tracks? During rush hour you could schedule trains from Van Nuys every 5 minutes alternating a long heavy rail train with a shorter comb train goes right through from Sylmar. It would be a great benefit to the lower income residents. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Have you considered connections/access to safe bike lanes to the stations? How would each of these options be affected by fires and resulting mudslides in the hills? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Have you designed options to be able to extend further north in the future and to have sufficient parking at the north terminus? Current parking at North Hollywood is insufficient to make it a viable alternative from Northridge? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | How are you taking the existing communities into consideration when planning with public private relationship? What option between West LA to LAX will have the least impact on residents? This question is raised in concern of the possibility of residential displacement? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | How deep will the tunnels be at Ventura Blvd going south? What damage to homes happened with previous tunnels? What happens in earthquakes? I am for plan 1. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | How loud would the heavy rail traveling along Sepulveda between Roscoe and Ventura Blvd be for the neighborhood? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | How will construction of options connecting the Expo/Sepulveda station impact residents? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | How will Metro revise the East SFV EIR to incorporate the initial Sepulveda Study results and the extension of the Sepulveda Project to Van Nuys Metrolink, including an alternative to integrate the East SFV into the Sepulveda project as one line? |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|---|
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | HRT 2 or 3 get my vote. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | I am a regular Orange Line user who consistently but variably works in Downtown and the Westside. The HRT 1 option is my choice. I expect the to exceed demand and think that if should be fast tracked. Conquering this portion of the 405 is both major task and locally and a victory. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | I am told there is not enough law enforcement already for the Orange, Red and Blue lines. Has there been added into each plan, increases budget to provide additional law enforcement officers for any new lines. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | I support HRT 1 option that connects with the Van Nuys Orange Line Station. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | I support the HRT 1 option. I like that it has a very high occupancy and has good travel time. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | I think it is very important to think big and long term. I am against monorail because it is too slow and not enough capacity for the future. I do not want to just do the cheap option as a quick fix because it will become obsolete. This is the biggest most important project and must be the most efficient means of travel for people. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | If considering a station on Sepulveda and Expo Line please make an effort to avoid disruption to residents by building on the north/east side of Sepulveda Blvd and Exposition. Security currently is not enough at the stations so in the future that needs to be greatly considered. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | If you go with the Expo/Sepulveda station development consider building the station on the north/east corner of the Exposition Blvd and Sepulveda Blvd intersection. You could develop businesses there that could generate revenue. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Is it only monorail on MRT 1? Has Metro discarded "rubber-tire" tram from previous meeting? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Is there any consideration to extend the Red Line to more stations further west/north into the valley, potentially connecting to the new Metro line? How do people who don't live near the extension stations use this? More stations? Park and ride options? (more than 1 at Sherman Way) |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | It looks like from the charts, that the LRT concepts would have met ridership demands if trains had been run at 2.5 minute intervals. Was that not feasible for economic reasons? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | It looks like the plans stop in South Valley. Most traffic through the valley from the North. What would it take to plan for rail from the North Corridor? How are you addressing all that current traffic? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | No light rail option. The monorail alternative would better . It is not as safe for a subway in car country. The ocean could collapse the tunnel. Don't use tunnel combo with monorail sounds silly. My pass is not goof for Metrolink. Please don't use Metrolink to Santa Monica Expo unless Metro pass can have stops. The monorail is cheaper - you are already overspending. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Personally, HRT 2 and 3 would require people riding south of Metrolink to bus north to Metrolink, these concepts would be out of the way for these people. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Please hurry. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | The Getty Center has almost 1.5 million visitors per year, and approximately 1100 employees and contingent workforce. Was a station ever considered for the Getty Center? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | There needs to be a stop at the Van Nuys station for people who are coming to the government center. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | This is not a joke. Are people aware that the intersection of the 405 and the 101 is the busiest intersection in America? |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|---|
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Too many transfers - why not extend of orange line north instead of light rail? Or extend new HRT further north? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Is tunneling cost, risk sharing, new technology, all contracted to third party? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Under what scenario can any of this be completed by the 2028 Olympics? Can you get projected timelines for the different scenarios? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | What are the new heavy rail design looks and also will be any vibrations under Van Nuys and Sepulveda while the train is moving? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | What happens to parking on Van Nuys? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | What is the cost difference between the different options? What is the time to completion difference between the different options? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | What is the state at plans for accommodating drivers to easily park and transfer? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | What kind of train is the Getty tram compared to heavy rail? It is feasible for this project? What is Getty's plus Skirballs input on this? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | What needs to be done to ensure completion by 2028? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | What needs to happen, specifically to accomplish the before the Olympics? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | What type of rail on Van Nuys Blvd? What happens to parking on Van Nuys Blvd? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | What will you do to mitigate traffic issues through the hillside community when streets are shut down while the project is being completed? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Why do you allow local buses on Van Nuys Blvd but stop the 788 to take that rail get off take the 788 again. Basically getting more money from Measure R and Measure M might as well have subway for Sepulveda. I do not want Metrolink. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Why do you always ignore the far northeast valley. Bad enough you eliminated #168 which would bring us to major connections now you ignore us by using San Fernando to Sylmar Metro instead of continuing onto Glenoaks. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Why not put ESFV LRT underground between Roscoe and Van Nuys and having HRT 1 terminate at Van Nuys allowing shorter ESFV headway to address capacity issue and reduce traffic impacts between Roscoe and Van Nuys also reduces cost. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Why put something where we already have gridlock? How will this project affect Sepulveda/Ventura? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Why was the station at Santa Monica and Sepulveda removed from consideration? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Why would you start at Sherman Way when the demand exceeds capacity at Roscoe? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Will Metro provide restrooms in the valley stations? The situation in the rest of the Metro system is shameful. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Will there be a geological study done south of valley vista/ north Mulholland between Scadlock Ln and Woodcliff Rd? For HRT 2 before announcing a selection there have been a history of landslides and documentation of an ancient landslide in this area? |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Will there be a review on potential gentrification? |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Will this project offer any connection to Burbank Airport? Can you give more detail about the location of the above ground location of the line between Ventura Blvd at Getty Center? This is a heavy residential between 405 and Sepulveda. |
| 02/02/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Will you be coordinating with LAPD on providing security along the new lines? |
| 02/02/19 | Source post | It blows my mind that the ESFV and Sepulveda line might be two different modes. Literally makes no sense |
| 02/04/19 | Project Email | Are there any realistic plans to have this rail system go from the valley to lax to Long Beach (CSULB)? That would have great potential to reduce traffic on the 405. I think the best option would be to have rail system on the 405 from the valley to Irvine. I know OC is a tough sell, but if you at least get to CSULB, you would be right on the county line. |
| 02/04/19 | Project Email | For the new Sepulveda line, I would like to please request a stop at the Getty. There is little public transportation here and we are right on the way of the developing line. We are a site for so many visitors, and the staff itself is 1500+. Please consider adding us |
| 02/04/19 | Project Email | I am heavily in favor of HRT 1 with Sepulveda/Expo option. I also strongly feel that an interchange with the purple line is crucial. This will allow for a one seat ride to and from DTLA to the valley and LAX. I know this isn't in your project scope, however I feel that it is a mistake not upgrading the Van Nuys line to subterranean HRT which will allow for a seamless connecting to San Fernando at high capacity and speeds. This type of transit option will also allow for a wider road which can foster bus lanes to allow for more reliable bus service. A better investment in transit gives more confidence to developers which will support denser development along Van Nuys and the surrounding area. Again, I know that last paragraph doesn't have to do with your project, but I want to add that as I believe it would greatly increase ridership on the Sepulveda Pass Line |
| 02/04/19 | Project Email | I would like to be added to the email list. |
| 02/04/19 | Project Email | My preference of the four options still in the running is HRT1. My least preferred option is the monorail option. It is preferable instead to have one of the HRT lines that connects to, and can potentially share vehicles with if necessary, the purple and red lines. For all of the four proposed options, on the Southern end, I believe there needs to be a station added at Santa Monica Blvd. -- a station which I believe will be very popular and to/from which there will be many transfers to Metro and Big Blue Bus lines. Thank you very much for moving forward with this project. |
| 02/04/19 | Project Email | Put a MONORAIL OVER THE 405 and be done with it... CHEAPER and SAFER than a tunnel... |
| 02/04/19 | Project Email | The slides on the Valley-Westside transit options are great. Sadly I can't make the community meetings, but I would like to share initial input: Keep it above ground! Let people see mass transit in action rather than shove the riders underground. When I lived in San Jose I took light rail up highway 87 where riders in cars stuck in traffic could see us zipping along past them. And we riders could see the drivers stuck in traffic and feel like we made a better decision. I had a car but chose to take light rail because it was faster and less stressful. Seeing transit in action reinforces how helpful it can be. |
| 02/04/19 | Project Email | There is only one choice. A Heavy Rail line from Sylmar to LAX. This is needed to support the capacity this corridor will generate. |
| 02/04/19 | Source post | If Sepulveda line goes Van Nuys to LAX, are they going to have to build a subway yard somewhere, or will they figure out how to get the equipment back to the downtown yard? |
| 02/04/19 | Source post | Why terminate the rail at 96th Street, continue it all the way to the new stadium complex and onto Vermont Ave to connect the proposed rail/BRT along the Vermont Corridor. That way there is no struggle with the FAA over extending the LAX people mover. |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Are there any seismic impacts that differ between the different options? |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Are you taking potential impacts of developments at the soon to be closed Santa Monica airport? What is the potential noise impacts for above-ground implementations would there be directly over existing streets? |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|----------------------|----------------------------|---|
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Can you please review the project cost and schedule? Can some of this alignment be completed by the summer Olympics in 2028? |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | From reading several articles on the project there seems to be some hesitancy with the MRT option. Is this due to the speed and ridership issues or is it because it is a foreign technology? From my understanding of monorail it can reach higher speed with higher occupancy, low noise, and would be the visibly appealing technology moving forward. |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Has there been consideration of service yard sites and how these opportunities might differ by alignment? The monorail alternative is attractive for cost savings yet ridership estimates assumes an extra station vs HRT. What is the monorail ridership like without that station since 1 image get value engineered out? |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | How can I show my support so that elected officials know that the community supports this project? |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | How is Metro implementing or planning to implement smart technologies to improve ridership numbers and experience? Is Metro looking at providing Express buses between highest ridership points between project development and completion? |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | I am curious about the thresholds used in your pie charts. Why did MRT rank lower than the others in community and construction impacts? Tunneling will require a lot of time and disruptions at the street level. The pie charts did not seem to provide the full assessment of trad offs for those impacts? |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | I have read a number of articles and documentation that shows that light rail and heavy rail can climb up to 7% in normal conditions and even up to 12% grade in some conditions. If the Sepulveda Pass is 5.5% grade why not use HRT Aerial through the Pass? |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | I prefer the Sepulveda alignment contains 4 modes of transportation, 405 freeway, HOV toll, dedicated bus, aerial heavy rail. This synergy will bring options to the Sepulveda Pass Transportation Corridor. |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | I want to make sure this project remains cheap and support the aerial 405 option and HRT3 option, with HRT 2 as a second for the northern section. I think heavy rail will serve Metro better since it would be less operational costs. |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | I would recommend a station between the Westwood/UCLA station at the expo line. |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | If heavy rail is selected will there be a rail to rail connection to purple line? If not will storage and maintenance yard be? Have you considered a route between 405 and Sepulveda Dam to avoid cluttering up Sepulveda Blvd? Why is ESFV called East? |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | In regards to MRT, will this actually be a 3rd technology Metro needs to understand or will the P3 nature of the project have another operator be in charge of it? |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Is it possible under project acceleration that the two segments of this project be combined? Any updates on the PPP? |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | It seems likely that the Sepulveda Transit line will be popular for drivers willing to drive to LA. Does the plan include parking in the Valley? |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Metro should absolutely not be building parking lots going forward. Any park and ride opportunity should be considered for infill TOD development or bus/bikeshare new mobility hubs. New parking lots directly contradict VMT and GHG emissions reductions goals. |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Noise concerns for above ground option. The topography of the mountains causes echoes and bouncing noise. Changing of wind direction due to different weather conditions also changes complex terrain and changing winds will require multiple angles of analysis. |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Preference to HRT 3, it is cheaper to build, higher capacity, allows potential extension to Metrolink. Preference for Purple Line extension for Westside/LAX allows for multiple stops along UCLA area, avoids wall of 405. |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Safety concern with LAX center and sinkholes. Has this been considered in the evaluation of alternative? Passenger alerts for upcoming projects in future? |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | The monorail option is the best option. It allows for the feasibility of stops at Getty Center and Skirball. It is time for Metro to consider the Arts. It is an important aspect of their plan. Also it just happens to be in general the least expensive. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Was the capacity concepts between Sepulveda and ESFV also done for the southern terminus at Expo/Bundy or Expo/Sepulveda? |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | What are Metro's top priorities in terms of cost, 2028 construction, speed/timing, and ridership. |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | What do you think of the claims of Elon Musk and his boring company to build faster and cheaper? |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Where could you put a storage yard near LAX/Westside? |
| 02/05/19 | Round 2 Community Meetings | Would not Purple Line perform better if the Valley interconnects with it? |
| 02/07/19 | Source post | This is what I was thinking as it is more feasible and probably faster than the old monorail. I think the big issue for this solution will be everyone's concern over earthquakes and the problem with suspended anything coming down in a big quake. The light rails are not the answer as there just is not anymore room on the land in the Sepulveda pass to place a track. The suspended monorail only needs posts every 100 or so feet. We need to start thinking up rather than out as we are running out of "out". Check this out: https://www.facebook.com/cheddar/videos/1954558858198176/ Subways are too expensive and the tunneling takes forever. The suspended monorails could be up fairly quickly. |
| 02/12/19 | Project Email | <p>(1) METRO SHOULD CHOOSE THE BUNDY/EXPO ALIGNMENT AND THE CENTINELA ALIGNMENT - First, development/housing follows rail stations and we do not want development/housing near the freeway where there are toxic fumes. Second, an alignment at the 405/Sepulveda would cause the same car crush getting to the 405 that currently exists (people riding that rail line would also use side streets to get to the 405); alternatively, a Centinela alignment would re-route those people away from the 405 and free up traffic. Third, the Centinela alignment provides a vital north-south link to Santa Monica/West-LA; no one is trying to get to an end destination at the 405 so these stations should be avoided. Fourth, don't make same mistake as Purple Line and stop at the 405, a decision that was roundly criticized. The Expo Line is already maxed out (the only rail line that actually gained riders last year) so you know there is pent-up demand for East/West transit. And once this project and the Purple Line are built, you will be funneling people from West of the 405 to both the Purple Line and the Sepulveda Line via Expo. That's a recipe for disaster, so it's better to put a couple stops West of the 405 so people don't need to use Expo as a funnel (they can walk, ride a bike or use a bus instead). Fifth, there is a ton of development along Bundy/Expo (see links below) and Centinela is near all the new tech offices on the West Side (Playa Del Rey, Marina Del Rey, etc.) Sixth, Expo/Bundy is near Santa Monica Airport Park, which will be a massive attraction by 2028 given the expansion plans (it is supposed to grow 4x in size as the airport is shuttered). Having two rail lines connect walking distance from the park will really enhance the west side. Seventh, the Bundy/Expo alignment is equitable because it gives West of the 405 a North/South option and East of the 405 already has one (Crenshaw Line). (2) METRO SHOULD STUDY A STOP BETWEEN THE PURPLE LINE AND THE EXPO LINE - First, this would help out Santa Monica residents immensely as they battle daily to get to/past the 405 (see rationale above) Second, the Santa Monica Blvd. corridor in West LA is growing at a rapid rate (Metro should consider the rapid recent actual growth and planned growth for that area). For example, there are tons of projects going up on the Santa Monica Blvd. corridor and near Bundy (see links below for just a couple of examples-happy to send more) so a stop on Santa Monica Blvd. makes sense. Third, Expo/Santa Monica is nearby Uni High-- a rail link will provide all of those students and teachers access.</p> |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 02/12/19 | Project Email | (3) THE SANTA MONICA FAULT LINE IS NOT AN IMPEDIMENT TO A STOP ON SANTA MONICA BLVD. - First, no one is positive about precisely where the Santa Monica fault line actually is (it could be just off Santa Monica Blvd. and if so, it wouldn't cause significant risk). Second, even if it is directly on the fault line, the Santa Monica fault is only supposed to be active "every few thousand years on average". Third, if they find the fault line directly on Santa Monica Blvd. at Bundy, they could build it just off that location (a couple blocks in any direction). Fourth, current estimates state that the fault zone does NOT run through Santa Monica Blvd. and Barrington so you could put the station there instead of at Santa Monica and Bundy (see map in LA Times article). LA Times Article: https://www.latimes.com/local/California/la-me-ln-santa-monica-earthquake-fault-map-20170713-htlstory.html . The overall point is, there are lots of options for station location on or near Bundy that would NOT be on a fault line and the fault line is very low risk (not to mention the VA is on a fault line and Metro already has a station planned there for the Purple Line.) |
| 02/12/19 | Project Email | For the Metrolink to Expo Line segment, I prefer Alternatives 1 or 2. Both are direct, reasonable alternatives. While Alternative 2 would be slightly longer, turning west to Sepulveda Boulevard, it may be justified if it has a higher ridership. Instead of the current ending points at Bundy Drive or Sepulveda, both alternatives should continue south under Westwood Boulevard in order to have a more direct route to LAX. Alternatives 3 and 4, with an elevated structure on Sepulveda Boulevard, should be dropped from further consideration because they will likely encounter strong community opposition due to appearance of the elevated structure looming over the Boulevard. An both are longer, going slightly north along the railroad tracks before turning south on Sepulveda Boulevard, which will increase travel times. For the Expo Line to LAX segment, in addition to the two alternatives of routing it along the 405 freeway or along Centinela Avenue to the west, a third alternative to the east of the 405 freeway should be analyzed. That alternative would go south under Westwood Boulevard, transition southeast to Overland Avenue in the vicinity of Pico Boulevard and connect with the Expo line station at Overland, continue south on Overland to Jefferson Boulevard in Culver City, merge with Sepulveda Boulevard, continue along Sepulveda through Westchester and turn east to the future LAX Transportation Center. The easterly route is more direct than the Centinela alternative and will serve several commercial centers at Pico Boulevard, Venice Boulevard, Jefferson Boulevard in Culver City, the Fox Hills Mall and downtown Westchester. The additional commercial centers served should generate more ridership than the Centinela alternative. Because it is more direct it should have a reduced travel time. |
| 02/12/19 | Project Email | I think all 4 options are subway or monorail. You should built light rail, so it can connect to the Van Nuys light rail, and use the same tracks as the Crenshaw line and Green line. Connectivity is the key! Otherwise, the subway will be a short stub/shuttle and limited distance. If you build Sepulveda as light rail, it can run from San Fernando to Torrance - 40 miles! |
| 02/12/19 | Project Email | Thank you for the information session in Van Nuys on Feb. 2nd about the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project. It was excellent, and laid out many of the issues in a clear and concise manner. After considering the options, I think Metro should eliminate the MTL (monorail/ rubber tire train) from consideration. The capacity is lower, the ride time is slower, it is a completely new rail system for Metro, it could be affected by wildfires in the Sepulveda Pass, and, as I understand it, rubber tire trains have much higher service and reliability costs because the rubber tires wear out faster.) In the past, the Valley has been short changed by ill-advised cost saving short cuts (The Orange Line!), and I would hate to see Metro cut corners again here. I look forward to following the progress of this project. Good luck! |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 02/13/19 | Project Email | <p>1. I concur with METRO's decision to NOT consider at-grade light-rail on Sepulveda Boulevard between the Expo Line and LAX, as LA City once proposed in their West LA Transportation Mitigation and Improvement Specific Plan. At-grade Light rail or dedicated Bus Rapid Transitway would take three lanes away from private vehicles, reducing the streets commuter carrying capacity by from 8% to 35% depending on bus headway, and forcing northbound private vehicles to divert from Sepulveda to Military and southbound vehicles to divert to Inglewood Boulevard. It would also eliminate the ability of remaining private vehicles to turn Left off Sepulveda causing them to drive up to 2 additional miles and make two additional turns totaling 270 degrees in place of a single 90 degree Left turn. There are already 40% fewer north-south lanes on the Westside as there are east-west lanes. Any at-grade transit option on Sepulveda would exacerbate that problem. 2. Providing north-south rail transit through the Westside should NOT be done by extending the Purple Line south. The Purple Line needs to be extended all the way to Lincoln in Santa Monica in order to accommodate the already over-capacity demand on I-10 from commuters trying to get to their jobs in Santa Monica's entertainment business centers. 3. Under "Preserve extension from Expo Line to LAX", the UCLA to Bundy-Centinelita-under the Ballona Wetlands/Playa Vista-to-LAX option should NOT be considered. The Ballona Wetlands/Playa Vista area has both an extremely high water table (only 1 foot below surface) and massive methane gas and hydrogen sulfide seepage and discharge problems making construction dangerous, subjecting any below-grade subway tube to flooding and passengers to asphyxiation and death. A Bundy-Centinelita alignment would also subject many of the few remaining single-family-home neighborhoods in the City of LA, including the Hilltop neighborhood, to spot up-zoning, placing 5 to 8 story apartment/condo buildings in the midst of single-family homes, if land developers are successful in gaining rights to Up-Zone properties within 1/4 or 1/2 mile of a rail line from R1 to R3 either through State Bills such as SB 827 or SB 50, or through their lobbying for such in Re-code LA. Sepulveda Boulevard should be the only alignment considered.</p> |
| 02/13/19 | Project Email | <p>I was alarmed to hear what sounded like there being little coordination between the two projects even though the most likely outcome is that both Sepulveda TCP and ESFV TCP are going to share Van Nuys (the monorail is too slow and I can only hope that the elevated HRT is a red herring - its tough enough to get heavy rail restarted in abandoned urban right of ways, let alone putting up new els on streets with a significant residential presence). In a region a spread out as Los Angeles with relatively few fixed mass transit options, it makes sense to avoid overlap and use any savings to extend lines. Unless I am missing something, it would appear that terminating Sepulveda HRT at the Van Nuys Orange Line Station (Orange Line) and tunneling ESFV LRT between Orange Line and Roscoe Blvd would cost less to build and operate and be net beneficial vs a Sepulveda HRT tunnel extending to the Van Nuys Metrolink station (Metrolink) with ESFV at grade its entire length. Non-financial Benefits No vehicle/pedestrian conflicts on Van Nuys between Orange Line and Roscoe Increased speed for ESFV LRT between Orange Line and Roscoe 2.5 minute headways achievable between Orange Line and Roscoe (necessary only if demand projections are correct) Non-financial Costs No direct link between HRT and Metrolink (only 3,596 Total Avg Daily Weekday riders as of 1Q2018 on Ventura Line (includes 11 of 31 trains terminating at BUR)) Construction Costs No ESFV LRT surface construction between Orange Line and Roscoe (2.9 miles) No Sepulveda HRT tunneling from Orange Line to Metrolink (2.2 miles) No Sepulveda HRT station at Metrolink Partially offset by ESFV LRT tunneling between Orange Line and Roscoe (2.9 miles) ESFV LRT subterranean stations at Orange Line, Victory, Van Owen, Sherman Way, Metrolink and Roscoe Operating Costs increase in ESRV LRT trainsets (if 2.5-minute headway between Orange Line and Roscoe is necessary) Increase in ESRV LRT trainsets operators (same) Increase in ESRV LRT station maintenance costs (due to additional stations) Partially offset by Decrease in Sepulveda HRT trainsets (due to 2.2 mile reduction in length of line) Decrease in Sepulveda HRT operators (same) Decrease in Sepulveda HRT conductors (same) (The preceding is not meant to be all-encompassing) I will not benefit or be harmed by any choice that will be made, so have no personal bias other than wanting MTA mass transit to be as robust and cost effective as possible. I have underwritten billions of dollars of transportation infrastructure investments and, as such, am well-versed in analyzing such projects. I recognize that I am working with far from complete information, so if I have overlooked something that makes this proposal more costly than current proposals or less net beneficial, I'd appreciate your letting me know. Also, I am curious as to the accuracy of pre-build passenger projections for the Gold and Expo Lines</p> |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 02/14/19 | Project Email | A MONORAIL over ONE LANE of the 405 would be CHEAP. A TUNNEL would cost a fortune, AND, I would NEVER Take it due to earthquake issues. This would also be HORRIBLY EXPENSIVE. Please build a MONORAIL that would benefit everyone And be very inexpensive... THIS SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE FIVE YEARS AGO, when the 405 Expansion was Added to ONE LAND at a horrible cost... The 405 is a PARKING LOT |
| 02/14/19 | Project Email | As a 5-day a week commuter over the 405 from the Valley, I am thrilled with the plan to build a subway through the pass. I know that project will take at least 10 years if all goes smoothly. In the interim, why not find ways to increase bus ridership over the pass by making a dedicated bus lane on the 405? Or at least increase the number of occupants required for a carpool. A bus lane that moved significantly faster than traffic would be a constant reminder to commuters to try transit instead. Right now, my commute would take almost 2 hours by bus. I live right off Ventura Blvd. in Tarzana and I work near La Cienega and 18th street in West LA. I would gladly take the bus if I could do it in an hour or less. But right now, as awful as the drive is, the bus ride is twice as long. A bus lane with frequent rapid bus service would help convince a lot of people to get out of their cars. |
| 02/14/19 | Project Email | HRT1 gets my vote. Please make stops at major intersections...Sherman way and van Nuys, Van Nuys and Ventura/UCLA UCLA and Wilshire, Etc. |
| 02/14/19 | Project Email | I drive from the valley to the westside each day...and sit in traffic like everyone else! I turn on to Sepulveda from Royal Hills Drive in Encino, which is not far from the tunnel and Skirball Center. Most days it takes at least 20-25 minutes from when I turn on the Sepulveda to get to the light at Mulholland. Real time should take less that 5 minutes. At that point, traffic miraculously opens up on Sepulveda. One would think that traffic lightens up because the majority are getting on the freeway, but that isn't the case. It looks to me like most of us continue on Sepulveda. Traffic sometimes backs up around Getty as well, and continues to Church Lane, which is where I turn right. Is it possible to synchronize the traffic lights between Royal Hills and Mulholland to help those of us traveling south on Sepulveda get to work a little faster in the morning? |
| 02/14/19 | Project Email | I recently read over the Sepulveda Phase 2 plans to connect the Phase 1 Westwood terminus down to LAX, and I think that regardless of whether the Sepulveda Blvd route or the Centinela route is chosen, it would be a mistake to not have a stop where the route crosses Santa Monica Blvd in West LA. If Metro is seeking to meaningfully shift rider behavior to make transit more relevant, then skipping Santa Monica Blvd and its ridership potential (as well as bus connectivity) would hinder the usefulness of the line and the massive investment. On a similar note, I believe that Phase 2 should be constructed as an extension of HRT from Phase 1 rather than as a Purple Line extension from the VA. Should Santa Monica change its stance on restrictive zoning and lack of regional integration with transit, I am hopeful that the Purple Line would be able to be extended down to the beach along Wilshire through Santa Monica as well. A future 4th/Colorado transit hub in 40 years could see the Purple Line, Expo Line, and Lincoln Blvd transit line all come together and really solidify the usefulness of transit on the Westside and bring to the Westside a connectivity never previously imagined. |
| 02/14/19 | Project Email | In addition to the below, I would also note the following Don't make same mistake as Purple Line and stop at the 405, a decision that was roundly criticized. The Expo is already maxed out (the only rail line that actually gained riders last year) so you know there is pent-up demand for East/West transit. And once this project and the Purple Line are built, you will be funneling people from West of the 405 to both the Purple Line and the Sepulveda Line via Expo. That's a recipe for disaster, so it's better to put a couple stops West of the 405 so people don't need to use Expo as a funnel (they can walk, ride a bike or use bus instead). (2) Expo/Bundy is near Santa Monica Airport Park, which will be a massive attraction by 2028. Having two rail lines connect walking distance from the park will really enhance the west side. (3) Expo/Santa Monica is nearby Uni High-- a rail link will provide all of those students and teachers access. (4) The Bundy alignment gives West of the 405 a North/South option. East of the 405 already has one (Crenshaw Line) (5) There are tons of projects going up on the Santa Monica Blvd. corridor and near Bundy (see links below for just a couple of examples-happy to send more) so stops at Bundy/Santa Monica and Bundy/Expo make sense; and Centinela is near all the new tech offices in Playa Del Rey and Marina Del Rey. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 02/14/19 | Project Email | It seems that the HRT will be of the 3rd rail option. Why does Metro look at an HRT that uses overhead cat and can be integrated with existing LRT for same platform access from the valley to LAX.... |
| 02/14/19 | Project Email | One Seat LRT is more convenient (and I assume faster). It is also cheaper and easier to extend. I wonder if your ridership projections are overoptimistic as we see recent rail ridership declines. If ridership demand ends up being higher than capacity, prices could just be raised, so this project could be self-funding. Same as congestion tolling freeways. |
| 02/14/19 | Project Email | Props to Cory and the rest of your Sepulveda Corridor Metro team for an excellent presentation at the West LA meeting last week! Really informative and inclusive! I filled out a comment card...but just wanted to plug the HRT #1 or #2 options again. It is really important to us in the SF Valley to expedite the completion plan for 2028...so that we can start removing cars from the 405 and head toward a greener future! Can wait for your final route decisions...Van Nuys or Sepulveda entry points would both work! It will be wildly successful no matter. |
| 02/14/19 | Project Email | Regarding the Valley-Westside segment: I support concept HRT-1. I believe all the concepts need 3 stations at UCLA. One at Sunset, one near the hospital, and the last one at Wilshire. Each station would serve a different population just like the three USC stops on the Expo Line. Regarding the Westside-LAX segment: I support the Purple Line Extension down Bundy/Centinela with the Valley line ending at Sepulveda Station. That concept would provide better connectivity for the Westside. I think a station at Santa Monica Blvd should also be included. With the possible future closure of the Santa Monica Airport and redevelopment in that area, a station should be looked at there too. The station at Washington seems redundant with the station at Venice. It would be amazing if this line could also serve the Fox Hills Mall area, but that doesn't seem possible. |
| 02/14/19 | Project Email | Thank you very much for the update about the feasibility study of the Sepulveda Transit Corridor project. Herewith, as a resident and business owner of Culver City I would like to express my full support of a north - south connection from the Valley to LAX along Sepulveda Blvd. It would be great if this public transportation project will become reality by 2028 for the Olympic games in LA. I am positive it will have a high acceptance and many residents will use this north-south connection as an alternative to the always congested 405. |
| 02/22/19 | Project Email | How can I find out dates for any upcoming public meetings regarding Sepulveda Corridor HRT projects? |
| 02/27/19 | Project Email | PLEASE - No train on Centinela Ave. |
