

Proper planning dictates that existing and potential traffic impacts should be minimized to protect these neighborhoods. To quantify potential impacts, if the existing Expo. R O W. is to be developed for any form of transit; a review of existing and projected traffic counts needs to be fully analyzed. The following information is accordingly needed.

**Scoping Questions:**

1. Can you please provide up to date traffic counts and the levels of service (day and night) in both directions identifying peak hours and typical 24-hour periods at:
  - a. Overland Avenue at key points between Olympic, and Venice Blvds. and Sepulveda Blvd. between the Expo. R O W and Venice Blvd.,
  - b. The intersections of Overland Avenue and the Westside Pavilion's parking lot's entrances and exits, and
  - c. The intersection of Overland Avenue and Cushdon, Ester, Ashby, Manning Avenues, National Blvd. (north and south of the 10 Freeway) Palms, Venice and National Blvds. (from Robertson to Overland).
  
2. Can you please provide an up to date count of all existing turning movements at:
  - a. Overland Avenue onto and off of Olympic, Pico, National (north and south of the 10 Freeway) Palms and Venice Blvd., and at the on and off ramps of the 10 Freeway,
  - b. Overland Avenue at the intersection of the Westside Pavilion's Parking lot's entrances and exits,
  - c. Overland Avenue onto and off of Cushdon, Ester, Ashby, Manning Avenues, and
  - d. National Blvd. at Robertson, Castle Heights and Manning.
  
3. Can you please provide an up to date count of the existing ADT and levels of service (day and night) in both directions, peak hours of traffic as well as typical 24-hour weekday counts at:
  - a. Ashby/Manning between Overland and Motor Avenues,
  - b. Westwood Blvd. between Pico and National Blvd.,
  - c. National Blvd. between Robertson and Palms Blvd.,
  - a. Exposition Blvd. (north and south of the R O W.)
  - b. between Sepulveda Blvd. and Overland Avenue,
  - c. Pico Blvd between Sepulveda and Robertson Blvd.,
  - d. Venice Blvd between Sepulveda and Robertson Blvd.,
  - e. Palms Blvd. between Overland Avenue and National Blvd. (at the train bridge), and
  - f. Palms Blvd. between Overland Avenue and Sepulveda Blvd.
  
4. Also please provide projected counts, projected levels of service and projected turning motion counts for the above noted locations (Question 1-3 above) if the existing Expo. R O W. (Phase 2) is used with the each modes of

transportation that could be employed on this part of this line when the system is operating at its projected optimum ridership - with and without grade separations at key locations (please identify which locations were modeled with grade separations).

5. What is the optimum projected ridership for each of the alternate modes and routes under study for this portion of the Expo. Line?

**Discussion:**

The projected peak hour levels of traffic on the above noted streets is key to understanding the impacts to the neighborhoods from new traffic levels and patterns that would likely be generated if the existing Expo. R O W. is utilized.

**Scoping Question:**

6. Please provide a complete analysis of all of the potential increased traffic levels and patterns in the study area if the existing Expo. R O W. is utilized for each of the possible modes of transportation that could be employed. Additionally, please provide a complete analysis of what measures could be undertaken to mitigate all potential impacts on the residential uses in these areas and quantify how successful these mitigation measures would be separately and in varying combinations.

**Discussion:**

It takes surprisingly little to negatively impact the image of a neighborhood and its accompanying value. Accordingly, any environmental impact that cannot be mitigated should form the basis for determining the appropriateness of any project. Clearly, it is not good planning or environmentally sound to negatively impact a local neighborhood in order to solve a regional problem if alternate solutions are available.

One of the key elements that defines the success of a neighborhood is the quality of its schools. Overland Avenue Elementary School is a very successful school. The placement of a transit system with short cycled headways, increased noise levels and added traffic congestions, regardless of the mode of transit selected, within thirty feet of this school will unquestionably have adverse impacts on this educational plant and its student body.

