

East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Scoping Outreach Documentation Report

March - May 2013

Table of Contents

East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study Outreach Documentation Report.	1
Introduction	1
Background	2
Alternatives Analysis Phase	2
Environmental Clearance Phase	4
Public Participation Program Timeline At-A-Glance	5
Public Scoping Activities	5
Elected Officials Briefing	5
Public Scoping Meetings	6
Notification Activities	6
Digital Engagement Activities	9
Meeting Materials	9
Scoping Meeting Dates and Locations	10
Meeting Format	10
Open House Portion	11
Presentation Portion	11
Public Comments Portion	12
Meeting Attendance	12
Formal Comments Submission	13
Public Agency Scoping Meeting	14
Summary of Comments Received	14
Light Rail Transit	14
Maintenance Facility	16
Bus Rapid Transit	16
No Build	16
Transportation System Management	17



Sepulveda Pass Project	17
Terminus-Origination Points/Stops/Configuration	18
Alignment	18
Buses	20
Bicycles/Bike Lanes	20
Other	21

Appendix 1 - Outreach Documentation Reports for Alternatives Analysis Phase

Appendix 2 - Scoping Meeting Notification Locations Listing

Appendix 3 - Digital Engagement Reports

Appendix 4 - Scoping Meeting Materials

Appendix 5 – Scoping Meeting Sign-In Sheets

Appendix 6 – Scoping Comments Received



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study Outreach Documentation Report

Introduction

Van Nuys Boulevard is the second busiest transit corridor in the San Fernando Valley and the seventh busiest bus corridor in the Metro system. Van Nuys Boulevard continues to be thriving, energized and vibrant, connecting many people along the corridor and across the region. It incorporates places to live, shop, conduct business, attend school, work, eat, play, and worship. The people who use Van Nuys Boulevard are diverse and share common needs including the need for clean, reliable and efficient public transit.

To that end, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), and the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) and in close cooperation with the Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando, launched the “Van Nuys Boulevard Rapidway Alternatives Analysis” in June 2011; focusing on identifying various transportation alternatives to determine how best to improve transit along the Van Nuys Boulevard corridor between Ventura Boulevard and the I-210 Freeway.

This effort included a robust public participation program to inform interested stakeholders about the study and potential project alternatives related to modes, alignments and configurations being considered. Metro and the FTA will continue to elicit feedback from stakeholders regarding which alternatives make the most sense for this key east San Fernando Valley corridor throughout the study process.

Throughout the process, the planning effort follows the requirements of both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This effort will lead to a combined EIS/EIR document prepared jointly by the FTA and Metro, in close coordination with the Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando.

The public participation program has been developed to focus outreach activities and efforts around a two-phase study process:

- 1) **Alternatives Analysis Phase** – This process determines which alternatives merit further study based on the Project Purpose and Need, Objectives, Evaluation Criteria and preliminary impacts (environmental, economic, community, etc.). This phase is completed when an Alternatives Analysis (AA) Report is presented to the Metro Board of Directors and then to the Los Angeles City Council. The AA Report provides information about all alternatives that were considered, the screening process,

stakeholder comments and explains which alternatives are being moved forward for further analysis in the environmental clearance phase.

- 2) **Environmental Clearance Phase** - This phase commences when a Notice of Preparation/Notice of Intent is issued alerting the public that an Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) will be prepared. There are three key milestones in this phase:
 - a. **Scoping** - As part of the noticing requirements, federal and state laws require that the public have an opportunity to provide comments on the “scope” of the DEIS/R and issues to consider during the analysis.
 - b. **Draft EIS/EIR (DEIS/R) review and comment** – During this milestone, a Notice of Availability/Notice of Completion is issued alerting the public that the DEIS/R is available for public review and comment during a designated public comment period. During this phase, the public participation program ensures that stakeholders know where they can access and review the DEIS/R, when public hearings will take place and how to provide formal comments. At the conclusion of this phase Metro, with input from the Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando, will be asked to select a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). The Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando will be asked to concur with the Metro Board action.
 - c. **Final EIS/EIR (FEIS/R)** – During this milestone, all comments received during the DEIS/R comment period are reviewed and responded to in the Final EIS/R. Additional engineering and environmental analysis on the LPA may be completed. At this point, the Metro Board will be asked to consider certifying the document, and the FTA will be asked to issue a Record of Decision (ROD). The combined actions will signal the end of environmental review of the project, at which point the approved project will proceed into the pre-construction, final design, and construction procurement phase.

Background

Alternatives Analysis Phase

The first key milestone in the public participation program culminated in the Winter of 2012/2013 with the publication and circulation of an AA Report. During the AA, Metro, and



the FTA, in close coordination with the Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando, launched three rounds of community meetings held in October 2011, April/May 2012 and October 2012. These are fully documented in separate *Outreach Documentation Reports* (Executive Summaries of these reports are included in Appendix 1).

The “East San Fernando Valley North/South Rapidways Study” was first introduced to interested stakeholders in a series of community meetings held October 26, 27 and 28, 2011. Based on an analysis of comments received, the project team concluded that it was necessary to expand the study area and examine the possibility that Sepulveda Boulevard may present a viable option for a new north-south transit system. Additionally, comments suggested that the study area be expanded to evaluate the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station as a potential northern terminus/origination point.

In April 2012, after further analysis and in consideration of comments at the October 2011 public meetings, Metro expanded the study area to include Sepulveda Bl as an alternative to Van Nuys Bl, and the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station as an alternate northern origination/terminus point.

In October 2012, Metro, in close coordination with the Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando, hosted a third round of four community meetings to present the preliminary results of the study that narrowed the numerous early concepts to eight viable options.

In January 2013, to recognize the expanded study area and to eliminate confusion, the Metro Board changed the project’s name from the East San Fernando Valley North/South Rapidways, to the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor. The expanded study area was reintroduced to stakeholders during a second set of four community meetings held April 12, 17, 18, and May 1, 2012.

After significant analysis and community input, an Alternatives Analysis Report recommended that four Alternatives be further studied through the preparation of an EIS/R. These include two required alternatives – No Build and Transportation System Management (TSM) – and two build alternatives –Light Rail Transit (LRT) and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). It should be noted that for the build alternatives, there may be multiple design/configuration options.

In January 2013, the Metro Board received the AA Report that identified the alternatives being recommended for further analysis in the environmental clearance phase. In February 2013, the AA Report was presented to the Los Angeles City Council.

Environmental Clearance Phase

Opportunities for public participation are required throughout the environmental clearance phase at key milestones. As discussed above, the first major milestone during the environmental review process begins with “Scoping.” During the scoping period, stakeholders had various opportunities to provide input on the issues they felt should be addressed in the Draft EIS/R. The scoping period officially started on March 1, 2013, when the FTA issued a Notice of Intent (NOI) and Metro issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP). The public scoping period ended on May 6, 2013.

