



Expo

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:

① I favor the Exposition Row alignment BECAUSE: There should be a Mass Transit line along the entire length of Sepulveda Blvd from North San Fernando to Pab's Verdes (Hence rendering Expo on Sepulveda moot).

② Monorail should be considered for: Sepulveda Corridor; S.M. Blvd / Franklin / Los Feliz corridor; Pico Blvd; and Lincoln Blvd / PCH. WHY - it keeps Mass Transit separated from auto traffic - it dovetails well with 2+3 story commercial buildings + pedestrian overpasses and elevated stations - It is easy to build into existing ROWs.

③ Feeder system of small electric shuttle buses on cross

Comments can be handed in at the meeting or sent to Joel Sandberg, 707 Wilshire Blvd., 34th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017. Tel: (213) 922-3976, Phase2@exporail.net or www.buildexpo.net

corridor streets - necessary + facilitate access to Main Lines.

Why not place the Row down the center of 10 Freeway between 4th St. and 20th? - MORE USE OF Freeway right-of-way is - a good, + be recommended.

[REDACTED]

To Mr. Sandberg and the Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority:

I must preface these comments by saying that while I can only speak for myself, and not for the community, transportation and planning organizations/entities with which I affiliate, I must emphasize how much they have influenced me. These organizations include Friends4Expo Transit, Friends of the Green Line, The Transit Coalition, the CD11 Neighborhood Empowerment Transportation Committee, the Mar Vista Community Council and the Westside Village Civic Association.

Clearly, the most controversial decision regarding Phase 2 is the question of whether this should be routed on the publicly-owned Exposition Right of Way or on Venice and Sepulveda Blvds. to connect Culver City with West Los Angeles. Other less-publicized but well-known controversial issues surround the lack of connectivity of this line to key portions of the Westside (Venice, Century City, UCLA, etc.)

1) The main message behind my comments is that effective mass transit brings neighborhoods together in addition to providing regional mobility options, so routing decisions must be made that don't set one community against its neighbor(s). Furthermore, this line and its inevitable future extensions and connections will have traffic, visual and other impacts that affect the entire Westside, so the neighboring communities (such as Rancho Park, Cheviot Hills, Westside Village, Mar Vista, Palms and Culver City) will not avoid these impacts regardless of which route is chosen.

2) I therefore must support the cheaper, shorter, quicker, less impacting routing along the publicly-owned Exposition Right of Way, but I cannot do so without emphasizing the need for this routing to be part of a greater network linking the entire Westside, Mid-City and Downtown regions. Reasons for this preference include:

a) The reduced cost of the Right of Way, which will be at least \$100 million or more of initial construction and certainly more on an ongoing basis because of the greater operating costs of a longer line (the Sepulveda/Venice routing is a mile longer)

b) The greater length/transit time of the Venice/Sepulveda routing (10 minutes longer) will be a powerful deterrent to ridership from the entire region and is a much greater factor than those neighborhoods immediately adjacent to the two potential routes in question.

c) Environmental justice and legal precedent favor the shorter, quicker route because the Phase 1 routing Downtown was also predicated to create the fastest ride as a way to enhance ridership. In Phase 1, the route was moved off a circuitous portion of the Right of Way on Hill Street in order to save 10 minutes of transit time and reduce operating expenses.

d) Engineering issues certainly favors the Right of Way as the easier option to pursue, because the Venice/Sepulveda routing faces obstacles such as the sharp turn between Venice and Sepulveda Blvds., the steep hills on Sepulveda adjacent to this sharp turn, expensive and disruptive utility relocation, as well as visual and traffic impacts on Venice and Sepulveda Blvds. Clearly, this routing is a result of the previous focus of Metro on creating Busways as the cornerstone of mass transit in the Westside, and is not consistent with the greater focus of light and heavy rail that Metro is now creating.

e) The greatest structural, economic and traffic impacts are on Sepulveda Blvd., which unlike Venice Blvd. does not have a wide median that was a former rail right of way. Sepulveda Blvd. is more narrow, and is particularly unsuited for light rail north of National Blvd. The creation of light rail between Venice Blvd. and National Blvd. would encounter challenges such as the aforementioned steep hill adjacent to Venice Blvd., potential removal of traffic lanes, removal of streetside trees and narrowing of sidewalks.

