



Attachment B – Community Outreach & Meeting Report

From the beginning of the study, Metro staff conducted a robust community outreach effort to engage residents and employees through the Study Area and beyond, including transit riders, neighborhood and homeowner associations, neighborhood councils, Westside Cities Council of Governments, Crenshaw/LAX Leadership Council, and major retail, medical and employment centers. To meet residents and other potential riders in their community, project staff helped distribute information about the project through informational booths setup at Black History Month events in Leimert Park, Taste of Soul in the Crenshaw District, PRIDE in West Hollywood, and Ciclavia's "Meet The Hollywoods" Additionally, staff organized briefings for elected officials' staff. Through outreach efforts that began in Winter 2018 to Winter 2020, staff received 171 emails, 224 in-person comments, and 675 survey responses.

As part of the additional outreach in Winter 2020, project staff held 32 direct meetings with ownership and management of major destinations and employment centers, community groups and residents in the project study area.

Spring 2019 Outreach

Four community open house styled meetings were held throughout the Crenshaw Northern Alignment Advanced Alternatives Screening Study area in Spring 2019 (March 21, 23, 26 & 28). The report below captures outreach activities during this periods and partial outreach activities following the meetings. Additionally, it captures high level information on the reach and engagement captured by e-mail distribution and Facebook ads. A summary of preferred alternatives is captured based on attendee feedback in either the comment cards or the question cards. The report captures data as of April 1, 2019.

General Summary of information captured from all four meetings:

- 82 relevant social media comments derived from four separate Metro Facebook Crenshaw Northern Extension event invitation posts and one The Source Metro Facebook post.
- 33 Crenshaw Northern Extension project email comments.
- 24 comments responding to two articles regarding the project posted on The Source.Metro.net.
- One phone voicemail from an individual who has utilized the Crenshaw Northern Extension Project Telephone Hotline.

As part of the Crenshaw Northern Extension's Advanced Alternatives Screening Study, Metro's outreach efforts to solicit public input yielded robust and diverse public comments and participation.

In Spring 2019 outreach efforts were focused around four community meetings held within the Crenshaw Northern Extension study area. In anticipation of the four initial community meetings, one elected official briefing and one media briefing were conducted prior to the start of the four community meetings.



Throughout the study period, there was ample participation by elected officials and their staffs, local media, community leaders, residents, business owners and the general public. From all of the meetings and community engagement, there was a demonstrated the desire and need to accelerate completion of this project. Although the comments and questions were diverse and varied the following common themes should be recognized:

- Acceleration of the project was frequently asked about and advocated for.
- The desire to explore innovative acceleration funding sources through partnerships with real estate developers was frequently asked about and advocated for.
- Specific alignment preferences were articulated and advocated for with Alignment A (San Vicente/La Cienega) most frequently cited due to the alignment's close proximity to job centers.
- Grade separation concerns were articulated with strong advocacy for not completing this project with at-grade alignments.
- Gentrification and displacement issues were cited as concerns.
- The issue of parking and neighborhood parking impacts in locations near stations were frequently cited as areas of concern.
- Rail transit line connectivity was frequently cited as a concern when studying connecting rail transit lines.
- Expedient completion of the Crenshaw/LAX line was often asked about and advocated for.
- Equity in Metro hiring and contracting was mentioned as a concern.

Fall 2019 Outreach

Community Meetings and Outreach Summary

Metro hosted a second round of outreach meetings to update the community on what changed with public input from the first round of community meetings in Spring 2019. The first round of community meetings in Spring 2019 was focused on introducing the Crenshaw Northern Extension project with alternatives that have been studied as feasible extensions to the Crenshaw Transit light rail line. The meetings were held in geographically sensible areas throughout the Advanced Alternatives Screening Study area, including West Hollywood, Central Los Angeles, Mid-City, Koreatown and West Adams. The purpose of the Fall 2019 outreach and community meetings was to receive feedback from the public on the preferred alternative of the five—including the newly proposed San Vicente Hybrid option—and reveal the potential stations for each alternative. Metro's presentation also included a transit-oriented communities analysis and



a first/last mile analysis to educate the public on the factors being taken into consideration for each alternative.

When preferences for specific alignment alternatives were articulated, A2 San Vicente-Fairfax Hybrid was most often cited as a preferred alternative. In addition to this, the A2 San Vicente-Fairfax Hybrid was most often cited as a preferred alternative by individuals articulating a concern with Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZ). The following is a breakdown of comments received by alignment preference during the Fall 2019 community meetings:

- 21 comments were supportive of Alternative A2 San Vicente-Fairfax Hybrid
- 6 comments were supportive of Alternative A San Vicente
- 6 comments were supportive of Alternative C La Brea
- 5 comments were supportive of Alternative B Fairfax and;
- 3 comments were supportive of Alternative A1 La Cienega

Below is a summary of attendees and comment and question cards received at the Fall 2019 Advanced Alternatives meetings:

Combined Meeting Report

Total attendees that signed in: 161

Total question cards submitted: 77

Total comment cards submitted: 30

Total comments (post-it notes) submitted on two feedback boards: 68

Total comments on social media: 24

A majority of the attendees expressed overall support for a line that would connect the Crenshaw Transit line north to the Metro Red and Purple lines. Attendees and individuals that submitted comments online articulated that they wanted an alignment that could get them to as many destinations as possible and be built in an accelerated timeframe.

In order to attract a substantial number of stakeholders to the open house meetings, various media outlets were used, such as email blasts with a reach of just over 800 recipients; Metro distributed the same e-blast to Purple Line stakeholders. An elected official briefing was also conducted beforehand, in preparation for the Fall outreach. These meetings garnered continued support for the acceleration of the project, along with common public feedback including:

- Historical Preservation Overlay Zones as they relate to Carthay Circle
- Possible funding sources that would allow an early project delivery
- Neighborhood preservation and pedestrian safety



- Factors that determine grade separation (at-grade, aerial and/or underground)
- Underground (below-grade) vertical preferences
- Community outreach concerns, specifically within Carthay Circle Historical Preservation Overlay Zone
- Demand for station parking lots
- Alternatives that have received the most support
- Accessibility to the Hollywood Bowl
- Ridership figures and comparisons

Winter 2020 Outreach Commerce and Employment Centers

To further enhance outreach in the CNE study area, the project team provided presentations to the ownership and management of some of the largest employers and centers for commerce in Los Angeles. The locations included The Grove, The Farmers Market, Beverly Connections, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, and The Beverly Center. There was a general consensus of support for northwestern alignments that would either have stations adjacent, under or in the vicinity of their facilities. These meetings garnered continued support for the acceleration of the project, along with feedback including:

- Finding ways to reduce vehicle parking while increasing patron visits
- Partnership to provide employees with more reliable and consistent transit options
- Exploring options to provide station access
- Reducing traffic congestion
- Expanding potential commercial uses to parking structures
- Placing stations near high-density mix-use commercial and residential structures

The following pages provide a more details about the community outreach conducted in Fall 2019



Open House Community Meeting & Outreach Report Fall 2019

I. Community Meetings and Outreach Summary

Metro hosted a second round of outreach meetings to update the community on what changed with public input from the first round of community meetings in Spring 2019. The first round of community meetings in Spring 2019 was focused on introducing the Crenshaw Northern Extension project with alternatives that have been studied as feasible extensions to the Crenshaw Transit light rail line. The meetings were held in geographically sensible areas throughout the Advanced Alternatives Study area, including West Hollywood, Mid-City, Koreatown and West Adams. The purpose of the Fall 2019 outreach and community meetings was to receive feedback from the public on the preferred alternative of the five—including the newly proposed San Vicente Hybrid option—and reveal the potential stations for each alternative. Metro's presentation also included a transit-oriented communities analysis and a first/last mile analysis to educate the public on the factors being taken into consideration for each alternative.