| 02/27/19 | Project Email | The BRT Boards are in favor of HRT 1 and 2. They are requesting more information about Express Lanes. Construction impacts on the existing infrastructure and construction will not negatively impact the petroleum and natural gas pipes, concerns regarding transit station parking, parking structures should be located on streets that do not serve as traffic corridors. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | Are there really plans to raise money by selling off the HOV lanes of the already congested 405 to FastTrack users? |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | As a Mar Vista resident, I prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela Route |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | As a Mar Vista residents we would very much prefer the planned extension to follow Sepulveda and NOT Bundy/Centinela |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | As a mother, I am completely against this project. We value our safety, and the relative peacefulness of our neighborhood, and do not believe this plan is appropriate, thoughtful, or safe. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | As the homeowner in the area I want you to know that I STRONGLY believe Sepulveda is the better route for this train line. Running along the 405, the main commuter vein across the city make more sense, rather and running through neighborhoods, which would complete ruin the neighborhood. It cause even more traffic and degrade the community we are trying so hard to build up for children. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | Bundy is not a place for this. It should go on Sepulveda. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | For the Valley to LAX new transit line, I PREFER THE SEPULVEDA ROUTE. It is a major highway and is more central to the entire westside. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | How can I find out dates for any upcoming public meetings regarding Sepulveda Corridor HRT projects? |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I am writing regarding the proposed new metro line from the valley to LAX. Its called the Sepulveda corridor, so I would assume that it would stick to Sepulveda, but there are rumors abound that it will possibly come down Bundy/Centinela with a stop at Venice Blvd/Centinela in Mar Vista. Can you please confirm the westside stops on that line? For obvious reasons, the line would be much better suited at Sepulveda than Centinela. There is already an insane amount of traffic at Venice and Centinela, and it is impossible to get through during morning and evening commutes. Also, Garcetti and Bonin have sold us the 'Great Streets Initiative', which is supposed to make our streets (speaking about Mar Vista specifically) feel more local and inviting. Putting a metro stop there is the complete opposite of that. Please confirm the proposed route and whether and how West Mar Vista will be affected. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I attended Metro's Sepulveda Transit Corridor meeting in El Segundo on February 5, 2019 and would like to provide feedback on the options presented. I live in the South Bay and regularly commute by car to Santa Monica, Venice, West Los Angeles, and Beverly Hills. Less frequently I travel to the Valley to visit friends. Regarding the Valley-Westside Transit Concepts that were presented, I prefer all of the Heavy Rail Transit options over the Monorail Transit option. Forced to choose, I'd pick HRT 2. If I'm going to give up my car for a Valley trip via Metro, I want to get there quicker than I can drive, so that means tunneling under the Sepulveda Pass is the only way to go. Yes, this is more expensive, but life is finite... any time saved is priceless. Regarding alignments displayed for the Westside, Sepulveda/I-405 versus Centinela – please, please – please build one of the Centinela alignments. It will be wonderful for the Westside to get non-bus mass transit; I would DEFINITELY take Metro to get to Santa Monica or West Los Angeles via the Green and Crenshaw Lines using either of the Centinela alignments. Given a choice I think the HRT option is superior to the Purple Line Extension. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I believe that the subway should be on Sepulveda no Bundy due to the fact that Sepulveda runs along the freeway and is a commercial strip. Also may sections of Sepulveda need redevelopment (strange commercial/industrial like buildings) and vacant properties |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I do not want it to go down Bundy/Centinela. We already have problems from Great Streets, which took out a lane on Venice Blvd. and put additional traffic on Palms Blvd., which is one lane each way. We also have gridlock from Playa Vista, even though we were promised it would not affect us. Bundy/Centinela cannot handle anything more. The streets behind Bundy/Centinela going north/south do not go through, so there is nowhere for traffic to escape. And we have a metro station on Bundy, as well. We used to be a lovely community and we are being destroyed. We are currently trying to build a Mar Vista Community Center on Centinela Avenue at Windward in Historic Fire Station 62. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I feel that Sepulveda Blvd. is a much better choice than Bundy Blvd. for the subway. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I greatly prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I most definitely prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I oppose the rezoning in Mar Vista. This residential area is for sfr, 5 story buildings. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I pay far too much property taxes to permit this over-building. It will severely impact my neighbors' most important asset. Build cluster housing in a more open area, such as in and around LAX. Build them on golf courses. In 1990, Sunset Park (St. Monica) and Mar Vista sent the Santa Monica Commons project into oblivion. Believe me, we can do the same thing again. We have plenty of attorneys in the neighborhood. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I prefer the route to be on Sepulveda Blvd only, |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I prefer the Sepulveda Route over the Centinela/Bundy route. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I prefer the Sepulveda route to the Bundy/Centinela route for the HRT extension project. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I prefer the Sepulveda route. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I prefer the transit line go the SEPULVEDA route. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I prefer to have the Sepulveda route as to not disturb the more residential area that is near Bundy/Centinela |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I strongly favor the Sepulveda option over the Centinela option. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I strongly prefer that the Metro go to LAX via Sepulveda, not Bundy/Centinela. The communities surrounding Sepulveda have been established around the freeway as an existing transit corridor, so it makes the most sense |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I strongly recommend the Line go down Sepulveda as the area is already one of the most recognized North/South corridors in region. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I support Sepulveda! |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I support the Sepulveda Corridor option for Metro extension under the Palms-Mar Vista- Del Rey Plan for development in my community. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I support the Sepulveda corridor. I feel that the Bundy/Centinela corridor will have more negative impacts on the community than the Sepulveda option. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I urge you to select the Sepulveda route when deciding the Westside/LAX option. Sepulveda is already used to accompanying a major transportation system (405). If the Metro expands to Bundy/Centinela, entire long-standing residential neighborhoods will completely change, disrupting families and tight knit communities. Fortunately, there is another, more practical and feasible option. Please choose Sepulveda. Thank you. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I would like the line to go down Bundy-Sepulveda. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I would like the line to go down Sepulveda rather than Bundy/Centinela. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I would like the line to go down Sepulveda. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I would like the Westside Metro line to go down Bundy/Centinela. There is more space available and more people would be served, particularly those who travel to/from Playa Vista via this route. Sepulveda is already well-served by buses that connect commuters to the airport, the San Fernando Valley and the Expo Line. Let's draw in those further west by giving them direct access to Metro in their neighborhoods. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I would like to see the subway along Bundy/Centinela |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I would prefer that the line go down Sepulveda Blvd |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | I would prefer that the Valley to LAX train go on Sepulveda rather than Centinela/Bundy. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | If there is a choice between using Sepulveda or Centinela to get to the airport please choose Sepulveda. Both of these choices leave much to be desired but of the two Sepulveda would be better for traffic and all concerned. Thank you. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | In favor of SEPULVEDA instead of Centinela. He is my neighbor, and he asked me to reply on his behalf. Thank you. Harriet |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | Keep Metro on Sepulveda! Not Centinela, we have enough traffic and mess! Leave the single family home zoning alone! |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | My husband, Robert Kelley, and I prefer that the Metro utilize the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route to extend the transit route to LAX. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | My wife and I strongly support the route along Sepulveda Blvd rather than Centinela for future consideration. Sepulveda is already zoned for larger apartment/condo buildings and has shopping and other commercial destinations for ridership. Also, it provides a more direct path to LAX, Westwood, the VA, and UCLA. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | No train/bus north/south on Centinela! No up zoning! No more road diets! |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | Only the Sepulveda corridor line makes sense! |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | Our senior population does not ride the Metro. There is no parking, and I cannot ride a bird or a bike to catch the Metro. Also, it is not safe. No safeguards are made. We already have many more home robberies, break-ins, from the homeless and the people being Metroed into this area. Deliveries are stolen right off our front door steps. See how the crime rate in this area has gone up. Another Metro will have us surrounded. I do not see families with babies in carriages riding the current Metro. Who are the riders? Why is this necessary? Traffic studies have not been made! It is now more than difficult to get around. The air is no longer healthy in this area, destroying a lovely neighborhood. Do they really believe we will give up our autos? There has to be a different solution to this. When was this brought to the public to discuss? What makes all the builders of all these new apartment buildings going up think that the Metro riders can afford the rents they will be charging! And where will they park My street is full of cars parked from the apartments on Barrington ave. I was told that they use their carports to rent out, or for storage, not cars. How is all this getting approved? Maybe we are not electing the right people to protect us. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | Please extend the Metro on Sepulveda Blvd., not on Centinela / Bundy. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | Please let our Mar Vista neighborhood exist and don't run a mass transit rail system down Bundy. We are a neighborhood of families and low density. Read Robert Caro "The Power Broker" and see how a neighborhood in the Bronx was destroyed by a large construction project getting rammed through a neighborhood. Read about how Jane Jacobs led a movement that saved the Greenwich village we know today from destruction. I personally think construction on Sepulveda, your other option, is a problem. With all the apartments you are zoning on Sepulveda (old Albertson's at Palms, the cement plant on Pico) the construction will make Sepulveda unpassable. If you wind up doing this, check out the construction methods of Vancouver, where the crane rides on the prefab concrete sections it lifts into place. I hope earthquake concerns don't prevent this type of construction. We lived with the construction of the Palms bridge over the 405 for 3 years, creating one lane going east/west for over a one mile stretch north/south. It was dangerous! I raised my family in Mar Vista, and I see others now doing the same. Please do not ruin the fabric of this unique community by having years of construction on Bundy, which is so crowded now (oh yeah, 500 apartments at the Cadillac dealership you ok'd?)that Every other North/South street is jammed. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | Please put line down SEPULVEDA. Much less Impact on residential and airport. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | Please stop this project! |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | Please use Sepulveda for project. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | Please use Sepulveda for the transit corridor project. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | Prefer Bundy/Centinela corridor over the Sepulveda transit plan We already use the train daily |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | Prefer the proposed Metro line to LAX to go down Sepulveda (and NOT Centinela). Thank you. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | preferred route on Sepulveda |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | Sepulveda! Bundy-Centinela -----no! |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | The HRT would be a disaster for our neighborhood!!! I am 200% against it as it would undermine our quiet peaceful streets. Please keep the subway routes under streets that are already busy. Don't run them under quiet residential areas! |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | The Purple Line should be routed down Sepulveda as it is a commercial street as Bundy is more residential. Better still would be the middle of the 405 freeway. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | The transportation corridor from the Westside to LAX should be on Sepulveda Blvd. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | We believe that Sepulveda is the perfect route for the proposed expansion of the subway line. It already is a mass transport hub for buses as well as the metro line. This would offer easy access for passenger transfers. We strongly urge Metro LA not to build this proposed line on Bundy. It would be an inefficient execution of this important expansion, and adversely effect the neighborhoods in this route. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | We do not favor routing the Metro through the Bundy Centinela corridor. Our preference would be along the already existing commercial corridor on Sepulveda. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | We highly prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | We prefer the Sepulveda Blvd Route for the proposal. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | We prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | We prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | We prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | WE prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | We prefer the Sepulveda route. Bundy/Centinela is a residential street and has adequate bus service. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | We prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | We prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | We STRONGLY prefer the Sepulveda route and vehemently object to the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | We strongly prefer the Sepulveda Route for the Valley to LAX Subway/Elevated Train extension. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | We strongly prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | We strongly prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | We think that Sepulveda Blvd is a much better choice than Centinela for a metro line extension to LAX. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | We think the Sepulveda route is far preferable to Centinela which is narrower and congested already and services more highly residential areas. Thanks. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | We very strongly prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | Would appreciate Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project to proceed close to 405 / Sepulveda. This area where we live is a very quiet community and feel would be very disrupted to change that when a more transit oriented commercial area would seem to be appropriate. |
| 03/07/19 | Project Email | Would prefer proposed subway route via Bundy not cutting thru a long established Historic Westdale Trousdale community |
| 03/19/19 | Project Email | A station at the hospital was considered as part of the initial transit concepts introduced last year. More information is available here: https://www.metro.net/projects/sepulvedacorridor/ . However, this station option was recently removed from further consideration due to lower performance, specifically related to future passenger ridership potential. The ridership was lower for all alternatives connecting at this station as compared to the other proposed station near the Wilshire/Westwood intersection, which would also provide a transfer connection to the future Westwood/UCLA station under construction as part of the Purple Line Extension project. The key difference in ridership had to do with whether alternatives served a station on the UCLA campus, which is a major activity center and would generate significant ridership for the project. With the hospital to the west of the 405, we were unable to identify an alternative that could reasonably serve the hospital and the campus along the same route. |
| 03/19/19 | Project Email | |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 03/26/19 | Project Email | <p>I was saddened and horrified to learn that Metro is proposing a raised rail line as an option along Sepulveda Boulevard within the siteline of single family homes. I live on Langdon Avenue in a home built in 1946. Our historic neighborhood was dramatically altered with the construction of the 405 freeway in the early 1960s. Even with sound walls, we live in a barrage of traffic noise, an airport flight path, and traffic helicopters. Our baseline for noise is already high. We support the Metro extension into the Valley and are excited about increased access and ridership along both Van Nuys Boulevard and Sepulveda. However, the proposal of bringing an elevated railway to the poorer parts of Los Angeles while digging underground for the wealthier residents along Wilshire Boulevard reeks of classism and racism. I suggest you research the impacts of a raised BART railway in West Oakland to confirm what we already know: raised railways divide communities and poorer communities always get the short end of the stick. Why this was even proposed is seriously beyond me as a resident, teacher of Planning at USC, and CEQA lawyer. Aside from these troubling social issues, the real issue is noise. As you will analyze in the EIR, noise impacts are based on sightlines. A high railway means sightlines straight to established single family neighborhoods. A raised line along Sepulveda would sandwich me and my neighbors between the busiest highway in the state and a raised heavy rail line in what is essentially a City block. I don't know how you think those noise calculations will pan out for CEQA purposes, but I severely doubt that a raised rail line, when at-grade or underground is available, will meet the standard for the Statement of Overriding Considerations your proposed action will require under the California Environmental Quality Act. We support rail. We support access. We are excited about what Metro is going to be doing in the Valley. But we are paying for this and we expect to get our fair share. This proposal for elevated rail along Sepulveda would not have made it past the drawing board on the Westside and I want to be clear that it will not be making it to construction in our beautiful part of Los Angeles, either.</p> |
| 03/27/19 | Project Email | <p>One burning question in our Bel-Air community — what is the reason why one of the refined scenarios does not include tunneling beneath the 405 freeway rather than the rail/rubber tire above ground? If there is a quick answer, it would be appreciated.</p> |
| 03/29/19 | Project Email | <p>For the connection to the purple line at Westwood/Wilshire, what exactly is being planned? Where exactly will the station box be? How exactly will it connect to the Purple line platform? Where exactly will the entrances be? For the connection to the purple line, I think the station box should be directly under Westwood Blvd, between Kinross Ave and Wilshire. And having entrances on Kinross, Lindbrook, etc. The planned Purple line entrance on the north-west corner of Wilshire/Westwood (replacing Chase bank) would also serve as a useful connector to the Sepulveda pass station and platform; given the direction of the stairs and escalators from surface level (according to the pictures in the presentations) Such a station would serve the surrounding shopping area very well. (I could be wrong in the following assumption. If so, please correct me) Looking at the connection dots in the concept pictures, it seems that the planners are implying that the station be west of Westwood Blvd., probably under Gayley or Veteran Ave. Given this be the case, I think its a bad idea, because it would be further away from the middle of the shopping area and wouldn't serve the area as well as if the station were on Westwood/Lindbrook.(Note: I also go by "Jae Hyung Ban" as my Asian name. And if I'm already on the email list, than no need to add me again.)</p> |
| 04/08/19 | Project Email | <p>Please see attached letter from the Village at Sherman Oaks Business Improvement District regarding our preferences for the Metro project.</p> |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | <p>As a Mar Vista resident, I prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinel Route</p> |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | <p>As a Mar Vista residents we would very much prefer the planned extension to follow Sepulveda and NOT Bundy/Centinel.</p> |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | <p>As a mother, I am completely against this project. We value our safety, and the relative peacefulness of our neighborhood, and do not believe this plan is appropriate, thoughtful, or safe.</p> |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | <p>As the homeowner in the area I want you to know that I STRONGLY believe Sepulveda is the better route for this train line. Running along the 405, the main commuter vein across the city make more sense, rather and running through neighborhoods, which would complete ruin the neighborhood. It cause even more traffic and degrade the community we are trying so hard to build up for children.</p> |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | <p>Bundy is not a place for this. It should go on Sepulveda.</p> |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | <p>Can you please tell me if this project is slated for a station at the West LA VA hospital? If not, why not?</p> |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | For the Valley to LAX new transit line, I prefer the Sepulveda route. It is a major highway and is more central to the entire Westside. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I am interested in receiving project updates specific to the development of this project. Meeting notifications / Procurement Opportunities / Project milestones |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I attended Metro's Sepulveda Transit Corridor meeting in El Segundo on February 5, 2019 and would like to provide feedback on the options presented. I live in the South Bay and regularly commute by car to Santa Monica, Venice, West Los Angeles, and Beverly Hills. Less frequently I travel to the Valley to visit friends. Regarding the Valley-Westside Transit Concepts that were presented, I prefer all of the Heavy Rail Transit options over the Monorail Transit option. Forced to choose, I'd pick HRT 2. If I'm going to give up my car for a Valley trip via Metro, I want to get there quicker than I can drive, so that means tunneling under the Sepulveda Pass is the only way to go. Yes, this is more expensive, but life is finite... any time saved is priceless. Regarding alignments displayed for the Westside, Sepulveda/I-405 versus Centinela – please, please – please build one of the Centinela alignments. It will be wonderful for the Westside to get non-bus mass transit; I would DEFINITELY take Metro to get to Santa Monica or West Los Angeles via the Green and Crenshaw Lines using either of the Centinela alignments. Given a choice I think the HRT option is superior to the Purple Line Extension. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I believe that the subway should be on Sepulveda no Bundy due to the fact that Sepulveda runs along the freeway and is a commercial strip. Also may sections of Sepulveda need redevelopment (strange commercial/industrial like buildings) and vacant properties. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I do not want it to go down Bundy/Centinela. We already have problems from Great Streets, which took out a lane on Venice Blvd. and put additional traffic on Palms Blvd., which is one lane each way. We also have gridlock from Playa Vista, even though we were promised it would not affect us. Bundy/Centinela cannot handle anything more. The streets behind Bundy/Centinela going north/south do not go through, so there is nowhere for traffic to escape. And we have a metro station on Bundy, as well. We used to be a lovely community and we are being destroyed. We are currently trying to build a Mar Vista Community Center on Centinela Avenue at Windward in Historic Fire Station 62. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I feel that Sepulveda Blvd. is a much better choice than Bundy Blvd. for the subway. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I greatly prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I know you're hesitating to put a station on Santa Monica Blvd because of a fault line. I wouldn't give up building a station near there (most likely on Sepulveda; or Bundy if purple line extension). It would be a great connection for BBB 1, Metro 4 and 704. I looked at maps of the Santa Monica fault line on this article in the LA times: https://www.latimes.com/local/California/la-me-ln-santa-monica-earthquake-fault-map-20170713-htlm1story.html . The Sepulveda / Santa Monica intersection is just on the southern edge of the fault area. Perhaps the station box could be built 500 - 1000 feet south of the intersection. Similarly, the Century City station (purple line) is 500+ feet south of the edge of the fault area. Unfortunately for Bundy/Sepulveda, that intersection is well inside the fault area, not on the edge. I concede that an underground station anywhere near there would be highly unfeasible (if Purple Line extension to Expo/Bundy). (Note: If going to Expo/Bundy from Westwood/Wilshire, then station box is perpendicular to Sepulveda under Nebraska Ave. Otherwise, under Sepulveda and perpendicular to Nebraska Ave. In any case, I personally favor going on Sepulveda rather than Bundy and Centinela.) |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I most definitely prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I oppose the rezoning in Mar Vista. This residential area is for sfr, 5 story buildings. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I pay far too much property taxes to permit this over-building. It will severely impact my neighbors' most important asset. Build cluster housing in a more open area, such as in and around LAX. Build them on golf courses. In 1990, Sunset Park (St. Monica) and Mar Vista sent the Santa Monica Commons project into oblivion. Believe me, we can do the same thing again. We have plenty of attorneys in the neighborhood. --Hal Golden, Marine St. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I prefer the route to be on Sepulveda Blvd only, Not Bundy/Centinela |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I prefer the Sepulveda route |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinel route |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinel route. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I prefer the Sepulveda Route over the Centinela/Bundy route. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I prefer the Sepulveda route to the Bundy/Centinel route for the HRT extension project. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I prefer the transit line go the SEPULVEDA route. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I prefer to have the Sepulveda route as to not disturb the more residential area that is near Bundy/Centinel. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I strongly favor the Sepulveda option over the Centinela option. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I strongly prefer that the Metro go to LAX via Sepulveda, not Bundy/Centinel. The communities surrounding Sepulveda have been established around the freeway as an existing transit corridor, so it makes the most sense. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I strongly recommend the Line go down Sepulveda as the area is already one of the most recognized North/South corridors in region. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I support the Sepulveda Corridor option for Metro extension under the Palms-Mar Vista- Del Rey Plan for development in my community. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I support the Sepulveda corridor. I feel that the Bundy/Centinel corridor will have more negative impacts on the community than the Sepulveda option. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I urge you to select the Sepulveda route when deciding the Westside/LAX option. Sepulveda is already used to accompanying a major transportation system (405). If the Metro expands to Bundy/Centinel, entire long-standing residential neighborhoods will completely change, disrupting families and tight knit communities. Fortunately, there is another, more practical and feasible option. Please choose Sepulveda. Thank you. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I was just looking at the video overview of the Sepulveda/west side transit corridor. I lived in Sherman Oaks for 7 years and have now been in Manhattan Beach for almost 9, so am very excited that this is on the agenda. I think connecting high density areas of the valley with the west side and LAX is long overdue and would be a home run. One quick idea that I haven't seen floated any place is a mass transit line of some sort that would connect LAX with the burgeoning high density development in Playa Vista areas with the high density corridor that extends from the Mar Vista/MDR area, Venice and in to SM, connecting w the Expo and perhaps purple lines . This part of LA is filled with people that would have high interest/pr propensity to use mass transit (as we know, SM is a place that people from NY moving to LA settle in to because it feels a bit like NY in some areas in terms of density). I think it would make great economic sense to link the Playa Vista/Silicon Beach epicenter with the rest of the rail network given the density of the development of both housing and offices there. Just a thought-- very exciting to see this all come together, and I hope 2028 Olympics drives much of it to be realized soon! |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I would like the line to go down Bundy-Sepulveda |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I would like the line to go down Sepulveda rather than Bundy/Centinel. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I would like the line to go down Sepulveda. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I would like the line to go down Sepulveda. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I would like the Westside Metro line to go down Bundy/Centinel. There is more space available and more people would be served, particularly those who travel to/from Playa Vista via this route. Sepulveda is already well-served by buses that connect commuters to the airport, the San Fernando Valley and the Expo Line. Let's draw in those further west by giving them direct access to Metro in their neighborhoods. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I would like to see the subway along Bundy/Centinel |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I would prefer that the line go down Sepulveda Blvd |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I would prefer that the Valley to LAX train go on Sepulveda rather than Centinela/Bundy. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I would very much support the effort to put a train on the 405 freeway. I think an elevated train would be an excellent way to put it in. It would be a great way to reduce traffic and address global warming. It seems to me an elevated train would be best and that it would work in the center of the 405 freeway with walkways like they have at Universal City walk and the Red Line as well as PCH in Santa Monica. I hope this will happen as soon as possible, because every day we delay addressing global warming makes the end result much more tragic, but every day that public transit is made more usable the more likely we can address it in time. Public transit is one the key areas of society that could lead to a livable planet. Please feel free to contact me to discuss this idea and more details. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | If there is a choice between using Sepulveda or Centinela to get to the airport please choose Sepulveda. Both of these choices leave much to be desired but of the two Sepulveda would be better for traffic and all concerned. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | I'm writing to voice my support for Metro Transit Route 2, which is the monorail above the 405. Please DON'T put any more transit along Sepulveda Blvd! |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | Keep metro on Sepulveda! Not Centinela, we have enough traffic and mess! Leave the single family home zoning alone! |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | My husband, Robert Kelley, and I prefer that the Metro utilize the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route to extend the transit route to LAX. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | My preference would be to maintain the main traffic corridor near Sepulveda. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | My wife and I strongly support the route along Sepulveda Blvd rather than Centinela for future consideration. Sepulveda is already zoned for larger apartment/condo buildings and has shopping and other commercial destinations for ridership. Also, it provides a more direct path to LAX, Westwood, the VA, and UCLA. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | No train/bus north/south on Centinela! No up zoning! No more road diets ! |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | Only the Sepulveda corridor line makes sense! |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | Please extend the Metro on Sepulveda Blvd., not on Centinela / Bundy. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | Please let our Mar Vista neighborhood exist and don't run a mass transit rail system down Bundy. We are a neighborhood of families and low density. Read Robert Caro "The Power Broker" and see how a neighborhood in the Bronx was destroyed by a large construction project getting rammed through a neighborhood. Read about how Jane Jacobs led a movement that saved the Greenwich village we know today from destruction. I personally think construction on Sepulveda, your other option, is a problem. With all the apartments you are zoning on Sepulveda (old Albertson's at Palms, the cement plant on Pico) the construction will make Sepulveda unpassable. If you wind up doing this, check out the construction methods of Vancouver, where the crane rides on the prefab concrete sections it lifts into place. I hope earthquake concerns don't prevent this type of construction. We lived with the construction of the Palms bridge over the 405 for 3 years, creating one lane going east/west for over a one mile stretch north/south. It was dangerous! I raised my family in Mar Vista, and I see others now doing the same. Please do not ruin the fabric of this unique community by having years of construction on Bundy, which is so crowded now (oh yeah, 500 apartments at the Cadillac dealership you ok'd?)that Every other North/South street is jammed. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | Please put line down SEPULVEDA. Much less Impact on residential and airport |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | Please use Sepulveda for project. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | Please use Sepulveda for the transit corridor project, thank you. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | Prefer Bundy/Centinela corridor over the Sepulveda transit plan. We already use the train daily |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | Prefer the proposed Metro line to LAX to go down Sepulveda (and NOT Centinela). |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | Preferred route on Sepulveda |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | Sepulveda!!!!!!Bundy-Centinela -----no!!!!!!!!!!!!!! |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | The HRT would be a disaster for our neighborhood!!! I am 200% against it as it would undermine our quiet peaceful streets. Please keep the subway routes under streets that are already busy. Don't run them under quiet residential areas! |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | The Purple Line should be routed down Sepulveda as it is a commercial street as Bundy is more residential. Better still would be the middle of the 405 freeway. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | The transportation corridor from the Westside to LAX should be on Sepulveda Blvd |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | The Village at Sherman Oaks Business Improvement District board of directors prefers the concept designated as MRT 2. We recommend the only above grade acceptable option to study is MRT 2; to have the monorail run from the northern terminus at Van Nuys Metrolink down the center of the 405 freeway to LAX. We will not accept any transit solution that puts trains or monorails on or above the streets of Sherman Oaks and therefore support the concept of a monorail down the center of the 405. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | We believe that Sepulveda is the perfect route for the proposed expansion of the subway line. It already is a mass transport hub for buses as well as the metro line. This would offer easy access for passenger transfers. We strongly urge Metro LA not to build this proposed line on Bundy. It would be an inefficient execution of this important expansion, and adversely effect the neighborhoods in this route. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | We do not favor routing the Metro through the Bundy Centinela corridor. Our preference would be along the already existing commercial corridor on Sepulveda. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | We highly prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | We prefer the Sepulveda Blvd Route for the proposal. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | We prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | We prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | We prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | WE prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | We prefer the Sepulveda route. Bundy/Centinela is a residential street and has adequate bus service. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | We prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | We prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | We strongly prefer the Sepulveda route and vehemently object to the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | We strongly prefer the Sepulveda Route for the Valley to LAX Subway/Elevated Train extension. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | We strongly prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | We strongly prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | We think that Sepulveda Blvd is a much better choice than Centinela for a metro line extension to LAX. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | We think the Sepulveda route is far preferable to Centinela which is narrower and congested already and services more highly residential areas. Thanks. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | We very strongly prefer the Sepulveda route over the Bundy/Centinela route. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | Would appreciate Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project to proceed close to 405 / Sepulveda. This area where we live is a very quiet community and feel would be very disrupted to change that when a more transit oriented commercial area would seem to be appropriate. |
| 04/15/19 | Project Email | Would prefer proposed subway route via Bundy not cutting thru a long established Historic Westdale Trousdale community |
| 04/16/19 | Project Email | I'm sorry to say I haven't been able to make it to any of your meetings, but I wanted to ask you if any consideration was given to placing a station at the Van Nuys FlyAway. HRT 3 and MRT 1, and to a lesser extent HRT 2 all come relatively close to the FlyAway and its massive parking structure. If this is meant to be the northern segment of a line that will eventually reach the new Airport Connector, it would only make sense to connect it to the FlyAway, |
| 04/16/19 | Project Email | Why isn't there a station planning at Mulholland? This would be great for all the schools there and the workers in the area. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 04/16/19 | Project Email | You're joking right? We taxpayers approve all these tax increases for these projects and you make the 405 corridor, the worst in the nation from a traffic volume standpoint your lowest priority? That's ridiculous and it has to change. Who do I need to speak to or write letters to convince to move this project up on the schedule?!?! |
| 04/19/19 | Project Email | Heard about this project from a classmate who is contact with Mike Bonin and wanted to advocate for the presence of a station at UCLA Anderson. Currently majority of grad students are on north campus near this location and majority drive to campus. Anderson alone is about 700 students and with about 500 driving every day you can imagine the other grad schools as well. Many drive from the West Hollywood or eastern regions to campus. Factoring in the 25,000 students that are Undergraduates (probably around half of whom commute from outside Westwood) at UCLA along with all the faculty (many of whom live more West) the impact on the hub eliminating this many commuters off the road would have a massive impact on Sunset Blvd and the 405 congestion which judging by the amount of traffic and narrow lanes, I'm sure is expensive to maintain and needs repair often. I'm sure this has all been considered but very excited for this to be a possibility in the closer future. |
| 04/24/19 | Project Email | HRT 3 and the Purple Line Extension look the most promising. The additional stop at Sherman Way on Sepulveda would offer greater transit coverage for the valley. The Purple Line Extension would benefit from a stop at Santa Monica/Bundy or Santa Monica/Barrington between the VA and Expo/Bundy stations. It makes more sense for the "One seat ride," that everyone clamors about, to be between downtown and LAX, not the valley and LAX. |
| 04/24/19 | Project Email | If they go with the Monorail rubber tire concept, they should put a stop in front of the Getty Center. Seeing that it's going past there anyway. There isn't currently an effective way to get down there without a car. |
| 04/24/19 | Project Email | Monorail keep for Disney, high operational cost, high maintenance cost, and low capacity. 405 express lane?! No sense, we already have enough taxes in this City/State. Also a Light Rail Train is a WASTE of money, people will still keep using their cars, a cheap solution, that will have a HUGE cost in the future. |
| 04/24/19 | Project Email | Thank you for taking the time to create this presentation for those who may have an interest in the project but are unable to attend meetings |
| 04/24/19 | Project Email | There should also be a station on Santa Monica Blvd. in west LA. Preferably on Sepulveda. The portion going to LAX should instead connect with the green / Crenshaw lines at the Mariposa station and also have a station on the Sepulveda ITF / Lot C of the LAX people mover. (Or even a station at the main terminals of LAX if possible). |
| 04/25/19 | Project Email | Please find a way to expedite this project. The traffic on the west side is unbearable. It's pretty clear that a majority of this traffic is not local and is simply hundreds of commuters getting on the 405 to head into the Valley (or coming from). A simple look at Google Maps / Waze during commuting hours will tell you this. This project would really improve the quality of life for many people who actually live in the West LA neighborhood and get "trapped" due to the vehicle traffic. I would recommend that the trip be made as quick as possible; please prioritize speed! The faster it is, the more people will be attracted to getting out of their cars. Think of the 4/5 express trains in New York. Trains don't need to stop every other block for people to take them. |
| 04/27/19 | Project Email | comment left at the end of survey - Do not forget to provide much needed parking - most parking lots fill up super fast. |