f) Both the Right of Way and Venice/Sepulveda routings serve equally dense portions of Palms, but although neither routing will provide adjacent access to all Palms residents only the Right of Way routing can ensure access to all Palms residents. An already-planned and budgetted Venice Blvd. Rapid Bus (and, for that matter, current bus service along Venice Blvd.) can indirectly link residents on/near Venice Blvd. to the Venice/Robertson station, but the converse is not true. A Venice/Sepulveda Exposition Line routing would necessitate the funding and creation of a new bus service/line along the Exposition Right of Way (i.e., paving the rail corridor over) in order for residents in the northern portion of Palms to access the rail line.

g) A rail station at Exposition/Overland is the best way to provide access for riders from Westside Village (where I live), Cheviot Hills, Rancho Park and those wishing to access the adjacent Westside Pavilions Mall. Current Metro guidelines mandate a grade separation at Overland Avenue; all efforts must be made to create a westward extension of the open trench that exists on the Right of Way east of Overland Avenue with the least visually-, safety- and traffic-impacting grade separation on Overland Avenue. Such an option is the best way to alleviate local concerns about traffic, safety at the adjacent Overland Elementary School, and include the greatest number of riders with access to the future Exposition Rail Line.

h) Perhaps the greatest argument favoring the Right of Way routing is that the Exposition Light Rail Line has as its primary mission the creation of multimodal transportation options along and adjacent to the 10

freeway, and the Venice/Sepulveda routing creates a north-south diversion for an east-west rail line. We do not do this for freeways or surface arterials, and we should not do this for effective mass transit, either.

3) A fully-functional, inclusive and comprehensive Exposition Rail Line will be one that not only utilizes the Right of Way from Culver City to Santa Monica, but one that incorporates a Venice Blvd. rail spur from Culver City to Venice.

a) In the debate over which routing to use to connect Culver City to West Los Angeles, the Exposition Construction Authority must consider a future incorporation of a "Phase 3" that includes the communities of southern Palms, western Culver City, Mar Vista, Venice, Marina Del Rey and Del Rey along the rail right of way on the Venice Blvd. median. These communities have at best indirect access to the future Exposition Light Rail, and do not sufficiently benefit from either potential routing of the future Exposition Line.

b) The precedent exists for rail on Venice Blvd., which for decades was the quickest way for commuters to access the beach from Downtown (and vice-versa) during the Red Car era. Although utility relocation and traffic impacts clearly make a Venice Blvd. rail line a more difficult line to create than the Exposition Light Rail Line that has an empty, unused Right of Way, the Venice Blvd. right of way still exists for a Major Investment Study to evaluate for a future dedicated transit line that incorporates light rail or a busway.

c) The future Rapid Bus on Venice Blvd. requires excellent signage and technological enhancements to create a speedy, reliable, attractive, comfortable and convenient way for commuters from the aforementioned communities to access the Exposition Rail Line, and for Exposition Rail Line commuters to access those communities as well.

4) Although funding constraints prevent the immediate construction of a Westside and countywide rail network, the funding and political will does exist for its study, and the Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority should incorporate its Phase 1 and 2 efforts with local and regional political efforts to extend rail mass transit beyond a singular Exposition Line between Downtown Los Angeles to Downtown Santa Monica.

a) Los Angeles Councilmember Bill Rosendahl has devoted \$200,000 for the City of Los Angeles to explore ways to create a Westside rail network, and this can include the study of a new "Culver Junction" at Venice/Robertson. "Culver Junction" was so named because of the three rail rights of way (Exposition, Venice and Culver) that converged on that rail station.

b) The two Phases (1 and 2) are not mutually exclusive, and when the Phase 2 routing question is resolved an elevated Venice/Robertson station can and should be immediately built so that:

1) the \$40 million needed to construct this station as part of Phase 1 should be dedicated from Proposition 1B funds for immediate access to construct the Venice/Robertson station once the Phase 2 routing questions are resolved.

2) the Phase 1 portion of the Exposition Line has its western terminus at Venice/Robertson, with a quality linkage and parking structure to best serve commuters from adjacent surface arterials and the 10 freeway, and with optimal ridership and operations that are far superior than the proposed interim station at National/Washington.