**Scoping Questions:**

7. If the existing Expo. R O W. is utilized for a new transit system, how could this system be designed to eliminate all potentially adverse environmental impacts on the student body at Overland Avenue Elementary School and the neighborhood adjoining this R O W? Among the potential

impacts that need to be addressed are noise, dirt, loss of privacy, traffic congestion/pollution, safety hazards, negative aesthetics, and impaired access.

**Discussion:**

The issue, of such factors as noise and dirt etc, applies not only to the classrooms but to the school's playground area. While triple layer glass window will cut down noise inside classrooms, it is no less important to protect the children when they are out of doors, which is an important part of their school day.

If the existing Expo R O W. alternative is selected as the best route for the planned transit system, it has been suggested that the crossing of Overland Avenue would possibly be at grade. This design would result in the need for shutting down north/south traffic with some form of warning system that might involve the use of bells and gates.

**Scoping Questions:**

8. What impact would the ringing of bells every few minutes (depending on the headway of trains or buses) have on the ambient noise levels in the area and on the students in their classrooms or out on the playground and on the surrounding neighborhood? How many transit trips would there be in a 24 hour period? What would the intervals between trains be? What would be the hours of operation of the trains or buses etc.?
9. What impact would stopped cars; waiting for the trains or buses to cross Overland Avenue, have on the levels of pollution in the area near this school and on the nearby neighbors?
10. What impact would stopping cars on Overland Avenue have on traffic flow, since this street already has a taxed capacity, and how would this impact traffic traveling to and from or across the 10 Freeway; and how would slowed traffic impact peak hour traffic on Overland Avenue and on adjoining streets in the area?
11. What mitigation measures could be employed to eliminate the adverse conditions discussed above? Please address quantitatively the impacts of each of these corrective measures could have on this neighborhood's residential environment.
12. If self propelled buses are used versus light rail, as was discussed at one of the meeting, would these buses be gas or diesel driven?
13. What mitigation measures would be taken to eliminate the smells and pollution cause by gas or diesel fuels used to power these buses, especially given the direction of prevailing winds?

14. To limit further pollution, could electric buses be used instead of gas or diesel buses?
15. If electric buses or trains are used what will be done to shield the viewing of the overhead wires from the school and neighborhood?
16. How high would the lines used to power these modes of transportation have to be above the street level on Northvale, at the school and points west?
17. Would there be any EMF health risks at the edge of the right of way due to the power lines needed to drive the light rail or electric buses? Please discuss the findings regarding EMFs, as they would apply to Expo. transit systems?
18. What would be required to ensure an Expo. transit system at Overland Avenue would be developed with a below grade intersection crossing? What would be required to ensure this portion of this transit system is lowered sufficiently to obscure viewing of it and any overhead power lines required over the length of this segment of this system?
19. It has been suggested that there are underground improvements that would be very costly to modify to allow a below grade system at Overland Avenue. Are there underground improvements that would make a below grade separation unduly difficult? What if any such improvements exist and what would it take to rework these improvements? What would it cost to modify such improvement in order to allow a below grade separation at Overland Avenue if a transit system is to be built along the Expo. R O W.?
20. Will the design of the transit system allow retention of the Palms Park bridge at Dunleer? It has been suggested this bridge might have to be removed to accommodate overhead power lines for trains or buses.
21. Who originally was required to install the Palm's Park bridge and what requirements were satisfied by its installation? Was it a subdivision requirement? Who has the legal right to remove this bridge and what restrictions regulate its retention?
22. If the Palms Park bridge were removed, will the need to drive to the park from the Cheviot area have an impact on patron trying to visit the park or library and on traffic on Overland and surrounding streets?
23. If the existing Expo. R O W. route is selected, what can be done to ensure a grade separation at the Overland Avenue Expo. R of W. intersection? What can be done to ensure it will be below grade rather than above grade? What factors will be used in making this determination? Who will make this decision and when?