This report documents all community outreach activities that were completed during the scoping period to ensure that the public, stakeholders and agencies had an opportunity to learn about the study and comment on the scope of the Draft EIS/R. The following key activities were completed as part of the public participation program:

- Scoping Meeting Notification Activities
- Digital Engagement Activities
- Elected Officials Briefing
- Four Public Scoping Meetings
- One Interagency Scoping Meeting

This report summarizes comments received during the scoping period. During this timeframe, 258 formal comments were received by Metro via US Mail, Email, Fax, Facebook (using the “scoping comments” app), and Twitter (using #EastSFVscoping) and at the four public scoping meetings.

Public Participation Program Timeline At-A-Glance

Timeline	Public Participation Milestone	Key Information Presented
October 2011	3 community meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Van Nuys Rapidway Study introduced - Numerous options being considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mode ▪ Alignment ▪ Configuration
April 2012	4 community meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expanded study area introduced to include Sepulveda and the City of San Fernando
October 2012	4 community meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alternatives narrowed down to eight (8) - Streetcar option eliminated
December 2012	Metro Board of Directors Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alternatives Analysis Report completed and alternatives recommended
February 2013	Los Angeles City Council Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alternatives Analysis Report received and alternatives recommended
March 2013	4 public + 1 Agency scoping meetings for DEIS/R	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Four (4) Alternatives presented - Public Comments received through May 6, 2013

Public Scoping Activities

Elected Officials Briefing

In advance of the March 2013 public scoping meetings, a briefing was held on March 8, 2013 at the Van Nuys Civic Center to update staff of elected offices representing the study area. Metro re-introduced the project to the 12 staff members in attendance and presented the four alternatives under consideration. Elected officials' staff members in attendance welcomed improved public transit opportunities in the San Fernando Valley and offered their comments on the project and study process. They agreed to help spread the word regarding the upcoming meetings to their constituents, on their websites, at their district offices, and

via their e-mail distribution and social media channels. Staff from the following offices attended the Elected Officials Briefing:

- Los Angeles County Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
- Los Angeles City Councilman Tom LaBonge
- Los Angeles City Councilman Paul Koretz
- Los Angeles City Councilman Paul Krekorian
- California State Senator Alex Padilla
- California State Assemblyman Raul Bocanegra
- California State Assemblyman Bob Bloomfield
- U.S. Congressman Tony Cardenas
- Los Angeles Unified School District Board Member Nury Martinez
- Los Angeles Unified School District Board Member Tamar Galatzan

Public Scoping Meetings

Notification Activities

Metro completed the following activities in an effort to inform study area stakeholders that a NOI/NOP had been issued for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study and that scoping meetings would be held on March 16, 19, 21 and 27, 2013, noting that the March 21 meeting would be live-streamed on the internet and available for viewing “on-demand” following the meeting for those not able to attend in-person.

- Sending scoping meeting information via US Mail to a database of 700+ recipients.
- Distributing more than 3,000 Take-One brochures with meeting and study information to legislative offices, schools, senior centers, recreation/community centers, and libraries.
- Distributing 400 flyers during Parent-Teacher night at Arleta High School.
- Delivering 300 flyers, as requested, to the Arleta Neighborhood Council for distribution among members.
- Distributing more than 10,000 Take-One brochures on-board public transit vehicles.

- Delivering 4,000 Take-One brochures door-to-door to targeted business locations along the northern area of Van Nuys Boulevard in the Arleta and Pacoima communities.
- Sharing project and meeting information on Metro's blog *The Source*.
- Purchasing display advertisements in the *Los Angeles Daily News* and *La Opinion* newspapers.
- Purchasing ad space on Facebook targeted to east San Fernando Valley users.
- Displaying 176 posters at study area senior centers, recreation centers, government buildings and libraries.
- Issuing a press release announcing the scoping meetings to local and regional print, broadcast and online media outlets.

Delivering eight eblasts with meeting and study information to the 700+ database of contacts on multiple dates leading up to the meetings. Eblasts were delivered on:

- March 1, 2013 - opened by 29.9% of recipients
- March 5, 2013 - opened by 23.3% of recipients
- March 8, 2013 - opened by 20.3% of recipients
- March 14, 2013 - opened by 25.8% of recipients
- March 18, 2013 - opened by 25.1% of recipients
- March 20, 2013 - opened by 21.1% of recipients
- March 26, 2013 - opened by 22.4% of recipients
- April 2, 2013 - opened by 28% of recipients
- April 23, 2013 - opened by 25.2% of recipients
- May 3, 2013 - opened by 21.1% of recipients
- Posting meeting information in the *Events* section on the project Facebook page.
- Tweeting updates with meeting schedules and reminders on Twitter.
- Announcing meeting dates and locations at various community gatherings of neighborhood councils, homeowner associations, business groups, non-profit organizations and others. Announcements were made to:
 - Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council – February 11, 2013

- Granada Hills South Neighborhood Council – February 12, 2013
- Sun Valley Area Neighborhood Council – February 12, 2013
- Van Nuys Neighborhood Council – February 13, 2013
- Pacoima Beautiful – February 20, 2013
- Granada Hills North Neighborhood Council, February 25, 2013
- Encino Neighborhood Council – February 27, 2013
- Sylmar Neighborhood Council – February 28, 2013
- Panorama Neighborhood Council – February 28, 2013
- San Fernando City Council – March 4, 2013
- Metro San Fernando Valley Service Council – March 6, 2013
- Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association - March 20, 2013
- Valley Economic Alliance – April 25, 2013
- Transit Coalition – April 25, 2013
- Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council – May 13, 2013
- Coordinating with other groups/organizations to share study and scoping meeting information within their networks. Groups that shared project and meeting information included:
 - Valley Industry & Commerce Association
 - Transit Coalition
 - East San Fernando Valley Transit Coalition
 - Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association

It is important to note that all noticing communications for the scoping meetings were conducted in English and Spanish. Collateral materials (brochures, flyers, emails, advertisements, and posters) were made available in both languages.

Appendix 2 of this Report lists all the locations where notification materials were dropped, distributed and/or posted. It also lists the groups that Metro communicated with regarding the study process and announcements for scoping meetings.

Digital Engagement Activities

The manner in which we receive information and communicate today has changed dramatically. We are connected to information 24 hours a day – seven days a week and we communicate continuously through email, text and social media applications on our smart phones and other portable devices.