3) future rail spurs utilizing the Venice and Culver rail rights of way aren't precluded from accessing this vital rail station.

c) As evidenced by the new Green Line Coalition of Councilmember Bill Rosendahl, Assemblymember Ted Lieu, State Senator Jenny Oropeza, County Supervisor Don Knabe, and House Representative Jane Harman, linkage of LAX to the MetroRail Network enjoys political support.

d) Although the proposed Green Line Construction Authority of Assemblymember Ted Lieu and State Senator Jane Harman is devoted only to extending the Metro Green Line to Lincoln/Sepulveda, it should be noted that the originally-approved Green Line Northern Coastal Extension EIR extended up Lincoln Blvd. to Marina Del Rey. A revisiting of the Culver/Alta rail right of way from Venice/Robertson to Lincoln/Jefferson Blvd., and down Lincoln Blvd. to LAX, creates a potential future connection of the Exposition and Green Lines that the Exposition Construction Authority should note in its Draft EIR.

e) At this immediate time, the rail project next prioritized on the Metro Long Range Transportation Plan after the Exposition Light Rail Line to Santa Monica is the Crenshaw Corridor Project, and political momentum appears to be moving towards a light rail line from the Crenshaw/Exposition rail station down Crenshaw Blvd. and the Harbor Subdivision Right of Way to Century/Aviation. Such a project would connect the Exposition Rail Line with the future LAX People Mover and the Metro Green Line, and should be noted by the Exposition Construction Authority as well.

f) A Metro staff report/update of the Metro Long Range Transportation Plan reported that the Downtown/Regional Light Rail Connector enjoyed the most riders per mile, and the most riders per dollar spent, and is likely to enjoy high prioritization in the updating of the Long Range Transportation Plan later this year, and already has a dedicated and funded Major Investment Study. This Downtown

Connector would link the Exposition and Blue Lines directly to vital Downtown connections and to Union Station (with its connections to the Pasadena and Eastside Gold Lines and to Metrolink and Amtrak lines), which Phase 1 of the Exposition Line fails to do.

Although Exposition Line riders will be able to access portions of Downtown and Union Station indirectly via the Red Line Subway, its failure to directly access key portions of Downtown that the Subway doesn't access, and its failure to directly access Union Station, will hurt Exposition Line ridership as assuredly as we've seen, ridership severely reduced on the Pasadena Gold Line because of the latter's lack of regional connectivity. It behooves the Exposition Construction Authority to advise and advocate for this Downtown/Regional Light Rail Connector now to avoid future Exposition Line ridership problems now encountered by the Pasadena Gold Line.

g) In short, the issues ultimately facing the operations of the Exposition Light Rail Line go far beyond the local/engineering problems facing its funding and construction, and needs to be viewed as part of the regional MetroRail network for which it will connect once the completed Exposition Line is transferred to Metro, and these issues are best identified and addressed now by the Exposition Construction Authority.

5) A properly-built Exposition Light Rail Line from Downtown Los Angeles to Santa Monica will likely enjoy very high ridership (similar to the Metro Blue Line ridership of >70,000 riders/day).

a) Stations that can accommodate four-car trains (and certainly no less than three-car trains) must be incorporated into station design for Phases 1 and 2.

b) Ridership will invariably be enhanced with rush-hour express trains that "skip-stop" with a minimum of key stops and travel time. Any reduction of transit time will enhance ridership of Phase 1, and this is especially true for a full Exposition Line to Santa Monica, with sufficient cross-trackings must be built into the wider portions of the Exposition Rail Right of Way to ensure successful express train service. Key stops of these express trains should be considered at:

- 1) The future Western Santa Monica terminus
- 2) Venice/Robertson in Culver City
- 3) Crenshaw/Exposition for accessing by Mid-City residents
- 4) A station at/near USC/Exposition Park

5) Because the right of way is so narrow at this portion of the line, and because Downtown is so replete with passenger destinations, it is probably not a helpful or even viable option to pursue express train service in the portion east/north of USC

c) Bicycle racks at both the stations and on the trains, with a complete and comprehensive set of pedestrian and bicycle paths connecting to Exposition Line rail stations, are needed to ensure full multimodal access to/from the line to the pedestrian destinations that the line is required to serve.



Expo

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:

I am very much in favor of the 2nd phase of the light rail. However, I am opposed to the optional Sepulveda-Venice realignment. This will add much cost to the project plus add 10 min \pm to the route. I am opposed to mixing the flow of auto and the light rail together. The route for phase 2 should follow the Expo R.O.W.



Expo

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:

I favor the alignment option which would run down the existing Expo right of way. It would be cheaper to build and would not further impact traffic on Venice & Sepulveda. It is my understanding that if the line were to run on Sepulveda, parking on both sides of the street would be eliminated which is unacceptable.

Shouldn't the rail line go to the beach instead of stopping at 4th?