A majority of the attendees expressed overall support for a line that would connect the Crenshaw Transit line north to the Metro Red and Purple lines. Attendees and individuals that submitted comments online articulated that they wanted an alignment that could get them to as many destinations as possible and be built in an accelerated timeframe.

In order to attract a substantial number of stakeholders to the open house meetings, various media outlets were used, such as email blasts with a reach of just over 800 recipients; Metro distributed the same e-blast to Purple Line stakeholders. An elected official briefing was also conducted beforehand, in preparation for the Fall outreach. These meetings garnered continued support for the acceleration of the project, along with common public feedback including:

- Historical Preservation Overlay Zones as they relate to Carthay Circle
- Possible funding sources that would allow an early project delivery
- Neighborhood preservation
- Factors that determine grade separation (at-grade, aerial and/or underground)
- Underground (below-grade) vertical preferences
- Community outreach concerns, specifically within Carthay Circle
- Demand for station parking lots

- Alternatives that have received the most support
- Accessibility to the Hollywood Bowl
- Ridership figures and comparisons
- Pedestrian safety

When preferences for specific alignment alternatives were articulated, A2 San Vicente-Fairfax Hybrid was most often cited as a preferred alternative. In addition to this, the A2 San Vicente-Fairfax Hybrid was most often cited as a preferred alternative by individuals articulating a concern with Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZ). The following is a breakdown of comments received by alignment preference during the Fall 2019 community meetings:

- 21 comments were supportive of Alternative A2 San Vicente-Fairfax Hybrid
- 6 comments were supportive of Alternative A San Vicente
- 6 comments were supportive of Alternative C La Brea
- 5 comments were supportive of Alternative B Fairfax and;
- 3 comments were supportive of Alternative A1 La Cienega

Below is a summary of attendees and comment and question cards received at the Fall 2019 Advanced Alternatives meetings.

Combined Meeting Report

Total attendees that signed in: 161

Total question cards submitted: 77

Total comment cards submitted: 30

Total comments (post-it notes) submitted on two feedback boards: 68

Total comments on social media: 24

Elected officials and/or representatives in attendance at meetings:

1. West Hollywood City Councilmember Lindsey Horvath
2. Former West Hollywood City Councilmember Abbe Land
3. Jay Greenstein, Chief Field and Transportation Deputy, Office of LA City Councilmember Paul Koretz
4. Stewart Lozano, Field Representative, Office of Assemblymember Richard Bloom
5. Angie Aramayo, Central Area Representative, Office of Mayor Eric Garcetti
6. Fernando Morales, West/Metro LA Senior Field Deputy, Office of LA County Supervisor Sheila Kuehl
7. Sonia Lopez, Senior Field Representative, Office of California State Senator Holly Mitchell

The Community Update Meetings were scheduled as follows:

- Meeting #1: West Hollywood
Plummer Park
7377 Santa Monica Boulevard, West Hollywood
Tuesday, October 22, 2019; 6:00– 8:00 pm
58 people signed in at this meeting, and 29 individuals submitted question cards.
Metro received 12 written comments at the end of this meeting.

- Meeting #2: Mid-Wilshire
 Wilshire Crest Elementary School
 5241 W. Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles
 Thursday, October 24, 2019; 6:00– 8:00 pm
 29 people signed in at this meeting, and 15 individuals submitted question cards.
 Metro received 6 written comments at the end of this meeting.

- Meeting #3: West Adams
 Virginia Road Elementary School
 2925 Virginia Road, Los Angeles
 Saturday, October 26, 2019; 10:00 am – 12:00 pm
 35 people signed in at this meeting, and 19 individuals submitted question cards.
 Metro received 2 written comments at the end of this meeting.

- Meeting #3: Beverly Grove / West Hollywood
 Rosewood Avenue Elementary
 503 N. Croft Avenue, Los Angeles
 Tuesday, October 29, 2019; 6:00– 8:00 pm
 Saturday, October 26, 2019; 10:00 am – 12:00 pm
 39 people signed in at this meeting, and 14 individuals submitted question cards.
 Metro received 10 written comments at the end of this meeting.

II. Overview of Support Tasks and Activities

To support Metro Community Relations, the Lee Andrews Group (LAG), implemented the following activities, and supporting tasks:

Tasks	Date	Notes
Take-One content	Electronic file available October 1: Print	Placed on Metro website October 1, 2019.
Define Take-One distribution Plan	October 9: Community distribution	<p>Hard copies distributed to the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robertson Branch Library (50 English/Spanish) • Baldwin Hills Branch Library (50 English/Spanish) • Washington Irving Branch Library (50 English/Spanish) • Pio Pico Branch Library (50 English/Korean & 50 English/Spanish) Memorial Branch Library (50 English/Spanish) • John C. Freemont Branch Library (50 English/Spanish) • Fairfax Branch Library (50 English/Spanish)

Website content	Final Content October 8: Live	Anticipate quarterly updates to the website content.
Social Media content	October 8- Pre-meeting During meeting Post meeting	Facebook posts 10/8-10/29. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10/22 West Hollywood Meeting Facebook post reached 23.6K Facebook feeds and generated 174 Facebook responses. • 10/24 Mid-City Meeting Facebook post reached 35.6 K Facebook feeds and generated 153 Facebook responses. • 10/26 West Adams Meeting Facebook post reached 29.4K Facebook feeds and generated 249 Facebook responses. • 10/29 Beverly/Fairfax Meeting • Facebook post reached 28K Facebook feeds and generated 147 Facebook responses.
Tasks	Date	Notes
Electronic Meeting Notification	October 11: Meeting Notification Email October 22: Meeting Reminder Email October 25: Meeting Reminder Email October 29: Meeting Reminder Email	Email Open Rates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October 11 – 400 opens • October 22 – 364 opens • October 25 – 294 opens • October 29 – 280 opens
Elected officials' briefing	October 16:	A total of 20 individuals from federal, state and local elected official offices including: City of Culver City, City of Beverly Hills, City of West Hollywood, Los Angeles City Councilmember Paul Koretz, Los Angeles City Councilmember Mitch O'Farrell, City of Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti, Los Angeles County Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, Los Angeles County Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, California State Assemblymember Sydney Kamlager, California State Assemblymember Miguel Santiago, California State Assemblymember Richard Bloom, State Senator Ben Allen, Congressman Ted Lieu, Congressman Jimmy Gomez, Congressmen Adam Schiff, Congresswoman Karen Bass and United States Senator Diane Feinstein
Stakeholder List	October 8: Utilize list to send email invite	Sent email to list of stakeholder email addresses, staff of elected officials, BIDs, local chambers, neighborhood councils, and association members, West Hollywood Advisory Board members, and various community leaders identified asking to promote and attend the series of community meetings

Community
Events/Pop-ups

October 11 -26, 2019

Take-Ones and additional information was distributed at the following events/locations: Taste of Soul, Hollywood & Melrose Farmers Market, West Hollywood Farmers Market, La Cienega Farmers Market. Communities surrounding the community meeting were additionally canvassed by street team members.