As part of the public participation program, Metro embraced this new way of communication and has shared important information with its stakeholders using digital engagement platforms. As part of the study process, a Facebook page was established (www.facebook.com/eastsfvtransit) that contains a wealth of information related to this study, as well as other relevant projects, events or articles that highlight regional mobility and public transit. Additionally, Twitter @eastsfvtransit showcases links and tweets regarding this study as well as other relevant information.

During the scoping period, Metro established procedures to receive official scoping comments via Facebook and Twitter, thereby broadening public participation opportunities. On Facebook, an application was used to receive scoping comments to be included as part of the official documentation for the Draft EIS/R process. The “app” was housed within the study Facebook page and easily accessible via a clearly marked “submit official comments” tab on the page’s “timeline.” During the scoping period, 76 comments were received via Facebook.

Additionally, Metro established an official hashtag for receiving official comments from Twitter followers. By including #EastSFVscoping in their tweets, stakeholders ensured their comments were included in the official record. A total of 16 comments were received via Twitter. Appendix 3 of this Report includes a summary of all digital engagement efforts that have been implemented to support the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project.

Meeting Materials

For the four scoping meetings, Metro created bilingual (English/Spanish) materials to inform, educate and engage stakeholders. The material provided background on the project alternatives, information on the scoping workshop format and avenues for stakeholders to provide their official comments regarding ideas and suggestions for Metro’s consideration in preparing the Draft EIS/R:

- Fact Sheet
- Posters
- Flyers

- Contact card
- Comment Sheet
- Welcome Road Map
- PowerPoint Presentation to provide an overview of the project
- Frequently Asked Questions
- Media Kits
- Display Boards

Copies of all materials can be found in Appendix 4 of this Report.

Scoping Meeting Dates and Locations

Four meetings were held during the scoping period:

Saturday, March 16, 2013, 10am-12pm

Panorama High School
8015 Van Nuys Bl
Panorama City, CA 91402

Tuesday, March 19, 2013, 6-8pm

The City of San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
208 Park Av
San Fernando, CA 91340

Thursday, March 21, 2013, 6-8pm

Arleta High School
14200 Van Nuys Bl
Arleta, CA 91331

Wednesday, March 27, 2013, 4-6pm

Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center
6262 Van Nuys Bl
Van Nuys, CA 91401

Meeting Format

Each scoping meeting featured an open house portion during the initial half-hour of the meeting, followed by a brief overview presentation by Metro representatives. The scoping

meeting was then opened to stakeholders to provide formal scoping comments that were transcribed by a certified court reporter.

Open House Portion

During the open house portion of the scoping meeting, various information stations were arranged around the room. Each station displayed information boards sharing various technical aspects of the study process, alternatives under consideration, and other information provided by Metro. Each station was staffed by a member of the study team to answer questions and discuss study aspects one-on-one with stakeholders. Spanish-language interpreters were available to share information and translate all discussions with study team members. Stations included:

- **Sign-in/Registration**
- **Environmental Review Process** –What is an EIS/EIR? How do my comments help shape the Project?
- **Alternatives Under Consideration** – What are the four Alternatives being considered? What should be considered in the EIS/EIR?
- **Public Transit Routes** – What are the public transit routes that currently operate in the San Fernando Valley? Where can I get schedules and information? How will these routes be affected if a project is built?
- **Next Steps**– What this Project could mean for the community? What are the next study process milestones?
- **Comments** – Allowed participants to share their comments via:
 - Written on comment forms
 - Verbally to a certified court reporter

Presentation Portion

During this portion of the scoping meeting, a brief project overview was provided to meeting participants by Metro staff that explained the purpose and need for the project, the study process and study area, information on the various alternatives being considered and next steps in the study process. Following the approximately 20-minute presentation, Metro received official public comments verbally from stakeholders that were transcribed by a certified court reporter. During the presentation portion of the scoping meeting, a Spanish language interpreter provided simultaneous translation of the presentation proceedings and formal public comments.

Public Comments Portion

Throughout the meetings, stakeholders were asked to complete speaker cards to facilitate the public comment process. During public comment, speakers were called on (in the order of speaker cards received) to provide a two-minute verbal comment. This time was doubled to four minutes for those needing their comments translated from Spanish. A total of 62 verbal comments were received at all four meetings and 30 *Comment Forms* were submitted

For those not able to attend in-person, Metro provided online participation by live-streaming the scoping meeting held on March 21st at Arleta High School. Using a channel on UStream, viewers were able to watch the presentation and provide comments through the channel's chat feature. The recording of this meeting also is available for others to view after the meeting concluded. To date, the scoping meeting on the UStream channel: <http://ustream.tv/channel/eastSFV> has received over 200 views. During the actual meeting, seven viewers watched the proceedings live and one formal comment was submitted.

Meeting Attendance

Attendance at the scoping meetings was measured by the number of stakeholders who signed the attendance sheets. Stakeholder contact information provided on these forms was also added to the ongoing project database to provide future project updates. (Please see Appendix 5 for copies of all sign-in sheets). Following is a breakdown of attendance for each meeting:

- Saturday, March 16, 2013 at Panorama High School
 - 25 Stakeholders signed in
- Tuesday, March 19, 2013 at San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 - 40 Stakeholders signed in
- Thursday, March 21, 2013 at Arleta High School
 - 33 Stakeholders signed in
- Wednesday, March 27, 2012 at Van Nuys Civic Center
 - 41 Stakeholders signed in
- **Total Number of Sign-Ins: 139**

Formal Comments Submission

To maximize the range of input received during the scoping period, Metro collected comments in a variety of formats, both written and verbal, as well as from those interacting with the project online. Written comments were received via US Mail, Email, Facebook, Twitter and in-person via Comment Forms at the scoping meetings. Verbal comments were received at the four scoping meetings and through the project hotline.

During the public scoping review period, 258 formal comment submissions were received by Metro from members of the public, elected officials and other government agencies. As mentioned above, stakeholders had various options for submitting comments:

- **US Mail to:**
 - Mr. Walt Davis
 - Project Manager
 - Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
 - One Gateway Plaza, M/S 99-22-4
 - Los Angeles, CA 90012
- **Email:** eastsfvtransit@metro.net
- **Facebook:** eastsfvtransit by clicking *Submit Formal Comment* tab
- **Twitter:** @eastsfvtransit using #EastSFVscoping to their post
- **Phone:** 818.276.3233
- **In-Person (Verbally):** At the scoping meetings, during the public comment period of the meeting, or directly to the certified court reporter available at each meeting.
- **In-Person (Written):** By completing a *Comment Form* available at each meeting.