24. If an above grade crossing was chosen at Overland at the Expo. R O W. how could an above grade overpass be justified given its potential adverse impacts on the school and neighborhood; and if it were approved despite its negative impacts how could it be screened to preclude its being seen from the neighborhood? How could it be designed to reduce noise and vibration factors? How could it be designed to provide privacy for the children at the Overland school play yards and the neighbors? How could all of the above be ensured and still provide an aesthetically acceptable structure?
25. How could potential traffic impacts generated by a station and/or a park and ride facility at the Overland Avenue be mitigated, since Overland Avenue is such a key route for north/south traffic as well as the fact that it provides the only access to the 10 freeway in this area?
26. How large a park and ride lot would need to be provided at Overland and/or Motor Avenue, if such facilities are going to be required? How many cars would they be designed to accommodate? How would their ingress and egress be provided without adversely impacting traffic on these already over-taxed streets?
27. How large would transit stations have to be at Overland and/or Motor Avenues, if they are going to be required? How many commuters would they be designed to accommodate? How tall would they be above the surrounding residential streets?
28. What is the minimum threshold (number of riders) required to justify the development of a station and/or a park and ride lots?
29. How many homes are adjacent to the existing R O W and how many feet are the closest homes to this R O W.?
30. What kinds of security fencing and or sound walls would be provided along the existing R O W and where? At these various locations how tall would these fences and/or walls be? What would these fences and/or walls be made of and what would be their design?

**Decussion:**

Clearly the intent of this project regardless of its route, is to maximize ridership. In developing a model to determine what route is best (whether it be the two under study or others not yet being considered), several issues need to be considered. One of the most important is no doubt surrounding area's demographics. These factors are in part an outgrowth of the land use patterns and correspondingly that area's zonings. It is therefore necessary to fully map out the zoning adjoining these routes and developments in and around these potential transportation corridors, to determine each areas holding capacity.

**Scoping Questions:**

31. What distances (radiuses) on either side of the proposed transportation corridors are used, in your computer modeling, to determine a local area's potential ridership? How is potential ridership and their modes of access to the system's facilities factored into your ridership models? Does ease of access to transit stations for pedestrians or difficulty of accessing a site by public transportation or private vehicles have a weighted value in your modeling? And if not, why not?
32. Please provide a detailed analysis of the numbers of projected riders, in an easy to read matrix form, showing expected distances traveled to reach each station, likeliest modes of travel used to reach each proposed transit stations and projected ridership for each corridor studied at on an off peak hours, and over a typical 24 hour cycle. Please provide a break down of the number of riders who will embark and disembark in each of the corridor alternatives potential station studied for the Phase 2 portion of this transit system. Also please include with this analysis general location where rider's can be expected to travel from to gain access to stations in the study area.
33. Please fully examine the General Plan Land Use designations along each transportation corridor studied for Phase 2 between Robertson and Sepulveda Blvds. and the corresponding zoning along these corridors to establish each area's population today and when fully developed as permitted by it zoning and General Plan designation. As part of this analysis, please include a projection of the potential ridership each of these area, will generate based on appropriate indices. Please provide a list of these indices and explain how they are utilized to develop your ridership models.

**Discussion:**

While the two study areas currently being reviewed would provide access to the Santa Monica, they do not represent the only routes that should be considered. There are at least three others routes that should be addressed.

34. Please fully examine an alternate route utilizing a portion of the 10 Freeway right of way for the first leg of the Expo. Line Phase 2. This route might begin just west of Robertson Blvd. The Phase 1 Exposition Route terminus is just east of the 10 Freeway on ramp. Will the Expo line when extended be elevated to avoid an, at grade crossing, at Robertson Blvd.; if not, how will potential traffic delays be addressed? To make matters worse, Robertson Blvd. does not intersect this transit roadways at 90 degrees, which would make any crossings at grade even more difficult and dangerous. If this crossing is not to be grade separated, how would vehicle safety be ensured? If the Robertson Blvd. crossing is elevated, why not then link it to the 10

Freeway's west bound on ramp. Once on the Freeway, it would seem reasonable to follow this route to Sepulveda Blvd. where it could once again join the Expo. R O W.