| 04/27/19 | Project Email | In response to survey question #1 - B. Somewhat likely - I try to ride the bus or rail instead of driving. In response to question #2 - I need to be able to travel B/T lines easily |
| 04/27/19 | Project Email | In response to Survey question #1 - D. Not likely at all. NO Parking - not near a freeway exit - Sepulveda Orange Line would be better |
| 05/02/19 | Project Email | I have seen the MRT2 proposal prepared by the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association and the Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council. Their proposal suggests that HRT1 and HRT2 are likely not affordable under available Measure M funding. I would like to know if Metro is reviewing (seriously) their proposal |
| 05/02/19 | Project Email | I just took your Online Survey but it did not give me the opportunity to specify my preferences for alignments. Did I accidently skip something? If the survey did not provide for that, what is the best way for us to give you our preferences on preferred alignments? |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 05/02/19 | Project Email | I'm the Mar Vista Community Council's Zone 3 Director and I wanted to pass along stakeholder input that I've received since I shared the information presented at the workshops to my community. There will be 4 documents. One is general communications on where the Westside alignment should be (Sepulveda or Centinela/Bundy) and some are responses to a poll on that question taken by the local Residents association. The overwhelming majority favored the Sepulveda alignment. They feel that whatever benefits it would generate would pale in comparison to the accompanying up-zoning that would accompany it. I would concur with this opinion and would add the following 2 points: a) Sepulveda is already a major transit corridor with many connections that would magnify the effectiveness of a rail alignment there and b) The Centinela/Bundy alignment would involve an area with an extremely high water table and massive methane gas and hydrogen sulfide deposits creating an undue hazard to the entire Westside. Please consider these in making your decision, and thank you for your efforts on our behalf! Mary Hruska PS: Please let me know if you don't receive all 4. |
| 05/02/19 | Project Email | Thank you for this invitation. You might consider modifying this question. It should not reveal the random rotation. |
| 05/02/19 | Project Email | Thanks for offering the public a chance to comment on the Sepulveda Transit Corridor alignment. I would like to send the web address of the Survey to our neighborhood but the "Having trouble viewing this email? Click here " link at the top of you email doesn't take me to the Survey, so I can't get the URL. |
| 05/02/19 | Project Email | This survey is poorly designed. It tries to educate while seeking responses, which leads to biased language. Please bring in communications people. We love our planners but they do not have the skill set to design a customer-facing public involvement components like this. |
| 05/03/19 | Project Email | I have not been able to attend any of the meetings, unfortunately. Can you tell me if there are any plans and what is the rough timetable for connecting the future Sepulveda line to El Segundo? I Commute from the San Fernando Valley to El Segundo Blvd and Douglas daily. A partial connection, only from the valley to the Expo Line is not of any benefit to me at this time unless there were a very rapid connection from the Expo Line to El Segundo. Better, of course, would be a direct segment from Van Nuys to El Segundo. |
| 05/03/19 | Project Email | I think it is excellent that you are creating an alternative to driving on the 405 freeway through the Sepulveda Pass. I would like to state my support for the HRT 1 alignment as I believe it provides the best travel times, highest ridership, least community impacts, and best integration with potential future systems. I think HRT 2 could also adequately integrate into future potential lines and offer similar travel times and ridership. I want to stress that I think MRT 1 is wholly inadequate and would fail to create a key "triangle" of fast, high quality heavy rail service between the red, purple, and Sepulveda pass subway lines. Therefore, I believe it is essential that the Sepulveda Pass Corridor be heavy rail, however expensive it may be, as it is an investment in the future of our rail system and creates a key backbone from which the slower, more frequent stopping light rail and bus services can expand. |
| 05/03/19 | Project Email | I wish to express my preference for Plan HRT 2 – the underground route from Van Nuys Metrolink using the Sepulveda Blvd route. I believe digging under Sepulveda Blvd will cause less disruption than using Van Nuys Blvd. Furthermore, the Sepulveda route would be closer to the I-405 which might make it feasible to build a highway ramp leading directly into a parking facility adjoining one of the stations – preferably the Ventura Blvd. station as this could also serve traffic from the 101 Freeway. The ideal place for the station and garage would be in the empty lot just north of the Sherman Oaks galleria (south of the 101 and east of the 405). It would be close enough for people to transfer (by walking) from buses on Ventura Blvd while avoiding the demolition of buildings in order to construct the garage. And this location ought to make the freeway access ramps feasible as it is so close to both the 405 and the 101. I am furthermore strongly oppose an aerial route in the San Fernando Valley. It would require more land acquisition, and result in increased noise and be visually offensive to our neighborhoods. The Red Line underground solution has proven to be a safe, attractive and efficient method of transportation and it should be the model for the Van Nuys-Westwood route as well. |
| 05/07/19 | Project Email | See attached letter |
| 05/07/19 | Project Email | The request is to find and make contact with the representative for planning of the Sepulveda Express Lane project between the San Fernando Valley and the LA Westside. I am helping coordinate with Alek Bartosouf the Mobility Deputy in LA Councilman Mike Bonin's office regarding said Express Busway. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 05/14/19 | Project Email | I am a resident of Bel Air in the Bel Air Ridge Homeowners Association. I have been active in providing feedback on the different options proposed for the mass transportation between the Valley and West LA. After reviewing the proposed options in the last report, I support an elevated monorail being proposed by members of the Sherman Oaks communities. The train above the 105 freeway works well and such an option would lead to the least disruption to surrounding communities and cause the least downtime. It is not clear from the proposed recent report why the 105 freeway type option does not work between Sherman Oaks to LAX. |
| 05/14/19 | Project Email | I have been trying to reach someone in your division over the phone. Your outgoing message says someone will return the call within 24 hours but that has not happened. I am hoping to speak with someone soon. In the meantime, I am forwarding the attached information and supporting documentation to one of the methods being considered for a solution to the Sepulveda corridor congestion. Please confirm your receipt and understanding of this information. |
| 05/14/19 | Project Email | I wish to express my preference for Plan HRT 2 – the underground route from Van Nuys Metrolink using the Sepulveda Blvd route. I believe digging under Sepulveda Blvd will cause less disruption than using Van Nuys Blvd. Furthermore, the Sepulveda route would be closer to the I-405 which might make it feasible to build a highway ramp leading directly into a parking facility adjoining one of the stations – preferably the Ventura Blvd. station as this could also serve traffic from the 101 Freeway. The ideal place for the station and garage would be in the empty lot just north of the Sherman Oaks Galleria (south of the 101 and east of the 405). It would be close enough for people to transfer (by walking) from buses on Ventura Blvd while avoiding the demolition of buildings in order to construct the garage. And this location ought to make the freeway access ramps feasible as it is so close to both the 405 and the 101. I am furthermore strongly oppose an aerial route in the San Fernando Valley. It would require more land acquisition, and result in increased noise and be visually offensive to our neighborhoods. The Red Line underground solution has proven to be a safe, attractive and efficient method of transportation and it should be the model for the Van Nuys-Westwood route as well |
| 05/14/19 | Project Email | I would like to request that due consideration be given to the following options: (1) Building the Sepulveda rail corridor with through service eastward on the Green Line; and (2) Building this corridor to pass directly under the midpoint of LAX, obviating a time-consuming transfer to the slow and lengthy people-mover line. |
| 05/20/19 | Project Email | At one point it was mentioned there would be another round of update forums scheduled for late May or June. Is that still on the calendar and when are they most likely to be scheduled? |
| 05/20/19 | Project Email | I am a longtime Sherman Oaks resident who lives adjacent to Sepulveda Blvd. I have recently learned of proposed above ground plans for rapid transit that would run along Sepulveda Blvd., in our quiet residential corridor. I absolutely oppose any elevated tracks above any Valley streets. It's unfair that it would seem OK here in the Valley but unacceptable on the West Side, and it would definitely unduly/unacceptably disturb the neighborhoods that run adjacent to Sepulveda Blvd., both during it's construction and once rapid transit is in place. We already have the freeway right there, and have learned to deal with it's sounds/traffic snarls and back-ups. We purchased our homes full well knowing it was there. I support a fully underground subway in the Valley, but only if it's affordable. My children commuted to downtown for school and took full advantage of the underground subway from north Hollywood to get back and forth. I believe in public transportation...but I do not believe in above ground rapid transit taking over a pre-existing family neighborhood. The ONLY acceptable alternative to a fully underground subway, would be a monorail above the middle of the 405. The Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association (SOHA) thinks that private industry may offer the only equitable, acceptable, and affordable rapid transit solutions through the Sepulveda Pass under Metro's Public-Private Partnership Program. In February 2019, SOHA and the Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council (SONC) began looking into affordable alternative concepts that would not destroy Sherman Oaks and Van Nuys with elevated tracks. It was determined that a monorail running above the middle of the 405 freeway was a terrific affordable alternative from the Valley all the way to LAX. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 05/20/19 | Project Email | <p>I concur with METRO's decision to NOT consider at-grade light-rail on Sepulveda Boulevard between the Expo Line and LAX, as LA City proposed in their latest West LA Transportation Mitigation and Improvement Specific Plan. At-grade Light rail or dedicated Bus Rapid Transitways would take three lanes away from private vehicles, reduce Sepulveda's commuter carrying capacity by 61% at the current 7.3 minute bus headways if Left Turns off Sepulveda are still allowed, or 15.5% if Left Turns are disallowed forcing private vehicles to drive up to 2 additional miles and make multiple turns totaling 270 degrees in place of a single 90 degree Left turn. Both options will force northbound private vehicles to divert to Military and southbound vehicles to divert to Inglewood Boulevard. There are already 40% fewer north-south lanes on the Westside as there are east-west lanes. Any at-grade transit option on Sepulveda exacerbates that problem. Providing north-south rail transit through the Westside should NOT be done by extending the Purple Line south. The Purple Line needs to be extended all the way to Lincoln in Santa Monica in order to accommodate the already over-capacity demand on I-10 from commuters trying to get to their jobs in Santa Monica's entertainment business centers. Under "Preserve extension from Expo Line to LAX", the UCLA to Bundy-Centinela-under the Ballona Wetlands/Playa Vista-to-LAX option should NOT be considered. The Ballona Wetlands/Playa Vista area has both an extremely high water table (1 foot below surface) and massive methane gas and hydrogen sulfide seepage and discharge problems making construction dangerous, subjecting any below-grade subway tube to flooding and passengers to asphyxiation. I prefer the southern segment to be under Sepulveda from the Expo Line to LAX rather than under Centinela because: there is room for a Park & Ride facility at Sepulveda but not at Bundy. it will serve UCLA student housing on and near Sepulveda, thereby reducing the Westside traffic congestion spike that occurs every Fall from new UCLA students. it will serve Fox Hills Mall the only shopping mall left on the Westside of LA City. it will have more stations, therefore more riders than the a Centinela routing.</p> |
| 05/20/19 | Project Email | <p>I oppose any elevated tracks above any Valley streets.</p> |
| 05/20/19 | Project Email | <p>I think the idea is great. I love the idea of having another train connection here through the westside. However, I don't like the methods with which to, and modifications to the surrounding cities as a consequence of providing mass transit options. I understand now the reasoning why the modifications are taking place. It's to make it prettier and more enjoyable ride to and from each location (ridership) and to pump up each stop to invite people to get off on stops they usually wouldn't to explore (economic development). These are good ends, and I value them. But the zoning and transformation of the area surrounding these mass transit options is not being done right. I know we can figure it out. This is outside the scope of this conversation, but it does impact my desire for mass transit connections. I am not alone in this sentiment. I think Centinela would be great, but I'm not interested in it as an option because of (2) it will destroy Mar Vista and the other smaller communities of the westside along the path of the train. I think Sepulveda would be good. To be honest, I have been riding recently as my car is in the shop. I like the Green Line and how it's on the freeway. I think it would be great to get those people off the 405, and onto the 405. It would intrude less and build quicker too. The problem is with getting to UCLA or VA. I think the train should be above on the freeway and then dip down subsurface and careen towards either UCLA or the VA stop. From an engineering standpoint, I think the stop should have been at 405 and Wilshire, to make the build straighter and easier for a faster better ride. But I understand the higher desire for those other locations.</p> |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 05/20/19 | Project Email | <p>Many of you know me well for my civic activism and I appreciate the work you do to try to improve the quality of life for citizen here in Los Angeles. I'm writing today with regards to Metro's Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project. As my wife Marsha and I live just a block from the 405 Freeway at Sherman Oaks Circle, we have endured the massive expansion of the 405 Freeway in recent years, fortunately we got a taller sound wall to minimize the noise, but the noise is still substantial in our community. Additionally, we are under the constant flight path of jets and helicopters from Van Nuys Airport. Noise is a constant issue for our community already, and adding more would be an unacceptable disaster for our neighborhood. We are excited to see an alternative to car traffic through the Sepulveda Pass (and feel it is essential that the system goes all the way to LAX). But we have grave concerns about an above ground and/or raised steel wheel rail-train system and find such an alternative UNACCEPTABLE as a solution because of the noise it will create. Having seen and heard above street Metro Trains make substantial screeching noise on a constant basis all around the city and county of Los Angeles. (It is especially egregious in Long Beach with the noise of the steel wheels echoing for miles over the area)</p> <p>As such, we are completely and totally opposed to above ground trains just a block from our home. Even if a Monorail system with rubber tires is to be considered, the cost of increasing the height of sound walls must included to minimize the noise even rubber tire systems will inevitably create. I fully support an underground subway from the Valley through the Sepulveda Pass and hope it is built deep enough so as not to effect the community while under construction.</p> |
| 05/20/19 | Project Email | <p>While I know that you favor HRT, it is better to have LRT because it can easily connect to the other lines. Also, since you do not use patographs for the HRT then it is impossible to run any of those trains on the LRT unless you add a third rail like other transit systems (e.g., Metro North). I just think that it is better to have several LRTs than fewer HRT even though they can carry more people at one time. I know the Blue line usage patterns is why you are thinking of HRT even though LRT would be better.</p> |
| 05/22/19 | Project Email | <p>An elevated rail system running through Sepulveda Blvd. would devastate thousands of people living in this area. The train would practically run through homes and businesses, creating unbearable noise and a devastating drop in property values. How this can even be a consideration is unfathomable. Do for us what you plan on the Westside and run the rail underground. If it can be done there, it can be done in Sherman Oaks.</p> |
| 05/22/19 | Project Email | <p>I oppose any elevated tracks above any Valley streets.</p> |
| 05/22/19 | Project Email | <p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project. I absolutely oppose any elevated tracks above any Valley streets. It's unfair and will contribute even more to our traffic issues along this busy corridor! I do support a fully underground subway in the Valley, but only if it's affordable, however I prefer the ONLY acceptable alternative which is a monorail above the middle of the 405. I have seen this arrangement in other cities and it has been very successful.</p> |
| 05/22/19 | Project Email | <p>I just want to be kept informed</p> |
| 05/22/19 | Project Email | <p>I live in Sherman Oaks and would like to see a monorail system down Sepulveda Blvd and on the 405 freeway. This area is a liquefaction zone and I don't think a subway through the area is the safest and best choice.</p> |
| 05/22/19 | Project Email | <p>I strongly disagree with the monorail option passing through Sherman Oaks. It's is obtrusive and not as effective as a subway option. Just look at the Expo line versus the Red line. It's unfair to burden the valley with the noise and eyesore of an above ground train when we already deal with Van Nuys airport and the 405. Yes to public transportation, but a subway is the best option for longevity and convenience for all.</p> |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 05/22/19 | Project Email | Metro's plan to have trains run on elevated tracks above Sepulveda Blvd is totally unacceptable. Such a project will bring blight to the area. The only smart and aesthetically acceptable solution to the transportation needs of east Valley residents and commuters from surrounding areas, is to build an underground subway. I understand "tunneling" is the most costly choice, but for a transportation system that will last 100 years, and beyond, the financial investment (of taxpayer money) made now is both wise and prudent. Also, virtually all other transportation routes recently built, or planned in Los Angeles south of the San Fernando Valley, exclusively involve tunneling. Why not the Valley? How can you justify not the Valley? You get what you pay for. Since blight is unacceptable, Metro will just have to find funding elsewhere. The foolishness of some government planning, as in the case of the "bullet train", which has wasted tens of billions of dollars provided by Federal, State and County taxpayers, illustrates the consequences of poor judgment and decision making. Notwithstanding the above argument for "tunneling", an acceptable and less costly alternative is a monorail along the middle of the 405 Freeway - a proposal brought to Metro's attention by the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association (SOHA). |
| 05/22/19 | Project Email | My first question is: are you out of your mind about running a subway on the Valley side south of Magnolia Blvd? There is a high water table there and the area is subject to liquefaction - which is what destroyed so many apartment buildings near Ventura Blvd. after the 1994 earthquake. I am also against partnering with private interests which I assume would be the ones building and running the toll lanes on the 405. I've paid my taxes which have gone into the Caltrans HOV lane projects, and do not expect to see that lane taken away for the construction of toll lanes. Charging people to go and come home from work is not an option. There is already a pathway to take - the 405. The 405 has never collapsed as the result of an earthquake, and won't affect foundations of homes as the result of tunneling - especially under the wealthy neighborhoods in the pass. The only special path is from the Metrolink station to the 405. |
| 05/22/19 | Project Email | My position is very firm |
| 05/22/19 | Project Email | My wife and I have lived in our Sherman Oaks home for the past thirty years. We worked hard to pay off our home and to retire to the peace and serenity of the hills of Sherman Oaks. In the hustle and bustle of LA, home was always a nice place to get away from it all. In the last few years, the tranquility has been under assault. First it was by land: the adaptation of Waze by commuters wreaks daily havoc on the streets of Sherman Oaks by drivers who are just passing through and create massive congestion every morning. Then it was by air: thanks to the FAA we are assaulted day and night by low flying planes from Van Nuys and Burbank that are so loud I must stop in mid sentence while speaking with my wife. And now this: more congestion and disruption to our neighborhood with four different plans that will destroy our neighborhood forever. Please vote against all these costly projects which likely double or triple in cost before they are done and instead strongly consider building a monorail down the middle of the 405 freeway where commuter traffic belongs. This is where it belongs. Thank you for listening. |
| 05/22/19 | Project Email | No above ground noisy monorail on Sepulveda. I would rather live thru awful construction Nightmare - like what's going on in Century City right now - than have Sepulveda all jammed up with monorail and traffic !!! subways are way more efficient |
| 05/22/19 | Project Email | Please find the funding and build the direct subway route Van Nuys to UCLA and LAX. HRT1 is the best way to go please do not short the communities with loud above ground transportation. Do it right the first time. DO NOT put subway on the west side and short the valley with loud above ground trains. Go subway all the way. Keep parking and congestion away from the funnel of the 405/ Ventura and Sepulveda. The entrance needs to be away from this major congestion area. Its grid lock now don't add to it with parking, access, uber traffic. Stay away from making the funnel worse. Why is the comment page hidden and not on the main page with your survey? get it on the main Page please. |
| 05/22/19 | Project Email | We (and every person we've talked to in Sherman Oaks) oppose any elevated tracks above any Valley streets. It's unfair to residents of the Valley with the noise and also for ruining the beauty of our neighborhood! Please realize that the ONLY acceptable alternative is a monorail above the middle of the 405. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 05/23/19 | Project Email | The Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association needs your help to stop Metro running noisy elevated trains above Sepulveda Boulevard! The flyer shows these horrible trains and how to comment to Metro officials. Please comment right away! See http://www.shermanoaks914.com/Sepulveda-transit-corridor.html for more. Metro is studying four rapid transit concepts from the Valley to the Westside. |
| 05/29/19 | Project Email | I Absolutely oppose any elevated tracks above any San Fernando Valley streets. This will ruin residential neighborhoods and bring our already congested streets to a halt! I support a fully underground subway in the Valley, if it's affordable. The ONLY acceptable alternative is a monorail along the middle of the 405. |
| 05/29/19 | Project Email | I absolutely oppose any elevated tracks above any Valley streets, this will only increase traffic congestion, Street noise and cost far more then other alternatives routes, Why wouldn't you follow the existing freeway system and put a monorail in the center median or on the side of the freeway, Is local government incapable of making a financially responsible decision. |
| 05/29/19 | Project Email | I absolutely oppose any elevated tracks above any Valley Streets. It's unfair to the Valley residents who will be adversely affected in order to accommodate the City of LA at a lower cost. Valley residents don't matter apparently. On the Westside and Downtown the trains are underground, are they more significant than we are? Elevating a train in the Valley will only increase the surface traffic on residential streets which we have been fighting for the last 8 years at least. Waze/Google sends commuters down our residential only streets and the alley next to my house to avoid the 405 Freeway and Ventura Blvd traffic. Its a nightmare that the homeowners pay the price for the City of LA's decisions affecting our quality of life, property value, safety and accessibility to our homes. Constructing an elevated train track will just double our traffic as you will be removing vital lanes and turn lanes. As there is only 1 left turn lane on to the 405 South that needs to be expanded to move the traffic off Sepulveda and Valley Vista quickly. Its a bottleneck now. With the 405 being expanded the congestion and traffic times are even worse now than before the time and money consuming expansion. It didn't work. Now you want to ruin our lives again and subject us to more traffic nightmares that will be permanent? Sepulveda Blvd is vital for Sherman Oaks we are being unfairly scapegoated by the City trashing our suburban community. Only an underground train or a monorail in the middle of the 405 freeways would be probable. Traffic through our community is unbearable as we cannot leave or homes (blocked by commuters) or access our homes. It takes 16 min to travel less than .2 of a mile as the streets are narrow and two cars cannot pass. Everyone is commuting through Sherman Oaks to the Westside abusing the residents and homeowners. We have had enough between WAZE, the FAA's NextGen , Homelessness, and now Metro destroying our lives to accommodate the rest of LA. Sherman Oaks doesn't count just trashing our communities to benefit the Westside. The Valley needs to secede at this point. Our rights, safety and a quiet suburban town have been violated. |
| 05/29/19 | Project Email | I absolutely oppose any elevated tracks above any Valley streets. It is unfair! I do support a fully underground subway in the Valley, but only if it is affordable. The ONLY acceptable and reasonable alternative is a monorail along the middle of the 405. |
| 05/29/19 | Project Email | I am a valley resident concerned about the route alternates being proposed by Metro. I can't support any of the three routes being proposed. The subway would be nice to have, but Metro's figures indicate that it is far from affordable. The other two routes will make auto traffic worse by taking room from an already traffic choked Sepulveda Boulevard. For what it is worth, these routes also have a tinge of unfairness, since the route goes underground on the Westside. The Neighborhood Council and SOHO, of which I am a member, have proposed another route which will utilize the existing right of way on I405. While it will carry fewer passengers, it makes much more sense to me. I realize it is an engineering challenge, but not a difficult one. I am a civil engineer. I realize that these are all difficult challenges and both the staff and Board have a lot of difficult choices. The Valley needs to have your attention though. So many people live here and work on the Westside or South Bay that neighborhood streets as well as Sepulveda Blvd and I405. We need relief but we cannot afford to reduce one traffic corridor through the Valley to help people get into and out of the Valley. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 05/29/19 | Project Email | I have been a Sherman Oaks resident for over 35 years. I am writing to vigorously protest the proposed elevated rail line along Sepulveda Blvd. The neighborhood is already threatened by lot-filling Mc Mansions, abolishment of height and parking restrictions on apartment buildings, consideration of development at the intersection of the 101 and 405 freeways compounded by antiquated infrastructure, and increasing (and law-flouting) helicopter activity and airport jet routing. Traffic is unbearable at many times, adding increased levels of air pollution, stress and physical danger affecting residents' health and well being. This ill-conceived elevated train, over Sepulveda, or any Valley street, is completely unacceptable: traffic lanes lost, left turn lanes lost (including those at intersections already subject to gridlock), privacy and light lost, noise and air pollution exponentially expanded. I cannot even imagine the fallout from the construction process itself. The preferred choice would be an underground subway if affordable, or if not a monorail above the middle of the 405 freeway. |
| 05/29/19 | Project Email | We and all of our neighbors in Sherman Oaks absolutely oppose any elevated track plan for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor. Metro will absolutely destroy the neighborhoods of Sherman Oaks and Van Nuys with this plan. It is misguided and unfair. The only acceptable alternatives are monorail along the middle of the 405, or a fully underground subway. |
| 05/29/19 | Project Email | We and all of our neighbors in Sherman Oaks vehemently oppose any elevated track plan for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor. The neighborhoods of Sherman Oaks, Encino and Van Nuys would be unfairly impacted by this plan, which blatantly favors West Los Angeles. It is misguided and unfair, and the only acceptable alternative is a fully underground subway for its entire length. |
| 06/04/19 | Project Email | Almost every time I speak with someone else from Chicago, the same refrain is heard: why doesn't L.A. have a rail line down the middle of the 405, like they have on Chicago's O'Hare line? This is a great idea. Los Angeles has become unbearably congested - both for driving to work and for enjoying all that the city has to offer. I support a monorail above the 405 wholeheartedly. |
| 06/04/19 | Project Email | I am 100% against this proposal because it will destroy every neighborhood in its path. It won't bring much ridership and the property values between the beginning to the end will suffer. Terrible idea. Why don't you just do it on the freeway like a "normal" city does? |
| 06/04/19 | Project Email | I am fully opposed to putting above ground transit on Sepulveda Blvd. It will create increased noise pollution along with the current noise pollution from the 405 Freeway. I agree we need mass transit from the valley to the city. This is not the way. Build the above ground transit along the 405 Freeway from Rinaldi to LAX. Make this city the envy of other cities with mass transit. This current proposal is short-sighted in its concepts. Anything that is built should extend to LAX. Not to Van Nuys as a terminal. Create "off ramps" along all the many streets in the city, such as Wilshire Blvd., Santa Monica Blvd., Olympic Blvd., Venice Blvd. etc. Make this investment one that will reduce traffic on the 405 and make it useful to both workers, retired folks, students well just about every one. PLEASE USE YOUR "THINKER" AKA BRAINS AND DEVELOP A PROJECT THAT MAKES SENSE. |
| 06/04/19 | Project Email | I have heard of Metro's recent plan to place elevated track along Sepulveda Boulevard. I writing this email to voice my strong opposition to this measure. A monorail along Sepulveda Boulevard will act as an eyesore for anyone driving through Sherman Oaks along Sepulveda, and to be frank, it is simply unfair. Many residents of Sherman Oaks, including myself, oppose this measure. We will support a fully underground subway in the valley as long it makes financial sense. Preferably, however, such a monorail would be placed in the middle of the 405 rather than along Sepulveda. I, as well as many other Sherman Oaks residents, demand that you hear our concerns and reconsider. |
| 06/04/19 | Project Email | I oppose elevated tracks above any Valley streets, it's unfair. I would support an underground subway. |
| 06/04/19 | Project Email | Of the four proposals of Metro to mitigate traffic from the valley into the west side. only 2 are remotely acceptable to Sherman Oaks/ Van Nuys residents (of which I am one, for many, many years.) I absolutely oppose any elevated tracks above Valley streets, especially Sepulveda. It is woefully unfair to residents, and I would challenge any of you in favor of it to live adjacent to such a massive construct. I support a fully underground subway in the Valley — but ONLY if it is affordable. The single acceptable alternative would be a monorail along the middle of the 405 — much as Bart runs down part of northern CA freeways. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 06/04/19 | Project Email | Where is the Transparency and truthfulness when affecting the residents of Sherman Oaks? Apparently Metro has already made decisions regarding an above ground train removing vital lanes from the Sepulveda pass increasing traffic and congestion for the residents. I am told Metro and the Mayors team are just going through the motions but have decided to negatively affect our areas and especially surface streets. All public comments and especially those of the directly affected residents need to be heard and considered first and all studies and avenues explored. An above ground train removing lanes)(like Garcetti's road diet disaster) is not welcome and will be met with a loud roar from the community. Metro and the City Government trample neighborhoods. Metros actions need to be investigated and all people affected need to be heard and notified by mail. As per LA Times today the decisions made affect neighborhoods severely like the extreme density in Koreatown with a major lack of parking becoming a "blood sport" hunting for parking. Developers ruined Koreatown with density and lack of parking the residents are left holding the bag. No planning, no consideration for residents/guests just a Government Agenda dictating how the residents and homeowners must live (giving up a car out of frustration, ticket cost, no space). |
| 06/10/19 | Project Email | I feel that the Metro Valley -to-LAX Subway Hub should be located under Sepulveda Blvd rather than Centinela Blvd. There is a brand new huge Condo complex there and is more central to most riders. |
| 06/10/19 | Project Email | I prefer the Valley-to-LAX Subway under Sepulveda. Thank you. |
| 06/10/19 | Project Email | I prefer the Valley-to-LAX Subway under Sepulveda. Thank you. |
| 06/10/19 | Project Email | Please put the Valley to LAX subway under Sepulveda Blvd which is more commercial corridor than Centinela which is more residential. |
| 06/10/19 | Project Email | Strong preference to put planned valley to LAX subway under Sepulveda, NOT Centinela. |
| 06/10/19 | Project Email | We don't want to fly above the Sepulveda Pass!!! Please don't even think about an elevated transit option. And I'm not too keen on the underground approach either given the pesky earthquake consideration., I don't know what the answer is unless it's to impose a fee on drivers who use the 405 through the pass - and I don't like that idea very much. I'm assuming you've looked at the fee system in Orange County and have evaluated whether or not it works. My heart goes out to all of you who are looking for solutions to the traffic issue in the Sepulveda Pass. Best wishes and good luck and remember this - you won't be able to please everybody! |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 06/20/19 | Project Email | <p>I am following up our meeting on 4/4/19 as requested. Using the Cal Trans surveys we have, I am providing Metro my monorail bridge supported System for a 405 Sepulveda pass Transportation Concept. The Geology of the hillsides are stable and allow for a strong anchoring system to the hillside geologic formation.</p> <p>405 Fwy - Sepulveda Pass-City Transportation Concept: Objective: The objective of this project is to provide a mass transit transportation system design on mostly government owned property though the Sepulveda Pass, on, over, and around the 405 freeway. This would be a new mass transit path for Metro allowing for a mass transit monorail system hung from the proposed stabilized bridge structures using Proposition M dollars. It would allow the Valley to be connect to the west side of Los Angeles. The stabilized bridges would be tied to good geologic conditions mountainside to mountainside. Calatrava style towers and wires ties can be used for stabilization and long span supports similar to the new San Francisco bridge. Method of approach: The method of approach to get this project to the next step in visioning would be to hire staff at my office to draw up and put into 3D fly thru a vision of this concept. This would need to be coordinated with Geologist and Structural engineers for concepts only at this time. Working with Cal Trans and Metro to know all our hillside property rights will need to be discussed. Mission: This suggested proposal will help support the accomplishment of Metro's mission to operate Metro services using transportation innovation and achieve goals towards mobility challenges. This is an alternative for the transportation system do the passage of Proposition M. In lieu of a tunnel, we can set up the future of Los Angles and the 405-transportation corridor for an integrated city system of uses defining Los Angeles as a futurist leaning state of the art city planning promoter. I have had a few meetings with Cal Trans and they have given me information to work from including the canyon topographic surveys and a tentative "yes, that this might work" statement. In addition, this is the best innovative idea in 20 years they have heard to resolve what to do for our transportation system at the 405 Sepulveda Pass. Please see the attached 3D design sketch showing our design intent for this concept. Let me know your thoughts and what else you need for this design option for the 405 Sepulveda Pass Transportation System.</p> |
| 06/27/19 | Project Email | <p>As part of the Sepulveda Pass HRT System you should place a station at the Sepulveda Orange line station and construct a large parking structure on the existing lot.</p> <p>Then add a new access road that runs down the eastside of the 405 and gives direct access to the north bound 405 on and off ramps.</p> <p>Along with the existing access road at the end of Haskell this will allow drivers to have direct access to the parking structure from the 405 to catch the Sepulveda Pass HRT Having a location that drivers can conveniently access, park and catch the HRT will be an encouragement for drivers to take transit over the hill.</p> |
| 06/27/19 | Project Email | <p>Find the money and build the Subway from Van Nuys line straight to UCLA and LAX. NO above ground trains for the valley NO Monorail. Do it right and it will last 200 years. Do not impact the traffic funnel of the 405 /101 over the hill keep the work away from this congestion do not make it worse for a decade. I look forward to more info and a place where you are open to the public coming speaking and expressing their views to their community and Metro and that you listen to the public.</p> |
| 06/27/19 | Project Email | <p>Good day decision makers of the Metro's Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project to run "rapid transit" needed from Van Nuys to LAX: Some 50 years ago a beer company just west of the 405 on Roscoe, had built an elevated working "train" for those visiting and to enjoy a good "This Bud is for you". For reasons unknown to me the train was disassembled and is gone, while "This Bud is for you" can still be had. This was a private enterprise determining "trains" for "rapid transit" in the Valley, if only to drink a "free" beer, do not work. At this time, please accept this email, as me voicing my opinion, to not have built on Sepulveda any "elevated tracks"; better choice from my vantage point is to build a Monorail from LAX to the beer factory (Roscoe Blvd the end point). If you wish to meet with me to hear my opinion in person, please feel to call me at 818.521.0072 as to when that meeting can take place?</p> |
| 06/27/19 | Project Email | <p>Hi - could you please let me know when the next community meeting is scheduled?</p> |
| 06/27/19 | Project Email | <p>I absolutely oppose any elevated tracks above any Valley streets. It's unfair! I support a fully underground subway in the Valley, but only if it's affordable. The ONLY acceptable alternative is a monorail above the middle of the 405. Please do not stick valley residents with a noisy eyesore. We need mass transit, we need it to be affordable, but we need it to benefit all LA residents, not just the Westside!</p> |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 06/27/19 | Project Email | I absolutely oppose any elevated tracks above any Valley streets. It's unfair! I support a fully underground subway in the Valley, but only if it's affordable. The ONLY acceptable alternative is a monorail above the middle of the 405. |
| 06/27/19 | Project Email | I absolutely oppose any elevated tracks above any Valley streets. It's unfair! I support a fully underground subway in the Valley, but only if it's affordable. The ONLY acceptable alternative is a monorail along the middle of the 405. AND WHY DID THE VALLEY NOT GET A SUBWAY--JUST ORANGE LINE BUS. WHY ARE valley citizens (small case is symbolic--we just don't matter as much as the rest of LA). WE TREATED THIS WAY??? Don't even get me started on the homeless crisis.... |
| 06/27/19 | Project Email | I am only in favor of a monorail system that runs in the middle of the 405! Having any other transit system would destroy and have major impact on environment and our community. But I just don't understand how a parking lot or stations can be built when Ventura and Sepulveda are at capacity. Just like the carpool lane that was built, it didn't change any traffic patterns and it took years and tons of money. |
| 06/27/19 | Project Email | I am totally against the corridor going down Centinela. All of the building and metros, etc., have significantly increased vagrancy, violence, and traffic in what used to be a series of lovely residential areas. When my parents are gone, I will sell and flee California. We caught a rapist in our alley weeks ago. I have lived in California for 45 years and invested in our communities. Never again. I'm ashamed at the joke we have become worldwide. And you are not helping. |