Expo

Exposition Corridor Transit Project - Phase 2

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

Name:

[Redacted]

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 best route for Phase 2
is to go from Culver City
west along Venice Bl.
through WAAH Vista to Lincoln
Blvd. - Then tunnel north
& under Lincoln to downtown
SoMa.

They could also go all the way
west on Venice Bl. to the
Windward Circle, then tunnel under
Main Street to SoMa.

~~I work in Venice~~
~~I live in SoMa~~

We could take it to the Airport

Comments can be handed in at the meeting or sent to Joel Sandberg, 707 Wilshire Blvd., 34th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017. Tel: (213) 922-3976. Phase2@expomil.net or www.builddexpo.net

in the future.

Thanks.



Expo

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:

I live in Mar Vista and work in Santa Monica.
 Please have phase II go from Culver City west along Venice Blvd. to Lincoln Blvd. and then north into Santa Monica. Then I could take light rail to work every day. Eventually they could extend to here from Venice/Lincoln to LAX.
 This route will simplify my life.



Expo

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:

Stay on the expo row all the way!

Make the platforms long enough for 4 CARS

Make it GRADE separated RR for as much as possible



Expo

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:

I am a 50+ yr resident of Cheviot Hills. Property values will not drop w/ the light rail. It is certainly better than the 10 F407 and that construction did not harm the area I support building on the Expo rt of way along the original path. Hurry! ebs



Expo

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 Expo Line should consider express as well as local stops as it moves into the westside where 350,000 workers who live east of Robertson, ^{into town + the east side of LA} reside. These people gridlock the 10 Freeway, Pico and Olympic and Wilshire Bluds especially during rush hours and specifically from Cloverfield Bluds. Does the Exposition Blvd right of way really abate the traffic if there are too many stops? What is the possibility of an Expo Line on the ¹⁰ Freeway with ^{express} stops there? If the Right of Way is the only option, I would prefer the Chevron Hills Route because it would provide more express movement of cross-town traffic. Sepulveda + Venice Blvd would create too much stop + go traffic problems in a heavily populated area.

Comments can be handed in at the meeting or sent to Joel Sandberg, 707 Wilshire Blvd., 34th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017, Tel: (213) 922-3976, Phase2@exporail.net or www.buildexpo.net



Expo

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:

- Need info on where parking garages will be placed - Concern for congestion at parking areas.
- We like direct Cheviot Hills route + wot alternative route.
- Want environmental impact Report
- Real need to mitigate noise, vibration etc.
- Real need to bring rail to Santa Monica.

Comments can be handed in at the meeting or sent to Joel Sandberg, 707 Wilshire Blvd., 34th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017, Tel: (213) 922-3976, Phase2@expo rail.net or www.buildexpo.net



Expo

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:

*I like the bike route but I see no reason why it shouldn't
go all the way to the beach.*

Comments can be handed in at the meeting or sent to Joel Sandberg, 707 Wilshire Blvd., 34th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017, Tel: (213) 922-3976, Phase2@exporail.net or www.builddexpo.net



Expo

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:

- USING THE VENICE ALTERNATIVE IS NOT LOGICAL.
1. RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH CHEVIOT HILLS HAS EXISTED FOR OVER A CENTURY. THE HOME-OWNERS CAN'T CLAIM IGNORANCE & BOUGHT THE PROPERTY WITH THE EXISTING ENCUMBRANCES;
 2. THE ROUTE WILL TAKE LONGER; ~~AND~~
 3. THE ROUTE WILL COST TENS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS MORE TO BUILD; AND
 4. IT WILL INCONVENIENCE 100,000'S OF PEOPLE DURING CONSTRUCTION ON VENICE BLVD.

Comments can be handed in at the meeting or sent to Joel Sandberg, 707 Wilshire Blvd., 34th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017, Tel: (213) 922-3976, Phase2@exporail.net or www.bulldexpo.net



Expo

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:

- ① Station on Motor should be moved to Palms/National for BBB Line 12 transfers and higher density in immediate area.
- ② Station on Overland should be moved to Westwood Bl. for transfers with BBB Lines 8, 12, Super 12 and Culver City Bus from UCLA, Westwood and Palms and Northridge and Century City. One of the most important transfer points on entire EXPO line.



Expo

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:

I am opposed to this project. This will create more congestion on surface streets. I live 1 block east of Bundy drive and stopping traffic on Bundy Drive will back traffic up on Bundy. I am also concern about having to view a train in front of my house. IF the train does go through I wouldn't want any cars parked in front of my house just to ride the train. I would prefer a large hedge so I ~~would~~ wouldn't have to view the train.