In addition to the four open public meetings conducted during the fall, Metro staff and the outreach team conducted outreach at the community group level with the following community groups:

- August 20, 2019: Carthay Circle Community Meeting
- October 10, 2019: Wellington Park Neighborhood Association Meeting
- November 19, 2019: Mid City West Neighborhood Council Meeting
- December 10, 2019 meeting with the leadership at Cedars Sinai.
- February 16, 2020 – African American History month event at Leimert Park

III. Open House Community Meetings Recap



Meeting 1

Date: October 22, 2019

Location: Plummer Park

Attendees: 58

Question cards submitted: 29

Comment cards submitted: 12

Total comments (post-it notes) submitted on two feedback boards: 33

Media: KNBC-4

Elected officials and/or representatives:

1. West Hollywood City Councilmember Lindsey Horvath

Below is a summary (by category) of the *questions* submitted:

Environmental

- Why aren't stations ever cleaned in areas such as Santa Monica Blvd.
- Besides environmental factors, are resident opinions and the WeHo City Council being considered when choosing at-grade or underground on San Vicente?

Alternative Selection

- If the train is at-grade on Santa Monica Blvd, where would it be? In the middle of the street? Will that take away traffic lanes?
- Would traffic lanes be eliminated altogether if the train runs on San Vicente?
- Is Metro surveying riders of the 105, 217, 780, 218, 212 and other N-5 routes to see what alignments they prefer, since they are the Angelenos currently traveling N-5 on this corridor?
- Will the City of LA support the development of the La Cienega alternative?
- Will Metro commit to underground to preserve WeHo public space if the San Vicente line is chosen?
- Who decides which route will be completed?
- Can a BRT and rail option be considered under the current scope (I.e. Alternative C with a BRT on San Vicente)?
- What are the operating cost comparisons between A2 and C?
- Will the San Vicente Hybrid option be significantly quicker than riding insurface traffic?
- Why can't there be a station at Crenshaw/Wilshire?

Transit-oriented Communities

- Does Metro offer incentives to cities to implement plans for pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the vicinity of stations?

- Has there been other cities with a strong distinctive character/personality such as WeHo that has acquired a Metro line? If so, were there any noticeable changes to the town?

Early Project Delivery

- Why aren't DOT funds being issued for funding the needed construction of the CNE line instead of a local sales tax increase?
- What funding sources will the City of WeHo use to accelerate the project?
- How will EIFD special taxing district work to provide more money to accelerate the project?
- Are property owners expected to pay more taxes for the budget of this project?
- What would make it possible for the line to open in 2028?

Other

- Land use
 - Will the City of LA change zoning of R1 lots where at-grade or underground rail lines will run? Has this happened before with other lines, such as the Expo?
 - How can the public make an informed decision on a preferred route without knowing the contents of the related transit plans, such as tenant protections and upzoning?
 - Did upzoning along routes cause a reduction in ridership?
 - Why not study the potential increase in ridership by building parking garages at stations?
 - Will the City of LA change R1 zoning on lots bordering or near new lines? Has this happened with other existing lines, such as Expo?
- FLM—What is being done for first/last mile accommodations?
- Displacement
 - What is Metro doing for the Leimert Park community and other areas regarding gentrification issues and businesses being affected.
 - How do we prevent displacement of residents and more gentrification?

Below is a summary (by category) of the *comments* submitted:

Environmental

- Children and elderly people are subjected to drugs and smoking at stations/stops.

Alternative Selection

- I support the A2 Hybrid route; I greatly oppose the other routes.
- Have the rail at-grade north of Melrose to resolve the “sharp right” turn issue—allowing the LRT train to run on the center median on Fairfax and make a right on Santa Monica Blvd.
- I like Alternative A2 for access to popular destinations (I.e. LACMA, The Grove, CBS, Cedars-Sinai, Beverly Center, WeHo Library, PDC, etc.).
- Aerial for alternative A2 would free up narrow crowded streets and prevent pedestrian injuries.

- The San Vicente Hybrid option supports gig food couriers in conducting their business effectively and safely.
- Metro should consider a station on La Cienega/Santa Monica Blvd and at the Hollywood Bowl.
- I believe alternative “C” (Fairfax Ave) makes most sense because Fairfax Ave has the most points of interest (Museums, La Brea Tar Pits, 3rd Street Farmer’s Market, The Grove, Fairfax High School, etc.) Fairfax Ave also has the most density.
- I vote for option A if it is underground only—aerial is ugly and at-grade makes traffic worse.
- I support the A2 Hybrid alternative, and greatly oppose the other routes and plan to fight them along with my neighbors and HPOZ community.
- As a resident of WeHo, I prefer the Hybrid option because it covers more dense areas.
- If WeHo and LA City pursue an EIFD, we should pursue a network concept consisting of option C and BRT on San Vicente from Sunset to Pico/Rimpau Transit Center. Bus lanes can be implemented on streets like Sunset, Fairfax, La Cienega, Beverly and 3rd Street. We need an actual network improvement in the area.
- The response to the question “Why can’t the Crenshaw line go to the Purple line/Wilshire Blvd was inadequate! The stop at Crenshaw/Wilshire would work as a transfer point to the Purple line East and West. This would bring passengers to the West and connect with new northern routes through WeHo.
- I’m a homeowner in the Miracle Mile HPOZ and I’m very excited about these proposed plans! Especially the portion that runs along San Vicente, whether or not it’s above ground. Right now, it’s noisy, polluted and always jammed with cars and terrible for pedestrians.
- I definitely prefer the Hybrid alignment as it serves the community and its largest employers and attractions (such as museums on Wilshire, Farmer’s Market, The Grove and Beverly Center). I also support the extension to the Hollywood Bowl.
- I am thrilled that there is preference for the San Vicente/La Cienega because that is way more effective and needed than moving farther east. San Vicente ultimately would be the absolute best for WeHo residents and the vast majority of visitors going to the Rainbow District.
- Location of stations is key—need to be convenient to destinations.
- La Brea makes for a better transit network.

Transit-oriented Communities

- Metro park and ride lots will not work if there is a \$3 charge per day.

Early Project Delivery

- Do not accelerate the timeline. Do it right and don’t rush!
- I believe the northern extension must be accelerated to be completed by 2030.

Other

- Safety
 - The elevators never work at stations in lower-income communities.

- There needs to be security at park and ride lots to avoid vandalism and theft.
- Funds—allocate funding to keep trains clean.



Meeting 2

Date: October 24, 2019

Location: Wilshire Crest Elementary School

Attendees: 29

Question cards submitted: 15

Comment cards submitted: 6

Total comments (post-it notes) submitted on two feedback boards: 7

Media: Larchmont Buzz

Elected officials and/or representatives:

1. West Hollywood City Councilmember Lindsey Horvath
2. Stewart Lozano, Field Representative, Office of Assemblymember Richard Bloom
3. Angie Aramayo, Central Area Representative, Office of Mayor Eric Garcetti
4. Fernando Morales, West/Metro LA Senior Field Deputy, Office of LA County Supervisor Sheila Kuehl

Below is a summary (by category) of the *questions* submitted:

Environmental

- To increase the usefulness of the CNEP, will the lights in the area be revised/increased to synchronize with the rail line?
- Does the study account for signal prioritization for at-grade?
- Will stations be designed to LEED standards or include solar power?
- Could safety improvements for people walking to future stations be included in the project?
- If Metro runs up Fairfax, is there an opportunity to improve pedestrian crossing/safety at the Fairfax asterisk? Would studies be performed?