For each of the above-mentioned methods, following is a breakdown of the comments received:

- US Mail (21 letters)
- Email (53)
- Facebook (76)
- Twitter (16)
- Phone (0)
- Verbal (62)
- Comment Forms (30)

Public Agency Scoping Meeting

As part of the scoping period, an interagency scoping meeting was held at Metro on March 20, 2013. Two public agencies sent representatives to participate in the meeting: Caltrans – District 7 and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Comments from Caltrans centered on consideration of possible grade separations on Van Nuys Boulevard for the Rail alternative, possible impacts to ramp operations to the US 101, I-5, and SR-118 Freeways and the preparation of a “Q analysis” to weigh both the positive and negative impacts to the freeways and drivers.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineer comments included the need to avoid the Los Angeles River and Pacoima Wash and to obtain Section 404 permits.

Summary of Comments Received

Comments received during the scoping period touched on a variety of themes and categories. Below is a summary of the types of comments/questions that were collected and presents those common themes that emerged during the scoping comment period. Please note that all comment categories are not reflected in the summary. It only provides a synopsis of the top trending themes. The comments matrix in Appendix 6 provides a listing of all comments received during the scoping period.

Light Rail Transit

119 of the 258 comments received focused on the Light Rail Transit (Rail) Alternative with the public overwhelmingly preferring this option. Comments favoring this alternative included the following sentiments:

- Ensure a LRT connection with future Sepulveda Pass Project
- LRT is the fastest mode for transportation
- LRT will carry the most passengers
- LRT is better for businesses and the local communities
- Stakeholders and the east San Fernando Valley deserve the best and most efficient mode
- The San Fernando Valley deserves equity with other Los Angeles County areas that are serviced by light rail.

- LRT provides better economic development opportunities and a sense of prosperity for the community
- Bikes, strollers, shopping bags and wheelchairs are best accommodated by LRT
- LRT is the best mode for regional connectivity
- LRT should be the option to choose, due to capacity, speed, reliability, appeal and safety
- LRT is the most cost effective option
- LRT would allow greater numbers of residents to access employment centers in the Valley and Downtown Los Angeles
- The Metro Orange Line BRT is at or near capacity and is a good example of why LRT is needed in the Valley
- LRT is better for the environment
- LRT is the best solution for the east San Fernando Valley: it will connect diverse communities to their destinations, eliminate traffic congestion, and decrease noise and air pollution
- LRT promotes compact, pedestrian-oriented revitalization

While a majority of the comments relating to Rail focused on supporting this mode, there were specific comments that emerged from those who shared concerns, including:

- Do not run Rail south of the Orange Line along Van Nuys Bl
- Danger of accidents with Rail 's faster speed along heavily residential areas
- Concern that Rail is too expensive
- Concern over potential loss of on-street parking
- Concern over economic impacts to business during construction
- Concern over the loss of traffic lanes to accommodate the LRT along Van Nuys Bl and the potential to make traffic worse on the Bl
- Concern that Rail may not be cost effective and may even be counter-productive

Maintenance Facility

Additionally, as part of the Rail Alternative, nine (9) comments were made regarding the location of the required maintenance facility. Comments included:

- Suggestions for places to locate the maintenance facility

- Locate the maintenance facility in the Panorama City industrial zone
- The maintenance facility should be in Pacoima or Van Nuys
- Concern over where a maintenance facility will be located and potential impacts to the surrounding community
- Questions about the number and types of jobs the maintenance facility could generate
- Requests for more detailed information regarding the facility, especially potential impacts to environmental justice communities.

Bus Rapid Transit

18 of the comments received supported a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system similar to the Metro Orange Line on Van Nuys Bl. Comments favoring this mode included:

- BRT is a safe, low cost option
- BRT has the ability to be more flexible than a Rail system
- BRT provides more opportunities in general
- BRT best meets the goals of handling high ridership along Van Nuys Bl
- BRT offers more frequent service than LRT and will better integrate with the Metro Orange Line and our existing streets

Comments were also received that shared the following concerns against a BRT option:

- BRT is a “Band-Aid” solution
- BRT is slower than Rail and will not increase capacity
- BRT is a waste of money
- Impacts of increased bus use is detrimental to road surfaces, like on Ventura Bl
- Do not build dedicated lanes for BRT south of the Metro Orange Line along Van Nuys Bl
- BRT will increase crime in the local area
- No point in BRT – going back and doing same work twice
- BRT would be a failure as it will not improve mobility

No Build

Two comments received specifically supported the No Build Alternative. Reasons for support of a No Build Alternative included:

- There is already lots of traffic on Van Nuys Bl and another mode of transit would just increase traffic hazards
- New modes will take away lanes for cars and add to traffic
- If you build, it will only increase crime for businesses and bring eminent domain to local property owners

Those opposing the No Build Alternative shared the following sentiment:

- No Build is not an option - the east San Fernando Valley deserves a new public transit system

Transportation System Management

Verbal and written comments clearly indicate that the public does not support the Transportation System Management (TSM) option. Other than the comments in support of the No Build option noted in the prior section, all comments focused their attention on ensuring that a new public transit system is built in the east San Fernando Valley. However, one comment was received regarding this alternative. The commenter stated that TSM improvements need to be in place prior to constructing any alternative.

Sepulveda Pass Project

Forty-six comments shared that anything built must include connections to the future Sepulveda Pass project to ensure transit service from the San Fernando Valley to the Westside. Many of the comments were made in support of a Rail alternative. Some key comments include:

- Plan this project in conjunction with the Sepulveda Pass Project
- If we need to wait for the tunnel under the Sepulveda Pass – that's fine
- Connectivity is key -- make sure Rail is connected to the Sepulveda Pass Project
- Design the Sepulveda Pass Project first – then design this project – thereby integrating and constructing the south San Fernando Valley terminus/origination for both projects once
- Not connecting this project to the future Sepulveda Pass project is a disservice to the San Fernando Valley, the Westside and the region
- By building both projects at once, greater ridership, accessibility, regional mobility and connectivity will be achieved

Terminus-Origination Points/Stops/Configuration

Twenty-four (24) comments were made by stakeholders regarding alternative alignment terminus-origination points, stops, or system configuration. Some of the key points include:

- Ensure a direct connection with Amtrak/Metrolink and future high-speed rail
- Ensure a connection to the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station
- Ensure that the station at the Panorama Metrolink/Amtrak station has easy access to the businesses north of the railroad tracks
- Try to connect the system to Mission College as well as Olive View Medical Center to strengthen ridership
- Include park-and-ride lots along the alignment
- Try to connect the alignment to popular destinations along the corridor
- Work with area businesses to ensure that stops help attract riders to local businesses around each station location
- Consider grade separations along the alignment to go under or over congested intersections
- Consider running the Rail underground along Van Nuys Bl

Alignment

Twenty-one (21) comments, one petition and 21 “form” letters were submitted indicating a preference for either the Van Nuys Boulevard or Sepulveda Boulevard alignment. Several automobile dealerships and businesses along Van Nuys Boulevard submitted comments opposing an alignment along Van Nuys, south of the Orange Line, due to possible impacts on their businesses. Additionally, a petition with 45 signatures and form letters signed by 21 business owners along Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line shared opposition due to the potential negative impacts construction and operations might have on their businesses.