| 06/27/19 | Project Email | I have been made aware of the alternatives being considered for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project. I want you to know that I am adamantly opposed to any plan that includes elevated tracks above any streets in the San Fernando Valley. Acceptable alternatives are a fully-underground subway or a monorail along the middle of I-405. Not only are elevated tracks a terrible eyesore, they will destroy the character and livability of any neighborhood through which they are placed. |
| 06/27/19 | Project Email | I'd like to cast my vote for HRT 3 as presented in the January/February 2019 alignment alternatives list. With the highest ridership amongst the four alternatives, it is the best use of funding. The extra station at Sherman Way is likewise very important for increasing ridership. Access is key! Additionally, for around \$1 billion, the line could someday be extended along the Metrolink right-of-way to Burbank airport. Maybe the Red Line can even meet it there one day! Imagine a heavy rail line that directly connects Burbank airport to LAX. Introducing a new technology (listed as MRT) will not only add up in operation and maintenance costs, but is also by far the slowest alternative. As someone who drives the 405 solo every day, I'd still drive rather than take it. However, if any of the subway alternatives get built, reserve me a space at the park-and-ride! HRT 2 is just a worse version of HRT 3 since it costs more to build, will likely have a station box pointed north under the Van Nuys Metrolink which wouldn't be extended since it doubles the ESFV LRT, and lacks a station stop at Sherman Way. HRT 1 has all the same drawbacks of HRT 2, though it is the fastest alternative by 3 minutes over HRT 3. Basically... HRT 3 is the best. Build it. |
| 06/27/19 | Project Email | is this a manned email address? The way the final "question" was written, it's obvious that the survey is being used to be told what you want to hear. I would put a stop to all train development if I could, because the train to Santa Monica has been a disaster for the community, for traffic, and for public transport. That's saying a lot since I don't even own a car. |
| 06/27/19 | Project Email | My name is Severin Martinez, I work in LADOT's Planning and Policy group. A part of our unit's function is to be involved with the environmental process for outside agency projects and we have several with Metro that we want to stay in the loop on, including the Sepulveda Transit Corridor project. I have two requests:1) Can you provide a status update on this project and what environmental phase it is in? From available materials it appears it is still somewhere in the scoping phase or DEIR development phase? 2) Can you add our team to your email list for this project and include us in future correspondence with the Department? I think they might already be on your list but the best contacts to include in future correspondence for these are my supervisors David Somers (david.somers@lacity.org) and Eddie Guerrero (eddie.guerrero@lacity.org) if they aren't already on your list. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 06/27/19 | Project Email | Please be advised that we are adamantly opposed to any elevated tracks above ANY Valley streets. This would not only be an unfair solution, but one that would negatively impact our quality of life. We would support a fully underground subway in the Valley, BUT ONLY IF IT IS AFFORDABLE. It is our understanding that Metro does not have sufficient funds to complete such a project. Therefore, the only acceptable alternative is a monorail along the middle of the 405. |
| 06/27/19 | Project Email | Please consider monorail on 405!!!! |
| 06/27/19 | Project Email | Please correct your street map as your map of Palms Blvd west of its intersection with McLaughlin/Barrington, in Mar Vista, LA 90066 is incorrect and misleading. The legally adopted Plans, Ordinances and all other documents all of which are available at the City of Los Angeles GIS website clearly document the fact that it is merely a residential street west of this point. It also has a legally factual ROW of a total of 60' and a weight limit of 6000 lbs. Please stop pushing dangerous cut-through single-rider traffic through what is entirely single family residential street. Make it safer for pedestrians, children and elderly by at least correcting your maps! |
| 06/27/19 | Project Email | Please include me on your updates in regards to this project. Our firm provides professional A/E/PM/CM services. Thank you! |
| 07/03/19 | Project Email | Looking for a presentation to their group. |
| 07/17/19 | Project Email | I'm a long time resident of Sherman Oaks who is adamantly opposed to elevated tracks above Valley streets. Our quality of life will be diminished and traffic will be even more unbearable. I feel that the only acceptable alternative to elevated tracks or an underground subway is a monorail along the middle of the 405. For years the City has created so-called solutions to issues like housing and the environment that have only exacerbated problems in the Valley, which is more dense, more polluted and more congested than ever. This time, please come to the right solution that will make life better for everyone. |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Are there any case studies that demonstrate how a monorail performs with a project of this magnitude? If so, how do they compare with heavy rail using the performance metrics Metro pays attention to? |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Are you planning for parking at Ventura or Oxnard? If so, use the Monorail down 405 and add a stop for the Getty. |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Can you consider San Jose BART, built with a single/double stack tunnel? |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Do NOT do Monorail! Please include a Getty stop and look at P3s. |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Does the HRT 1 proposed route going along Van Nuys Blvd. tunneling underground without Monorail have an advantage because it is not invading the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association and seems more direct? |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Doesn't it make more sense in the short term to extend the purple line to Bundy/Expo Station in order to guarantee connectivity between the Expo and Purple Lines in the time for the 2028 Olympics? |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Excellent Presentation! Would definitely support HRT 1, 2, or 3. Prefer HRT 1 or 3. HRT 1 seems the most direct and would circumvent the Sherman Oaks homeowners association issues (e.g. Monorail). HRT 3 along Sepulveda underground would be geographically desirable and also connect to the Orange Line. Monorail seems too immediate and create too many legal issues with homeowners. Would support private partnership to expand the process and make up the increases proposal costs from 2016 estimate. |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Have you considered operating both the Purple Line and the Sepulveda Line between Westwood and LAX on the same tracks? |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Have you seriously looked at the BYD Sky Rail? Much less costly! Public Private partnership! |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I live in Inglewood and work in North Hollywood. I take Public Transportation once/week, drive the other 4 days. The easiest and most economical solution is to simply designate "bus only" lanes. Why not do this rather than costly tunnels, elevated rail, etc. Thank you. |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I love the information about Metro Sep Transit Corridor Project. It is a huge project and complicated; however I support it. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I wish I could use Metro more, but the poor bus connections and lack of parking mean that it takes too much time and is not reliable enough to use. I need to get to Downtown for appointments. On Westside LAX, please use existing 405 medians. The underground route must go under Ballona Creek or Sepulveda Blvd and on Centinela Ave. we have the two electric transmission. Lines for Scattergood Transmission Stations to Santa Monica. A mistake to put all their infrastructure in one place. An above ground option on Centinela will split the community. |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Palmdale! |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Please confirm location of the Tuesday, July 30 meeting. |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Primarily I would like to see a region-wide project that would satisfy the needs for transit through the Sepulveda Pass. The LA County Coastal/Orange County Coastal train originating from SW/Riverside LAX to Westside Sepulveda Pass, San Fernando Valley, Santa Clarita, Palmdale, and Victorville, Secondarily, I like the MTA's HRT 2 plan. I proposed the Purple Line Extension bend northwest to Brentwood Village then south through Santa Monica, Venice Pier area, Marina Del Rey, then east along Jefferson Blvd. to Howard Hughes Commercial/Corporate Center, then south through Westchester CBD, and into LAX ground transit center (then a possible extension to Inglewood stadium). In addition, I propose a Pasadena Purple Line spur. Spurring north from Beverly Hills station to Santa Monica Blvd. east to Highland, then north to Red Line. They serve south Burbank, Central Glendale, Eagle Rock, Pasadena, South Pasadena, Alhambra, and Cal State LA. Can a Purple Line extension be planned to connect the new football stadium in Inglewood with the LAC transit Center? Can the green Line be extended north from the 105 to the rear of the football stadium, then connect to the Crenshaw Line to the airport (LAX)? |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Extension HRT 3 to Magic Mountain south to LAX Airport east/west Purple Line from Westwood to Disneyland via HRT 3 West Santa Ana Branch HRT 3 line. |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Regarding the UCLA to LAX segment, are you taking into account one of the most congested North-South corridors in the area? Lincoln Blvd. from Santa Monica to Westchester? |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Since I live in the city of Carson, which is not too far to the Del Amo Metro Blue Station, I would be taking the Metro Blue Line Northbound, then connecting w/ the new Metro Crenshaw Line heading Northwest, and then connect with the Metro Expo Line Westbound, and then connect with the help of the first 2 alternatives northbound that represent w/ the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project and vice versa. As I get off the Woodley Metro Orange Line station. I wonder how long would it take to go to this same destination, but via the Light Rail or proposed heavy rail? |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Thank you for the presentation. Since the actual project will take years, please work on the Express Buses from the Westside to the Valley and back. I drive the 405 too much and it makes me sick. LAX to Chatsworth connections that are quick & smooth. Also, work on the Shuttle Buses for all the Stations that have no parking. I have heard that Sherman Oaks folks are fighting it starting there. That makes the most sense. Sherman Oaks to LAX. The Olympics will be here in 2028. How soon can we start? I live about 5 miles from here and it took me more than 40 minutes. |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | The Centinela alignment should be seriously considered with the development potential along the corridor (up-zoning). The Playa Vista connection is a major bonus of this alignment as this is a huge job center without transit connectivity. The Culver City Mall station is not as regionally significant, except for the Transit Center, which can be relocated. |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | The green line is on the freeway. Why not this one? You could remove a travel lane and have walkways over/under the freeway. Why can't you do an express bus lane on the 405, which will be ready before 2050! |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | The Monorail (Rubber Tire) is the Best option, considering cost and the real possibility to have stations stops at the Getty Center and/or Skirball. It's away of connecting Arts and Culture to the community. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Why 2057? That's about 40 years from now. |
| 07/24/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Why would travel time be longer to Downtown from LAX? Is the Arts District turn around aiming for 5 to 8 m/h turn around? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Although I currently live in Westwood, I'm very interested in ensuring a one-seat ride from the valley to the UCLA campus and then to LAX, as I consider future places to live. Also, in support of my colleagues and friends who want to access UCLA as efficiently as possible, a one-seat ride to UCLA from the Valley and Inglewood is very important. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Do projections of ridership (and any idea of traffic reduction) take into account population growth over the next 16 years for Valley-Westside/35 years for Valley LAX? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Does choosing monorail mean none of the Westside-LAX alternatives besides the 405 one can be chosen? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Environmental impact considerations seem to be limited to noise and wildlife habitat. Which alternative is presumed most sustainable, in terms of fossil fuels consumed for construction? Boring tunnels and transporting must have a significant impact The LAX extensions end at off-site people mover. What is the status of that portion? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I fully support the initiative. I would vote for MRT1 option. We will suggest earlier construction and completion of current phase II. For phase II route proposal, 405 or Sepulveda works better in our opinion. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Given the high cost of underground construction, why is MRT not more cost competitive? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | How much of the reported budget short fall for the subway options is attributable to accelerating the projects for 2028? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | How will Metro make their route decision ultimately? After community meetings, who will then make decisions? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | How would transit connections by bus and schedules/transfer be made? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | HRT 1 is shortest route (shortest travel time) and Van Nuys Bl is busiest corridor. Add some stations on Van Nuys and replace Van Nuys light rail with bus rapid transit. Santa Monica Bl station yes! Sepulveda alignment to Expo is shortest. Build Purple Line extension to LAX with stations at Santa Monica/Bundy and at Santa Monica Airport redevelopment. NO MONORAIL! Freeway stations don't coincide with transit user needs and are unpleasant for riders. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I am in support of the train from west side to LAX via Sepulveda Blvd. or Centinela Ave. A public transportation alternative on the west side is urgently needed. We should not wait until 2056 - global warming is not waiting. We need to act now. Thank you. Please consider phase II as soon as possible. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I have a number of friends and coworkers who are afraid to try transit primarily because of transfers. What does your research show about a 1 seat ride vs. transfer on ridership? How might that impact a North-South alignment vs. Purple Line extension? If a new federal administration were to provide significantly greater funding, would it be at all possible to build BOTH segments by the 2028 Olympics? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I submitted two questions; your answers were polite, but not concrete. These answers were deemed "vague" and not helpful by two of my fellow educators. Along which street will the west to east portion of all the routes travel to the Expo station? The Expo station used to have almost sufficient parking, now we have almost no parking because huge buildings were built on the parking lot. If the new line joins at Expo will there be tons of parking or insufficient parking? Seniors and the disabled will not bike, walk or Bird to the stations, we have walkers, scooters and bad legs. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I support HRT for Valley to Westside. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I think it is very important to locate a UCLA station on campus. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I vote for the alternatives that will have the ability to be built the fastest, with least impact to existing traffic and the environment/ecology. Thank you for the valuable opportunity to weigh in and learn the options. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I'm most supportive of HRT1, followed by HRT3. MRT1 does not provide sufficient projected ridership, which should be the most important measure in coordination with travel time. I think that parking should be minimized or non-existent, with a focus on getting to stations via other means. MRT should also not be considered for Westside to LAX. I'm more supportive of underground construction rather than at-grade transit that competes and can be delayed by traffic. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I'm very pleased to see a stop at UCLA in every scenario. Can you explain more specifically where that stop will be? That is, on the official campus at the end of Westwood Blvd? Or somewhere else, not actually on campus? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Please describe the cars: I'm considering the southern destination is LAX, there will be a lot of passengers with bulky luggage. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Purple Line extension is wonderful and will do the most positive impact for the westside to multiple areas served = less westside and Culver City cut through car trips. Valley riders transfer is ok. Overland Blvd. is the best alternative as related to urban planning principals, specifically housing and density. Sepulveda is not the best option. It is already served well by buses, too close to 405 for T.O.D. associated growth, and would be the most negative impact to Culver City and the already organic potential growth on Sepulveda. Use Overland or Centinela. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Reassess your ridership estimates for monorail 7 minute delay does not equal 40-50,000 riders given the traffic. For the Westside, having a station between Venice and the Culver Transit center is very important - Preferably at Culver. You need better First/Last mile bus exchange and parking at stations, if you truly want to increase ridership. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association DOES NOT REPRESENT SHERMAN OAKS! |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Stations need parking. To get from my home to a station less than 1 mile away, I'd drive. No scooters or bikes nearby, Uber costs too much and is inconvenient. I used to love Culver City parking and I used it to ride. When it went away, I stopped riding. At UCLA, consider north and south stations. It's a big campus. If there is only one station, it needs to serve the hospital on the south side. Do not put a stop in Westwood, it needs to be on campus. Overland/Westwood traffic is heavy and poorly served by bus to/from UCLA. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Thank you so much for doing this project! I take Amtrak, and metro to the Van Nuys station and it would save me hours compared to having to take the Expo to Union Station and then north on Amtrak. Please expedite this project if you can! Thank you for doing this project. It looks like Monorail is about \$40 million cheaper per year (to maintain) than heavy rail. Why not consider Monorail along any of the HRT 1, 2 or 3 routes? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | This is an important and much needed project for LA. As a car-free resident of LA, it will directly effect me. Two things I would like Metro to consider are that because this line will connect, eventually, to LAX the transfer points on the Expo and Orange lines need to be far better built than the soon to be Crenshaw/Expo transfer. The Crenshaw transfer seems it will require riders to cross a major street and with bags this seems shortsighted. Second, I strongly support HRT3, and am not a fan of adding a new type of infrastructure mode like MRT because of complicating maintenance, however if MRT could add a stop to the Getty Museum it would be a much more interesting option. Thank you. Please build it ASAP. Considering these are line connection to the airport people will need easy transfers with bags, what is the easier stop on the expo line/and how easy will connections be to the Orange Line? |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Very excited for the potential this project has to transform Los Angeles to a more sustainable and transit-friendly city. Especially for my fellow UCLA graduate students (there are 10k of us), it would massively boost where we could live and commute to campus. Comments don't hamstring the future by choosing the slower and lower ridership monorail, I strongly prefer the heavy rail alternatives. I also dislike the alternatives along the 405 on the Westside: freeway adjacent stations are unpleasant environments that are usually harder to walk or bike to, or build TOD near, as someone who used similar stations in the Bay area and Chicago. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Very excited to see this project come to fruition. Keep up the good work, and thanks for including the community so well. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | We support Metro and it's process. What can we do to expedite construction? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | What percentage reduction in vehicle traffic on the 405 would be expected once the Sepulveda pass line is complete? Would the construction time be reduced with the monorail option? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | When the Culver City Expo line station first opened there was a large parking lot that was very popular with commuters. Then it was replaced by an apartment building with very expensive apartments for people who will never use the Expo line. Will the same thing happen with this project? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Which option will cause the most noise? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Why does the line come near LAX - then go east away from LAX? Why can't it go to Sepulveda and Century? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Yes, build the Sepulveda Pass subway. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Will the project process updates be available online? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Will the proposal to the board in December include the West LA to LAX portion of the line? What should I expect if the option selected tunnels directly beneath my home? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | No monorail, don't need another mode. Please use HRT 3 on northern segment with stop at UCLA. No Santa Monica stop. South portion - Sepulveda route please, elevated segment along 405 to Santa Monica. Add a stop at LAX intermodal station over to 96th Street to shortcut transfers to LAX for all southbound riders. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Build the Sepulveda train. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Build HRT! |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | This a no-brainer. We need to relieve the traffic on the busiest N-S corridor in Los Angeles. |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Build Sepulveda Pass train |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Will the Valley-Westside plan be the only one to be chosen to study in December, or will the LAX part be chosen too? |
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Would like to see a connection at Bundy and Olympic. It just makes sense to put transit close to where people both live and work. The Expo/Pico option borders the 405, which acts as a barrier for folks who live on either side. This would also help entice folks who work in Santa Monica and hopefully alleviate traffic on the 405. Also, it spaces out the connections with the Crenshaw line/Expo line. No need to have two lines to LAX that close together. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 07/27/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | You have the priorities backwards for the two phases. Build the LAX-Westwood section first. Serves more people and would be more valuable for Olympic traffic and transportation. Keep this project separate from Purple Line. The Purple Line should run along Wilshire all the way to Santa Monica 3rd Street. That traffic corridor is also very congested. |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | 2029-2033 is a long way off - the Westside needs relief now. How about an express bus from SFV to Santa Monica and another to WeHo instead of changing buses in Westwood? Current bus routes take too long as mentioned in your video. |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | A private proposal by a Chinese battery company, BYD, is proposing another option of a monorail down the 405 Freeway which would not have a direct stop on the UCLA campus. Since your projections show a UCLA station would be the highest volume station. Is there any motor city in the world that operates a high capacity high speed monorail system that carries the extremely high volume of riders expected for this Valley-Westside corridor? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Do costs include construction and train cars or are they only for construction? Please explain the exact location of the Sepulveda above ground proposal. Please specify location at Bel Air Crest. |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Are there public service lines for rail and monorail? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Based on continuing Metro experience with Purple Line and costs per mile as of today's date. Is Metro on target with designated funds to date? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Can monorail accommodate bicycles as well as heavy rail? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I have concerns about the high water table along Centinela and number of methane fields in Playa Vista. How can underground routing be located within these areas of hazards? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Describe how the digging would work in the mountains through a canyon? The mountain is narrow on Bel Air Rd, which looks like where HRT 1 will go. How will that work? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Do not build any parking at stations - Irresponsible in 2019 Consider building MRT above Crenshaw yard or on VA property with housing above. Assembling 120 parcels in the Westside or asking the valley to accept another after the ESFV fiasco doesn't see realistic. Metro should consider other options like downsizing the MSF by using crossover tracks & Stations for overnight storage. Metro should consider joint development of land around elevated stations or station portals to offset project capital costs; ex: Arial station rendering in the valley should include private parking. It is bizarre that monorail is still being considered. DO NOT introduce a 3rd rail mode to generate and maintain which would increase operations, training, maintenance and replacement costs with minimal benefits - monorail would also limit future flexibility for extension. Happy Santa Monica station is back! |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Do you have any info on the decimal level of the monorail option through the pass taking into account that the hills and canyons amplify the bounce noise? Where will the money come from for the tunnel option? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Does MTA contemplate providing any parking at any stations? Central locations Westwood/Van Nuys may justify that feature. Do riders have to have access to UBER? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | For the maintenance facilities, why are they restricted to different route alignments? For the valley options why can't you extend the track to reach the desired options? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Have our ridership models been tested for accuracy against real world data of existing transit lines? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | HRT down Centinela Ave. to LAX is the position of the Del Rey NC. We love and want it. |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | How does Metro interact with street maintenance? Both Ohio and Massachusetts have been torn up with no good alternative. Many use Cotner from the 405 to access on eastbound route. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | How many people do you intend to displace by eminent domain, if you choose the Sepulveda route. What about high pressure water main on Sepulveda. If you are doing Metro why would you also add toll roads. |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | How much will HRT 1 & HRT 2 cost and how much money does Metro have now? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I heard a rumor that 100 homes will be eminent domained and demolished as part of HRT 3. Where did that rumor come from and is there any truth to it? Events like these are great but they are imperfect means of soliciting feedback. What is Metro doing to make sure that the feedback it collects is representative of everyone rather than just a handful of people? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I noticed that Washington Blvd has been removed from consideration as a possible station site. I would like to point out that there is a massive densification is planned along Washington between Inglewood and Lincoln and this should be considered when making this decision. |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I think the monorail option should be taken out of consideration. Even though it's the cheapest option, it is significantly slower than the other three heavy rail options. Travel time is a big consideration, and I think a faster train will draw more users. I am also not a big fan of the westside-LAX concepts that run along Sepulveda Blvd. and the 405. I think that the Overland and Centinela routes are much better, and they will reach more people. I also like the idea of doing both a Purple Line extension along Centinela and the Overland route. Two subways in the Westside would increase ridership throughout the system. Selfishly, I like the route that would hit Expo/Sepulveda and then go down Overland; however, I think that Expo/Bundy and Centinela could really help people west of the 405. Either way, I prefer HRT 1 or HRT 2. |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I would like to express my support for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor project and a premium-transit option between the SFV and the Westside in general. Specifically, I would like to express my support for alignment HRT3, to promote the largest ridership and lowest commute times. Additionally, it is extremely important that this line is extended all the way to LAX eventually. Specifically the Overland option, giving another low-income community access to better public transit and connecting them to Los Angeles. |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | If a tunnel goes under a home, what would be the impact be to the residents during construction and later when the train runs? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I'll come back when you want input about public transportation as opposed to low income worker/student transportation. |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | In terms of noise pollution, how would you mitigated that? In terms of security, I assume there will be 24/7 security on staff. |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Initially the Purple Line was named "Subway to the Sea" The Westside between Ocean Ave and the 405 has grid lock traffic during rush hour. The Sepulveda Corridor Line should go south to LAX. |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Only one proposed path has a station supporting Westside Community College. I like the idea of a hanging rail (upside down monorail) taking the path of Balogna Creek and LA River. |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Please add me to your interested parties list. Thank you. Loved the Q & A. |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Please keep me informed about the project. |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | The monorail option takes almost twice as long as the fastest HRT option. Is there any data on how that would affect the ridership? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Vancouver has a train propelled by Linear Induction Motor which would go over the hill like the monorail but have speeds like a heavy rail. Have you looked into LIM or Skytrain technology? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | What are the larger property acquisitions for the underground options? What are the depths of the tunnels? |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|---|
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | What consideration/planning does Metro conduct for re-routing buses to connect to future rail stations to improve access to/from places like Santa Monica? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | What date will the preferred route be determined? When will Bel-Air residents be informed if their homes are above the subway route? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | What existing monorail projects have been evaluated? What is the number of housing units that would be taken to accommodate the monorail the Valley? What are the estimated duration of construction for each alternative? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | What is the construction period for all 4 alternatives? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | What is the difference between heavy rail and light rail? Why call the project heavy rail? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | What sort of criteria are you using to determine the East of 405 vs West of 405 alignment? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | When it comes to security, plans should be made to have patrol of some kind as many things happen (I know this because we live in front of Expo/Sepulveda line) and there is practically no patrol in sight when crimes happen. Consider any route for rail underground especially in Westside as above ground would impact traffic. |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | When would the station for the Expo/Sepulveda station be in the different conceptions? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Where are the stations going to be located and how will you access them? What parking will be available at the stations? What is the cost? Is it fully funded? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Why is there no proposed station at Mulholland Dr for the Monorail alternative? There are many schools on the Mulholland corridor. There are a large numbers of trips associated with the schools. While underground stop on a HRT tunnel is too deep for a stop. When you calculate potential ridership, do you take into account LA City's new transit oriented community program which seeks to increase density along current transit corridors. There is mention of public private partnerships. What might that mean in terms of impact on eventual cost to the public user of the transit? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Will Metro have a say about the housing at some sections of the line? and if yes, will there be a commitment to some affordable housing? |
| 07/30/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Would it be possible to build both the Centinela and the Overland options for the Westside to LAX Segment? |
| 07/31/19 | Project Email | As a millennial who regularly takes public transportation this link will be vital for the growth of Los Angeles. Most millennials like myself take uber or Lyft / train to get to our destinations. It is very crucial we make this link, and make more rapid express busses that will stop less than 4 stops especially around the film studios which generate lots of jobs, generally I see my age group from out of state come to LA for the entertainment business. It takes me over to go the west side with public transportation. |
| 07/31/19 | Project Email | ESFV Corridor and Sepulveda Corridor (HRT 1 and Centinela HRT) all one line. |
| 07/31/19 | Project Email | Good seeing you again yesterday at the Proud Bird. Glad to see you're leading this project and looking forward to your joining us. As you know, Valley VOTE started in 2001 with the effort for SFV secession because the City of LA. had taken the valley for granted for so many years. When this effort failed we morphed into an organization dedicated to making the SFV the best community possible. We meet at Galpin Ford 15555 Roscoe Blvd. North Hills second-floor conference room with mixer at 6:30 and program at 7PM. You will be our main topic with approximately forty five minutes for a presentation and then questions on the Metro Sepulveda project. This has been a topic of interest for years so I expect we might need you for a little extra time to address all of the questions. Although we have had as many as several hundred people attend a meeting, the "normal" is about 40 who belong to various organizations throughout the Valley. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 07/31/19 | Project Email | Hello. I attended the community meeting 7/24/19, listened to the various corridor pitches, and submitted my question, which was read by the moderator, combined with another, unrelated question. It was ignored. Nary a word. So I'll ask my question here: I've had the opportunity to pour through the reams and reams of proposals, EIRs, plans, ordinances, announcements, impact statements, et al, dating back to 1968. In almost every case, Palmdale was touted as a viable relief airport for LAX and the southland. One 1978 LADOA report specifically outlined the importance of Palmdale to the valley, saying that ONT and LAX will both be overwhelmed by 1990. Yet...the city and Metro now ignore Palmdale. No mountains to traverse, wide open right-a-ways for routes, relatively few condemnations required...yet, NO Palmdale. Why not? What's changed since the millions and millions spent on EIRs, proposals, plans, etc., all cite Palmdale as a solution the valley access? |
| 07/31/19 | Project Email | Hooray for efficient public transit! I want to voice my support for an underground route that will connect directly to UCLA. Like thousands of others, I live in the Valley and commute to UCLA, and the lengthier proposed path along the 405 with a stop at the Federal Building would make the travel time too long for me to consider switching from my car. I'd love to ditch my car and I hold out hope that a direct (mostly underground) route from the Orange Line to UCLA would let me and many others do so. |
| 07/31/19 | Project Email | I am 100% against this proposal because it will destroy every neighborhood in it's path. It won't bring much ridership and the property values between the beginning to the end will suffer. Terrible idea. Why don't you just do it on the freeway like a "normal" city does? |
| 07/31/19 | Project Email | I am a 65 year los Angeles native and have been waiting years for this project. Love to see this project expedited and completed in my lifetime. The project should include a stop at UCLA and onward thru the Westside/Venice to LAX as traffic is unbearable. |
| 07/31/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of the project and would highly encourage the fixed-guideway LRT option through the pass. |
| 07/31/19 | Project Email | I am in support of the Sepulveda Corridor Transit project, however I want an option that allows direct access to UCLA in order to truly minimize the time needed to get to campus. Anything between 15-30 minutes is feasible but I know that even among my friend circle, people have said anything more than that we might as well just drive (because you also have to taken into account transport to the station, and transport from the stop at UCLA to wherever you are on campus). With a car you could at least minimize these latter two concerns. |
| 07/31/19 | Project Email | Just a quick note to express my hope that the Sepulveda line will have a stop conveniently located for access to UCLA, Westwood Village, and the new Purple Line station. Transfers between lines and buses will be so important and it's hard to imagine Metro would consider a line that bypassed this important hub thus creating the necessity for additional transfers and hassles to get to this area. |
| 07/31/19 | Project Email | Please consider an alternative where the Sepulveda Transit Corridor and Purple Line interline between Wilshire/Westwood and Bundy/Expo via the VA. This line could continue down Centinela to LAX. This would create a one-seat ride between LAX and the valley (via Crenshaw Transit Corridor) and LAX and Downtown LA (via Purple Line). Also, you get one transfer point to the Expo Line at Bundy for both the Purple Line and the Sepulveda Transit Corridor without the unnecessary cost of building two parallel subway tunnels and two underground stations (Bundy and Sepulveda). Last, having to transfer twice from Expo to Sepulveda to Purple to get from Santa Monica to Downtown LA (as shown in H1-3 and M1) will increase travel times and hurt ridership. |
| 07/31/19 | Project Email | Stations adjacent to the freeway are almost as bad as those in the median; they're noisy, and hard to reach. For example, the Sepulveda/Expo station is extremely unpleasant to reach from the West because of the crossing under the 405. And because freeway-adjacent areas are blighted, these stations are less likely to spur redevelopment. I believe Metro should favor alternatives that place stations away from the freeways (i.e. Santa Monica/Barrington over Santa Monica/Sepulveda, Ventura/ Van Nuys over Ventura and Sepulveda, etc.) Regarding the Centinela alignment alternatives – Has any consideration been given to a variation that includes stations in both Playa Vista and Fox Hills (Slauson/Jefferson)? Of all the Overland/Sepulveda alignment stations, Fox Hills is the one I would miss the most, and it seems at least feasible to add a kink in the alignment that reaches the businesses and the mall east of the 405 before turning South towards LAX. |
| 07/31/19 | Project Email | Supporting this project including expediting the completion for the LA Olympics and including a stop at UCLA |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 07/31/19 | Project Email | Thank you for your interest in improving public transportation in the Sepulveda Pass. Please note, it is COMPLETELY UNACCEPTABLE to run elevated trams above Sepulveda Blvd in Sherman Oaks and Van Nuys (or elsewhere). Elevated trams seem to be a cost effective alternative to subways, but they should NOT be placed where they will have a terrible impact on the existing communities. Why not run them above the middle of the 405 instead!? Thank you in advance for your attention to this important matter. Please protect Sherman Oaks and Van Nuys from the horrendous proposals to run loud, ugly elevated trams on one of our main thoroughfares. We are already suffering so much from BUR airport flight paths. PLEASE do not create another crisis for our community. |