Alternative Selection

- Is Metro seriously contemplating a below-ground alternative that our city council assured us its approval depended on?
- What determines where the line is above/below ground?
- Why doesn't Crenshaw line connect at Crenshaw/Wilshire?
- Would the Hollywood Bowl station/stop reduce car traffic on Highland?

Early Project Delivery

- How soon could this extension open if the funding was found by the local communities? What would be the advanced/expedited timeline?

Other

- Funds
 - Is the \$2 billion the max that is needed?
 - How would EIFD be decided in LA? Is this a voter decision to divert tax revenue away from general fund?
 - How many of Metro's rail projects were fully funded at this stage? Would this be competitive for State and Federal grants?
 - What measures is Metro (not West Hollywood) taking to secure the funding required to expedite the project?
- Outreach
 - Has Metro written to all property owners on San Vicente to inform them of meeting dates and route options? Most properties are not owner occupied. How did you notify property owners along San Vicente?
 - How have you engaged with non-English speaking communities?
 - Have you proactively engaged with young people/children? They will be the ones benefiting the most.
 - Can more outreach be done like radio, signage, etc.
- Stations
 - Will stations include bicycle storage and/or mobility hubs?
 - Will you take away street parking near the new stations to get more people into transit and out of cars?
 - Will you build new turnstiles to prevent cheating on fares?
- Art
 - For murals, is there anything historical for African-Americans?

Below is a summary (by category) of the *comments* submitted:

Environmental

- My house on San Vicente Blvd falls under historic zoning; Metro should follow the same restrictions as residents when it comes to construction.
- I could not care less about parking—why are we subsidizing your private vehicle use?

Alternative Selection

- The A2 option would be the best choice.
- I would suggest starting a study for La Brea to have a BRT, preferably with a dedicated bus lane in the middle. This could push for a car-ban all along Hollywood Blvd, similar to 14th street in New York.
- I prefer alignment A (San Vicente) all the way!
- Alignment A2 seems like it would be a fantastic way to connect destinations in WeHo with the transit system. It's imperative, though, that this is accompanied by upzoning, reducing parking minimums and creating more walkable communities.
- Any above ground rail system on San Vicente will cut our Carthay Circle in half. It will diminish our physical continuity, bring noise, remove part of our community greenery, serenity, and "small town" feel that we cherish in the middle of our sprawling city. Historic (HPOZ) neighborhood residents wish to keep their neighborhood intact.

Transit-oriented Communities

- We need more density around stations! Home owners will whine but us renters desperately need transit-oriented options.

Other

- Stations
 - I suggest that a small entrance be installed underground to cross Hollywood Blvd.
 - All stations need to be ADA compliant—no excuses.
 - Please protect bike storage; not comfortable leaving my bike chained.
- Rail stops
 - Ensure that there are less than 6-minute headways on all rail lines!



Meeting 3

Date: October 26, 2019

Location: Virginia Road Elementary School

Attendees: 35

Question cards submitted: 19

Comment cards submitted: 2

Total comments (post-it notes) submitted on two feedback boards: 10

Media:

Elected officials and/or representatives:

1. West Hollywood City Councilmember Lindsey Horvath
2. Sonia Lopez, Senior Field Representative, Office of California State Senator Holly Mitchell

Below is a summary (by category) of the questions submitted:

Environmental

- What are the top three things that will impact the route decision?
- How will traffic be affected?
- What is the role of the public during the environmental process next year?

Alternative Selection

- What is the most supported alternative line option based on current feedback?
- Which sections will be underground, at-grade or aerial?
- Have the purple line extensions planned for/incorporated a connection to the CNE?
- Is it possible for the project to be built in phases; phase 1 connecting to the purple line beginning in 2021-22 to be ready before the Olympics, and phase 2 connecting to the red line.
- Why was the Pico – San Vicente stop at mid-town not considered as a station stop? There is no shopping center at Olympic – San Vicente and connections to BBB #7 bus.

Transit-oriented Communities

- Will any existing home be destroyed to make way for railway?
- Will zoning laws be changed to permit density building (i.e. 5-story apartment complex)
- How will VMT (vehicle miles traveled) change the environmental review of transit projects? Will this be the first Metro project that uses VMT instead of LOS?

Early Project Delivery

- How long is it going to take to finish the project?
- Why is the CNE projected to take longer to build than the Expo?
- What is the timeframe for the five options?
- Unfortunately, the Metro boards current plans do not call for construction to even begin until 2041. This does not focus on the underserved communities and a pathway to travel to work and more. Do we really want additional generations or minority residents to be denied full access to LA's economic and cultural life because they can't travel easily?
- What would the accelerated timeline be?

Other

- Stations
 - Would the Hollywood Bowl station only operate during events?

Below is a summary (by category) of the *comments* submitted:

Alternative Selection

- Most of the focus in this effort seems to be building the train lines. As I see, making it easier for riders to use connecting buses (better/larger shelters, bus hubs, easier to quickly load/unload bikes) might make the train alignment choices easier, faster and more user friendly. I believe we need to retrain riders to use train/bus combinations.
- Alignment A2 is a winner, providing access to the Beverly Center, Farmer's Market, LACMA and more.
- Strongly suggest the San Vicente route, above ground on the San Vicente portion. Keep cost down by using current median.
- Do not use Adams Blvd. as a stop; use Washington Blvd. instead.
- Could you combine the CNE with a WeHo streetcar to capture both regional and local trips? Perhaps the budget savings on a more direct route (options C or D) could be used to fund the streetcar. Perth, Australia, is looking to use "Autonomous-rail rapid transit" (ART) to build light-rail-like capacity and ride quality for the price of BRT! Perhaps this technology can be used for a WeHo streetcar.

Transit-oriented Communities

- Displacement of lower income residents for builders to take advantage of convenient travel for middle and upper class.

Early Project Delivery

- Accelerate construction and start by the end of 2021.



Meeting 4

Date: October 29, 2019

Location: Rosewood Avenue
Elementary School

Attendees: 39

Question cards submitted: 14

Comment cards submitted: 10

Total comments (post-it notes)

submitted on two feedback

boards: 18

Media:

Elected officials and/or representatives:

1. West Hollywood City Councilmember Lindsey Horvath
2. Jay Greenstein, Chief Field and Transportation Deputy, Office of LA City Councilmember Paul Koretz

Below is a summary (by category) of the *questions* submitted:

Environmental

- What has Metro's process been in terms of partnering with planning and HPOZ's to determine the impact of alignments A, B and C on Carthay Circle?
- What acknowledgement and consideration is being given to the impacts of alignments A, B and C on Carthay Circle, which is a historic, residential community?
- Regarding land use, have the percentages of residential areas directly impacted by the various alignments been calculated?
- What will you be able to do to minimize disruption during construction?
- What are the impacts of underground construction to nearby properties (i.e. access, noise, vibrations, pollution, debris, traffic, etc.)?
- I am a HPOZ Carthay Circle resident. A decade ago San Vicente underwent a "Flood Zone" improvement costing millions to the taxpayer, including removing median trees, crating, having arborists care for trees—some over 100 years old—by putting transit underground, how will this impact flood draining, does it negate?
- What measures will be taken for protecting HPOZ residential areas, Carthay Circle in particular.