Comments favoring use of the Sepulveda Bl as the preferred alignment include:

- Van Nuys Bl is very narrow between Laurel Canyon and San Fernando Rd
- The Rail or BRT system must start/stop at Sepulveda/Ventura
- Do not put an elevated train on Van Nuys Bl to Ventura Bl

- Taking away lanes on Van Nuys for bus/rail will create a dangerous situation for truck drivers delivering cars to the dealerships.
- Build the system on Sepulveda because we need to preserve the sales taxes generated on Van Nuys Bl
- I live two blocks west of Van Nuys Bl, I can hardly get in/out of Otsego St now - I vote for Sepulveda
- Please leave Van Nuys Bl alone south of the Metro Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive
- We support City of Los Angeles Councilmember Tom LaBonge's recommendations to further study alternatives that run on Sepulveda Bl south of the Metro Orange Line
- Study Sepulveda Bl from Sherman Way south to Ventura Bl

Comments favoring the use of Van Nuys Bl centered around the following sentiments:

- Van Nuys Bl has the highest number of riders
- Van Nuys Bl is one of the busiest transit corridors in the County
- Put the service where it's needed – on Van Nuys
- Van Nuys Bl has many key destination centers and major employment hubs (The Plant, Van Nuys Civic Center, Metro Orange Line connection, Panorama Mall, two high schools, etc.)
- Van Nuys Bl makes the most logical sense to build a new public transit system because it was created with public transit in mind
- Building along Van Nuys Bl will help boost businesses along the highly commercial corridor
- Van Nuys Bl is the central spine of the Valley that could really be used to build a workable and highly used transit system for the Valley
- Sepulveda Bl is a better choice for Rail physically, but it would not serve as many riders

Three comments shared disappointment that the Brand Bl option was no longer being considered:

- It is too bad you are not considering the old Red Car alignment through Brand Bl in the northern portion of the alignment

- It would be easier to construct the route up Van Nuys Bl to Parthenia St to Sepulveda Bl to Brand Bl and then San Fernando Rd as it is the former Pacific Electric Red Car route and these streets were built to accommodate trains running in the center median

Other alignment comments included:

- The alignment needs to get off Van Nuys Bl near the railroad tracks to either Saticoy or Sherman Way and go down Sepulveda

Buses

Eight comments were made concerning current bus routes and frequency

- Do not cut current local/rapid bus routes
- Do not eliminate local/rapid bus line stops – we do not want to walk farther to ride the bus
- Fix the current bus routes
- Enhance current routes to create more efficient service
- Before any project is built, continue 734 Rapid Bus service further down Sepulveda Bl to LAX with stops at the Metro Expo line

Bicycles/Bike Lanes

Six comments were related to bicycles and bicycle lanes. Many commented that LRT is a better option for transporting bicycles. There is a need to accommodate more than 2-3 bikes on transit options on Van Nuys Bl. No comments were made negatively concerning bicycles or bike lanes. When given the option, most commenters indicated preference for bicycle lanes instead of parking lanes.

- Bike lanes must be included with any project moving forward
- Bicycles and wheelchairs are better accommodated on LRT
- Bikeway is preferred versus street parking, if having to make a choice
- Bicycling facilities along Van Nuys Bl need to be effective
- Put bike lanes on Van Nuys Bl and Truman St
- Work with the Los Angeles County Bike Coalition to identify which bicycle projects to include with this study
- Include robust bicycle parking facilities at stations


- Ensure a continuous bike lane along Van Nuys Bl with a minimum 10' width reserved between intersections

Other

Other common comments focused on capacity and costs associated with any public transit system. Following are examples of some of the more general comments shared by stakeholders:

- Capacity is more important than cost
- Ensure that trains/buses are large enough to ensure higher capacities
- Do not raise fares to cover the cost of this project
- Ensure safety of Van Nuys Bl to reduce the number of accidents before building anything
- Ensure parking is available with any alternative that is built
- LADOT Dash should merge with Metro to save taxpayer dollars
- Preferences for a heavy-rail subway instead of a Rail or BRT system
- Ensure that the project built has a state-of-the-art audio speaker system, communicating in various languages, for visually impaired individuals
- With any improvements on Van Nuys Bl, ensure that storm water flow improvements are made to reduce traffic flow issues

This report along with comments received, will be considered during the Draft EIS/R process.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Appendix 1: **Outreach Documentation Reports for Alternatives Analysis Phase**

March - May 2013

Introduction

The second busiest transit corridor in the San Fernando Valley, Van Nuys Boulevard continues to be a thriving, energized and vibrant corridor that connects many people across the region. There are places to live, shop, conduct business, attend school, work, eat, play, and worship. Although the people who use Van Nuys Boulevard are diverse, they share common needs – like the need for a quick, clean, reliable and efficient public transit system.

To that end, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), in cooperation with the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), launched the Van Nuys Boulevard Rapidway Study in June 2011. Over the next 18 months, the Metro project team will study various transportation alternatives to determine how best to improve transit along Van Nuys Boulevard between Ventura Boulevard and the 210 freeway.

A robust public participation program has been initiated to educate interested stakeholders regarding the proposed project and potential alternatives related to mode and alignment that are being considered. During this initial (Alternative Analysis) phase, Metro and the City of Los Angeles have elicited feedback from stakeholders regarding which alternatives make sense for this key San Fernando Valley corridor. This report documents these pre-scoping meetings, including promotion, execution, supporting materials and comments collected.

Alternatives Analysis Phase

The public outreach program was initiated to raise public awareness and provide for early involvement of stakeholders for the project and prepare for the upcoming environmental review process. Known as an Alternatives Analysis process, the Project Team presented a wide range of alternatives for public review and comment. The goal of this phase is to screen the wide range of alternatives to a few alternatives that will be carried forward for further analysis in an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/S) for this project.