35. Please fully examine another alternate route. Palms Blvd. intersects National Blvd. (where the existing rail line crosses the old train bridge). Developing Palms Blvd. as a transit route would provide a shortened access to Sepulveda Blvd. Sepulveda Blvd. could then be followed to the Expo. R O W. It would of course be necessary to protect the environs of Palms Junior High School.
36. Please fully examine a final route alternative. The Robertson Blvd. Phase 1 terminus is in close proximity to Washington Blvd. This roadway is quite wide and could serve as a direct route to Santa Monica. The land use developments that flank this roadway could lend themselves to a transit line.

#### **Discussion:**

It has been suggested that a station and/or a park and ride facility could be located at or near the Overland Avenue portion of the Expo. R O W. or in the Manning and Motor area. The development of such facilities would add traffic congestion to already busy roadways. The resulting added traffic would increase noise levels, decrease pedestrian and pet safety, likely result in increase speeds from bypass traffic (looking for the quickest routes to possible transit stations), increase ambient light levels, add pollution and contribute to the denigration of existing residential neighborhoods. Proper planning dictates that local streets should not be use as collectors, especially those that are curvilinear, hilly and narrow. Unfortunately transit patrons coming from the north will either have to the few collectors in the area or find routes over local streets to the Expo. R O W.

#### **Scoping Questions:**

37. How could the impacts created by added trip end traffic accessing proposed transit station and/or park and ride lots be reduce to avoid adverse impacts that would affect both Overland Avenue school and the quality of life of the residences living in the surrounding neighborhoods.
38. What mitigation measures could be implemented to protect Manning from increased traffic and still facilitate access to the Expo. Line; since there are no viable collector streets in the area.
39. How can the transit system's roadway grade, west of Overland Avenue, be lowered where it adjoins the many existing home located on the north and south sides of the R O W? What design alternative can be provided to minimize the impact on the families living in along the roadbed, if this portion of the R O W must be utilized?

**Discussion:**

One of the important indices that helps define a successful neighborhood is its quiet environment. The problems associated with high decibel noise sources near local residential communities and schools are well documented. Clearly, decibel ratings in the 80's are too high for residential neighborhoods. Single source noises, such as bells at gate crossing, or the noise of a light rail train or even buses will have an adverse impact on nearby residences. High noise levels affect both the quality of life and property values. In the Cheviot Hills area, noise sources are magnified by the reflection of noise due to the temperature inversion layers, which the area is regularly subjected to. Noise from the 10 Freeway is already a problem and the adding of another high decibel noise source will further impact the quality of life in the area.

In a City where too few neighborhoods function well and too many of its schools are suffering from under productive results, how is it prudent or wise to compromise the quality of any of its viable neighborhood when alternate, more satisfactory solutions are available?

**Scoping Questions:**

40. How can the development of this project along the existing Expo. R O W. between Robertson and Sepulveda Blvds. occur in any form without adversely impacting surrounding neighborhoods and their residents' quality of life based on increases in noise and traffic congestion, reduced traffic safety, loss of neighborhood cohesiveness, school safety and an overall diminished quality of the educational environment at local schools?  
How can such projects be developed without impacting property values?

**Conclusion:**

Given the many questions and concerns regarding the use of the existing Expo. R O W. the key question becomes:

Why select the existing Expo. R O W. when so many of the problems associated with this alternative can be eliminated by utilizing the Venice/Sepulveda Blvd. alternate route, or the 10 Freeway right of way or perhaps the Palms or Washington Blvd. alternatives? This question may be even more relevant when the issue of higher potential ridership is fully examined for these alternate routes.

Thank you for your review and consideration of this material and answering my Scoping Questions. Should you have any questions please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

INEX2-00284  
RECEIVED  
EX241.1  
APR 02 2007

**Exposition Light Rail Phase II Extension  
Statement of Concern**

Exposition Metro Line  
Construction Authority  
Document Control

I support the Expo Light Rail Phase II Extension route down the Venice /Sepulveda Alignment.

I support the Expo Light Rail Phase II Extension route all the way down Venice Boulevard to Lincoln Boulevard.