Alternative Selection

- Where will the rail be above and below ground?
- How does an alignment on San Vicente "preserve the character" of the historic Carthay Circle community or respect the protections of the HPOZ?
- This project is a critical link in our rail network. If the La Brea alternative is chosen, will West Hollywood still support this project?
- How many people drive into Beverly Hills and Century City who live in Mid City and WeHo who could be served by this project?
- How would the light rail stations connect to subway stations?
- What is the likelihood of the line being above ground?

Transit-oriented Communities

- Will homes and businesses be condemned? What type of businesses will go in stations?

Early Project Delivery

- Will the CNE be operational in time for the Olympics?

Other

- Rail stops
 - How often will trains run?
- Council
 - What is councilman Koretz's view on the alignments directly impacting the Carthay Circle historic community?

- Outreach
 - In terms of community outreach, what has the process been for the notice of meetings? Carthay Circle residents haven't been noticed yet and the top 3 alignments directly bisect our historic residential community.
 - Why hasn't there been a meeting in Carthay Circle?
- Art
 - How can I get involved in Metro art projects?

Below is a summary (by category) of the *comments* submitted:

Environmental

- HPOZ charm of neighborhood above ground train would ruin appearance of San Vicente. Underground utilities buried will be impacted. These are concerns of most of the residents of Carthay Circle, the same as those of WeHo who apparently do not want this eye sore in "their" tolerant community but would benefit from its commerce.

Alternative Selection

- Extending plans to Hollywood Bowl sound smart.
- Option A2 looks like the most versatile option, but the require funding is concerning. Option A or A1 would be a great 2nd best option, especially for WeHo residents and workers.
- I support the project, specifically the A, A1 and A2 routes. My concern is regarding to use of at-grade track on San Vicente between Olympic and Wilshire; for many reasons I hope that segment would be underground.
- Please choose alignments B or C. La Brea is likely better, but Fairfax works as well. I support elevated alignments if it saves money, and I think the views from the train would be incredible.
- The top three alignments threaten to critically impact the historic, residential/Carthay community. This makes me think of the Boyle Heights community that was forever changed by infrastructure, freeways bisecting that historic community. Communities can be destroyed by these large transportation projects.
- La Cienega has businesses, restaurants, and a school that would be accessible! Nothing on San Vicente!
- What is important to me and the community that I live in is the congestion you will bring by building A1 or A2 above ground (which I am totally against) or below ground. Between the station and the parking, you destroy the atmosphere of WeHo that everyone is trying to get to. Have you factored in the proliferation of Uber and Lyft, which is unstoppable?
- I like the San Vicente Alternative 2; it's the option I would personally utilize the most. It seems to me that with all the money, time and effort that goes into each of these extensions, we should take advantage of an opportunity to create a line that links the most visited/lived in areas of LA rather than focus on how short the trip from A to B is.
- Options A2 and B make the most sense to me. I think it's of critical importance to connect to the Hollywood Bowl. Like a lot of Angelenos, I'm worried about gentrification, but I think that connecting our major stadiums and culture is extremely

important (The Bowl, Dodger Stadium, Getty, etc.). That could actually make a huge difference and strengthen the access to our institutions and alleviate event traffic and parking.

- Fairfax would be ideal as this is a business access and only impacts Park Ls Brea residents instead of an entire cozy HPOZ protected area.

Transit-oriented Communities

- Close Hollywood Blvd. to cars! It's already shut down so often for events.

Early Project Delivery

- This is a critical project for the future of the region. Whatever is necessary in terms of alignments, securing funding sooner, etc. – Do it! The opponents are local, but do not reflect LA's future.

IV. Social Media Feedback


Relevant Facebook Comments on Crenshaw Northern Extension – Overview Video

- **Alex Jenkins wrote:** "Wouldn't it be good if we could have a time machine, go back to perhaps the 1930's and 40's, and keep the entirety of the Los Angeles Railway and Pacific Electric, and then build up the zoning laws in LA county around them, with zoning based on proximity to LARY and PE Lines, so the closer you'd be to them, the higher you could build (so essentially TOD all around LA county)? I believe the northern extension must be accelerated to be completed by 2030."
- **Btomimatsucunard wrote:** "It'd be awesome! Tho the travel times might have been an annoyance. I looked at an old rapid transit proposal from '47, and they referenced current travel times from Santa Monica to LA as being 70 minutes. Similar travel times for Hollywood as well."
- **Alex Jenkins wrote:** "btomimatsucunard I wouldn't be surprised if part or all of the network, especially in Downtown LA and the surrounding areas would have been put in tunnel or elevated in that case Or the monorail could have been built up, that's shorten journey times massively"
- **Btomimatsucunard wrote:** "@Alex Jenkins the plan had that in it I believe but I was referencing the old Red Car system. We lost a huge opportunity for a relatively easy and cheap upgrade of the existing system."
- **Alex Jenkins wrote:** "btomimatsucunard Ah, sorry, I think I might have misunderstood you. It'd actually be good today, if the PE network, especially in Downtown, Hollywood and those areas, was put into tunnels, but as you said, it's a huge opportunity that we've lost."
- **Btomimatsucunard wrote:** "Right, if the first incarnation of the MTA or the County could have seen the opportunity we had and modernize the Red car and Yellow car systems we could have been on par with San Fran or Pittsburg with their heritage systems."

- **Alex Jenkins wrote:** “btomimatsucunard Yeah, or even something like the Stadtbahn networks in Germany. It would have been possible to create a full blown metrosystem out of them in the future if LA had gone down that route”
- **Xcelron wrote:** “I agree, but that all sounds like a dream. It'd be nice if this was a train city. It's more relaxing to be on a train, i'm on board with this.”
- **Jh Zhou wrote:** “Yeah, but with a groundbreaking date set for 2041 and expected opening in 2047. I would be 200 yrs old by then.”
- **ChariotManGaming wrote:** “That's why NYC MTA Transit is the best because it takes you anywhere in the city.”
- **Richared Le wrote:** “Thank you based Metro”
- **nintenmetro wrote:** “First off, if it goes to Hollywood/Highland, I hope you can extend it to Universal, Toluca Lake (iHeartRadio theater), and Burbank (Olive/San Fernando). Second, what's the name of the music in the background?”

Relevant Facebook Comments on Crenshaw Northern Extension – Overview YouTube Video Posted to Facebook

- **Michael Ramirez wrote:** “While a Crenshaw Northern Extension would be great how about instead of having the line meet up and terminate at Hollywood and Highland we extend it down Santa Monica Blvd through Hollywood to Echo Park and Silver Lake where it turns into Sunset and to downtown to end at Union Station instead and fill more than the gaps in West Hollywood?”
- **Paul Karaitis wrote:** “Michael Ramirez Oh, YES. If I had the \$4 billion or so it'd probably take to make that happen I'd give it in a heartbeat! Unfortunately, I don't have anything near that amount.....”
- **Kyle Remmenga wrote:** “Michael Ramirez call me crazy, go to hollywood highland since hollywood has way more people and tourist and that’s where it should go BUT add another designated line along the route you propose going from union station up sunset and tunneled parallel between sunset and santa monica to eventually meet and connect with crenshaw northern extension.”
- **Rick Russell wrote:** “Michael Ramirez a better rout would be to extend from Hollywood to the valley conecting the orange line”
- **Luis Rebolledowrote:** “Ha.....Realistically this is a proposal that will not benefit anyone in the near future. I have yet to hear any ideas that would benefit our current traffic situation. I realize planning for the future is important but what is metro doing for the now?”
- **Samantha Carroll wrote:** ““2041 groundbreaking” what’s. What’s the point of even talking about it like this now? This won’t benefit, like, anyone who lives here now?”
- **Adam G. Linder wrote:** “Samantha, HAHAHAHAHA. And here’s the problem with the entire world. ^^ screenshooting this for history books on why the kids of the future don’t have nice things.”
- **Carlos Velasco wrote:** “2041? We ain't gonna need no metro bythen”
- **Julien Jorda wrote:** “Christelle Cenatiempo Jorda Arnaud Lefay well, it's planned for 2041 ...but it's qd mm colos!”