Elected Officials Briefing

On October 6, 2011, public participation program was officially launched via an all San Fernando Valley Elected Officials' Staff Briefing. During this briefing, Metro introduced the project to 12 staff members in attendance via a power point presentation. For detailed meetings notes, see the "Elected Officials Briefing" tab. Staff members in attendance welcomed improved public transit opportunities in the Valley and offered to assist in engaging their constituents regarding the upcoming community (pre-scoping) meetings. Some requested project information materials to distribute among their constituents. Meeting notices were provided to the following offices:

- Councilman Tony Cardenas
- Councilman Richard Alarcon
- Councilman Paul Krekorian
- Assemblyman Felipe Fuentes
- Assemblyman Bob Blumenfeld
- Assemblyman Mike Feuer
- Senator Alex Padilla
- Senator Carol Liu
- Congressman Brad Sherman
- Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa
- City of San Fernando

Community Meetings

Three community meetings were hosted by Metro and the City of Los Angeles. They were held:

- Monday, October 26, 2011 at Panorama High School
- Tuesday, October 27, 2011 at Pacoima Neighborhood City Hall
- Wednesday, October 28, 2011 at Van Nuys Civic Center

Notification

The meetings were noticed via:

- A postcard to more than 57,000 occupants within the project area and key stakeholder groups
- Take-ones on San Fernando Valley Bus routes
- E-mail blasts sent to the stakeholder database
 - October 20, 2011 – opened by 33% of recipients
 - October 25, 2011 – opened by 34% of recipients
 - November 9, 2011 – opened by 49% of recipients

- Drop-ins and material distribution to key groups in the project area, including:
 - Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council
 - Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association
 - Arleta Neighborhood Council
 - Pacoima Neighborhood Council
 - Van Nuys Neighborhood Council
 - Valley Alliance of Neighborhood Councils
 - Foothill Trails District Neighborhood Council
 - Panorama City Neighborhood Council
- Elected officials offices and website calendars
- Online media channels, including:
 - Facebook at MetroVanNuys
 - Twitter @metrovanuys
 - Metro.net/vannuys
 - The Source Blog
 - LA Streetsblog
 - Transit Coalition Blog
 - Daily News Blog
 - EveryBlock Blog
- Newspaper Display Ads on:
 - Los Angeles Daily News
 - San Fernando Valley Business Journal
 - La Opinion (Spanish-language)
 - El Sol (Spanish-language)
 - Azbarez (Armenian-language)

- Community Events – At which 55 stakeholders registered to be added to the project mailing list to receive updates.
 - Van Nuys Civic Center Farmers Market (Oct. 13 and 20)
 - Sherman Oaks Street Fair (Oct. 16)

Format

The meetings were conducted utilizing an open house format allowing participants to drop in any time and learn about the project. Project team members were available to walk attendees through a series of information boards, answer questions and receive feedback. The open house had several stations:

- Project Overview – provided a video overview of the project
- Purpose & Need / Screening Criteria – highlighted the project’s goals and criteria for screening down the alternatives presented
- Study Area Characteristics – provided demographics information about the corridor
- Mode Options – showcased the proposed modes being considered: Light Rail Transit, Bus Rapid Transit and Streetcar
- Interactive Model – allowed participants to create their vision of transit on Van Nuys Boulevard using blocks, toys and other materials
- Corridor Map – allowed participants to write their comments regarding specific areas of the corridor on oversize maps of corridor
- Comments – provided various ways for participants to share their comments, via:
 - Comment Forms
 - Online Questionnaire
 - Video Commentary Recordings

Materials

Consensus Inc. created the following materials to inform, educate and engage stakeholders at the pre-scoping open houses and beyond. These provided background on the project, information on the pre-scoping meeting format, as well as provided avenues for stakeholders to provide their input and ideas for Metro for consideration in project planning:

- Fact Sheet (bilingual)

- Contact Card (bilingual)
- Comment Sheet (bilingual)
- Welcome Sheet/Open House Road Map (bilingual)
- Project video with Spanish-language subtitles
- Power Point Presentation (bilingual)

Sign-In Sheets

While there were some attendees that did not sign in (approximately 20), attendance at the pre-scoping meetings were measured by sign-in sheets. Stakeholder contact information provided on these forms was also added to the ongoing project database to provide future project updates to those who attended the meetings.

- Panorama High School – October 24, 2011
 - 47 stakeholders signed in
- Pacoima Neighborhood City Hall – October 25, 2011
 - 45 stakeholders signed in
- Van Nuys Civic Center
 - 58 stakeholders signed in
- Total Number of Sign-Ins: 150

Summary of Comments Received by Mode

Although 150 participants signed in during the three-day course of meetings, more than 400 comments were received regarding the Van Nuys Boulevard Rapidway Project. The open house format and social media platforms allowed stakeholders to provide comments via a wide range of methods:

- Comment Forms (hardcopy and online)
- E-mail
- Mail
- Hotline
- Easel Pads located at each station during the open house
- Oversize maps of the corridor at each open house
- Video recordings
- Facebook
- Twitter

The following is a summary of all comments received. [Full written and video comments are provided in the Comment Section](#) along with copies of sign-in sheets, meeting materials and newspaper advertisements.

Light Rail Transit (73)

The public overwhelmingly prefers a Light Rail Transit (LRT) option. Seventy-three comments were received stating support for a LRT on Van Nuys Boulevard.

- 18 comments request that the LRT option be tied to the Sepulveda Pass project to connect to UCLA, Westwood, and beyond.
- 10 comments request that the LRT option also include bike lanes along Van Nuys Boulevard
- Three comments were from people who felt the LRT is an efficient, inviting mode for tourists and believe the LRT mode is a tourist attraction in itself.
- Three comments were from people who said the LRT is faster and carries more people in one trip than other modes of transit.
- Other comments included that the LRT option:
 - Increase rail options for the Valley

- Provide better transit options for seniors
- Ensure a comfortable safe option for riders that include capacity for bicycles and wheelchairs.
- Bring economic benefits
- Be extended north on Sepulveda to San Fernando
- Include station stops at San Fernando Road, Glenoaks, Laurel Canyon and Arleta
- Ensure that the north terminus reaches (Chase Street and Van Nuys Boulevard) at Panorama Mall for a 1st phase

Red Line / Heavy Rail / Subway (30)

A subway alternative was the next preferred transit option for Van Nuys Boulevard. Many feel that a subway will preserve current traffic lanes and maintain parking along Van Nuys Boulevard. Others feel a subway is the best alternative for businesses to thrive. A major theme among subway preferences was connectivity – requests for connections to Mission College, Sherman Way, and the Orange Line. Following is a synopsis of the comments made regarding this mode:

- Preserves current traffic lanes and parking (4)
- Must provide connections to the Red Line and Orange Line (3)
- Must be constructed to connect with San Fernando (3)
- Serves as the best option for businesses (2)
- Provides opportunity to connect to the lower part of the Valley to Mission College and Olive View (2)
- Does not take any space from Van Nuys Boulevard
- Can connect to the Orange Line
- Must be considered all the way. If the option is unlikely, it should connect from the 210 freeway to Nordhoff or Sherman Way on Van Nuys Boulevard.
- Provides the most sustainable option and doesn't pollute
- Must be constructed underground for the entire alignment
- Must be provided between Ventura Boulevard and Sherman Way
- Should provide connection to LAX and to future High Speed Rail system in Sylmar/San Fernando

Additionally, the Studio City Neighborhood Council stated that it wants to see a “Red Line” type of train from Westwood under the mountains to Ventura Boulevard and Van Nuys Boulevard, above or below grade north on Van Nuys Boulevard to Sylmar.”