| 07/31/19 | Project Email | Thank you for your work on the planning for this. I'm pleased to see that HRT3 is still in the running - on all the important project metrics (ridership, cost, low-income riders), it blows the other options out of the water. It provides better connectivity than all of the other options to major job, housing, and leisure destinations in the valley (places I've had to go to frequently and really, really wanted a better option than driving). Especially since the station spacing in the valley is already so large, more stations are definitely better (compared to HRT2). I just hope that the community meetings in Sherman Oaks go well - modern elevated rail is definitely much less of an imposition than it used to be, with quieter materials, etc., and Sepulveda is definitely wide enough to support it. I'd only hope that there's some thought given to how to connect the bottom of the Van Nuys LRT line with the Ventura / Sepulveda station of HRT3 - maybe in the far off future, the LRT line can be extended there; but hopefully in the meantime a shuttle bus could be implemented, so that the transfer for people South of the Orange Line (or Van Nuys Station, to avoid multiple transfers) is assured. Despite that current lack of connection, I think the benefits of HRT3 still largely outweigh any issues. The addition of a Santa Monica station is crucial. I hope it works within budgetary constraints; but it's super important not just for the connection to the 704 / Santa Monica buses, but also for access to the density there. Finally, (I know we're not close to this point yet, but I wanted to mention it anyways) I hope that any final designs for the elevated stations think creatively about how to use space. The preliminary rendering e.g. shows a huge concrete plaza next to a freeway - I'm all for more public space, but this one will be better spent by building some mixed-use developments there - offices, homes, retail, etc. - the Delhi Metro (see e.g. Nehru Place station) is one example of a system that very effectively uses the space around and *in* stations by incorporating retail etc. into the station building itself. (PS: I hope nothing needs to be said about MRT1 and that it quietly leaves the AA process soon - it's much too slow to be a good option, and it's definitely in Metro's interest to operate fewer different types of technology for efficiency / etc. reasons) I'm very excited for this project, I think it will have an absolutely transformational impact on LA. |
| 07/31/19 | Project Email | There should be a stop studied at the Getty Center, the region's most attended art museum that happens to lie right in the pass. It has over 1.5 million visitors each year, and this would connect all of LA's major cultural centers to each other and to the public (the Hammer, LACMA, and MOCA). As each of these museums remove their admission charge, having them be transit accessible would be a major move towards equity in access to our region's cultural treasures. |
| 07/31/19 | Project Email | This was the my BEST idea to solve the problem buy I got just a letter of congratulations ! |
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | As a Metro commuter and Sherman Oaks homeowner, I am well aware of the benefits and drawbacks of public transportation in Los Angeles. And the HRT 2 does its best to minimize the drawbacks. Time in transit is a huge issue, every trip and transfer adds to the travel time. And although I like the idea of a monorail, the estimated 9 minutes in transit that HRT 2 saves is significant. As for HRT 3, the savings achieved by using elevated stations in the Valley isn't enough to offset the impact that an elevated line would cause on Sepulveda Blvd. I also worry about the heat of the Valley - a malfunctioning air unit on a subway car might be uncomfortable, but on an elevated line it could be catastrophic. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | <p>As a regular user of LA Metro on the Westside, I love that this project is moving forward. Here is my feedback so far: First with a note, I believe that freeway-running metro lines are a poor design choice and should be avoided whenever possible. The disruption to the street grid makes it near impossible to truly develop a pedestrian-friendly neighborhood. The noise and pollution from the highway would also create a negative experience for transit riders. Finally, destinations near a freeway will be less competitive against driving versus destinations deeper into the street grid because of how convenient it is to hop on the freeway rather than navigate tons of stoplights. All of these factors negatively affect ridership. Valley-Westside: HRT 1 is the best alternative. One, it is the fastest and most direct route but also it is far enough away from the 405 to avoid the problems listed above. In the long run I think this will produce the strongest ridership. Any HRT is far preferred over MRT to keep the infrastructure similar to the existing red and purple lines and therefore easier to maintain than a brand new standard. Railyard: I'm no expert but I'd imagine land near Metrolink is far cheaper than land near the 405 in Westwood. Westside-LAX: HRT-Centinel via Expo/Bundy. Again, this avoids stations near freeways as much as possible. Expo/Bundy has far more job centers than Sepulveda does (i.e. Riot Games). A potential station at Santa Monica Airport would allow us to take full advantage of a massive increase in available land on the Westside, and make it transit-friendly instead of the car-oriented office park that exists near it today. A station in Playa Vista would connect all the new tech offices to high quality transit as well. Any separated route is far preferred over interlining with the Purple line since that will limit the maximum capacity of both lines as well as have delays on either line to cascade into the other which has proven to be a major design flaw of the New York Subway. Finally, I would love to see an alternative for an extension to Inglewood after LAX. The Forum, the NFL Stadium, a future Clippers Arena, and Inglewood itself would all be huge ridership generators that would overwhelm any other lower-capacity transit options.</p> |
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | <p>Hi. 20 years ago you installed lines that served no one (Blue) then you installed lines that went to Universal studios by the time a valley driver got to universal they might as well have driven to downtown as the major part of the drive was over. A train down Sepulveda is brilliant but please please please do NOT have it cross on the street Like Expo Barrington is a disaster. Above ground along 405 and above ground train for 101 would actually solve traffic problems and help people instead of pet projects that got done first. Focus on relieving traffic not just connecting cities. Efficiency is important. If you spend a dollar and it connects and that same dollar reduces traffic that should take priority. So yes please Sepulveda and Ventura Railways NOT BUSES and NOT ON THE GROUND ABOVE GROUND> thanks for all your hard work. If it was easy everyone would do it. God Bless</p> |
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | <p>I am so excited for the Sepulveda train, our community needs this as fast as possible. I commute on the 405 every day and I constantly see people abuse the carpool lane. The carpool lane is completely gridlocked and defeats the purpose. I personally think we should eliminate the carpool lane to cars entirely and implement a bus only lane instead like the orange line. That bus can travel the 405 faster and stops at the planned stations while the train / monorail is being built. I think this could be a huge benefit especially if the construction causes more traffic. But this will only work if you block off the carpool lane.</p> |
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | <p>I live in the Sepulveda Pass area and would welcome a rail/monorail or light rail line with a stop at Mulholland Drive as well as Ventura Blvd. In any event my family and I have lived in the corridor for 24 years and would welcome an commuter transit station on Mulholland Dr.</p> |
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | <p>I love the proposal for a north-south corridor from Van Nuys to the Westside. I am a longtime Encino resident and Metro user. I do not own a car and rely on Metro for my daily travel. I may be applying to UCLA in the coming years and would love to continue to stay green and not get a car (and not contribute to traffic!) while I study there. I frequently make trips to the westside. Please, please make this project happen! I encourage all my friends to utilize transit and this particular hurdle (getting to the westside) seems to be one of the big ones!</p> |
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | <p>I would like to call for the line to have a Santa Monica Blvd. stop, connect at Expo/Bundy and continue down Centinela.</p> |
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | <p>It is a great idea however, schedules must be practical like start at 5 so I can drive from Woodland Hills to van Nuys and have train ready and don't get late to work. Cause have to walk from sunset to work like 20 min</p> |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | It should definitely have a Santa Monica Blvd. stop, connect with Expo at Expo/Bundy and then travel down Centinela. This will connect better to the jobs on the west side and is where all of the housing growth is centered. Plus, it will alleviate traffic getting to the 405. |
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | My vote is for HRT Sepulveda option. Ridership #'s are high and Sepulveda Blvd. from west la to LAX is ripe for redevelopment. I could envision lots of high density housing being built along this thoroughfare. I would like to suggest that you may want to reverse the phases. Make phase 1 westside to lax and phase 2 westside to the valley. The impact seems greater this way .In the city (ridership numbers are higher than valley) , and connections to purple and expo lines are ready to go. Construction has just begun on the LAX tram. LAX is a very congested and is only getting worse. |
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | No reducing Sepulveda by taking away lanes and making more traffic!!! No cement in the middle of Sepulveda for vandals to spray paint and make ugly!!! No noise!!! NO TRAINS ON SEPULVEDA!!! |
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | Please don't doom the CRITICAL Sepulveda Pass project to failure by caving to political contributions from a certain unproven monorail company backed by the Chinese government. Metro already has the complex task of managing two rail gauges/vehicle types between LRT and HRT. Please DO NOT unnecessarily add the Monorail as a third system for Metro to manage. |
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | <p>Regardless of which proposal is eventually adopted, it is clear that this corridor is in desperate need of service. I am an enthusiastic supporter of this project, and am heartened to see it on the 28 by 28 list. HRT 3 is by far the best option of those under consideration. It boasts the highest potential ridership, at 137,000 trips per day. HRT 1 and 2 have 16 and 17 minute end to end trips, respectively. While HRT 3 would take 19 minutes end to end, it more than makes up for it with it's much higher estimated ridership. The monorail option MRT 1 is by far the worst one, with a drastically longer 26 minute end to end trip, and lower ridership than any of the HRT options. These significant downsides could potentially be justified were the monorail estimated to be of significantly lower cost. But Metro's own estimates do not reflect this. HRT 3 is estimated to be ever so slightly more expensive than MRT 1 (9.9-12.2 billion dollars for HRT 3 as opposed to 9.4-11.6 billion dollars for MRT 1).</p> <p>HRT 3 is thus the second cheapest behind MRT 1 while also being the highest (by a large margin) in ridership. It also proposes to build 8 stops whereas HRT 1 and 2 offer only 7, yet the fact that some of it is aerial results in it being significantly less costly to build. One of the alleged downsides would be reduced parking spaces along Sepulveda. This is not an actual downside in any way since the point of expanding transit service is to discourage driving, reducing traffic and hopefully saving our planet from the worst effects of climate change. The other potential downside would be more interruption to properties. While this is a fair criticism, it is a short term downside, which I would argue is more than worth it for the long term benefit of the option's higher ridership. As with all policies, there are winners and losers. The balance of HRT 3 is the most favorable of those options presented. A final point I'd make would be that HRT 3 (and HRT 2 and MRT 1 for that matter) meets the Orange line at the Sepulveda station rather than the Van Nuys stop. And HRT 3 and MRT 1 both have an additional stop on Sepulveda north of the Orange line stop, servicing another high traffic street.</p> |
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | Strongly prefer the Purple Line extension for the Westside-LAX extension. Seems logical to expand the Metro rail network on the westside which would maximum local commuter use and connect well with planned/existing line networks. |
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | Thank you for forwarding the proposals. I am unable to attend the presentations due to work schedules, and this is very helpful. It appears that while HRT 1 is the most expensive initially, it is the most economical to operate on a per rider basis. As the fastest option on the table, it should be the first choice for Metro. Any aerial segments will encounter significant eminent domain and EIS lawsuits. The forecast is likely to run significantly over budget due to delays. Metro should take heed of Seattle's cautionary tale and work out contract terms that protects us from similar problems as experienced with the Alaska Way Viaduct bypass drilling. |
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | Thank you so much for the incredibly important work that you do in order to help Angelenos get around Los Angeles County. I am writing you today to register my support for either the HRT 1, HRT 2, or HRT 3 options for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project. While a monorail would likely be cheaper, it would not have as high a ridership due to its slower speeds. If Metro is serious about providing fast alternatives to cars, that option should probably be scrapped and the other options should be pursued. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | The line should connect with the Expo Line at Bundy and then go down Centinela to LAX. There should also be a stop at Santa Monica Blvd. This route is preferable because of all the news jobs and housing west of the 405 (both recently built and in the planning stages). Additionally, it will help decrease traffic getting to the 405 in the evening, which is currently crippling. |
| 08/01/19 | Project Email | This looks beautiful and a long time overdue. Thank you! |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | A UCLA station is imperatively a major destination and resource for LA and region. UCLA is the #4 largest employer in LA County and #1 health services/hospital in LA/CA. Excellent cultural events. Comparable cities around with Monorail Systems - are they working for the communities? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | After years of commuting the Sepulveda pass, - Via 761, car and bicycle, I could not be more excited that this transit corridor is finally happening. UCLA is the largest employer in the area and thousands of employees and students commute every day from the Valley and beyond. Please ensure there is a direct stop at UCLA and do not create another last mile problem. There is a huge constituency at the campus and it is worthy of a direct route. Please include bike parking and racks on trains and station locations! |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Anything BUT a Monorail. HRT 1 or 3. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Are any additional stops being considered in the San Fernando Valley? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Are there any incentives for contractors to stay on budget? What is the contractors liability/accountability for safety? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | As I came over here I saw a cleaning crew working at the stop for the 233 bus. A homeless woman had left her belongings on the bench a man told me that he got orders to throw all the stuff away (food, clothing) in the trash and sweep the sidewalk over the stop and surrounding area. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Audio Quality especially in the overflow room was poor. Peter's microphone was low, quiet and he did not clearly speak into it. Additionally, there was only one speaker in the overflow rom. One would expect two speakers for stereo audio. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Based on traffic on Sepulveda Blvd. today, any Monorail or above ground solution would be not acceptable. Above ground trains cause disruption, noise and traffic, we need to plan long-term. I know the cost is greater, but underground is the better long-term option. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Can Metro show 1 project that made traffic better? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Can you explain Public/Private Partnerships in more detail. I wish you would think of college campuses like UCLA, USC, and CSUN as transit hubs. They are a goldmine for reliable ridership. I wish you would take the approach to build underground. I would rather spend more, take longer to build. You will get a faster system and more people would use transit. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Choose Monorail transit and add a Sepulveda/Vanowen station; Sepulveda/Burbank station and Getty Center station. Also, add a station between Van Nuys Metrolink station and Sepulveda Blvd. to better serve the Target store hidden behind industrial buildings. Heavy rail transit 3 is also another good option, but add Sepulveda/Vanowen station and Sepulveda/Burbank station and also the station to serve the Target store. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Curious if successful transit systems in other countries are looked at in informing what is considered and proposed here? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | As a UCLA student with a job in Santa Monica, I believe the HRT 1 or HRT 2 proposals would be the most helpful to my community. Many people are hesitant to use public transportation because of the slow travel time and the inconvenience of changing buses. I think far greater numbers of people would use the HRT 1 and HRT 2 public transit options. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Did Metro deposit or make leaflets available on Bus Route 788? Was the Metro outreach on this project to communities that are predominantly Spanish speakers at NC and public schools in Van Nuys and Panorama City? Has Metro made the projects known in either, or both, Telemundo or Univision news local broadcasts? There aren't many Spanish speakers present. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Do we have access to today's PowerPoint presentation? The presentation is different on the Metro Transit project website. The Agenda is updated. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | What are your plans when a Monorail or elevated train stops prematurely on the subway you can't get off? You can't on a Monorail or elevated train. Do we stay on it. It will happen, not maybe. It will happen and you can stop it. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Drop concepts MRT 1 and HRT 3 from consideration. Raised tracks above Sepulveda will create noise, traffic congestion and prevent left turns the length of Sepulveda. These concepts will destroy the livability of Sherman Oaks. Stop this insanity! I fully support HRT 1 or 2 and a Monorail down the middle of the 405 freeway. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I am concerned about earthquakes and the safety of the homeless who will live under the elevated tracks. I am concerned about safety, inaccurate specs., financing the project, and suggest express lanes over a train. Again when I asked about where the money is coming from, I was skipped over. Since low-income is the majority of riders presented in your specs by the time project is completed, the line will no longer meet the inhabitants of now income due to rising costs of living and property. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Elevated trains are not the option. HRT 1 is the best option in all measurable and has the least resident impact. Again, absolutely no elevated trains and HRT 2 is also not ideal. HRT 1 is the better tunneling option. What are the intentions for HRT 2 over HRT 1 when all the data points to HRT 1 being better? (i.e. further, cheaper, shorter, more ridership, no residential impact). What guarantees are there for residential impact on HRT 2? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Exactly how many automobiles will be eliminated from tunneling on the 405 by implementing the Metro train through the Sepulveda pass? Will traffic really be reduced? Does Metro really know for certain that commuters will give up traveling by automobile through the pass? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Fires in the summer? Station at Van Nuys and Ventura Blvd, but train runs Sepulveda? If you have a train why do you need a paid fast track lane? Does cost include taking peoples homes? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | For Westside/LAX segment, choose the Metro Purple Line extension to LAX, so there can also be one seat train ride to LAX from DTLA Union Station. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Geologically are any of the tunnel routes safer or easier than others? What are the comparative long-term maintenance needs and cost estimates? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Given the impacts of the Sepulveda Line on the East San Fernando Line, is Metro reconsidering the East San Fernando Line to increase capacity (e.g. replacing the planned LRT with HRT)? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Great job Metro! Love your new project! Go Metro! |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Has Metro looked into a blended heavy rail/monorail technology that could offer speed/ flexibility, and cost savings? Such as Hi-rail technology? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Have they talked about Earth Quake preparation for the Monorail? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Heavy Rail Transit (HRT), Vermont/Sunset Red Line Station. Add a station at the following bus stations: MRT, Valley-Westside, MSF, Sepulveda/Vanowen Westside-LAX |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | How are you determining the noise and pollution impact? What is the current level of pollution and noise along proposed routes? How will the proposed routes change the existing pollution and noise measures? What will be the increase in proposed routes in pollution and noise in the routes? Will this be completed for the Olympics? The 405 construction took a long time. How will you control construction development so this does not become the SoCal bullet train fiasco? How many contractors vs. government staff will be used? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | How does Metro address different types of mobility integrated into the design of transit stations that allow safety and open space into these stations (i.e. ride share, scooters, e-bikes, e-v, passenger drones)? |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|---|
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | How does the monorail down the 405 cost estimates account for connections to other transit? It sounds like a road to nowhere. How do we ensure a UCLA station given to the 10,000 + commuters from the Valley to UCLA? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | How is construction expected to affect car traffic? Will it make traffic worse than before it makes it better? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | How many residencies will have to be destroyed by the HRT 1? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | How much do you have in aerial funding for this project? And if there are more funds needed, where will you get the additional funds? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | how much louder is the heavy rail to the monorail and how far will the sound carry for each? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | How reliable is projection of riders for all four alternatives? How were the figures in your slide "Projected ridership in Valley" calculated? What is the data on noise impact for a monorail over the fwy vs. MRT 1? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | How will you make riding bus/train a more pleasant experience? I have been riding bus (Metro Rapid) and I am appalled at the conditions: urine on seats (never know if you will be sitting on one) smell and not feeling safe. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | HRT 1 is the only logical alternative. I was on the CAC for the I-405 project. Nobody in charge listened to the public. People who live in the effected areas do know what works best. The I-405 project spent \$1.4 B for almost no improvement. For Encino, the only improvement is the added lane from the Skirball (S) exit lane to the Skirball Bridge on Sepulveda Blvd. Please, let's do it right this time. Secure money from the High Speed Train (to nowhere) for HRT 1. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Metro should select HRT 1 or HRT , the full subway concepts that would not wreak havoc on Sherman Oaks and Van Nuys. They would be faster and less damaging than the other routes. Elevated trains on Sepulveda Blvd. would cause noise, destroy property and eliminate left turns. Please don't make the valley suffer the blight of elevated trains. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | HRT 1 is the only viable solution: 1. Fastest Transit Times 2. Cost sharing for maintenance facility for Sepulveda & LAX/Westside 3. Costs for new mechanics & support staff not displayed on MRT 4. Easiest Transformation for future Rail continuation 5. Traffic impact from exits off 405 to Sepulveda Blvd. (MRT 2, 3, HRT) 6. Both Encino and Sherman Oaks only support HRT 1 Q: Why after 2 meeting requests there is no cost clarification for each end costs with the new equipment and training of mechanics and service equipment for the MRT? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | The most important factors for us are environmental impacts, capacity and speed. For these reasons we prefer HRT 1 & 2 options. Please no above ground options. No monorail, especially no monorail above the 405 nonsense. I'd be happy to pay more taxes to get HRT 1 over the rest. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | HRT 1 is the simplest option, however HRT 2 is a suitable alternative. Anything to make a "traffic immune" transportation option is needed. Community from Chatsworth station to UCLA have taken me 3+ hours during rush hour. The Orange Line took about an hour regardless of the load of traffic. However, the Orange Line upgrade is well-rounded. The 734 slowed to a crawl and suffered delays during the morning. Please just reduce traffic on the 405 and Sepulveda. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | HRT 1 or 2, just start now and get it done. Pressure that a lawsuit filed by the families of the 10's of thousands who die prematurely each year from transportation pollution caused all the freeways to close - get this done now. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | HRT 3 is by far the best option. Future extension to Burbank Airport could be under \$1 Billion. it includes an additional station at Sherman Way, has the highest ridership, and costs less than HRT 1 or 2. No Monorail or rubber tire vehicles; costs too much in maintenance and operation, no possible eastern tie-in to the Red Line and is the slowest. Put the Santa Monica station at Westwood rather than Sepulveda; better Westside coverage that way. I'd like a meeting with a Metro rep please! |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I am 100% against HRT 3 and MRT 1. It will create more traffic on Sepulveda Blvd. More noise pollution and more air pollution. Traffic accidents will become more prevalent and emerging vehicles will not be able to get where they are needed most. Left turn lanes will have to be removed causing more illegal turns and more problems. new upscale apartments will have a team within 50 feet at their bedroom windows creating less occupancy. businesses will suffer on Sepulveda because of so much traffic on the street. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I am concerned that Monorail option will impact my ability to leave my home by car in the morning we live one block from Sepulveda/Ventura and be able to tavern the boulevard. I am concerned about the noise level living one block away. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I am opposed to overhead rail which will have a huge negative environmental impact on Sherman Oaks. My preference is for a subway or monorail. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I am not sure why you would not support the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association's proposal to run the Monorail down the center of the freeway-less noise and less money to implement - why not? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I am strongly against the Monorail. the smallest ridership and longest travel time makes it obsolete by the time it is built. This is the heaviest traveled area in the city and therefore requires the fastest most efficient and highest capacity possible so it can handle future population growth. We do not need the quickest/cheapest fix or it will become obsolete and have to be replaced (like the Orange Bus Line). I personally prefer HRT 1 or 2 so it is entirely underground in the Valley. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I love the project. Monorail is awesome. I'm disabled and welcome Metro! Make it happen please! |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I prefer HRT 1 as it's the most direct route. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I strongly believe the UCLA station should be on the UCLA campus not on Wilshire Blvd. Where will the UCLA station be located? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I support HRT 1 plan with a plan to get this done by 2028 instead of 2057! Also what is the plan to support immediate transit needs and more buses to UCLA/Century City with weekend service would immediately help and possibly encourage less car traffic and more commuters. Parking. What are your plans to accommodate commuter parking? The Encino park/Ride is often at capacity by 100% during the school year. DO you have sufficient parking for this project? The 573 only takes about 25 minutes now. What about increasing buses and service as where is currently now weekend service? That would be an immediate benefit and not 38+ years away! What are Metro's immediate solution suggestions? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I support HRT 2. No above ground steel wheel trains! We already are bombarded by Jet and Helicopter noise; putting in noisy steel wheel trains means out home will make living in our home unbearably bad! I also support the SOHA quiet Monorail proposal. Finally - extend to LAX as quickly as possible. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I want to thank Metro for their hard work on making this happen. Not everyone will be happy with how we get to the end project. However, past leavers have let us down by not addressing this specific issue in the past. Let's stop looking inward and asking how I will be affected and look forward on how everyone will benefit from this! |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I was at the meeting a year ago. Nothing is going forward. We are down to 4 - you are still looking at alternatives? Get this going! |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I'm really excited that Metro is moving forward with this project - it will make a huge difference in my life as a UCLA faculty member. The most important things to me are environmental impact, servicing the greatest number of riders, and having a Metro Stop on the UCLA campus (not a shuttle from another stop). I am also very opposed to having express lanes on the 405. This lane should be for buses, carpools, and electric vehicles. - not yet another benefit for the wealthy that negatively impact greener transportation (buses, carpools, electric cars). |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|---|
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I support your HRT 1 and HRT 2. I prefer HRT 2 because it will be more central to Sherman Oaks development if it happens at Van Nuys. I am totally opposed to your monorail and heavy rail above Sepulveda Blvd that would ruin all our attempts an making the community more pedestrian friendly. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | HRT 1 is the best option. Start the project before you have all the money. Costs always go up, take money from the High Speed Train project. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Is a P3 considered? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | No monorail please, Valley deserves underground transit that is fast. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Please ignore the selfish complaints of the Sherman Oaks property owners. As myself a participant at the community meeting, I could not help but notice that most of those protesting from Sherman Oaks were of a quite advanced age. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Is the monorail down the 405 in consideration? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Is there going to be secure bicycle parking at each station? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | It is vitally important for noise impacts to be determined with certainty prior to deciding on the concept that will be put forward because SO residents already are dealing with significant noise problems due to flight patterns from VNY, BUR, and helicopters. Having an ongoing above ground rail system will substantially degrade quality of life and ability for residents to live peacefully in their homes for thousands of residents. Perhaps the reverse option needs to be considered that is underground in the Valley and above ground in a noise corridor near UCLA. Above ground on freeway to Wilshire Blvd. at Westwood. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I am looking for the most direct line, most energy efficient line, most cost-effective line, with a reasonable completion date. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Metro recently estimated that their two full subway concepts (HRT 1 and HRT 2) could cost more than \$13 Billion, while Metro's elevated train and monorail concepts could cost only 10 to 15 percent less. There is only about \$6.5 billion (2019\$) available from the Measure M sales tax plus federal, state, county, and local funding. We all want the best system possible, but are worries what could happen since all four Metro's concepts have estimated costs significantly exceeding available funding. Does Metro have any insights that could be shared with the public on how the potential \$7 Billion funding shortfall might be corrected? Or is there an alternate "Plan B?" |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | No elevated trains on Sepulveda because there will be graffiti and homelessness from Valley Vista to Sherman Oaks. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | No elevated trains on Sepulveda. It will create one giant homeless encampment. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | No on elevated trains above Sepulveda Blvd. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Oppose any elevated track above Valley Streets. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Oppose any elevated tracks above Sepulveda. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Will there be any parking fees? |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|---|
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | The presenters were excellent in their presentation and responding to questions. We were especially favorable toward the monorail proposal because of less tunneling. Second choice is HRT 1 because its route seems the most direct from the Valley to the Westside. We look forward to seeing the next phase of this project. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | I am in favor of HRT 1. I am opposed to any plan that puts mass transit above ground. I am originally from Chicago and am personally aware of the noise and distribution caused by the elevated trains. HRT 2 would be my second choice. Do not build over Sepulveda Blvd. Traffic on it is already a mess. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Please confirm that all four Valley-Westside alternatives will be part of the EIR analysis. Rumor has it that only two alternatives will be studied. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Please keep ALL partitions of this project underground. Above ground in the Valley would be too intrusive. Above ground through the Sepulveda pass has many problems. #1 - Noise in and above the canyon. Adding one lane on the 405 has tripled if not more the noise from the 405 into the hills. A monorail or elevated train would ruin the area for hill residents and we count too! #2 - Fire risk - wildlife needs prevention. Underground does that. #3 - stations (later) above ground in the mountains would greatly increase fire risk for residents in the hills by making it easier for people to get into the hills as a place to live in the canyons. - Skirball Fire for example. Too dangerous! HRT 1 is the best overall option. Get the funding and do this! |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Prefer Heavy Rail HRT 1 or 2. HRT 1 seems to align EVT stations along the route, but it's on Van Nuys Blvd. HRT 2 runs along Sepulveda Blvd, which is the center of SFV. Two stations seem sufficient. HRT seems a better choice, not monorail. Would advocate private partnership to make up cost deficiencies to BM. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Prefer HRT 1; alternative meets at busy Ventura/Van Nuys and follows (partially old Chandler-Sepulveda) Pacific Electric route. Also the alternative is completely underground. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Prioritize bicycle routes accessing the stations, Plan bicycle space on trains. Bikeshare is great, but understand that many people need to bring their own bikes. Plan restrooms at stations or on board trains. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Regardless of estimates, these projects run at least 2-3 times the projections. Where is the money coming from? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Sepulveda Blvd. is a residential area. It is too dangerous to build elevated trains track in residential area. Any person may use it by climbing up and have suicide attempt. Have you thought how it would be dangerous? Have you thought about putting elevated train tracks in Residential area, and how the noise of a train will disturb life of the people living close by train track? Usually the price of property drops down where there is elevated train tracks, have you thought about it? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Station - Sepulveda and Erwin - Bus line behind the LA Fitness. When will stations be moved onto Sepulveda as an overpass station? How will that big parking lot be used in the future? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | There is talk against the 405 monorail, is there is no room for it on the freeway? We are not opposed to taking out the HOV lanes to accommodate the monorail. This is sometimes the only way to get people out of their cars and take public transportation. We here in L.A. are not used to getting out of our cars, but this is a must going into the future! |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | There needs to be enough space at each station to accommodate hundreds of bicycles in a secure indoor building. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | To go from east valley project to this line - will a change of trains be required? When will parking be added and will you have to pay? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | We are against the above ground trains proposed on Sepulveda. It's a greater environmental impact on my neighborhood and the Valley in general. Also, against for the reason of excess noise, congestion, influx of people and it turns my suburban neighborhood into an urban mess. Q: What's the noise impact on local homes in corresponding neighborhoods? For HRT 3 or MRT 1? |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | We only want HRT 1 or 2. We would like you to study the Monorail concept above the 405, Not Metro's monorail proposal. HRT 3 would be too loud. I take the Red Line everyday to go downtown - heavy rail is much faster. When I take Expo Line into Santa Monica, the train is slow and I might as well drive. I find it hard to believe that you don't need more park and ride lots. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | We strongly think that the only valid option is HRT 1. It is the only option that has zero negative impact for us residents. All other 3 options involve a lot of negative impacts for us, like noise, traffic increase on Sepulveda and in HRT 2 a tunnel under hundreds of residential homes. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | What about all the businesses and residents on Sepulveda that would be affected by HRT 3? This is disastrous and not fair. Sepulveda up to Sherman Way would be ruined. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | What are chances of getting bullet train money to complete an HRT design faster? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | What has been the input from Native American Tribes concerning construction through/adjacent to the Sepulveda Pass? I want the MRT for visual appeal and enough tunnels! Tourists would enjoy Monorail much more as well. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | What is eminent domain and will my home be affected? I understand Metro will be eliminating 100 homes in the process of this project. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | What is the worst realistic possible outcome? Constructed in 2060? Too expensive to ride? Too slow? Unexpected permanent cause for route change? Bel Air lawyers sue Metro until they kill the project? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | What plans are there to include green scape along these corridors - environmentally cooling the route? Also, what plans are there to include art/site installations along the corridor? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | When the subway was first built, the contractor could not get the thickness of the tunnel walls consistent. When Caltrans did the 405 widening, they did not sufficiently plan for buried utility lines. How does Metro plan to avoid contractor screw-ups and not doing thorough analysis of the options and chosen route? Q: The Southern part of the valley routed for HRT would be in high water table area the 1994 earthquake caused multiple red tagged apartments owe to liquefaction. Why would you propose tunneling where there is increased possibility of collapse in case of an earthquake? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | When will the UCLA station be built on campus? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | When will we see the most basic improvements in Metro's service in the San Fernando Valley? I.e. clean buses/trains, bus stops/platforms, trash cans! |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Why can't you run a mode of transportation on the ground in the middle of the 405? Why does it have to be elevated? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Why do you expect that the Monorail system would be driverless but an HRT system would need drivers? Thank you! |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Why does the Westside model projects permit all underground yet the Valley side shows 2 proposals that are above ground? Why not go directly down Van Nuys Blvd. vs. adding a curve to Sepulveda? Shorter route. |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Why hasn't a stop/station at the Getty Center being considered with any of the options? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Why not run the line right next to rather than down the median of the 405? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Will there be a consideration of a Roscoe station? How does this project interact with the north SFV, BRT project? |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|---|