- **Arnaud Lefay wrote:** “so you stay 10 more years??”
- **Mita Fane wrote:** “The Grove is not in West Hollywood. He needs a map”
- **Kim Walling wrote:** “No traffic congestion hassles for me, for 20+years, LA West area. Only 2block walk to 7 different Transit lines, via www.metro.net THE better way by: helping clean air, no car costs/hassles, far safer from distracted drivers, crime, +more ppl bonding! 


Meeting 1

Date: October 22, 2019

Location: Plummer Park

Questions submitted:

1. Will LA City change zoning of R1 lots where above or below-grade rail lines run? Has this happened with other lines, such as Expo?
2. Where is WeHo with helping the ½ mile to 1 mile...residents need to travel to stations (i.e. scooter, e-bike)?
3. Instead of a local sales tax increase, why aren't the state of California and the Federal government DOT funds being issued for funding for the needed construction of the CNE line? Sales tax is a very regressive measure!
4. What is Metro doing for the Leimert Park community and other areas as far as gentrification issues and businesses being affected?
5. How can the public make an informed decision on a route for the Crenshaw extension without knowing the contents of the related transit plans, including tenant protections and upzoning?
6. Is the City of LA transit plan upzoning along the routes responsible for reducing ridership?
7. Why can't the Crenshaw line connect to the Purple line?
8. If you have above ground on Santa Monica Blvd. or any other street, where would it be? In the middle of the street? Will that take away traffic lanes?
9. Would you eliminate car lanes altogether on San Vicente if that route is chosen?
10. Why not study the potential increase in ridership by building parking garages at stations?
11. Is Metro surveying riders of the 105, 217, 780, 218, 212 and other N-5 routes to see what alignments they prefer, since they are the Angelenos currently traveling N-5 on this corridor?
12. If the alignment is on La Cienega that would be the City of LA, thus less costly to WeHo; will the City of LA support that development?
13. Does Metro offer incentives to cities to implement plans for pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the vicinity of stations?
14. Who decides which route will be completed?
15. Does Metro have any opinions they can share regarding the recent findings of the City of WeHo funding sources, which could be used to accelerate the project?

- 
16. Explain how EIFD special taxing district would work to provide more money to accelerate the WeHo connection? Are you expecting property owners to pay even more for the budget?
 17. Could a BRT and rail option be considered under the current scope (i.e. a pairing of option C and a BRT on San Vicente)?
 18. Can you describe the operating costs between option A2 and C?
 19. When does the money need to be in place to be completed by 2028?
 20. Is it true that the San Vicente/Hybrid alignment will be significantly quicker than riding in surface traffic?
 21. Have there been other cities with as strong a distinctive personality/character that has gotten Metro, and has there been any noticeable change to the town?
 22. Environmental impacts are what decide whether the line in WeHo is about or underground, but what about what many residents want and what the WeHo city council said that it must be underground?
 23. Why can't the Crenshaw line end at Wilshire with a station at Crenshaw and Wilshire?
 24. When preserving HPOZ, will you go underground only (i.e. San Vicente)?
 25. How do we prevent displacement of residents and more gentrification?
 26. Will LA City change R1 zoning on lots bordering or near new Metro lines? Has this happened with other existing rail lines, like Expo? R1 to R3 would support property value.

Comments submitted:

1. I support the A2 Hybrid route, and greatly oppose the other routes.
2. Safety and environmental factors need to be taken into consideration such as people (particularly children and elderly) being subjected to drugs and smoking around the stations, safety hazards like nonworking elevators, and uncleaned train stations.
3. I want the train near my house so we can get more places.
4. I love this project and wish I could ride the line today.
5. A solution to resolve a "sharp right" turn issue—from Fairfax onto Santa Monica Blvd—is to bring the train onto the street level—north of Melrose. The LRT train could then run in the center median of Fairfax, then make a sharp right (at-grade) onto Santa Monica Blvd, continue at-grade.
6. There are many Metro park and ride lots that were placed there for easy commutes and to have a cleaner environment. Metro has decided to charge \$3/day; now the lots are empty and LAX workers are affected. Rates of \$3 do not seem to work, especially with no security onsite to monitor vehicle safety, vandalism and theft.
7. Allocate funding to keep trains clean and tidy.
8. The best option is to complete the Crenshaw line to Wilshire.
9. I like A2 for access to LACMA, Grove, CBS, Cedars-Sinai, Beverly Center, WeHo Library, etc. Overhead would reduce traffic density and free up narrow crowded streets and avoid pedestrian/traffic injuries.
10. I very much like the Hybrid option A2, as this will provide the greatest coverage for access to key community sites (i.e. Grove, Cedars-Sinai, CBS, WeHo Library, rec. center and Beverly Center). Provides western most course, enabling the line to go down middle of Santa Monica Blvd.



11. I support the San Vicente Hybrid option. As a gig food courier, it helps me (and my colleagues) conduct (our) business effectively and safely. The San Vicente Hybrid option serves destinations residents and tourists like to go to (The Grove, Beverly Center, San Vicente/Santa Monica Blvd, WeHo Gateway and Hollywood/Highland). I would like to see more consideration toward adding a station on La Cienega/Santa Monica Blvd and a station at the Hollywood Bowl. I would also like Metro to consider another study to extend the Crenshaw line north of the Hollywood Bowl to Downtown Burbank or Burbank Airport via Barham Blvd, Olive Ave, or Hollywood Way; this can potentially alleviate traffic on Burham Blvd during Hollywood Bowl events.
12. I believe the alternative "C" (Fairfax Ave) makes most sense because Fairfax Ave has the most points of interest (Museums, La Brea Tar Pits, 3rd Street Farmer's Market, The Grove, Fairfax High School, etc.) Fairfax Ave also has the most density.
13. For the "sharp right" turn from Fairfax onto Santa Monica Blvd, it is possible by bringing the LRT onto the street level. The LRT can run in the center median of Fairfax Ave, then proceed east in the center of Santa Monica Blvd.
14. I vote for Option A; this alternative is the best as it goes to the City Library and park, the main WeHo nightlife area, the Sherriff station and Pride/Halloween events.
15. I vote for underground only—aerial is ugly and at-grade makes traffic worse.
16. Do not accelerate the timeline; do it right and don't rush!
17. I support the A2 Hybrid route; I greatly oppose the other routes and plan to fight them along with my neighbors and HPOZ community.
18. As a resident of WeHo, I prefer the Hybrid option because it covers more dense areas (i.e. The Grove, Beverly Center, Cedars-Sinai, WeHo entertainment area and Pacific Design Center).
19. If WeHo and LA City pursue an EIFD, we should pursue a network concept consisting of option C and BRT on Sam Vicente from Sunset to Pico/Rimpau Transit Center. Bus lanes can be implemented on streets like Sunset, Fairfax, La Cienega, Beverly and 3rd Street. We need an actual network improvement in the area, not a Disneyland circulator train (A2).
20. The response to the question "Why can't the Crenshaw line go to the Purple line/Wilshire Blvd was inadequate! The stop at Crenshaw/Wilshire would work as a transfer point to the Purple line East and West. This would bring passengers to the West and connect with new northern routes through WeHo.
21. Please stay off San Vicente from Pico to Wilshire; it is only residential and would destroy historical communities.
22. I'm a homeowner in the Miracle Mile HPOZ and I'm very excited about these proposed plans! Especially the portion that runs along San Vicente, whether or not it's above ground. Right now, it's noisy, polluted and always jammed with cars and terrible for pedestrians.
23. Please complete the project in phases, at least up to Wilshire, to encourage new ridership and earn more money through fees to fund the remaining phases.
24. Please improve your app, and GPS sync with Google Maps; this is the primary reason why young people find it so frustrating to "Go Metro."
25. I am extremely pleased to see the addition of the A2 Hybrid route. I definitely prefer that alignment as it serves the community and its largest employers and attractions