Other \_\_\_\_\_

I oppose the Expo Light Rail Phase II Extension on the Expo right of way (ROW) because of the following concerns :

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> noise nuisance                               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> loss of property values        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> traffic overflow onto side streets |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> vibration                                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> traffic jams at rail crossings | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> impeding freeway access            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> negative impacts to Overland Avenue School   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> damage to homes, roadways,     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> and parking lots from excavation   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> danger to pedestrians, pets, near the tracks |  |  |

I am against at-grade crossings and elevated crossings due to concerns that they would cause unacceptable traffic congestion, safety and noise issues, and/or visual blight.

I don't feel ridership and demographics support light rail on the ROW between Motor and Sepulveda.

Further comments or personal statements: \_\_\_\_\_

*Please see attached letter dated March 27, 2007.*

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Mail by March 15, 2007 to: Mr. Joel Sandberg, Project Manager, Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority.  
707 Wilshire Blvd., 34th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017

[REDACTED]

March 27, 2007

Mr. Joel Sandberg  
Project Manager  
Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority  
707 Wilshire Blvd., 34<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Statement of Concern regarding Exposition Light Rail Phase II Extension

Dear Mr. Sandberg:

We write regarding the extension of the Exposition Light Rail Project Phase I from the current planned terminus at the Venice/Robertson Station in the City of Culver City to a station near 5<sup>th</sup> Street/Colorado Boulevard in Santa Monica.

We support the Expo Light Rail Phase II Extension route down the Venice/Sepulveda Alignment. We would also support a Phase II Extension all the way down Venice Boulevard to Lincoln Boulevard or the whole way to the ocean.

We oppose the Phase II Extension route through Cheviot Hills (our neighborhood) on the Expo right of way (ROW) for the following reasons.

1. Ridership. The Venice/Sepulveda Alignment has the potential of attracting many more riders than the ROW since both Venice and Sepulveda Boulevards comprise businesses and multi-family housing complexes rather than the single-family houses of Cheviot Hills. Demographics simply do not support light rail between Motor and Sepulveda via the ROW.
2. Train noise. Trains traveling along the ROW would cause intolerable noise pollution, and Overland Avenue School would be especially impacted. Trains are always much noisier rounding curves than traveling along a straight route. The ROW has a number of curves, including one right by the school. If the trains cross Overland at grade level, bells and whistles will be sounded right by the school. If an above-grade crossing is built at Overland, unacceptable noise levels will be generated by the trains themselves, as they climb from the tunnel by Motor to the Overland overpass, and will be broadcast all over the area.
3. Station noise. A station has been proposed at Overland and Exposition, right by Overland Avenue School. The school would be impacted by loudspeaker noise at the station, by the noise of accelerating and decelerating trains, and by the extra traffic generated by commuters entering and leaving the trains.

4. Vibration. Trains along the ROW would cause intolerable vibration that could easily damage the foundation of many houses in the neighborhood including ours. We know that this has been the case along the Gold Line route.
5. Traffic. Neither at-grade crossings nor elevated crossings at Overland Avenue and/or Westwood Boulevard would be satisfactory. The former would cause incredible traffic back-ups; the latter would be unsightly and there would be no way of mitigating the noise the trains would generate. Our neighborhood streets, already impacted by traffic to and from Century City, would become even more crowded as commuters try to avoid Overland Avenue and other streets with level crossings.
6. Quality of life. We are concerned about the impact the trains would have on our quality of life and on the potential loss of property value. We in Cheviot Hills would like to preserve our neighborhood of single-family houses. We already contend with automobile noise from the I-10 freeway and with noise from planes making their approach to Santa Monica Airport. We do not need more pollution of this sort. Trains would pose a hazard to pedestrians and pets near the tracks and would cause traffic jams at rail crossings around the clock. Our neighborhood works hard to support Overland Elementary School and we want it to remain the school of choice of the residents. Unnecessary noise and vibrations from light-rail trains could easily turn a sought-after elementary school into a poor second choice.

We believe that the trains should be put where the riders are, rather than simply using an available right of way.

We and the Homeowners Associations along the ROW are following the Phase II scoping process closely. We know from the placement of the Blue Line and the Golden Line that the MTA does not primarily take into consideration the interests of the communities through which it routes its trains.