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Will there be restrooms at the stations or will Metro provide bushes and elevators like on the Red Line? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Will you guarantee that this project will not make things worse, during construction, and after construction. Why won't this project make traffic worse as demonstrated by the 405 "remodel" project? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Would HRT rolling stock be compatible with existing Metro Trains? Has Metro already forecast MRT rolling stock? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Would Metro consider speeds above 65 MPH in the tunnel? |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | Years ago I noticed how the hype tunnel drilling machine was operating along/under south Chandler in the Valley. If you build underground will you use a similar device tunneling may be initially more expensive but I feel that the result is better |
| 08/03/19 | Round 3 Community Meetings | You are dreaming if you think the elevated train will not take a lot of room from Sepulveda Blvd. The Monorail looks better. How much will bus pass increase to pay for this? |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | An above ground train along the 405 would be devastating for my neighborhood (15528 Royal Ridge Rd. Sherman Oaks, CA 91403) Cal trans already destroyed it 5 years ago with the 405 expansion. I've seen how long it's taken Metro to build the Purple line and I would not want that outside my house for 5 more years and then a noisy train going by. What kind of money would property owners get since that would kill property value in Royal Woods if you live even remotely close to the 405? Please don't let this happen. Let us know what we can do to stop this option. |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | As a Sherman Oaks resident (corner of Magnolia and Kester), and as a citizen and voter in the area, my priority is how quickly the project can be completed. Heavy traffic on both the streets and freeways needs be alleviated. I believe that whichever option can be completed fastest should be the project that is constructed. I would like to voice my support for the monorail. I think the designation is MRT1. MRT1 can be completed by 2028 (in time for the 2028 Olympics), and MRT2 will take until 2033 to complete. So by the time MRT2 is completed MRT1 will have carried 5 years worth of passengers perhaps at half capacity. If my math is correct off top of my head, it would take until 2037 + 11 months or one month shy of 2038 until MRT2 will carry more passengers than MRT1. Please forgive me if my acronyms/abbreviations are incorrect (MRT1 and MRT2), however I would like to reiterate that whichever project can be completed quickest should be the one constructed. We are so far behind other major cities in public transportation that immediate action is needed. |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | Do not build this. No more rail projects |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | HRT 3 is the very best option because it transports the most people and it's cost is very good compared to the other Rail options. HRT 2 is my next favorite option. The MRT option is terrible. The Gold Line trains in the middle of the freeway is terrible. Please don't build anymore lines like this. Metro should do the best thing for the city/region and not be bullied by wealthy homeowners. |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | I absolutely oppose any elevated tracks above any Valley streets. It's unfair! I support a fully underground subway in the Valley, but only if it's affordable. The ONLY acceptable alternative is a monorail above the middle of the 405. Please do not stick valley residents with a noisy eyesore. We need mass transit, we need it to be affordable, but we need it to benefit all LA residents, not just the Westside! |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | I absolutely oppose any elevated tracks above any Valley streets. It's unfair! I support a fully underground subway in the Valley, but only if it's affordable. The ONLY acceptable alternative is a monorail above the middle of the 405. |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | I currently reside in Encino, California. I would like to express my opinion on the four rapid transit concepts from the Valley to the Westside, including LAX. Based on all the 4 concepts, I feel that the monorail is the most economical transit and most feasible form of transportation for the local residents. Many people are uncomfortable riding on subways in Los Angeles. The monorail will be the quietest method of transit and the most modern form of transportation for our city. Thank you for reading my comments. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | I have lived in Sherman Oaks for 10 years. I prefer HRT2 because it brings the underground through the valley near or under Sepulveda. My second choice is SOHA's MRT2 monorail option (NOT Metro's MRT1). SOHA's monorail option is faster and carries twice as many people. So first choice: HRT2 Second choice: MRT2 I oppose ANY elevated tracks above any Valley streets. I would support FULLY UNDERGROUND subway in the Valley. The only acceptable alternative in a monorail above the 405. |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | I oppose the above ground Sepulveda transit corridor options. Please please don't approve the Sepulveda transit corridor project above ground the 405 options. This would be detrimental to my family and to the Sherman oaks/Encino neighborhood and the valley. The 405 is already one of the most traveled freeways and then to add above ground transit corridor to it would be so much pollution, noise, traffic and people traveling in one area. I think it would bring more crime to the neighborhoods and bring our property values down. We worked so hard to be able to own a house and have property in Los Angeles. Our street is quiet and safe now. If this passes, the noise and pollution for the next 100+ years would be horrible for the neighborhood. The amount of traffic it would cause to build this would increase in an already traffic heavy freeway. We see deer all over our hills and this could take their home away. Please please listen to us homeowners and don't build this option. I really appreciate you taking the time to read my concerns and listen to us. Also, something for you to consider, what is the plan to reimburse residents for lost home value? |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | I vote for an underground subway with some type of parking on either end. I think this will get the most people in the shortest time to the Westside. Also it would be the quietest and less obtrusive. |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | I've been waiting since 1964 for a rapid transit means of getting from the Valley to the Westside. At that time there was a measure on the ballot for putting a monorail on all the major freeways, which of course, failed. Unfortunately I won't live long enough to use this one, but I still have a question. Why can't the monorail version follow alongside the 405 all the way, in the Valley and on the Westside? It only seems to follow the freeway through the Pass. Wouldn't that mean less property acquisition and therefore less disruption? |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | Please consider a monorail over the 405. Its the best solution for travel to and from Westside/Valley. |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | Please consider a monorail over the 405. Its the best solution for travel to and from Westside/Valley. |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | Please, consider the subway, HRT1, as the only solution. I have had 4 sleepless nights, since attending the St. Paul metro meeting. The thought of losing my home, or living near many years of construction, is making me ill from worry. Please try to find the extra \$ to not have a monorail on Sepulveda. It would take out very useful lanes as well. I vote, not that you will listen to me, NO on the Sepulveda Monorail YES on HRT 1. |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | Rail line from the valley to the Westside. I am all for above ground transportation and NOT a subway line which will disrupt travel on the 405 for years. |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | Taking away lanes from Sepulveda exacerbates traffic, does not alleviate it. The 405 freeway already has the infrastructure and space for a train. |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | Thank you for asking my input. A resident for 42 yrs, I hope that the project will be one with underground rail. Sepulveda and all N/S streets in Van Nuys and Sherman Oaks are terrible now. Unless the project opts for an underground rail, any other is going to add ugly surface or overhead rails, making traffic patterns worse. Also, why does the Valley again get short changed when over the hill on the west side, the get a subway with no surface ugliness. Please stand up for Sherman Oaks people. Fair for all. |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | The elevated trains above Sepulveda will create homeless encampments from Valley Vista to Sherman Way. It will also serve as another canvass for graffiti, Elevated trains will create massive blight along Sepulveda in a city already overrun with blight which the city of LA refuses or can't control. |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | The feedback I got from the Metro meeting held today in Van Nuys was NOT IMPRESSED. We don't care about anything else except where that blasted train will be built. We don't care about the stops in Westwood or the stops in Van Nuys or stops in Sherman Oaks. The only the we care about is NO TRAINS ON SEPULVEDA. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | The only workable solution that is fair and has the lowest community impact is subway straight down Van Nuys HRT 1 Please find the money to do this correctly do not stick the Valley with the cheap end. Start the construction in the valley and you will be given the money to finish it on the west side. NO Elevated train or on grade trains |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | When will maps of the potential Westwood station areas be published ? |
| 08/06/19 | Project Email | With the population growing the need is greater than ever. |
| 08/07/19 | Project Email | I would like to share my comments on the Sepulveda Transit Corridor project. Though I am a Neighborhood Council Board member in Greater Toluca Lake, these comments are my own and do not reflect the opinion of my council. For the Valley to Westside options, I prefer HRT1, but only slightly to HRT 2. HRT 3 would be my third choice. I lie HRT1 I like the third station stop on Ventura being farther away from the freeway and closer to shops. I also like that its fast, has a low environmental impact, is almost exclusively underground, and still services the second largest number of people and new transit trips. Its also important to me to minimize property acquisition, seeing as we already have a housing and office space crisis. That was a big factor in my preference for HRT 1 and HRT 2.For Westside to LAX, I prefer the purple line extension. While I love the idea of being able to get from the Valley to LAX on one seat, I think the extra ridership capacity of that option is significant and important, and its connection to many other lines is helpful. I support taking extraordinary measures, including private partnerships, to get this done by 2028. We desperately need this line, and I want to see it implemented as fast as humanly possible. |
| 08/14/19 | Project Email | I'm a North Hollywood resident who attended the Sepulveda Pass Rail Project meeting in Van Nuys last Saturday (I took the Orange Line to the meeting instead of driving to make it easier on myself regarding parking). I am writing to show my support for both the HRT 1 and HRT 3 options to connect the San Fernando Valley with the Westside and LAX. I currently avoid driving to areas such as: Sherman Oaks Galleria, Ventura Blvd bars/restaurants, and Westwood due to severe street parking issues and the asphalt headache that is the 405. Having a rail line as another option to avoid all of those issues would be a godsend. I have no particular preference between the two options, so long as both have a station near the Galleria, with easy access to the Ventura Blvd. strip. I think that the monorail option should be removed though, as Metro should not introduce a new type of rail system that may be difficult to connect with the upcoming Purple Line subway to Westwood, and may be slower than said subways. This project will be the second game-changing rail line (after the Expo Line to Santa Monica), that all Angelenos, even ones that are against the street alignment portions, will not only use, but in the months and years after its completion, wonder how we ever survived traffic without it. Thank you for your time, and have a great day. |
| 08/14/19 | Project Email | Here's the Van Nuys community meeting that was held by Metro presenting their idea on expansion of the SFV 405 freeway corridor project. The public came out to standing room only to listen & learn on the different options regarding this huge project. I thought Metro did a good job presenting their different ideas on the 405 expansion. Attached is a title still and as always you can put up this video anywhere you'd like with my credit as "Video Courtesy of Mark Hovater." https://youtu.be/mWpt1v_h-gk < https://gcco1.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fyoutu.be%2FmWpt1v_h-gk&data=02%7Co1%7CChandlerP%40metro.net%7Cb7984579479348062a8608d71c1266be%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7Co%7Co%7C637008737690594199&sdata=oobaR7%2FSyvGFVJRVD9zdijDIC8QNYPPo%2FR1cPJktrY%3D&reserved=o |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/14/19 | Project Email | I am a Sherman Oaks homeowner. Unfortunately I was unable to attend the community meetings about rail transit through the Sepulveda Pass, but if you are still open to public comments or feedback, I'd like to express mine: Yes, please build heavy rail in the Sepulveda Pass as fast as you possibly can. Of the options have seen, I personally prefer "HR1" (the heavy rail option that runs down Van Nuys Blvd.) That seems to make the most sense to me, as so many businesses and government buildings are on Van Nuys. We could definitely use a stop at Van Nuys and Magnolia, for instance. That would help residents in both Sherman Oaks and Van Nuys equally. The Sherman Oaks / Van Nuys Memorial Park is right there, and it draws people from all over for soccer and Little League. The car dealerships are there. Lots of apartment buildings too. It seems like an obvious choice. The Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association's fears about this are overblown, and their opposition is shortsighted. Their suggestion of a monorail does not seem serious to me, as a monorail could not connect to any other trains. Anyway, their position is not mine. We need to build a transit system that will work 20 and 30 years from now. That means a train. And we need it where people go. That means Van Nuys Blvd. |
| 08/14/19 | Project Email | I commute from Northridge to UCLA Athletics everyday. I would definitely use the train through the Sepulveda Pass to go to and from work. I have utilized the commuter express sometimes but having a direct train would be a perfect option for me. I support this project wholeheartedly! |
| 08/14/19 | Project Email | I favor either a subway under the 405 freeway or light rail above the 405 freeway. I oppose any elevated tracks running on Sepulveda Boulevard or any other San Fernando Valley streets. |
| 08/14/19 | Project Email | I live at 1377 Casiano Rd, Los Angeles, CA 90949. My house burned down in the Skirball fire and I am currently rebuilding. I am very concerned that I am spending a great deal of money to rebuild and your plans for the metro from the San Fernando Valley to LAX may impact my home. Before I spend any more money I need to know if your plans may impact my home. Your drawings are not specific as to which homes may be impacted. Please tell me if my home may be impacted. I have been unable to attend your sessions. |
| 08/14/19 | Project Email | I work at UCLA and I'm in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/14/19 | Project Email | In favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/14/19 | Project Email | Just wondering if Metro has considered the low cost option of Bus Rapid Transit through the Sepulveda Pass. I know we have a bus line that traverses the pass on the 405. If Metro raises the car pool requirement to 3 occupants during rush hour, that would free up the car pool lanes through the Sepulveda Pass. Can a bus keep up with car traffic in the car pool lane at 65mph climbing up the mountain? Would it be possible for the Orange Line busses or the contemplated North San Fernando BRT provide a single seat ride to the west side and ultimately to LAX? My recommendation: limit the stations to where the 405 crosses the other Metro lines like the purple line, Exposition Line, and Green Line. |
| 08/14/19 | Project Email | So, why would we consider HRT2 or MRT1? Why would you put mass transit on Sepulveda when there's nobody living there to access it? Sepulveda has a barrier on one side - the 405. On the other side, there is mostly low-density residential (single family homes). Nobody will be able to walk to the stops. On Van Nuys Blvd, the whole way down, there are huge swathes of high/mid density apartments (the people who need public transit) in addition to tons of single family homes as well as commercial businesses (as opposed to industrial along Sepulveda). It makes no sense to consider any other option if the intent of the expenditure is for people to actually use and access public transit. Plus, let us not forget the connection on Van Nuys to the (disgusting, homeless infested) Orange Line. Otherwise, I'm hopping in my car and driving to Santa Monica and back every day as I always have. Billions of \$ and years of construction will make no difference when people cannot easily access public transit. Please select HRT1 and be done with it! |
| 08/14/19 | Project Email | The 405 is way too congested for there to NOT be a train to UCLA |
| 08/14/19 | Project Email | Where / What are the stations not intersecting existing / planned Metro Lines located shown on the Westside route options? |
| 08/14/19 | Project Email | Yes! Yes! Yes! its high time we do something about our local residents daily commute struggle. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | A direct line from the valley to UCLA /the west side is needed rather than having transfers. We are a community of over 42,000 people just on campus and that does not include thousands of visitors and people who come to see our providers for patient care every single day. Having a direct line would not only be more efficient for everyone's time and convenience, it would be helpful for the environment and it would modernize our city. (LA is so behind and backwards compared to everyone else and 2057 is way too far, it needs to be completed asap This is a long time coming. We cannot just think of the Olympics and our guests but the everyday Los Angelinos who deserve a more efficient commute and should have more efficient methods of transportations. A direct line is the way, not transfers. (Transfer are the easy option, not the solution) |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | As a denizen of Los Angeles for 20 years now, living in the West Valley and now working at UCLA for 18 years, I would readily use a public transport system if it was located for transport directly from Valley to the Campus. If this project is finally to be done I think it should be done right rather than short sighted. With the high cost of living and tens of thousands of matriculates and employees - students could find more affordable living in the family with a reliable train system, and workers could cease driving with a train that operated directly to the campus, operated into the late hours both directions (for everything from Healthcare workers, to research scientists with bizarre or unpredictable hours) and encouraging more participation in cultural events and performances on campus and community events with reliable and consistent transport directly to the hospital. Even healthcare benefits for those with tighter budgets or the elderly could more readily access care with a train system that reliably connected directly to campus from the Valley. Please bring the corridor train directly to UCLA for a host of reasons, and do the long overdue project the right way. |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | Currently, I commute from the Palm Springs area by Flix Bus in order to occasionally present for UCLA Extension. It goes directly from downtown Palm Springs to Union Station. Some of the buses actually continue to the dormitory area and make a final stop on Gayley at UCLA. It would be wonderful if there were a train going straight to UCLA from downtown. I love Metro! Keep up the great work. |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | I'm an undergraduate student at UCLA going into my fourth year studying Environmental Science. I'm from the San Fernando Valley, originally from Winnetka and now my family lives in Chatsworth. I have a car over the summers but the cost of tuition and rent during the regular school year prohibits me from being able to afford car insurance and parking September through June. Throughout the past three years attending UCLA I've had to take Ubers or Lyfts back home to the valley, which total to around \$40 round trip every time I want to visit my family. This has resulted in a reluctance/hesitation to go back home which is detrimental to my relationship with my family considering I'm only 25 miles away. I have two siblings who are going into high school and every time I go back home they've grown so much. The installation of a transit corridor would allow me to visit my family more often and without any reservations. I hope you consider my experience as well as the experiences of many other Valley Bruins in deciding on the fate of this project. |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | Hi, I have commuted from Valley Glen to UCLA nearly every weekday for the past 6 years. Previous to that, I drove from Tarzana to UCLA for 4 years. The commute has gotten worse every year; more congested and takes longer. Please create a line that connects the valley directly to UCLA. If this is not possible, then have a fast transfer line from the corridor drop-off to UCLA. It is necessary to have a connector line that is fast and frequent. It is also essential to have a parking lot in the valley. The current problem with many metro line stops is the lack of parking. A corridor connector needs to have a parking structure (not just a lot) with an abundance of space to ensure that people will take the public option. I have tried a couple times before to take the bus from the valley to UCLA and it takes so long that it makes it unrealistic for every day use. Please also ensure that the line will be patrolled and secure. That is a big problem with the orange line and metro lines. There are always people that seem mentally ill either on the lines or at the stops. Thanks for listening! |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer! |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | I am in firm support of a Transit Corridor Project solution that would provide a direct train to UCLA rather than a solution that involves transfers. |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | I commute from the valley everyday to get to UCLA because I can't afford to live in Westwood. Having a station at UCLA in the Transit project will help people like me who struggle in traffic everyday coming to school wasting hours and hours weekly driving a car while this could be spent reading if a quick public transportation alternative was available. The UCLA students and workers for sure, will appreciate having a station on campus to make their day to day lives easier. |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | I live in Calabasas and work at UCLA, and I make that commute every day. Taking the 101 East and 405 South, that is a 20 mile drive that can take up to 1-1 1/2 hours each way. If there were a viable public transit option that went directly to UCLA, I would use it. Please consider a direct train to UCLA. Thank you. |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | I live in Santa Clarita and commute daily to UCLA for over 25+ years. Please have direct trains to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | I live on one of the streets that serves as an alternative to the 405 Sepulveda Pass route. There are daily traffic jams, up to a mile long, on our street. Serious vehicle accidents are common, including, on my block alone, one rollover, a crash that nearly killed my neighbor's child sleeping in her bed, and a hit-and-run that completely destroyed a parked car. I have had many conversations with frustrated commuters as they sit in their cars, inching past my house -- some are tearful, others angry, but all recognize that the situation is untenable. These are hard-working people who are simply trying to get home to their families. All of this occurs because the 405 is wholly overloaded, and desperate commuters resort to treating residential streets as if they were freeways. Neither the interests of commuters nor those of residents are well served in this situation. Efficient mass transit will save millions of person-hours of time lost to traffic jams; greatly reduce air pollution; and enhance the safety of many residential neighborhoods in the region. PLEASE BUILD MASS TRANSIT THROUGH THE SEPULVEDA PASS! |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | I strongly support a train route directly from the Valley to UCLA. |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | I SUPPORT A DIRECT TRAIN FROM THE VALLEY TO UCLA CAMPUS 100%! There are so many advantages to having this train built and I'm sure you've heard the revenue, time, traffic, environmental benefits, but understanding personal stories is also the need that sometimes is not voiced. The public NEEDS this train! Bottom line, serving the public with this "need" (versus a "want") is making this train from the valley to UCLA. |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | I would like to have a direct route to campus without any transfers. |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | In favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | My understanding is that there is some consideration being given to an option for the Sepulveda Corridor line to bypass the center of the UCLA campus and instead have a stop closer to the 405/Wilshire Blvd. Interchange. UCLA is LA's "Second Downtown," and the activity center with the highest transit mode share in Southern California! To not provide direct service to the center of UCLA's campus would be a mistake that could have very negative ramifications for years. |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | Please have the route directly to UCLA. There are 50k students and 30k faculty and staff. Please make sure UCLA is included in the Sepulveda project. |
| 08/16/19 | Project Email | The train would help assist my commute and help assist traffic on the 405 |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | A direct line is a must!! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | A metro stop at UCLA would allow me to ditch my car completely. If the stop is elsewhere, it would add to my commute time making it nonviable. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | A subway line from the Valley that stops at UCLA is essential to freeing up the highway and transporting individuals to Westwood in a more time efficient manner. As a law school student that traveled from Woodland Hills to K-Town everyday, I would take me on average 1.5 hours each way to travel back and forth - Approximately 60 minutes on the Rapid Bus and 20 min on the train with wait times varying wildly. Now, if I wanted to get to UCLA, I'd have to take two buses with approximately the same travel time due to wait times. Our transit system needs to take note of the systems in London, Paris, and NY. RFID cards and readers, as well as more regular/abundant buses and trains will help alleviate L.A.'s reliance on highway traffic. Please consider the needs of students and working residents who need more efficient methods of travel to/from school and work. Thank you. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | A train through the pass would open up new housing opportunities for students and employees at UCLA. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | A train through the Sepulveda corridor that does not include a stop at UCLA would be a mistake. Please do not consider any choices that would not make this very obviously convenient stop. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | A train through the Sepulveda Corridor will be the key leg to connect all key areas of the LA Basin and uncork the bottleneck that is our world-renowned traffic. It will give people a viable option for getting to work and recreation that finally raises Los Angeles to be on par with other world-class cities. PLEASE BUILD THIS TRAIN! And connect it with all the major lines that people rely on, including direct access via public transit to LAX and Union Station. Thank you! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | A transfer at the Federal building would bring additional time to get to my work site at UCLA. It would be better to create some type of direct drop off near Lot 32/36. This would entail a 2 block walk to my work site. Thank you. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Adding a train route would help many students who commute and don't have a car the ability to get to school. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | An efficient Sepulveda transit corridor to UCLA is essential. I've managed to carpool before to UCLA for a year but that did not decrease our commute time to arrive to UCLA. If the Sepulveda transit corridor were available now, I'd use it to decrease my environmental impact, save money on gas and car maintenance and I'd hope it would be faster than my regular 1hour+ commute time. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | As a long term SF Valley resident and UCLA employee, I am very concerned about the above ground options proposed for the SF Valley. It seems like a monorail would be a good option, but the option proposed by the Sherman Oaks HOA seems like it is not being considered. I will probably be retired by the time this project is completed. Nevertheless, as a daily commuter I know that this is very necessary. However, it seems like the impacts to homeowners along Sepulveda are not being properly considered. Neither are impacts to traffic. Finally, I feel like impacts to homeowners on the west side receive greater consideration. Please consider cleaner, less noisy options, like a monorail along the 405 median. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | As a resident of the San Fernando Valley, specifically Northridge, who commutes daily to UCLA, I am greatly in favor of this project. I, along with many others, would benefit very much from a reduced commute time and more sustainable commuting option. I implore Metro to seriously consider this option as I believe it would benefit the community, our environment, as well as Metro itself. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | As a student who frequently travels from the Valley to UCLA and back, I'd appreciate a train that drops me off directly at UCLA than having to transfer. With a transfer, it would actually take twice as long for me to ride the train than drive to the campus, so the direct route would greatly benefit me and students like me. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | As a student who has commuted to UCLA for the past two years, I would love if the metro had a direct stop at UCLA instead of a transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | As an employee of UCLA, I am in favor of a direct train from the valley to UCLA, rather than routes that would involve a transfer. Train travel that is direct will create environmentally stable transportation as well as less congestion on the 405. The benefit is also to the students, staff and faculty who would benefit from affordable travel options. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | As one of the largest employers in California, why the Metro does not have a direct line to the school's campus is beyond me. Especially a line that would directly connect the San Fernando Valley directly to the UCLA campus. So many of the people that work at the school commute daily from the SFV to the school. Is the Metro truly concerned about things like; pollution, carbon footprints, etc.? I can't see how a public transportation organization would make these claims yet fail to do anything to help ease the traffic on the world's worst, most congested freeway. The freeway is jam packed with people and cars BECAUSE there is no alternative. Please, please consider connecting Metro from SFV directly to UCLA. It will be money well spent and most importantly it will be a huge investment in California and Los Angeles. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | As someone who commutes daily from Northridge to UCLA, I wanted to voice my support for a direct train from the valley to UCLA. If such a train existed, I would most definitely stop driving in to work and take it for my daily commute. If I was forced to do a transfer in order to get to my work at UCLA, increasing the travel time to around what it takes to drive in the traffic (or more), I highly doubt that I would ever use this train. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | As someone who commutes from Burbank to UCLA daily, I would very much be in favor of a direct train to UCLA, as that would allow me to connect at the Burbank Metrolink to Van Nuys and go directly to campus. Having to take another shuttle would bring the travel time up to more than what it would take to drive, disincentivizing me to pursue this option. Thank you for hearing my feedback. I look forward to having a green option for my commute to UCLA. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Being that I frequently make the trip back and forth between UCLA's campus and the San Fernando Valley for work, I believe a metro train route between the two places would be a highly beneficial alternative for transportation for me and the many other people who face the difficulty of LA transportation and parking fees. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Build more trains! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Commuter train from Lancaster to UCLA. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Completely support the Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor Project! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Currently taking the CE-573 service and find that it is often packed and have to wait 20-30 minutes for the next bus, which could also be full. Would be great to see a more better reliable scheduled on-time service to the Valley area. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Dear Metro Planners: Bringing the new Metro line to UCLA will be a huge plus for the entire West Side. More than 100,000 people come to UCLA every day and if even a fraction of them can use this line, it will have a high capacity factor. Plus, it will encourage students and faculty who now live elsewhere to live in places close to metro stops in the Valley, thereby further decreasing congestion on the West Side. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Direct line to UCLA instead of transfer |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Direct line to UCLA! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Direct transit corridor to UCLA on Sepulveda is necessary to reduce the traffic from San Fernando Valley to Westwood. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | EXCELLENT IDEA!!! THE CURRENT COMMUTE IS A NIGHTMARE. TOO MANY PEOPLE WITH ROAD RAGE AND TOO MANY ACCIDENTS. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Far past time to bring some sort of rail/light rail system connecting the SCV/SFV to West LA. Commutes on the 405 are getting worse despite the efforts to expand/widen the freeway. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Hello! As a commuter to UCLA, making a direct stop from the San Fernando valley to UCLA would be life changing, truly. I have spent so much of my life on the 101 and the 405. If transportation were more accessible, I could use that time to study and work. Not only this but taking the metro as an option would also be beneficial to our environment!!! The amount of students who would ditch their cars and commute using public transportation would be so massive that we truly could reduce carbon emissions by a lot. This is such a brilliant idea and I wish it had been implemented years ago. But it's so important that we takes steps forward to actually make this happen for future generations and Bruins to come. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Hello. I am in favor of the train that is Direct Service to UCLA. I was hoping for direct service from the Warner Center as well since that is soon to be the NEW downtown of the Valley. There is a need since so many new apartments are being built. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Hello. Thank you for all the times you solicited our opinions. I have been unable to attend a meeting due to work schedule. I live in Van Nuys and work at UCLA. I could not and cannot afford to live on the Westside. My drive can range up to 1.5 hours! Please consider constructing a train, monorail, anything that can move people over the Sepulveda Pass directly from the Van Nuys area into Westwood/UCLA. Please. I have lived in Tokyo and London and am shocked at how this one stretch of the 405 makes me want to move my entire life away from LA. I really appreciate your service. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Hopefully the plan gets funded. Traffic is getting worse, it takes me 2.5 hours to get home from Santa Monica to the valley. Please fund this project. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | HRT3 would be my vote. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am a resident of the San Fernando Valley and plan to be for the rest of my life. I am a daily commuter from North Hollywood to UCLA and sit in hours of traffic a week. I write to urge Metro to choose the option that will create a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that involve transfers. This will save many students and residents so much time, money and stress. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am absolutely in favor of a direct train to UCLA, rather than any time consuming process involving transfers. Transfers would discourage riders and not benefit the majority of people who would think about using this service. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am absolutely in favor of a route from the SF Valley to UCLA! The grid lock is unbearable at times not to me toon the cost of gas and the environmental benefit of getting more people out of their cars . Please do consider this route. Thank you |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am also in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am commenting to advocate that any proposed train from the San Fernando Valley to the Westside have a direct stop at UCLA. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am currently a staff member at UCLA and I strongly agree we need to bring the Sepulveda corridor train to UCLA. Traffic is really bad and will help ease up the traffic. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am currently a third year student at UCLA and I am commuting to campus 3-4 times a week. Each commuting day I spent about 2-3h in traffic for a 14 mile distance alone. 14 miles is the distance from my house to campus. The time wasted in traffic just to go to school is extensive and totals about 40-50h a month. That is an entire work week spent in my car where I cannot study. Having no direct public transportation to campus highly impacts my academic, social and work life. I am hoping I will be able to switch to public transportation if you, METRO, create a train offering transportation from The Valley to UCLA. Personally, I favor not only a reliable train but a train with a direct line. It would take too much time and stress transferring especially during rush hour traffic in the mornings and evenings. I am sure I am not the only one hoping for and favoring a direct train helping students to not only save time but also leave less of a carbon footprint as a community in the city of Los Angeles. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I AM FOR THE NEW METRO SEPULVEDA TRANSIT CORRIDOR TO UCLA & BEYOND. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am highly in favor of a Sepulveda Corridor metro train and I think that it will be beneficial to a large number of people commuting from the valley to DTLA. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor for the direct train. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train route to UCLA rather than one that requires a transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA (from Valley, Sherman Oaks, Sepulveda and Ventura) rather than routes that would involve a transfer |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA from Sepulveda pass. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than have to make transfers in transit. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. As a member of the Burbank community I spend up to 2 hours, sometimes 2.5 hours in commute one way to UCLA and this would be an enormous benefit for all of students and faculty who live in the Valley. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. As a UCLA employee who lives in the valley, I would take a train that took me directly to work. I would be less inclined if I had to transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. It would give my students and I better options to get to campus and for affordable housing. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. Thanks! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. Thanks. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve transfers. As and individual who has commuted between the SFV and UCLA for the past 8 years, both as a student and now as an employee, I have taken multiple routes between the two - carpooling via the 405 or Sepulveda pass, and via public transit through the metro line 734 and commuter line 573. Its important that there is one contiguous transit line between the valley and westside. Spending resources on multiple types of lines that will add transfers and increase the commute time, seems like wasted resources. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA/Wilshire rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a metro train that comes directly to UCLA. Going to an off-campus location and taking a shuttle to campus is better than nothing, but it is not the ideal solution. I have commuted from the San Fernando Valley to UCLA for many years, and would definitely use the train. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of direct train to UCLA and LAX |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of Metro having a direct train to UCLA and also to the West Los Angeles VA Medical Center, rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am IN FAVOR of the direct route to UCLA as opposed to the transfer stops. As a resident in the Valley, traveling to UCLA, the commute is rough. I'm no stranger to commutes but in the field I work in, the drive is not only more exhausting than most but actually adds physical, emotional, and financial stress which is already strained due to the type of work I do. PLEASE BUILD THIS TRANSIT STRAIGHT TO UCLA |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of the Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor Project, as a current UCLA student. It would make it easier to have the option of commuting if I had a direct route. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in full support of a direct train to UCLA. This would only take 16-26 minutes with no stops in between which is far better than the route I have to take right now. As a commuter, I cannot easily go back and forth from my home to campus. So, I need to wake up very early, and I end up staying at campus for the entire day. This was very difficult to get used to at first, and it made my transitioning into college more difficult. The route I currently take requires me to take two buses and this takes around an hour and 30 minutes. The time I spend on commuting is very wasteful and tiring. Being a commuter also restricts how I plan my classes because I prefer to go to classes a few days a week as possible. If my commute time decreased to 16-26 minutes, this would make planning and searching for my classes much easier, and I would have a lot more options. Public transportation is my only option if I need to head home early because other transportation services such as Uber is too expensive. Therefore, I wish future Bruins whose only affordable choices are public transportation to be able to shorten their time and save their energy from a long and unnecessary commute. I believe that any difficulties that keep students from pursuing their education should be addressed. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am in support of a metro train running from the valley to UCLA |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am interested in a direct train to UCLA preferably one with an exit near Murphy Hall or one that easily connects to an on campus bus that goes to Murphy Hall. Thank you! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am wholeheartedly in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am writing in support of a direct train route from the valley to UCLA. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am writing in support of direct train access from the san Fernando valley to UCLA. I carpool from home to UCLA for work. I would certainly take the direct train. The train would be a great option for many commuters who work or study at UCLA. Additionally, a direct train would improve commute times and reduce congestion on the 405 and nearby streets. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am writing to advocate for a direct train between the San Fernando Valley and UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. Studies indicate that a train from the San Fernando Valley without a direct route to UCLA would double the traffic time compared to a train with a direct route to UCLA. As a Valley resident who commutes to UCLA, I am already frustrated with the increasing number of housing units being built (e.g., the Sunkist project) and the decisions to limit commuter access through the various roads that connect to Mulholland. It is absolutely critical for Metro to provide a direct route to UCLA (one of the largest employers in the state). |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am writing to express my enthusiastic support for a train between the San Fernando Valley and the west side. As a regular commuter on the 734 bus, it would be a huge improvement to my commute to be able to avoid traffic and have a smoother ride to work. I know there are a few different options being considered for the project; I implore Metro to choose the option that will maximize passenger capacity and minimize transit time, NOT whatever option that the rich people in the hills want (unless those two happen to align). It is more important for our community and our climate that we bring our transit infrastructure into the 21st century as soon as possible, rather than worry about appeasing a few rich homeowners (who likely don't even pay much in the way of property taxes due to Prop 13). |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I am writing to voice my support for a direct train to the UCLA campus. Many of UCLA's students and employees commute from the San Fernando Valley and a stop here would be an incredible asset to thousands of people. Please reconsider bypassing the campus. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I believe that the idea of a train in the Sepulveda Transit Corridor is a good idea that may significantly help to alleviate traffic in this area. I am in favor of a train with a direct route to UCLA rather than a route which will require a transfer to get to UCLA. If a transfer is involved it is likely that most of the advantage of taking the train will be lost for UCLA commuters and many will still probably take their own car. Thank you for your time. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I cannot emphasize how important this mode of transportation is to those of us who work remotely and travel from other areas where our community practices are located. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I cannot overstate my support for opening train service from the San Fernando Valley to UCLA! |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I commute 50 miles each way from Acton every day and have been for the past 24 years (starting when I first lived in Santa Clarita). Because of my work schedule, I need the flexibility of a variable schedule and need to be here during core hours, so a van pool has never been an option. Commuter buses are limited and often people stand the whole way to and from. My daily commute is 2-2.5 hours in the AM and 1.5 hours in the PM. It has only been obvious to those of us who drive this killer commute that the need for a light rail option is necessary and has been for years. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I commute every day to work in Westwood. As a member of the valley community for over 15 years, I have tried taking the bus, commuter express, carpool, and solo driving to get to work. I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes which would involve transfers. This would incentivize more employees/students of the area with similar commutes to make the switch. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I commute from Burbank to UCLA and back every day, and it's agonizing. An hour to an hour and a half each way, and if it's raining or an accident- even longer. Those of us who live in the San Fernando Valley would greatly benefit from a transportation option to UCLA! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I commute from North Hollywood to UCLA every day, and even though it is only 12-14 miles depending on the route I take, it takes me at least an hour one way every day! I would really appreciate having a direct train to UCLA so that I can have a public transportation option to get to work that takes less than an hour. A train that involves transfers would be too much of a hassle and many people may opt to continue driving. UCLA is one of the biggest employers in Los Angeles, but it has limited options on how to get to it, so this causes much congestion. A direct train from the valley to the campus would definitely help alleviate some of this for commuters. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I commuted from Santa Clarita to UCLA for my entire undergrad degree, and will likely do it again for my graduate degree. It was difficult to find someone who lived close to me with a similar schedule to carpool, and I often found myself driving alone. A metro line running through the 405 would be immensely helpful to students and those who work in this area, and hopefully help decongest traffic. I often used the metro from my workplace in Santa Monica to UCLA as well, and that commute method worked great to make sure I made it to class on time as opposed to driving and having to find parking in an already packed Westwood. Please consider opening a line here as well! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I currently live in Sherman Oaks and work at UCLA. I strongly support this project and its potential acceleration. I support HRT1 for the Valley-Westside alternatives presented in summer 2019. HRT1 better serves the current downtown portion of Van Nuys and allows for future growth. A stop at UCLA is crucial for this project, preferably in the Ackerman Loop enabling easy access to most of campus. I prefer the Centinela or Sepulveda alignments for the Westside-LAX connection. Connecting through Expo/Bundy seems to better serve current job centers. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I currently live in the San Fernando Valley (Victory and de Soto). Direct service from the valley would be a game changer. The traffic coming from the valley is atrocious and a direct line without transfers would most definitely help. Also, it may help those with less reliable cars get to work in a timely fashion, as I frequently see stalled or overheated cars causing traffic to back up. Please strongly consider adding direct metro service from the valley. Thank you! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I drive from the San Fernando Valley every work day to UCLA, and it would be SO great to have direct transportation to campus/Westwood! I would definitely use a commuter system that's convenient and direct. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I favor the construction of a direct train to UCLA without transfer. The reason being is that I currently commute to UCLA transferring up to 3 times between the orange line and the underground red line which results in an exhausting commute. A direct line to UCLA would mean many students like myself could commute to campus in a time efficient and reliable way. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I fully support the train plan.--It's about time! |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I have been a commuter from SFV to UCLA for the past 10 years, and it has only gotten worse via car and bus due to traffic increases and the rerouting of the express from Van Nuys to Sepulveda Blvd. If a new transit solution is being proposed it needs to avoid existing traffic prone areas and must have a direct stop at UCLA. There are thousands of people who would benefit from a direct to UCLA train/tram/bus, whereas stopping in West LA and requiring a second leg of bus or shuttle to campus will effectively kill ridership as it is too inefficient. Please consider serving our university community with a direct transit solution to campus, for the sake of traffic, pollution, stress, and to set an example for the rest of Los Angeles transit planning. Thank you. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I have been commuting from Burbank to UCLA for 8 years now and the traffic gets worse every year. A subway/express line from the valley to UCLA is long overdue and would ease the headache/funds on a lot of us. The morning commute from Burbank is at least 1.5 hrs, if not longer. It has taken me 3 hrs to get to UCLA before. My recommendation is to keep the station away from Sepulveda Blvd. as that area is already impacted with traffic and will only increase that. I would also recommend having a train leave every 15 minutes during the normal peak traffic times (6 - 10 am & 4 - 7 pm). Please consider providing this transportation. It would significantly improve a lot of our lives and ease the anxiety of having to face that commute. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I have been commuting from Northridge to Westwood via 405 for the last 10 years. The traffic was worse in 2009 and is the same now despite several billion dollars spent on the "improvements". Every day @5Pm when I get on the 405 to head home, I found myself in a massive parking lot, where thousands of cars are wasting time, gas, and creating huge amount of pollution to the environment. Clearly, we should be able to do much better than that. The real solution is to build a subway under 405. Technical feasibility of such project is a "no-brainer", just send your engineers to Tokyo and have them study the way they have build the subway in a heavy earthquake zone. Financially, the cost is well-justified as you can add up the loss in productivity for people like myself. I fully support LA Metro to start planning for an underground public transportation between Valley and West LA. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I have been commuting to UCLA from the San Fernando Valley (Sylmar, San Fernando, Lake Balboa, and now Encino) for more than a decade. A direct line to UCLA would allow me to take up public transit as my commute mode, something I will not consider if there is no direct line to the university due to family responsibilities. As a major employer on the west side of Los Angeles, UCLA has thousands of commuters that would benefit greatly from a direct connection to the university. Direct connections to universities are common in other parts of the US and the world, and in Los Angeles. It's time to address the need for UCLA students and employees. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I just wanted to voice my support for a direct train to UCLA Campus from the Valley. Having an option to simply ride a train instead of driving would be huge savings in emissions, in addition to traffic congestion in neighborhood streets -which sometimes cause 15-20 minute delays to simply cross Ventura Blvd from 1 block over! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I live in Porter Ranch. I have been commuting at a crawl on the 405 and backroads to UCLA for my entire adult life. I would love a time efficient mass transportation option directly to the UCLA campus. The UCLA campus, medical center and Luskin Conference Center are daily, primary destinations for thousands of students, staff, faculty, and visitors. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I live in Santa Clarita and that has been a long time talk and dream to have a train along the 405 freeway. Hopefully it would extend all the way to Santa Clarita along the 5 FRWY and the 14 FRWY towards Canyon Country |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I live in the San Fernando Valley and work at UCLA. The commute through Sepulveda Pass is nightmarish both morning and evening and would be vastly improved by a train line. I would ride it! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I live in the valley, so this is a good way to commute |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I live in valley and very traffic |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I sold my car and now bike and bus to campus. The commute isn't great, and I'd love to hop on a train straight there!! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I strongly prefer a direct train from the San Fernando Valley to UCLA or close to UCLA |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I strongly support the proposal of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. It is unacceptable that LA as a one of the largest cities in the world has not yet been able to provide fast and comfortable transport to its biggest university. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I STRONGLY SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL OF TRAIN FROM VAN NUYS TO UCLA |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I support a direct route to UCLA. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I support a direct train through the Sepulveda corridor, directly to UCLA that does NOT involve routes that require a transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I support a direct train to UCLA and would use it daily |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I support a train that takes you directly to UCLA |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I support a train to UCLA. There are students in the valley that are near the school that don't find living on campus worth it because of the heavy cost. However, they may not have a car or other means of transportation to get to school. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I support HRT 3 since it is projected to service the most people, however HRT 1 would best meet my needs. I use it more often than any other route. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I support the railway track! Living close to LA is a real benefit but the traffic is horrendous and this would save a lot of time and money. Thank you! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I support the Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor Project. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I support the train to UCLA |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I think this is an excellent idea and would like to add my voice to the others requesting that such a transit system stop at UCLA. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I vote for HRT1 please. It is the most efficient design you offer and it will be the least damaging for the neighborhoods (I'm think BART in Oakland above and below the earth). Thank you for your time. Have a nice day! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I want to voice my support for the most direct route from the valley to UCLA that will only take rider 16 minutes. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I work at UCLA and commute through the Sepulveda Corridor every weekday. It would save a ton of time (and pollution) if I could ride a train directly from the Valley to UCLA. A transfer will not work for me. Since there are thousands of UCLA employees, I think it would be worth it to have a direct train. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I work at UCLA in Westwood but live in Porter Ranch. I fully support and am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I work for UCLA. I'm all in for some sort of transportation over the Sepulveda pass. Unfortunately, my sticking point of course, besides how long and inconvenient the project will be until completion, is how far I'll need to drive from home to the nearest connector point from my home (e.g. Van Nuys, Sepulveda Blvd.). |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I would like a direct route from the valley to UCLA, without any transfers |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I would like the metro to go straight to UCLA |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I would like to voice that in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. It would make the life of those who live on my side of the valley so much easier than with the transfer option. The daily commute to UCLA is already draining enough and any time and concern that we can save is a win for us. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I would love to have the Sepulveda transit corridor project. It would benefit riders and drivers alike. The current red bus sometimes gets stuck for a long time at intersections and a lot of drivers are upset over this. Not only that but the current redline has a wait time of 15-20 mins in between buses and those times are even more delayed when there is traffic or there are any accidents. The corridor would provide tons of students, laborers, professors going to UCLA with a form of transportation that is unaffected by traffic. I think the amount of people taking this form of transportation will increase and it would also open up the traffic in the 405. I really hope this goes through. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I would very much like a train going over the Sepulveda Pass to go directly to the UCLA campus. This would make my commute so much easier!! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I'd like to have the direct route from Van Nuys to UCLA. This well help those living in the valley have direct access to UCLA - evening classes, training programs, etc. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I'd love a subway system directly to UCLA, ever since attending as a freshman, I've dreamt that LA might have a train system like Tokyo, my other love. Let's make it happen! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I'm a student at UCLA and I would've saved so much time and money if I could've taken the metro to UCLA! This would've changed my undergrad experience immensely. Please add a UCLA stop! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I'm in favor of a direct train to UCLA |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I'm in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes involving transfers. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I'm in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I've been taking the Commuter Express bus to UCLA for the past 3 years. If we are giving more public transportation option, people will use them. I'd like it very much to have a train alternative. Thanks |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I'd like to voice my support for the Sepulveda pass transit project. First I think this project will improve Los Angeles so much and I am thrilled at the possibility of new ways to reduce traffic and more importantly project our environment. As a member and daily commuter of the UCLA community I would highly encourage you to consider a direct train to UCLA rather than transfers from another location. Thousands of us travel to UCLA from the Valley every day and rather than rely on extra time and transfers having a stop at UCLA would change the community lives of many of us. If the stop was at another location, I am not sure I would utilize the service. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | If a train is to be built from the Valley to the Westside, it should definitely have a stop at UCLA. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | If LA Metro line is responsible for the project there is a chance it will be affordable. However the cost must be less than driving to UCLA from Sherman Oaks to UCLA 5 days a week or very few people will use it. This means the cost must be under \$6.00/per day round trip to make this desirable. (\$ 2.50 each way is a price people may go for.) Anything over \$120/month will be a hard sell to all but the most pro-active environmentalists. What will the impact be on traffic? |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I'm favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. My commute from the Valley to UCLA would be much easier and faster and less stressful. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I'm in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I'm in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer: thanks! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I'm in favor of adding a transit line through the Sepulveda pass directly to Westwood. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | I'm NOT in favor of this my reason why is this project is only gear towards people that work during the day Monday thru Friday 8 to 5 when their also group of medical professional that work 12 hours 7am to 7pm an there's people that work 7pm to 7am 3 to 4 days a week. medical professional end up driving 2 to 3 hours just to get to work an same for going home after working 12 hours. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Important to improve transportation and access to the Westside from the San Fernando Valley. Adding extra lane to the 405 was completely ineffective and beyond costly - poor choice . Train/monorail option that will work |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | In favor. Currently a UCLA student who lives in Palmdale and would have to wait till AVTA line to pass around 4:00 pm. This new transport will make lives so much easier with more accessible times to get to school and go back home. I've live in the valley as well and would have been a quicker ride riding the train as opposed to the Metro line. Definitely would be a great thing, however, if done, should be done quickly! There's already so much traffic and during the construction period, there's going to be a lot more than necessary! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | It is crucial that this train be underground -- not an above ground monorail, etc. An above-ground train will destroy parts of the Sherman Oaks community. We deserve to be treated as well as the Westside. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | It takes me daily 4hrs(to & back from Santa Clarita to UCLA) to commute to work. So a direct train will really be a blessing fir me. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | It would be great if there was a train to UCLA from the Valley. It would really help with the congestion in traffic. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | It would be great to have a direct route that ran along the 405 with a station near the 405 or on the west side of it for the thousands of employees that drive from areas like Northridge, north hills, Chatsworth, lake balboa and Reseda. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | It would be wonderful if there was a direct line straight to UCLA! Would make the commute so much better! Also maybe a direct route from every city so everyone that works in UCLA has access to take it! Like Orange County, South Bay etc. :) |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | It would help me immensely if there was a train from the valley directly to UCLA. This would allow less financially secure students to live in cheaper apartments in the suburbs of LA, while not having to sacrifice the ease of getting to campus! Please! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | It's long overdue. Better start from North Hills. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Just wanted to voice my support for the direct train from the Valley to UCLA. We definitely need it. The line would cut carbon emissions as well as save everyone so much time normally wasted in traffic. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Last I heard, UCLA is one of the major destinations on Los Angeles' Westside. Not providing direct service to UCLA would be of a nature similar to not providing direct service to USC. The line could very easily be routed down Van Nuys Boulevard and directly South through the UCLA Campus, stopping at Ackerman Union or within 5 minutes' walking distance. The next stop, logically, would be Wilshire and Westwood Boulevards or Westwood and Weyburn Avenue. USC has stops on the Expo Line at Vermont and Exposition (less than 600 feet walking distance to Campus) and the Museum of Natural History (about 200 feet walking distance to USC's campus). There is also a third stop a very short distance (~600 feet?) from the eastern corner of the campus (Jefferson Boulevard/Flower Street, one short block walking distance) which is also on the Expo Line. These distances compare quite favorably to locating stops at Ackerman Union and at Wilshire and Westwood Boulevards, with a third stop within Westwood Village proper (Westwood/Weyburn or Westwood/Le Conte). From Westwood/Wilshire, the line could easily go South to LAX' present Lot C bus terminal and serve the people mover terminal. It could even interchange with the Green Line and the new Crenshaw Line. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | My commute from Tarzana to UCLA takes almost one hour in the morning and afternoon each way. A more feasible public transportation option would be great for easing traffic and giving riders some productive time to rest or work instead of driving. Thanks! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | My vote is for one-method transit as far as possible, and that means a train directly to UCLA. I prefer monorail (cleaner and more pleasant, minimal disturbance to unstable ground, and if planned correctly a minimal profile) over underground, but either would make a major improvement. Were I to take public transit from my home in the east valley to the west side (UCLA specifically), it would take at least two hours--more than twice the time of my regular auto commute, which itself has increased by at least 25% over the last decade. Monorails/above-ground trains rule, but be smart: don't place stations where they would impede street traffic, completely block views, or otherwise negatively impact the immediate surrounding area. Use real-world logic to inform new traffic flows, lowering stations where possible and appropriate, and truly valuable landscaping, among other strategies. Compensate for inconvenience with real benefits. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Our household would use any type of Public Transit from Sherman Oaks to UCLA, 5 Days a week. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Please authorize a rail line that will connect the San Fernando Valley directly to UCLA. I live in the Valley and commute to my work at UCLA several times a week during the academic year. The commute is grueling, and a drive that should take around 35 minutes each way can sometimes take 90 minutes or more. Much of it, needless to say, spent sitting in stalled traffic on the 101 and 405 Freeways. In an effort to avoid the freeways, I often end up in stuck in traffic in residential neighborhoods, which is terrible for the local residents and little help to commuters. A direct rail link to UCLA will allow me to leave my car in the Valley and take the train directly to campus. A route that would require an additional transfer would make the commute too long, and send me and thousands like me back to the clogged freeways. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Please bring the train to UCLA, as it would mitigate and possibly lower the current traffic gridlock on the 405 and lower the smog level. As a daily commuter to UCLA from the north end of the San Fernando Valley, I would gladly give up driving to catch a train to work. Thank you. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Please bring the train to UCLA. Make it affordable option of transportation. Every metropolitan city has it. The traffic is terrible, causes stress and a train would add to quality of life. Thank you. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Please consider a train to UCLA as it would improve the commute time and quality of life of many residents of the SFV. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Please consider building transportation from the San Fernando Valley to the Westwood area. This would help to decrease congestion on the 405 and make it easier for those who work in the area to save money on gas and cut down CO2 emissions. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Please do us all a huge favor and put a stop from Sepulveda to campus. Lots of students commute to and from the Valley. This will be a great start to connecting the valley to the city. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Please give us a reliable transportation from Santa Clarita to UCLA. The morning traffic from the SCV taking the 405 is exhausting and stressful. You have to leave 5am to get to your destination even if your appt is 9am and it us such a waste if time and energy. As a cancer patient, my husband takes me to my appt usually around 9am. If my son has school we have to leave at 5am that means he has to go back and take my son to school and come back for me. This thing had worn our tirea and our mileage big time. With sickness this thing is putting so much weight for us. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Please go forward with a train through the Sepulveda pass with a stop at UCLA. Widening the freeway has not helped. During the school year, should I choose to drive, it takes me upwards to 2 hours to commute from Sylmar to UCLA ONE WAY. I gave up my parking pass and now take the Commuter Express, but my commute still takes up to 1 Hr. 40 minutes one way. A train would lessen my commute and those of my UCLA colleagues. Thank you! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Please have the train stop at UCLA so I and many other people can get to work / school in a single step. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Please have this service available commuting is really hard |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Please help bring a direct train from the Valley to UCLA, and it would be better if we did not need transfers! So many students have to drive in order to commute to campus from that region, which only adds to traffic congestion. Having a direct train would relieve that and help locals commute much easier! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Please include a direct connection from the Valley to UCLA. This would greatly help reduce congestion in the area and shorten commute times. Thank you |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Please instate direct service from the Valley to UCLA campus on the Sepulveda Corridor Train!!! It would be so useful for UCLA staff and grad students like me! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Please make sure there is a stop at the UCLA campus. I think this would greatly relieve congestion in the area, especially at the Sunset off-ramp that can back up traffic all the way to Reseda and Tarzana some mornings. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Please proceed with the Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor Project, providing a direct train to UCLA! Thank you |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Please select a direct transportation link to UCLA |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Please, please allow a train to go from the Valley to UCLA. That would take so much traffic off the 405! It would be fantastic. How can I express my support any more than I have? |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Prefer direct train to UCLA than routes that requires transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Regarding the Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor Project, I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. A public transportation option needs to be available that provides an equivalent or smaller commute time to UCLA from the San Fernando Valley in comparison to driving a personal vehicle. The UCLA community contributes substantially to the commuters that travel through the Sepulveda Pass, there is a noticeable difference in travel times during University holidays. Providing a public transportation option that is advantageous for this community is essential if this new public transportation option is to make a significant impact on traffic. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Since subways are generally faster than buses, I would be all for a subway route to UCLA from the East Valley. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Students want a direct route to campus without any transfers! |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Thank you for allowing us to submit our feedback, as I was unable to attend the in-person town hall. I support the initiative to launch a train/monorail from the San Fernando Valley to Westwood. I currently rely on Santa Clarita Transit for my daily commute to UCLA. While this public transportation system has served the community well, and while the 405 Freeway widening project has brought new lanes, my daily drive-time has not changed at all. If we had a rail/train option, it would significantly alleviate rush hour traffic while shortening commute times. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | The arrival of such a train would be extremely beneficial to a large percentage of the Los Angeles population, and I strongly support this prospect. Personally, I spend ~3 hours per weekday commuting and any extra time shaved off of that would be much appreciated. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | The monorail option is the wrong approach to a long term fully integrated mass transit system. By adopting a less expensive experimental alternative, such as the monorail or surface train, Metro will give up the opportunity to fully integrate the Sepulveda Transit with the Purple line subway. By adopting a subway line, Someday, people could travel from the San Fernando Valley to Downtown LA via the Sepulveda Corridor subway without having to transfer trains. Do it right from the beginning, adopt the heavy rail subway option with a direct train to UCLA. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | The new metro train/subway originating in SFV and going to the westside must make UCLA one of its major stops. UCLA is a MAJOR employer of the city with 1000s of employees residing in the SFV and points further north. Many of these employees work various shifts. It would help retain critical faculty and staff knowing that there is easy way to get to UCLA without having to drive the 405 and 101 fwy. To require UCLA employees to take a bus from the VA is idiotic and defeats the whole purpose of the subway which is to make getting to work faster and less stressful. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | The train through the Sepulveda corridor would help thousands. This highly populated area needs transit that can move large numbers of people at once. Students who commute to UCLA need affordable transit options. Build the train! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | This benefit will benefit me by having a faster commute to my workplace and back home as well as it will benefit the environment. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | This is a no brainer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | This is long overdue. This is a great step towards giving LA the robust public transportation system it so desperately needs! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | This is one of LA's biggest bottlenecks for traffic. Connecting San Fernando and the rest of LA would a spectacular achievement. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | This is would be such a huge help in my daily commute to work! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | This route is highly needed!! After graduation, one of the main reasons I didn't want to stay in LA was because of the commute I would have to do. The valley is more affordable and less compact but inner LA like Westwood and Santa Monica have the jobs but a lot of traffic. If this route was there before I moved to the valley, I would have stayed Post- graduation. But now I'm in Washington state. If this guess built, I will definitely reconsider moving back to the valley because I really did love LA. It was that the traffic was mentally and physically draining. It was taking a toll on my stress and relationship. It was not worth it anymore. Please do connect the lines from west LA to the valley! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | This transit line would greatly improve the lifestyle of UCLA students and staff. With rent increasing, it is near impossible for folks to live on the West side. Most folks are being pushed farther and farther out, making the commute to work so much more challenging. Living in the valley is a much more common experience for students and staff at UCLA. UCLA is unfortunately stuck between very wealthy communities that have a lot of push back to a greater lifestyle for students and low or middle class folks. Research has shown that traffic has a negative impact on physical and mental health. Why not improve this for the mass majority of folks going to school at UCLA and also working here? It saddens me, that this is just becoming a potential option. Cities like New York, Chicago, Washington DC, and San Francisco have excellent public transit programs that allow living in those cities or surrounding cities real options for people that don't make over 100, 000 a year. Los Angeles could be one of the greatest cities and I hope that folks start to take this more seriously. Its simple, by allowing the option for more metro lines, folks will have better mental and physical health, a better work/life balance, better air quality, better environmental impacts, it would decrease the amount of traffic in the wealthier neighborhoods, and just create an overall better life. It impacts everyone, not just those commuting. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | This will be extremely beneficial to all people using the 405- but it would help also people going from the valley to LAX so I hope that in the near future they also consider the train coming all the way to LAX |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | This would be a great idea. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | This would be a well deserved, climate saving endeavor. Full support and I wish it goes through |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Too bad this has come so late in my life. I hope that this project comes to fruition. I have been commuting to UCLA from Palmdale CA for 30 years. I could never understand why there wasn't a good mode of transportation (rail) down the 405 at least because of LAX. I supposed it won't happen in my life time but for future commuters this is a needed transportation option. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Traffic congestion around UCLA and Westwood is reaching a crisis point--any form of relief would be much appreciated. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Train along Sepulveda corridor sounds good |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | UCLA is the fifth largest employer in Los Angeles, the train should definitely have a stop at UCLA. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Very much in support! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | We need a train with direct route to westside with a stop at UCLA. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | We NEED A TRANSIT FROM THE VALLEY TO UCLA!!!! ITS MORE CONVENIENT FOR ME!! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | We need the Sepulveda corridor train to UCLA. This is my 15th year commuting from Woodland Hills to UCLA. I commute with 3 kids attending UCLA's Lab School (1st Grader) and UCLA's Geffen Academy (6th and 8th graders). My wife works at the Getty Center in the Research Library. If I can drive down to the Orange station on Canoga Ave, take an electric train to Van Nuys, and take a train to UCLA I would be off the freeway for good! I have no other way to get to UCLA for work so please help us improve our way of life, our environment, and our wonderful Los Angeles county! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | We need the train, too much traffic on the 405 freeway every day, and it's getting worse. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | We need this. This project should be implemented ASAP. Everyone in the valley would appreciate this. I 100% support this project |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | We need more transit options to UCLA from the valley please do this ! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | We need to make it as easy as possible for students, staff, and faculty to travel from the valley to the UCLA and back again. I fully support the idea of a direct train, without need of transfer. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | We really need this transportation. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | We should've had this way before the Red, Purple and other lines!!! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | When creating the Sepulveda Corridor route, a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer make the most sense for the majority of transit users and residents. The Purple line will already have stations to service UCLA and the connection of these lines would make the most logical sense for the train system as a whole. Forcing students, staff, faculty, and visitors to utilize a transfer that would nearly double travel time to campus would also then just create even more congestion around the Westwood area and discourage people from using transit. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | When doing work on the new line from the Valley to Westwood, I would like to see improvements made at the street level to make either Sepulveda or Van Nuys safer and more comfortable for pedestrians. Currently on Sepulveda between the Orange Line and Ventura Blvd, there are few trees, sidewalks are not ADA accessible, and cars speed and don't pay attention to pedestrians in crosswalks when turning. I am Sherman Oaks homeowner who rides public transit (the 734 and the 788 buses) to and from my job at UCLA in Westwood. I want transit put in. It would be great if the power lines on Sepulveda could be buried beneath the street as part of this project. I am in favor of options that include a stop at Ventura and Sepulveda. |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Would really make life easier!!! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Yes please bring it on. I need the train for my commute to work from the valley to UCLA. Thanks! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Yes please! I vote for a direct train to UCLA! |