(such as museums on Wilshire, Farmer's Market, Grove and Beverly Center). I also support the extension to the Hollywood Bowl.

26. I believe the northern extension must be accelerated to be completed by 2030.
27. I am thrilled that there is preference for the San Vicente/La Cienega because that is way more effective and needed than moving farther east.
28. San Vicente ultimately would be the absolute best for WeHo and LA residents visiting WeHo. Why? The vast majority love visiting the Rainbow District/Gayborhood; it is one of the largest collections in the world for LGBT activities, bars and shops and I am constantly being asked on the buses on Santa Monica Blvd how to get to the Rainbow District. That is the shining star of our wonderful city; anything else (such as routes B and C) would be an extreme mistake and misuse of funds.
29. Thank you so much for all your incredible work! WeHo is amazing and I try to tell everyone I know to use Metro because it doesn't get enough credit and it is wonderful.
30. It is important to guarantee frequent service—minimum of every 20 minutes.
31. Location of stations is key—need to be convenient to destinations.
32. La Brea makes for a better transit network. People don't just want to go to all the destinations in WeHo, they want to move around LA efficiently. If we don't make a functional network, we won't get people out of cars. La Brea, at half the cost, half the travel time, and the same ridership, is the more responsible choice. Just build a busway down Santa Monica Blvd.


Meeting 2

Date: October 24, 2019

Location: Wilshire Crest Elementary School

Questions submitted:

1. Is Metro seriously contemplating a below-ground alternative that our city council assured us its approval depended on? West Hollywood West residents are concerned that an at-grade or aerial route on a San Vicente alignment north of Beverly would divide our neighborhood, run in front of homes on San Vicente and interfere with the Halloween and Pride festivals.
2. To increase the usefulness of the CNEP, will the lights in the area be revised/increased to synchronize with the rail line?
3. Is the \$2 billion the max that is needed?
4. Has Metro written to all property owners on San Vicente to inform them of meeting dates and route options? Most properties are not owner occupied. How did you notify property owners along San Vicente?
5. How have you engaged with non-English speaking commuties?
6. Have you proactively engaged with young people/children? They will be the ones benefiting the most.
7. Does the study account for signal prioritization for at-grade?
8. Will stations be designed to LEED standards or include solar power?
9. Will stations include bicycle storage and/or mobility hubs?
10. Can more outreach be done like radio, signage, etc.
11. What determines where the line is above/below ground?
12. Employment of communities involved?
13. Why doesn't Crenshaw line connect at Crenshaw/Wilshire?
14. For murals, is there anything historical for African-Americans?
15. How does the ridership of this line compare to other existing and planned Metro lines?
16. How many Metro staff members took alternative transit modes (i.e. not driving) to get here today?
17. Could safety improvements for people walking to future stations be included in the project?
18. If Metro runs up Fairfax, is there an opportunity to improve pedestrian crossing/safety at the Fairfax asterisk? Would studies be performed?
19. How would EIFD be decided in LA? Is this a voter decision to divert tax revenue away from general fund?
20. How soon could this extension open if the funding was found by the local communities? What would be the advanced/expedited timeline?
21. Would the Hollywood Bowl station/stop reduce car traffic on Highland?
22. Does Metro have a list of artists that they would consider using to commission work and how will they choose them?
23. How many of Metro's rail projects were fully funded at this stage? Would this be competitive for State and Federal grants?
24. Will you take away street parking near the new stations to get more people into transit and out of cars?
25. Will you build new turnstiles to prevent cheating on fares?

- 
26. What measures is Metro (not West Hollywood) taking to secure the funding required to expedite the project?
 27. What is being done to ensure Crenshaw line trains will have signal preemption when operating at-grade (to avoid the frustrating wait times Expo line riders experience in DTLA)?


Comments submitted:

1. My house on San Vicente Blvd falls under historic zoning; Metro should follow the same restrictions as residents when it comes to construction.
2. Please install Chicago/New York style entrances. I take the 780 to Hollywood and Western B line to the 720, and have lost too many connections because I have to wait almost a minute to cross the street. It adds 10-15 minutes to my commute, and buses slow down after rush hour. I suggest that a small entrance be installed underground to cross Hollywood Blvd.
3. The A2 option would be the best choice. Having a heavy-rail option would be a better long-term solution. La Brea (212/312) is underserved. I would suggest to start a study for La Brea to have a BRT, preferably with a dedicated bus lane in the middle. This could push for a car-ban all along Hollywood Blvd, similar to 14th street in New York. Make no unnecessary reductions to project due to neighborhood pressure; this project is crucial to the area.
4. NIMBY's are always the loudest; ignore them. For every NIMBY, there are 10 NIMBY's who couldn't attend or didn't feel comfortable speaking up—I'm tired of angry property owners yelling and misbehaving
5. We need more density around stations! Home owners will whine but us renters desperately need transit-oriented options.
6. All stations need to be ADA compliant—no excuses.
7. Please protect bike storage; not comfortable leaving my bike chained.
8. I could not care less about parking—why are we subsidizing your private vehicle use?
9. I prefer alignment A (San Vicente) all the way!
10. Alignment A2 seems like it would be a fantastic way to connect destinations in WeHo with the transit system. It's imperative, though, that this is accompanied by upzoning, reducing parking minimums and creating more walkable communities. Also, ensure that there are less than 6-minute headways on all rail lines!
11. I live in historic Carthay Circle, which was built as its own small community—1926 movie theater, market, park, school, gas station, medical offices and underground utility lines. Any above ground rail system on San Vicente will cut our Carthay Circle in half. It will diminish our physical continuity, bring noise, remove part of our community greenery, serenity, and “small town” feel that we cherish in the middle of our sprawling city. The above ground rail line on Exposition/Jefferson did cut that neighborhood in half; that result is unfortunate. Historic (HPOZ) neighborhood residents wish to keep their neighborhood intact.