Bicycles/Bike Lanes (33)

Thirty-three comments were related to bicycles and bicycle lanes. Nine people requested bicycle lanes up and down Van Nuys Boulevard. The correlation between bikes and LRT is evident (as noted above) as several commented that LRT is a better option for transporting bicycles. There is a need to accommodate more than 2-3 bikes on transit options on Van Nuys Boulevard. Only one comment was negative toward bicycles saying there is no room on Van Nuys Boulevard for bicycles.

- Put bike lanes everywhere all up and down Van Nuys Boulevard (9)
- Can't take a bike on a bus, LRT is a better option for bikes (2)
- Need to accommodate 2-3 bikes at a time on transit
- Consider bus, light rail options with opportunity for biking and walking
- Integrate transit with bike options
- Incorporate bike infrastructure and add elevations for bike route planning
- Bike racks and lockers at every transit stop. Average travel to transit by bike is 2 miles per Metro study. Bikers need the option of leaving their bikes behind as per the Orange Line.
- Bike path on San Fernando Road to connect Van Nuys
- We don't have room on Van Nuys Boulevard for bike lanes
- Continue the bike route, started in Sylmar – Blue Line connection

BRT (24)

The public would like a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system similar to the Orange Line on Van Nuys Boulevard.

- BRT is a safe, low cost option (3)
- Run it down the center of the street (2)
- Stops should be located at Laurel Canyon and Van Nuys Boulevard (2)
- A BRT system will support local businesses, would provide more direct routes than rail, and is a low cost and comfortable option.

- Need an Orange Line-like mode of transportation
- Need BRT, but it must support local businesses
- BRT provides more direct routes than rail can provide
- Rapid bus from Sherman Oaks/Ventura Boulevard to Pacoima or Lakeview Terrace
- Need more BRT near Van Nuys Boulevard and Norris Avenue
- Orange Line-type transit allows for faster travel times to get to downtown

Bus Operations (82)

We received over 80 comments and suggestions related to improving current bus routes, schedules, and frequency. In particular, six comments were from riders who want to see the 902 bus come back as they felt it was a good backup to the 233 and 761 buses. Also, there were six comments asking for an increase in the Metro Line 761 bus, six comments asking for improved bus benches and shelters, and four comments stating the need for later evening and improved bus service. Several comments said using all doors for boarding would improve speed and create efficiencies. Additionally, two comments stated that another DASH-type system is needed beyond the current route within this corridor.

Other comments included:

- Have buses stop on the same side of the street (3)
- Need off street location for payment system to speed up boarding process (3)
- Increase frequency throughout the day (3)
- Provide better bus shelters for students at Van Nuys Boulevard and Beachy Avenue
- Provide more earlier morning buses
- Improve punctuality as system is not always on-time
- Provide tighter security
- Expand bus operations into Orange Line
- Add overhead space on buses to hold books for school or shopping purchases.
- Add more payment options - you can't buy an all day pass at a senior price.
- Add more buses on Laurel Canyon
- Provide transfer at San Fernando High School

- Improve bus speeds
- Suggestions for including transit stops along the way
- Add a bus line on Victory and Woodley
- Provide Lower Buses – buses can kneel but drivers refuse to do it
 - Provide platform-level boarding for bus making it easier for the elderly, children and wheeled entry and exit

Streetcar (23)

The streetcar option is seen as a cost effective and practical option in comparison to BRT and LRT. We received three comments from people asking about the old red streetcars from the 1950s. Streetcar is also liked because it can accommodate more passengers and riders would not be turned away as they are on the Orange Line and is an efficient mode of transportation for seniors.

- Good cost effective and practical option compared to BRT and LRT (3)
- Recreate the red Streetcars that criss-crossed the city prior to the 1950s (3)
- Prefer streetcar, more passengers allowed
- Prefer streetcar, already have a Rapid Bus
- Streetcars with additional bike infrastructure is the way to go, similar to those in operation in Portland, OR
- Woodman, Arleta Avenue, Terrabella and Brandford Streets work best with a streetcar-type system
- Holds more people, wouldn't have to turn people away like the Orange Line does
- Would be the “show stopper” in the Valley
- Would provide efficient transportation for seniors

Monorail (11)

Six comments from people said Metro should think big and go with a monorail system like Disneyand. Other comments said a monorail down the center would only take 1-2 lanes. Comments acknowledged a monorail is an expensive option.

- Think bigger, use a monorail like Disneyland (6)
- Monorail down center with escalator/elevator, would only take 1-2 lanes

- Expensive option

No Build (3)

Only three comments received were related to no build option. Two comments cited there is already lots of traffic on Van Nuys Boulevard and another mode of transit would just increase traffic hazards. Another comment said transit options will only interrupt suburban neighborhoods and add noise and traffic.

- Lots of traffic hazards already (2)
- Will interrupt suburban areas, project may be dangerous and contribute to noise and traffic

Transportation Systems Management (TSM) (10)

A few people commented on making improvements to current transportation system and adding additional bus service along Van Nuys Boulevard. Fuel efficient vehicles, traffic signal synchronization, and variable speed limits were suggested. Also, working with insurance companies and utilizing Global Positioning System recorders was also suggested.

- Whatever option is picked, fuel efficient vehicles should be a significant component
- Need traffic signal synchronization
- Use variable speed limits
- Work with insurance companies and use GPS recorders to get motorists to drive slower
- Improve the overall service by adding Rapid Bus and adding Metro Lines along Van Nuys Boulevard

General Support for Any Improvements (28)

We received twenty-eight general comments from stakeholders welcoming any improvements on Van Nuys Boulevard; two comments were directed at the idea for better transit and prefer whatever is faster and more efficient to build.

Other Mode-Type Comments

Various other comments were also received:

- Nine comments relating to building the project grade-separated either in an elevated structure or underground.

- One comment was made in opposition to any mode that would require overhead electrical lines (e.g. streetcar, LRT, trolley).
- One comment said articulated buses are uncomfortable.