We feel we have to be prepared to sue privately or as part of a class action in case the Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority/Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority opts to use the Expo ROW rather than the Venice/Sepulveda alignment, and if concerns expressed by the homeowners' associations and/or in this letter are not met.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

INEX2 -00288  
RECEIVED  
EX2411  
APR 02 2007

**Exposition Light Rail Phase II Extension  
Statement of Concern**

Exposition Metro Line  
Construction Authority  
Document Control

I support the Expo Light Rail Phase II Extension route down the Venice /Sepulveda Alignment.

I support the Expo Light Rail Phase II Extension route all the way down Venice Boulevard to Lincoln Boulevard.

Other \_\_\_\_\_

I oppose the Expo Light Rail Phase II Extension on the Expo right of way (ROW) in our neighborhood because of the following concerns:

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> noise nuisance  | <input type="checkbox"/> loss of property values                                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> traffic overflow onto side streets |
| <input type="checkbox"/> vibration   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> traffic jams at rail crossings                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> impeding freeway access            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> negative impacts to Overland Avenue School | <input type="checkbox"/> damage to homes, roadways, and parking lots from excavation |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> danger to pedestrians, pets, near the tracks          |  |  |

I am against at-grade crossings and elevated crossings due to concerns that they would cause unacceptable traffic congestion, safety and noise issues, and/or visual blight.

I don't feel ridership and demographics support light rail on the ROW between Motor and Sepulveda.

Further comments or personal statements: BETWEEN PICO + NATIONAL

there is very little foot traffic & no who will benefit if the rail goes along Exposition — where are the riders?

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Mail by March 15, 2007 to: Mr. Joel Sandberg, Project Manager, Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority.  
707 Wilshire Blvd., 34th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017



# Expo

INEX2-00289

RECEIVED

EX2461

APR 02 2007

Exposition Metro Line  
Construction Authority  
Document Control

## Exposition Corridor Transit Project – Phase 2

*Thank you for attending today's scoping meeting. Please take a moment to complete this form.*

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Affiliation: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone/Email: \_\_\_\_\_

I attended the following workshop (check one):

Tuesday, February 27

Tuesday, March 6

Wednesday, February 28

Thursday, March 15

Comments:

THE "VENICE TO THE SEA" ROUTE IS THE BEST  
OPTION - IT SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN PREMATURELY  
REJECTED. THIS PURPORTED EVALUATION PROCESS  
DOES NOT APPEAR FAIR.

THE CHEVIOT ROUTE IS THE WORST OPTION.

IN EX-0290  
RECEIVED  
EX 41.1  
APR 02 2007

Exposition Light Rail Phase II Extension  
Statement of Concern

Exposition Metro Line  
Construction Authority  
Document Control

I support the Expo Light Rail Phase II Extension route down the Venice /Sepulveda Alignment.

I support the Expo Light Rail Phase II Extension route all the way down Venice Boulevard to Lincoln Boulevard.

Other \_\_\_\_\_

I oppose the Expo Light Rail Phase II Extension on the Expo right of way (ROW) in our neighborhood because of the following concerns:

noise nuisance  loss of property values  traffic overflow onto side streets

traffic jams at rail crossings  impeding freeway access  vibration

damage to homes, roadways,  danger to pedestrians, pets, near the track parks, from excavation/construction

negative impacts to **Overland Avenue School (NOISE, pollution from standing traffic at grade crossing, drop off/pick up congestion, loss of teacher parking, construction dangers)**

I am **against** at-grade crossings and elevated crossings due to concerns that they would cause unacceptable traffic congestion, safety and noise issues, and/or visual blight.

I don't feel ridership and demographics support light rail on the ROW between Motor and Sepulveda.

Further comments or personal statements: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Mail by March 15, 2007 to: Mr. Joel Sandberg, Project Manager, Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority.  
707 Wilshire Blvd., 34<sup>th</sup> Floor. Los Angeles, CA 90017

IVEX 2-00291  
RECEIVED  
EX 241,1  
APR 02 2007

Exposition Light Rail Phase II Extension  
Statement of Concern

Exposition Metro Line  
Construction Authority  
Document Control

I support the Expo Light Rail Phase II Extension route down the Venice /Sepulveda Alignment.