Meeting 3

Date: October 26, 2019

Location: Virginia Road Elementary School



Questions submitted:

1. How long is it going to take to finish the project?
2. What is the most supported alternative line option based on current feedback? Is there any effort to get more large-scale feedback from people who aren't at these meetings?
3. How will VMT (vehicle miles traveled) change the environmental review of transit projects? Will this be the first Metro project that uses VMT instead of LOS?
4. Which sections will be underground, at-grade or aerial?
5. What are the top three things that will impact the route decision?
6. Why is the CNE projected to take longer to build than the Expo?
7. What is the timeframe for the five options?
8. How much of the alignment will be underground?
9. Have the purple line extensions planned for/incorporated a connection to the CNE?
10. Will any existing home be destroyed to make way for railway?
11. How will traffic be affected?
12. Will zoning laws be changed to permit density building (i.e. 5-story apartment complex)
13. Is it possible for the project to be built in phases; phase 1 connecting to the purple line beginning in 2021-22 to be ready before the Olympics, and phase 2 connecting to the red line.
14. Would the Hollywood Bowl station only operate during events?
15. What is the role of the public during the environmental process next year?
16. Unfortunately, the Metro boards current plans do not call for construction to even begin until 2041. This does not focus on the underserved communities and a pathway to travel to work and more. Do we really want additional generations or minority residents to be denied full access to LA's economic and cultural life because they can't travel easily?
17. What would the accelerated timeline be?
18. Why was the Pico – San Vicente stop at mid-town not considered as a station stop? There is no shopping center at Olympic – San Vicente and connections to BBB #7 bus.

Comments submitted:

1. Most of the focus in this effort seems to be building the train lines. As I see, making it easier for riders to use connecting buses (better/larger shelters, bus hubs, easier to quickly load/unload bikes) might make the train alignment choices easier, faster and more user friendly. I believe we need to retrain riders to use train/bus combinations.
2. Displacement of lower income residents for builders to take advantage of convenient travel for middle and upper class.
3. Alignment A2 is a winner, providing access to the Beverly Center, Farmer's Market, LACMA and more.
4. Strongly suggest the San Vicente route, above ground on the San Vicente portion. Keep cost down by using current median.
5. Do not use Adams Blvd. as a stop; use Washington Blvd. instead.
6. Accelerate construction and start by the end of 2021.
7. Could you combine the CNE with a WeHo streetcar to capture both regional and local trips? Perhaps the budget savings on a more direct route (options C or D) could be



used to fund the streetcar. Perth, Australia, is looking to use “Autonomous-rail rapid transit” (ART) to build light-rail-like capacity and ride quality for the price of BRT! Perhaps this technology can be used for a WeHo streetcar.


Meeting 4

Date: October 29, 2019

Location: Rosewood Avenue Elementary School

Questions submitted:

1. Will homes and businesses be condemned? What type of businesses will go in stations?
2. Where will the rail be above and below ground?
3. How often will trains run?
4. What has Metro's process been in terms of partnering with planning and HPOZ's to determine the impact of alignments A, B and C on Carthay Circle?
5. What is councilman Koretz's view on the alignments directly impacting the Carthay Circle historic community?
6. How does an alignment on San Vicente "preserve the character" of the historic Carthay Circle community or respect the protections of the HPOZ?
7. In terms of community outreach, what has the process been for the notice of meetings? Carthay Circle residents haven't been noticed yet and the top 3 alignments directly bisect our historic residential community.
8. What acknowledgement and consideration is being given to the impacts of alignments A, B and C on Carthay Circle, which is a historic, residential community? Carthay elementary is just two blocks away from the proposed alignments on San Vicente.
9. Regarding land use, have the percentages of residential areas directly impacted by the various alignments been calculated?
10. What will you be able to do to minimize disruption during construction?
11. What are the impacts of underground construction to nearby properties (i.e. access, noise, vibrations, pollution, debris, traffic, etc.)?
12. This project is a critical link in our rail network. If the La Brea alternative is chosen, will West Hollywood still support this project?
13. How many people drive into Beverly Hills and Century City who live in Mid City and WeHo who could be served by this project?
14. How would the light rail stations connect to subway stations?
15. What is the likelihood of the line being above ground?
16. Why hasn't there been a meeting in Carthay Circle? Is a surface line splitting Historic Carthay off the table?
17. I am a HPOZ Carthay Circle resident. A decade ago San Vicente underwent a "Flood Zone" improvement costing millions to the taxpayer, including removing median trees, crating, having arborists care for trees—some over 100 years old—by putting transit underground, how will this impact flood draining, does it negate?
18. Will the CNE be operational in time for the Olympics?
19. How can I get involved in Metro art projects?
20. What measures will be taken for protecting HPOZ residential areas, Carthay Circle in particular.
21. Why can't we have electric bikes in WeHo (i.e. Jump/bikes)?
22. Does ridership take into account huge events like Pride and Halloween in WeHo?



Comments submitted:

1. This is a critical project for the future of the region. Whatever is necessary in terms of alignments, securing funding sooner, etc. – Do it! The opponents are local, but do not reflect LA’s future.
2. Extending plans to Hollywood Bowl sound smart.
3. Option A2 looks like the most versatile option, but the require funding is concerning. Option A or A1 would be a great 2nd best option, especially for WeHo residents and workers.
4. I am grateful for the support of Metro and the City of West Hollywood.
5. Close Hollywood Blvd. to cars! It’s already shut down so often for events.
6. I support the project, specifically the A, A1 and A2 routes. My concern is regarding to use of at-grade track on San Vicente between Olympic and Wilshire; for many reasons I hope that segment would be underground.
7. Please choose alignments B or C. La Brea is likely better, but Fairfax works as well. I support elevated alignments if it saves money, and I think the views from the train would be incredible.
8. The historic Carthay Circle Theater was demolished in 1969 and it is now iconized and has been replicated at Disney California Adventure. Yet, now Metro’s top three alignments threaten to critically impact the historic, residential/Carthay community. This makes me think of the Boyle Heights community that was forever changed by infrastructure, freeways bisecting that historic community. Communities can be destroyed by these large transportation projects.
9. La Cienega has businesses, restaurants, and a school that would be accessible! Nothing on San Vicente!
10. What is important to me and the community that I live in is the congestion you will bring by building A1 or A2 above ground (which I am totally against) or below ground. Between the station and the parking, you destroy the atmosphere of WeHo that everyone is trying to get to. Have you factored in the proliferation of Uber and Lyft, which is unstoppable?
11. I like the San Vicente Alternative 2; it’s the option I would personally utilize the most. It seems to me that with all the money, time and effort that goes into each of these extensions, we should take advantage of an opportunity to create a line that links the most visited/lived in areas of LA rather than focus on how short the trip from A to B is.
12. Options A2 and B make the most sense to me. I think it’s of critical importance to connect to the Hollywood Bowl. Like a lot of Angelenos, I’m worried about gentrification, but I think that connecting our major stadiums and culture is extremely important (The Bowl, Dodger Stadium, Getty, etc.). That could actually make a huge difference and strengthen the access to our institutions and alleviate event traffic and parking.
13. HPOZ charm of neighborhood above ground train would ruin appearance of San Vicente. Underground utilities buried will be impacted. These are concerns of most of the residents of Carthay Circle, the same as those of WeHo who apparently do not want this eye sore in “their” tolerant community but would benefit from its commerce.
14. Fairfax would be ideal as this is a business access and only impacts Park Ls Brea residents instead of an entire cozy HPOZ protected area.