| 08/19/19 | Project Email | Yes this line would benefit a ton of commuters. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/20/19 | Project Email | Although terminating at UCLA is a great idea, I think terminating on Wilshire Blvd. makes the most sense for those that work East and West of the 405 Freeway and Wilshire Blvd. Frequent shuttles to UCLA should help students and staff as needed. |
| 08/20/19 | Project Email | I am a UCLA graduate student, and I am in full support of creating a transit line that will link the valley, the UCLA campus, and LAX. Those are the areas that I'm going to often, and I would love a viable and affordable transit option like Metro so I wouldn't need to drive there. This is a good example, in my eyes, of a transit project that will serve LA commuters well even after the Olympics. |
| 08/20/19 | Project Email | I am sending this to support having a direct train to UCLA. As nearly 25% of people on UCLA campus including faculty, staff and student are live in valley area, a direct train will definitely attract many people to use the train instead of getting stuck in traffic on 405. This change will not only significantly reduce the traffic on 405 freeway but also will reduce the pollution. Thank you in advance for your consideration. |
| 08/20/19 | Project Email | I live on one of the hillside thoroughfares connecting the Valley and the West Side. Over the past twenty years, the daily traffic jams have grown steadily worse, as have the number of collisions and injuries. Emergency responders are a common sight. Their sirens have become daily reminders of the risks involved in navigating our street. When the roads are not entirely congested, drivers dangerously exceed the speed limits. Pedestrians must be hyper-vigilant due to the hazards posed by the traffic. Many residents feel they can no longer safely walk on the street, instead they drive to safer locations. It has also become increasingly difficult for residents to safely pull their vehicles out of their driveways onto the street. In addition, air quality has grown increasingly poor. These are the untenable conditions experienced by both commuters and residents on all of the hillside thoroughfares used as alternative routes to the 405 freeway. The time for efficient mass transit through the Sepulveda Pass has come. It holds the promise of improving air quality, enhancing safety, shortening commuter times, and more — as such, it is an urgent health issue impacting a huge segment of our population. |
| 08/20/19 | Project Email | This line would be great! |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | 1) For the refined Valley-Westside alternatives: from my perspective, it is quite odd that this project is being considered separately from the East San Fernando Valley Corridor. All alternatives that are listed impose what seems to be a needless transfer between the Van Nuys line and the Westside line. Wouldn't the impact of this project be so much greater if passengers coming from much of the Valley did not have to change trains to get to the Westside? I understand that light rail would not provide adequate capacity for the Westside line, but there must be a better solution than partitioning what is really a single corridor into two different rail lines.2) Please consider holding a round of community meetings in the West LA area, in proximity to the stations that are being discussed for the refined Westside-LAX concepts. I strongly support adding a station at Santa Monica Blvd., and I also really wish you would make it easier for those of us who live in the area to learn more about the different alternatives and to provide feedback. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | A direct line to UCLA from the San Fernando Valley will greatly alleviate traffic and be great for the environment! |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | A direct train line to UCLA would encourage me and many others to stop commuting by car. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | A train linking the San Fernando Valley to the Westside/UCLA would offer tremendous value. I have worked at UCLA for 20 years. I find it increasingly difficult to recruit and keep staff that live in the Valley and beyond with the lengthy drive overwhelmingly being the cause. A train would minimize traffic, as well as the amount of traffic pollution being generated. It will bring families closer together by shortening work commutes, enable those without vehicles better mobility, and would be an awesome solution to help the traffic issues. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | As a commuter from the San Fernando Valley to UCLA multiple times throughout the week as a student and now as a faculty member for over 10 years, I am highly in favor of a direct Metro route from the Valley to UCLA. When work is consistently increasing and the days seem to be shortening, it would be beneficial to get work done in transit to and from work. Instead, I am sitting in traffic for any where from 2 to 4 hours round trip daily. This takes away time from my family and to get adequate rest to instruct our students the following day. As an undergraduate at UCLA, I opted to dorm and live in the apartments because it was "more convenient," even though my residence was 20 miles away. I have many classmates and colleagues that have very similar experiences. So please, strongly consider a direct route from the San Fernando Valley to UCLA/Westwood. Thank you. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | As a commuter student from the valley, I think a train to UCLA could help not only UCLA students but Valley students who want to attend great two-year schools such as Santa Monica College as well. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | As a frequent user of the MTA services and active member in my community, I would fully support and the Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor Project create a stop directly at UCLA. I have spoken with neighbors, colleagues, and friends and despite the possibility of extending completion time of the full project, none of us believe it would be efficient to create the Sepulveda pass excluding a stop at UCLA because a LARGE amount of traffic congesting the 405 is created by student and employee commuters to UCLA coming and going at odd times that. With the skyrocketing increases to the cost of living in the heart of Los Angeles, there has been a huge influx in the valley of former Angelinos looking for cheaper housing. This is not expected to stop or reduce in the coming years. Thanks to a city mayor who vowed on making San Fernando Valley, the next "Downtown LA"-like center, we are seeing our own neighborhoods congested with traffic. The METRO Transit pass would assist in ensuring some relief to expected traffic in these areas. Furthermore, most states known for their railway and public transportation systems have created stops nearby major Universities and large employers to ensure a larger community is able to reap the benefits of the transportation expansion. Los Angeles METRO can make us become a state also known for its efficient use of public transportation by ensuring easy access and convenient stops to a larger population. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | As a person who have to cross the valley to work, I experience the traffic on 405 twice a day. And everyone at work share the same feeling. I can also see where the problem is: almost all my colleagues are driving to work. However, when I ask that whether they will take the public transportation if it is direct and faster, they are all willing to give a try. Because they all value time more than anything else. UCLA is currently the 3rd largest employer in LA with more than 65,000 employees, in which large percentage are reside in the valley and surrounding areas. Making a direct connection between the Westwood campus and the valley will dramatically change everyone's way of commute, thus benefit the whole city. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | As a property owner in Sherman Oaks and Van Nuys, I implore you to please not build an elevated heavy rail on Sepulveda. It would ruin the sanctity of our lives and deplete the value of our properties. We've worked hard and saved our entire lives to afford them. The board should select a concept that would treat the valley fairly with the Westside, giving both areas a subway for the entire route. I understand HRT 1 would be the quickest route of all four. Also, the tunneling on HRT 1 would be safer than going through the Sepulveda Pass because there are no water table issues along that route. You must be looking at that. Please select either HRT 1 or HRT 2. I know you've already decided against a monorail for the entire route, so I won't go there. HRT 3 or MRT 1 would be a blight on Sherman Oaks and Van Nuys. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | As a student at UCLA, who commutes from the SFV I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | As a UCLA graduate student with family in the Valley, this corridor train project would be immensely helpful to commuting--especially during peak hours, making it a viable option to stay in the Valley. I am sure many other students feel similarly. I strongly encourage you to support this project. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | As an Antelope Valley commuter, it is imperative that transportation in the San Fernando Valley is relieved of congestion. We have to leave at wee hours of the morning to avoid the gridlock that takes over the 405 freeway on a daily basis. It would also be awesome if AVTA could link up with transportation options in the Sepulveda corridor so that even Antelope Valley residents can have an option of driving less and using public transportation to Westside jobs. Thank you. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | Bring the corridor to UCLA. I worked for the university for 21 years and used many alternative forms of transportation such as car pooling and it would have taken years off my life and my car if there had been decent transportation to my work. Don't make another generation of workers and students have to suffer driving on the worst and most congested freeway in the world. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | Can't wait. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | Encourage Sepulveda 405 Transit Corridor Construction Project in 2019 and 2020. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | Having a train transportation may not only release the traffic stress on 405 but also help reduce air pollution for the commuting cars. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | Hello. I am very excited for the construction of a north south line along the Sepulveda pass. Ever since I moved to LA I've wondered why it is so difficult to go north or south on public transportation. I, like many others, use public transit every day to commute to UCLA where I work. It's pleasant to not have to pay attention to driving, and it feels nice that I'm lowering my carbon footprint. I want to express my support of building a direct train to UCLA for the Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor project, rather than routes that would require transfers. Such a decision would make the proposed transit line considerably more useful for those relying on public transit to get to school or work. Thank you. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I am a faculty member at UCLA and live in Encino. I am strongly in favor of having a DIRECT train from the San Fernando Valley that would go to UCLA and the Westside. It is a shameful matter that, in what likes to think of itself as the most advanced country in the world, we have no train services. No healthy society can be sustained without a mass, efficient, and rapid transit system. Having such train services cuts down on commuting time, decreases congestion, greatly diminishes pollution, and has incalculable benefits of other kinds, such as creating community and fellowship among people. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I am a resident of SF valley and have been waiting for this project for decades. I think Metro should accelerate the project. 2033 is 14 years from now! That's such a far deadline for a project that should have been done yesterday considering its importance. Even a partial metro line opening would be a better deal. For instance, run the train Ventura Blvd, to UCLA while the rest of the stations are being built. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I am a UCLA employee, and I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I am in favor for direct train to UCLA |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. Please give people in the valley like myself an accessible daily route to the West Side. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of a direct train to UCLA. UCLA is more than just a school, but a tourist attraction for thousands, one of the cultural centers, and sports centers of Los Angeles, and the School has many activities that benefit high school students. Having a train to campus would allow these students from low-income areas to come to the School and experience the School's activities. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of having train to UCLA |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I am in favor of the direct train transportation to UCLA rather than having to take another transfer to and from the UCLA. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I am very much in favor of a direct train from the Valley (I live in Encino) to UCLA where I work. If there are transfers, it will no longer be convenient. thank you. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I am writing to voice my support for the construction of a direct train to UCLA. As a major institution that provides employment, education, and numerous other services to the LA community, LA residents would surely appreciate the convenience of taking a Metro line that directly takes them to campus rather than taking multiple lines in order to get there. As an alumna of UCLA who had no other means of transportation other than the Metro and LADOT during her undergraduate years, I could have benefited greatly from a direct train to UCLA from the San Fernando Valley. With my commute time slashed, I would have had more time to focus on my academics and more opportunities to participate in extracurricular activities that often occurred after class sessions without having to worry about timing my transfers and arriving home at an unsafe hour. My experience is not unique as UCLA is largely a commuter campus with many students from all over LA county commuting to receive a world-class education. A surefire way to make that education evermore accessible is by providing direct train access to and from campus. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I commute on the 405 4 days a week from Santa Clarita to my job at UCLA and I would gladly take a dedicated bus, light rail or even a monorail to get to and from work without having to drive. The recent 405 freeway expansion did nothing to minimize the traffic congestion so the only option now is mass transit through the Sepulveda Pass corridor. This would also reduce the amount of cars that are bypassing the 405 to go on to residential streets such as Beverly Glen and Roscomare. These are huge chock points during rush hour and are contributing to air pollution and are an annoyance to the residents who live in those neighborhoods. Please fix this! Thank you! |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I commute to UCLA from Santa Clarita. I was taking a bus to and from work, but the commute was not any shorter. The bus would sit in the same traffic I would if I was driving. I continued to take the bus until the times no longer worked with my schedule. Any transportation that is not susceptible to the automotive traffic would be incredible. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I fully support a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I greatly appreciated the Van Nuys presentation and think HRT1 looks like the most logical choice for implementation. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I have been commuting from Studio City to UCLA for the past 16 years and it's just become more challenging with each year. We have practically no public transportation options besides a bus (which is not direct and takes almost an hour each way, and I don't honestly feel safe traveling as a single female). We desperately need either a subway or monorail. I know that thousands would benefit! Please consider a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. We have so many people who come to campus each day and it's hard enough to get here in one step. Transfer buses or trains would delay the process even more. Please do something!!! |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I have been waiting for years for a connection to be built to UCLA. Working in Westwood is really convenient at the moment to commute via public transit and I want to rely less on my personal vehicle. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I have read the letter drafted by our organization and believe it was well thought out and reflects my and my community's views. Please consider it carefully. I prefer the alternative plan above the 405 freeway as well as the other recommendations. I would park my car at the station as I do now when I take the Metro to go down town or into Hollywood. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I request the authorities to bring the Sepulveda corridor train directly to UCLA. With the unbearable traffic currently in I-405, I can't even imagine how that would be in the coming years. A direct train will help alleviate the problem to some degree. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I strongly endorse the 3 critical recommendations of SOHA about development in the Sepulveda pass. Elevated heavy rail or monorail tracks above Sepulveda Blvd would produce a nightmare for our community. We should be treated as well as residents of the westside of LA. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I strongly support a direct train to UCLA from the San Fernando Valley. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I support a train from the valley to UCLA. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I support having a direct line to UCLA without any transfers. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I think it's great that Metro is tackling this gap in our transit infrastructure. On average I commute three hours each day Monday-Friday. This is a total of 15 hours per week that I spend in traffic and it's a waste of time. Having the option to take the metro from the valley to UCLA would give me back part of this time and increase my mood and level of satisfaction during the week. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I think the best option would be HRT1, the subway directly from UCLA to the intersection of Ventura and Van Nuys Boulevards. It would be the most direct route, there for the quickest, it would be centrally located for the valley, and it would cause the least danger. I understand there is a water table issue under the Sepulveda Pass that could cause a lot of problems. Under the HRT1 route, I've heard there are only sewer lines that can be easily avoided and/or changed. I also feel elevated trains would be unsightly and cause a lot of noise along Sepulveda, which has a lot of R2. They would badly damage the quality of life along that route. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I think the issue is the number of cars on the road in Southern California. If there's a way by perhaps providing dedicated buses that take people to and from certain areas to work. I know a lot of tech companies do this in the Bay Area to commute throughout the Bay. It's not just the train system (BART) but there are actual buses that will pick you up from the city and take you to the work place. The less people that drive on the road, means less cars on the road, thus meaning less traffic right? Then, if there are dedicated transportation services specific to employer then it could help with traffic. This and issues with merging onto different lanes/freeways/highways. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I totally support the comments and recommendations in the enclosed letter by the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association. The Board must select both great heavy rail HRT 1 and HRT 2 subway concepts and explain how additional funds will be found to build them The Board must select one or more viable, affordable alternative concepts through its public-private partnership process – such as a monorail above the 405 media The Board must NOT select either unacceptable HRT 3 or MRT 1 concept with elevated heavy rail or monorail tracks above Sepulveda Boulevard in the Valley |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I want to voice my strong support in favor of a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer in the Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor Project. This would significantly alleviate traffic on the perpetually congested 405 and Sepulveda pass and give direct access from the valley to UCLA and the westside. Please count my voice, thank you |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I work mainly with front line staff on campus, such as custodians and food service workers, many of whom are coming from the valley and take public transportation. Many of these employees also have mobility issues. A large number work swing and night shifts and are taking unreliable public transportation home in the middle of the night. A direct line to campus would be so extremely beneficial for these employees I particular. Think of our low wage workers. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I would like a direct train from the valley to UCLA. Thanks |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I would like to see Metro develop a direct train to UCLA rather than routes that would involve a transfer. But, I'd also like to keep plans realistic and create a budget that is realistic with goals. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I would like to use direct train to UCLA on metro |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I'm in favor of a direct train to UCLA since there are so many students and faculty that would benefit from this route. Thank you. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | It would be a tremendous help if the train would be directed to UCLA instead of routed to make a transfer over. If there was easy transportation to get to UCLA I would prefer to take that instead of driving. The only reason I don't take the bus at the moment is because of all the traffic and amount of time it takes to get to work and then back home. If there was transportation that goes directly to UCLA it would save me and a lot of people who commute from the Valley to UCLA. Thank you for listening to me. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | I've attended a couple meetings about the Sepulveda corridor project, and FYI when I first moved to LA 8+ years ago I complained to friends and asked why on Earth there wasn't already a rail line linking the valley and the westside. This was in the midst of the 405 expansion. Anyway - in looking at the various proposed plans, are you considering traffic patterns on the westside that will affect passengers' ability to access the line? From my experience, getting east of the 405 any time between 3-7pm on weekdays (and probably weekends) is insanely difficult. Streets west of the 405 are packed with traffic. Any passenger NOT using the Expo line to connect with the new line will struggle to get to the station if it is placed east of the 405 at Expo/Sepulveda. Therefore I am in favor of placing the transfer station at Expo/Bundy. Furthermore, I am incensed that the new timeline for completion of this line is set for 2035. At that point (if I'm still alive and in LA), I will be 46 years old. At the completion of the LAX extension in 2057, I will be 68. I understand that these are difficult projects to undertake, but with the effects of climate change growing exponentially and without MAJOR GLOBAL CHANGES TO ADDRESS THE SITUATION, we cannot wait for these kinds of projects that will bring such positive change to a city in need of relief and hope. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | Please Do NOT select either unacceptable HRT 3 or MRT 1. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | Please having direct train to UCLA. The traffic is sooooo bad. I wish I could have more time with my kids in stead of stuck in 405 and 10 all day. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | Please help alleviate some of the transportation issues. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | Please help bring a train from the valley to UCLA!!! |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | Please incorporate a direct stop to UCLA in this new transit system. Living north of Los Angeles is difficult, and as a student who relies on public transport to get around (I do not own a car) this would be critical in allowing me to be more connected to my campus during breaks and take advantage of opportunities at UCLA as well. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | Please make a direct train line from Sherman oaks to UCLA |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | Please make accessing UCLA via train more efficient. This would assist with so much traffic on the 405. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | Please, please- we need better and efficient public transportation. I drive 9 miles to/from work and it takes me about an hour door to door. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | Sounds like good plan. Hope it can be done on time and under budget. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | The 405 is just so congested. We need alternate route to UCLA. I've been to Japan and their train system is excellent! We should emulate them. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | This is very good idea for the traffic. We can use the train instead of our vehicles. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | This is way overdue in LA! |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | UCLA has tens of thousands of employees, students, staff, and faculty, with a high proportion commuting from the valley. Although UCLA is an attractive place to work, the vehicular traffic build-up along the only two arteries from the 405 (Wilshire Blvd and Sunset Blvd) is at a standstill throughout much of the day. Having a direct access to UCLA as a stop on a Sepulveda line would be a tremendous savings of time that also would acknowledge UCLA as a major economic engine on the Westside of Los Angeles. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | We need a rail tunnel connecting UCLA and Expo Line to Van Nuts Blvd. |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | We need a train to/from the Valley to the Westside. Please make this happen. The traffic is only going to worsen. Thank you! |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | We need a train, would help us UCLA employees coming from Lancaster, Sylmar. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | <p>Westwood is seriously lacking any sort of public transport connection to the valley east or to LAX. I mean they even recently shut down the LAX shuttle from campus. It's like you want the traffic. Any given day commuting east of campus after long day of class (or work for our many great professors) is not only grueling but a waste of time, resources, and bad for the environment. I cannot begin to list how many qualified talented individuals have either left or are planning to leave the city given these issues.</p> <p>They agree on the potential of the LA region and the city has such a chance to leverage this talent to diversify the industries present in the region yet who would want to deal with this on a daily basis when you can easily move to many other livable cities with intellectual curiosity.</p> |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | <p>When I first began working at UCLA, my commute to and from home wasn't great. I would drive to the Aviation/LAX station (Park & Ride) which would take anywhere between 30-40 minutes in the morning, drop off my car and hop on the Culver City Rapid 6 bus to head straight to campus. That morning commute would take anywhere between an hour and a half, sometimes two. When it came time to head home, I found that commute to be much worse. I would leave campus by 5 p.m. and get home around 7:30-8 p.m. at night, forcing me to sometimes skip a workout I wanted to fit in for the week. I was emotionally and physically exhausted. I would drive up to campus sometimes when I knew I had to stay late for work and sometimes, that was much better than taking the bus halfway to get to work. There were times when I thought "maybe, if there was a train that started off in the South Bay somewhere and take me straight to campus, my commute wouldn't be as bad..."When UCLA Transportation announced earlier this spring (March) about the new commuter service for Long Beach Bruins, I couldn't believe it. Within the first few weeks taking the bus, I was reading (going on my fourth book now), taking long naps to and from campus/home, listening to some of my favorite podcasts, making new friends, talking on the phone with family without having to worry about the road. There were about five to seven commuters taking this service and now, we nearly have a full bus and depending on the hours, commuters and myself get to ride the 60-foot long anticipated bus, which means more and more commuters are aware of this service. So, I'd like to thank UCLA Transportation and Long Beach Transit for collaborating on this effort and helping the City of Los Angeles reduce their carbon footprint. My commute now takes about an hour to an hour fifteen at the most. Now, I'd like to do the same for my colleagues living in the Valley and commuting to and from campus everyday and support the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project. The majority of colleagues I work closely with live in the Valley or Lancaster, who sometimes use two buses to get to work. The drive for them is also not the greatest because they only have the 405 freeway to rely on, versus down in the South Bay/Long Beach area, we have Sepulveda Blvd., the 405, maybe the 110 to rely on, I guess the 91 freeway that turns into Artesia Blvd. However, traffic in the South Bay is also pretty bad, so if there is also a way maybe in the future to move forward with providing public transportation service to UCLA campus from the South Bay area, that would be a great service to the public. The reason I am sharing my experience with you all is because I want everyone in Metro to know that a service like this can make a difference. We are all tired of sitting in traffic, we need to spend more time with family, friends, loved ones instead of in our cars when we are headed home and we need to collectively be more mindful about ways we can access public transportation when it's there and available to us. I'll be honest, I have friends who enjoy driving and would rather be behind a steering wheel instead of sitting on a bus or train. But I think the more and more we push these efforts on ways we can reduce our carbon footprint and that driving shouldn't just be an option, the public will start to respond a take note of that. I am a bit bummed I am unable to attend the meetings that have been happening these past few weeks due to other commitments. But, I am there in spirit and I hope that by the end of this year, our community gets the wonderful announcement of a train coming to UCLA.</p> |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | yeesssssss we want this! The west side is DESPERATE for more transit! |
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | Yes, please build this train line. We in the valley need to go to UCLA, the airport and the west side in general. We are priced out of the west side, now at least let us arrive there when we need to. |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/26/19 | Project Email | You are shedding ridership by starving the bus system, and this strategic error has gone on far too long. Grand construction dreams have driven you into a corner, and now we have your poorly conceived, incredibly ugly elevated monster plan to wipe out apartments and community in Sherman Oaks. I am sure you will be hearing from other Valley residents who do not live in Sherman Oaks, but who are in solidarity against this overheated, overreaching plan that will, like so many other errors by Metro, fail to reduce congestion and fail to ATTRACT MORE RIDERS. People, please stop building monuments. Everyone knows we need to upgrade thousands and thousands of bus stops. I realize this isn't sexy. But it's the right thing to do to stop your plummeting ridership now down to 1985 levels. Don't ruin Sherman Oaks to create a massive ugly project that in fact will do no good. |
| 08/27/19 | Project Email | I and many of my neighbors have attended several meetings on the proposed Sepulveda Transit Corridor solutions, given both by community organizations and Metro. We are unalterably opposed to the idea of heavy rail, monorail or any other form of transit elevated above Sepulveda Boulevard or any of our streets. Noisy, ugly and very disturbing to the traffic patterns established on existing streets and intersections, this is a step backwards to an earlier time where the environment was not as critically important as it is today. We are unilaterally in agreement that the construction of a subway system covered under both the HRT1 and HRT2 plans are the most favorable concepts under which to address the traffic situation in the Sepulveda corridor and encourage Metro to adopt whichever of these plans Metro feels would be located in the most desirable geography and would meet the budgetary limitations. Unfortunately, my community also feels that monetary considerations may cause Metro to eliminate or severely pare down these two extraordinary plans sometime after selection and perhaps during construction, causing whichever plan selected to be a confusing, unsightly and less than ideal solution to the clear problem we face in mobility. One need only to look at California's High Speed Rail program for an illustration of what happens when budget and construction costs become incompatible. For that reason, we believe the solution making the most sense sense from budgetary, construction costs and/or environmental concerns is the one relying on a monorail system running down the center of the 405 Freeway. It is our understanding that this plan has been studied in some depth by the private company of BYD and is supported by numerous community groups. This system would be far faster to build and cost appreciably less than all the other alternatives. Additionally, the environmental concerns would be largely negated by its location and the countless engineering problems necessary to accommodate street level or elevated systems above existing streets would be a non-factor. Our community appreciates the outreach efforts by Metro in its decision making process and after much consideration insists the choice of systems take into account the impact any new mass transportation system will have on the quality of life of the residents of Sherman Oaks, who will clearly bear the brunt of this effort. Only HRT1, HRT2 and the monorail system on the 405 freeway will be acceptable to those of us who live here. No other plan being considered will be acceptable to us. |
| 08/27/19 | Project Email | I have written in the past to express my opinion on proposed transit corridor plans. Now that SOHA has conducted a community meeting and composed a summary letter I am communicating my support for the organization's position letter attached. |
| 08/27/19 | Project Email | I sincerely hope that your board has the wisdom to adopt the obviously superior plan to build above the 405 freeway. Any option with a line above any streets is totally unacceptable and would be a disaster. |
| 08/27/19 | Project Email | I support SOHA's metro recommendations! |
| 08/27/19 | Project Email | I totally support the comments and recommendations in the enclosed letter by the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association. The Board must select both great heavy rail HRT 1 and HRT 2 subway concepts and explain how additional funds will be found to build them. The Board must select one or more viable, affordable alternative concepts through its public-private partnership process – such as a monorail above the 405 media The Board must NOT select either unacceptable HRT 3 or MRT 1 concept with elevated heavy rail or monorail tracks above Sepulveda Boulevard in the Valley |

**Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project
Public Comments - March 2018 - September 2019**

| Date Received | Comment Source | Comment |
|---------------|----------------|---|
| 08/27/19 | Project Email | I urge selection of the Sepulveda Pass transportation project plan that accepts a community supported option as outlined: The Board must select both great heavy rail HRT 1 and HRT 2 subway concepts and explain how additional funds will be found to build them The Board must select one or more viable, affordable alternative concepts through its public-private partnership process – such as a monorail above the 405 media The Board must NOT select either unacceptable HRT 3 or MRT 1 concept with elevated heavy rail or monorail tracks above Sepulveda Boulevard in the Valley |
| 08/27/19 | Project Email | I write in STRONG support of the August 21, 2019, letter submitted by the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association with respect to proposals for mass transit in the Sepulveda Corridor. There is no question that underground (Westside)/aboveground (Valley side) will have huge adverse impacts on thousands of residents and businesses on the Valley side of the corridor. Putting heavy rail on tracks above Sepulveda Boulevard is a horrendous idea: the intangible costs and impact are incalculable, and the monetary costs are extraordinary. Likewise, a monorail running parallel to the 405 will have similar impacts on the pass, including such institutions as the Getty Center and the Skirball Cultural Center which occupy much of the property on the west side of the 405. I urge you to extend environmental review to HRT1, HRT2, and the SOHA-conceived 405 median monorail. The other two options (HRT3 and MRT1) are laughable on their face. |
| 08/28/19 | Project Email | Getting from the San Fernando Valley into the Westside is a NIGHTMARE both with respect to effort and time expended to get back and forth and it is only getting worse. Ultimately, LA has to unhook for cars. In Europe, I routinely use public transportation; in New York City as well. A light rail between SFV and the Westside strikes me as the best alternative, whether above ground or below ground. |
| 08/28/19 | Project Email | Monorail above the 405 will be least disruptive, most popular and better for everyone in both the short and long run! |
| 08/28/19 | Project Email | Please read the Sherman oaks homeowners association letter written and please support this regarding the Sepulveda pass project! |
| 08/28/19 | Project Email | The Board must select both great heavy rail HRT 1 and HRT 2 subway concepts and explain how additional funds will be found to build them The Board must select one or more viable, affordable alternative concepts through its public-private partnership process – such as a monorail above the 405 media The Board must NOT select either unacceptable HRT 3 or MRT 1 concept with elevated heavy rail or monorail tracks above Sepulveda Boulevard in the Valley |
| 08/29/19 | Project Email | I am emailing you as a long time resident of Sherman Oaks. I live just off of Sepulveda Blvd at Magnolia in a residential neighborhood named Magnolia Woods. My husband and I have owned our home and have lived there for over 16 years. We oppose any elevated tracks above any Valley streets. It's unfair that the Valley side has proposed elevated trains and the Westside proposals are ALL underground. These elevated tracks and trains will destroy the beauty and pollute our neighborhood with noise and vibrations. I strongly feel that this will lower the value of our home. We support fully underground subways in the Valley, if affordable. The only acceptable alternative is the monorail above the 405, down the middle of the freeway. I have attended the public meetings and am insulted when Metro claims that no one lives along Sepulveda Blvd. The elevated tracks will negatively impact many families and their homes. |
| 08/29/19 | Project Email | We are residents of Sherman Oaks and are writing to express our support for the recommendations of the SOHA regarding the Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor Project: The Board must select both great heavy rail HRT 1 and HRT 2 subway concepts and explain how additional funds will be found to build them: The Board must select one or more viable, affordable alternative concepts through its public-private partnership process – such as a monorail above the 405 media The Board must NOT select either unacceptable HRT 3 or MRT 1 concept with elevated heavy rail or monorail tracks above Sepulveda Boulevard in the Valley. Please advocate for the residents of the San Fernando Valley and select one of the first two options. |