I support the Expo Light Rail Phase II Extension route all the way down Venice Boulevard to Lincoln Boulevard.

Other support the Expo Light Rail on the Expo ROW provided mitigation is provided as described below:

I oppose the Expo Light Rail Phase II Extension on the Expo right of way (ROW) because of the following concerns :

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> noise nuisance                               | <input type="checkbox"/> loss of property values        | <input type="checkbox"/> traffic overflow onto side streets |
| <input type="checkbox"/> vibration                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> traffic jams at rail crossings | <input type="checkbox"/> impeding freeway access            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> negative impacts to Overland Avenue School   | <input type="checkbox"/> damage to homes, roadways,     | <input type="checkbox"/> and parking lots from excavation   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> danger to pedestrians, pets, near the tracks |   |   |

I am against at-grade crossings and elevated crossings due to concerns that they would cause unacceptable traffic congestion, safety and noise issues, and/or visual blight.

I don't feel ridership and demographics support light rail on the ROW between Motor and Sepulveda.

Further comments or personal statements: They must be elevated

or sunken crossings at Overland, Westwood

and Sepulveda. At grade crossings are

unacceptable. They are dangerous and

are a traffic hazard. Children are not

safe as traffic is easily blocked by

Name at grade crossings

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Mail by March 15, 2007 to: Mr. Joel Sandberg, Project Manager, Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority.  
707 Wilshire Blvd., 34th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017

IN 2002 92

RECEIVED  
d. 2007 41.1  
APR 02 2007

Exposition Light Rail Phase II Extension  
Statement of Concern

Exposition Metro Line  
Construction Authority  
Document Control

I support the Expo Light Rail Phase II Extension route down the Venice /Sepulveda Alignment.

I support the Expo Light Rail Phase II Extension route all the way down Venice Boulevard to Lincoln Boulevard.

Other \_\_\_\_\_

\*  I oppose the Expo Light Rail Phase II Extension on the Expo right of way (ROW) because of the following concerns :

- noise nuisance
- vibration
- negative impacts to Overland Avenue School
- danger to pedestrians, pets, near the tracks
- loss of property values
- traffic jams at rail crossings
- traffic overflow onto side streets
- impeding freeway access
- damage to homes, roadways, and parking lots from excavation

I am against at-grade crossings and elevated crossings due to concerns that they would cause unacceptable traffic congestion, safety and noise issues, and/or visual blight.

I don't feel ridership and demographics support light rail on the ROW between Motor and Sepulveda.

Further comments or personal statements: I understand and support the need

for public transportation with the light rail, but using the Expo

right of way simply for convenience makes no sense. I have strong

objections to the light rail running so close to Overland Avenue School.

This is an accident, and likely lawsuit, waiting to happen. Please  
strongly consider the Venice/Sepulveda Alignment option.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Mail by March 15, 2007 to: Mr. Joel Sandberg, Project Manager, Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority,  
707 Wilshire Blvd., 34th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017

INEX2-0029  
RECEIVED  
EX241.1  
APR 02 2007

### Exposition (AQUA) Line Phase 2 Comments

Exposition Metro Line  
Construction Authority  
Document Control

I want the Expo (Aqua) Line Phase 2 to continue on Venice to the beach

I want the Expo (Aqua) Line Phase 2 to continue on Venice to Sepulveda

I want the Expo (Aqua) Line Phase 2 to continue on Exposition ROW

Other: if it exists why not use it?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(attach extra sheet if needed)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_



Please fax (310 475.2126) email to [neighborsforsmartrail@smartrail.org](mailto:neighborsforsmartrail@smartrail.org) or mail to WOWHOA, PO Box 64496 LA 90064.

If you would like to be added to our email distribution list, please email us: [neighborsforsmartrail@smartrail.org](mailto:neighborsforsmartrail@smartrail.org)

Visit our website at [www.smartrail.org](http://www.smartrail.org)

# The Light Rail is Coming YOUR INPUT IS NEEDED!!!

The Exposition Light Rail Phase 2 is underway!

The Exposition Construction Authority (ECA) is holding a series of community open house scoping meetings to present their options for Phase 2 and receive comments from the community. There will be a meeting on **March 15<sup>th</sup>** at the Vista Del Mar Child and Family Service, 3200 Motor Ave. in the Gym. You can go anytime from 6:30 to 8:30 there is no formal presentation but they have people there to answer your questions.

It is **VERY** important that you attend this meeting to let your voice be heard. If it is impossible to attend you still can have your voice heard by submitting your written comments or the attached Aqua Line Phase 2 Survey.

Please fill in the Aqua Line Phase 2 Survey and mail to:  
Joel Sanberg P.E., Project Manager, Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority,  
707 Wilshire Blvd. 34<sup>th</sup> Floor, LA 90034. **DEADLINE IS APRIL 2, 2007.**

Please provide a copy for our files: NFSR, PO Box 64496, LA, CA 90064. Email us at [neighborsforsmartrail@smartrail.org](mailto:neighborsforsmartrail@smartrail.org) to be added to our email list and get latest Aqua Line information. Visit our website: [www.smartrail.org](http://www.smartrail.org)

\*\*\*\*\*

The MTA is now studying extending the subway (Red Line) down Wilshire to the Beach.

We are asking that they study having the Exposition line continue on Venice to Beach.

IF the train continues on Exposition our community needs to be properly mitigated.

### Impacts of Light Rail on Right of Way

North/South traffic will be heavily impacted if the line is at grade at any intersection. During rush hour, the crossing guards would come down every 2-3 minutes.

As an example, the Gold Line stops traffic on certain arterial streets where it is at grade, for 44 minutes out of an hour during rush hour.

The consultants will be studying stations at Motor, Overland, and Sepulveda.

**REMEMBER YOU CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE  
MAKE SURE YOUR VOICE IS HEARD**

ENEX 2-00294

Friday, March 30, 2007

RECEIVED

EX 241.1  
APR 02 2007

Exposition Metro Line  
Construction Authority  
Document Control

[REDACTED]

Joel Sandberg  
Project Manager  
Exposition Construction Authority  
707 Wilshire Boulevard, 34th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017-3720

Re: Comments for Expo Phase 2 Scoping

Dear Mr. Sandberg:

Thank you for the opportunity to voice our concerns during this scoping period. Several of these concerns have been expressed during the scoping meetings. Nevertheless, we hope that these and other issues will be addressed thoroughly in your draft Environmental Impact Report. This study must also offer meaningful mitigation strategies for the community.

The draft EIR should consider whether a grade separation at both Overland Ave. and Westwood Blvd. would be beneficial for pedestrians, street traffic and trains. Noting that traffic is particularly dense in the Westside, your EIR should identify sections of the line where a trench below grade would be preferable to avoid cross-traffic. We also wish you consider a station near Santa Monica College. The line would provide students and faculty a suitable alternative to fighting the existing parking crunch at the school.

When considering both route options for Phase 2, please take note of the impact light rail will have on cross traffic and, in the case of the Venice/Sepulveda option, parallel traffic. We believe that Sepulveda Blvd. may be too narrow to fit a light rail right of way and that such a route may either take away lanes of traffic or require property purchases to increase the width of the street. We also believe that such a diversion would add 10 to 15 minutes to the schedule. Running trains on this longer route may increase operations costs by as much as \$5 million per year. What actions can be taken to build a Venice/Sepulveda route that will not disrupt traffic or residents?

Also, we are aware that Venice Boulevard is a state highway, which would obviate direct cooperation with Caltrans. How will your agency work with Caltrans to build and operate light rail on Venice should the EIR recommend this route? It should be noted that The Transit Coalition has not taken position on the choice of routes.

The Transit Coalition will continue to support your efforts to bring rail service to the Westside.

Sincerely,  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