Summary of Comments Received by Corridor

Sepulveda Pass Corridor Project (40)

At all three meetings, the Transit Coalition sent representatives to share its alternative proposal that focuses on connecting the Van Nuys BI Rapidway Project with the Sepulveda Pass Project. As a result, forty comments we received asked that the Sepulveda Pass Study be linked to the Van Nuys BI Rapidway Corridor Study or that the project provide connections to Westwood and beyond. Two comments suggested that the Transit Coalition proposal makes more sense, rather than the I-405 HOV Lane project -- given its \$1 billion price tag. Specific comments included:

- Link the Sepulveda Pass Study to the Corridor Study
- Use the Transit Coalition Plan (2)
- Go under the Sepulveda Pass and connect to West LA (2)
- Provide a real traffic solution to I-405, not \$1 billion Northbound HOV lane

Sepulveda Boulevard Corridor (7)

Seven comments we received were related to the Sepulveda Boulevard Corridor:

- Wants no dedicated transit on Van Nuys Boulevard, it should be on Sepulveda Boulevard instead
- Van Nuys Boulevard and Sepulveda Rapidway projects need to be combined. Both Measure R funded projects do not warrant separate studies as the corridors are only one-mile apart from one another
- Improve east/west transit as well as the Sepulveda Corridor
- Unlike Sepulveda Boulevard which is wide from San Fernando to Sherman Oaks, Van Nuys Boulevard narrows.

Summary of Comments by Alignments(s)

Sylmar/San Fernando Alignment (34)

Thirty-four comments were received regarding the Sylmar/San Fernando alignment. Some comments related to ensuring that the northern terminus be located at Sylmar/San Fernando. Others want the Sylmar Station to tie into service to West LA or to connect to the Sylmar Hospital. One comment suggested that heavy rail meet the proposed High Speed Rail system at Sylmar.

- Make northern terminus at Sylmar/San Fernando
- Consider a Sylmar Station, it is a good possible end point for the Van Nuys project
- Consider a continuous mode from Sylmar to UCLA (West LA)
- Connect to Sylmar Hospital

Mission College Alignment (14)

Transit to Mission College for students was a key request. Four people want to see an alignment connect at Glenoaks. Two comments want to see Metro include San Fernando to Mission College in the study. In addition, service to Mission College needs to have a late night option for evening class students. Also, three comments suggested that the Mission College alignment be provided a stop at Olive View Medical Center. Detailed comments regarding this alignment alternative included:

- Connect to Glenoaks (4)
- Include transit to Mission College (Norris Avenue and Van Nuys Boulevard) (2)
- Include San Fernando to Mission College in the study (2)
- Analyze Hubbard Boulevard which is highly congested near Mission College (2)
- Connect Mission College to Westwood
- Consider a station at Mission College to connect with Orange Line
- Run the Metro Line 761 by Mission College
- Provide late night service to Mission College for students
- Service Mission College and connect with Metro Orange and Red lines to access Hollywood and Los Angeles

Connect to Westwood (10)

Six comments were directed to a LRT option that would connect Sylmar/San Fernando to Westwood. One comment asked that the 233 bus be connected to Westwood while three other requests were more general asking to connect this corridor to Westwood.

- Consider a LRT from Sylmar/San Fernando to Westwood (6)
- Connect this corridor to Westwood (3)
- Have the Metro Line 233 go to Westwood

Connect to Metrolink (4)

Those that use Metrolink want to see a connection to Van Nuys Boulevard; four comments asked for a Rapid Bus connection to Sylmar/Metrolink, one specifically for Palmdale residents. Two others said a new stop should be added or extend Van Nuys Boulevard service to meet all trains; connect to Mission College and Santa Clarita.

- Connect a Rapid Bus to Sylmar/Metrolink (4)
- Add new Metrolink stop at Van Nuys Blvd or extend Van Nuys Blvd service there to meet all trains (2)
- Connect to Sylmar/Metrolink for people living in Palmdale work along Sepulveda and could get to work faster
- Service Mission College and connect with Metro line to access Hollywood and LA
- Connect to Santa Clarita

Other Alignment Comments

Other alignment comments included extending the route to the north side of the Foothill Freeway, adding signage for “last train” times, removing on-street parking to make way for transit, and choosing transit options that are business friendly.

- Extend route to north side of Foothill Freeway
- For busway or rail there should be a digital sign that says “Last Train runs at . . .” informing riders when the last train/bus will operate for that day
- Remove on-street parking and dedicate a lane to transit
- Choose options that don’t destroy commerce or communities

Desired Transit Stops

Many comments were made on the large corridor maps provided at the community meeting. Many of the comments focused on identifying area where station stops should be considered. Libraries, schools, education and training centers, as well as healthcare facilities and employers and local businesses are desired destinations for transit riders. The following is a list of transit stops requested in comments received:

- Library is an important stop, (Van Nuys and Roscoe Boulevards.)
- Panorama High School (Van Nuys Boulevard and Lanark Street)
- Pacoima Skills Center has major ridership (Van Nuys Boulevard between Haddon Avenue and Keweenaw Avenue)
- Youth Build Charter School – 120 students need access to transit (Norris Avenue and Van Nuys Boulevard)
- Consider a stop near North East Valley Health Clinic (Van Nuys Boulevard between Glenoaks Boulevard and Borden Avenue)
- Need to extend service to Glenoaks, consider service for San Fernando Garden Residents (Van Nuys Boulevard between Pala and Lehigh Avenues)
- A transit hub/Metrolink connection should be developed at this location with additional lines going north to Olive View Hospital and south to Burbank, Glendale and downtown L.A. (Glenoaks and Van Nuys Boulevards)
- More connections to Olive View Medical Center
- Van Nuys Boulevard between Haddon and Oneida Avenues
- Provide access at Herrick Avenue to the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station
- Rapid stop (corner of Huston Street and Van Nuys Boulevard)
- Local stop (corner of Van Nuys Boulevard and Riverside Drive)
- Van Nuys and Victory Boulevards
- Van Nuys and Vanowen Boulevards
- Van Nuys Boulevard and Herman Way
- Van Nuys Boulevard between Roscoe and Chase
- Van Nuys Boulevard and Nordhoff Street

- Need local stops from Ventura to Roscoe Boulevards

Wickes Property (2)

Comments suggest the Wickes Property would be a good location for a Metro transit center.

- Buy the Wickes building and use it as a transit center (2)
- Consider the [Wicks] property as it allows for many options to be built there

Park and Ride (2)

We received two comments about the locations of Park and Ride's along the corridor:

- Consider a park and ride at the site on Van Nuys Boulevard just north of the 210 freeway.
- Move the current park and ride up the corridor.

Other Transit Related Issues

Pedestrian Issues (6)

Two comments received were related to pedestrian priority so riders can make connections to buses. Other comments include pedestrian accidents at Van Nuys Boulevard and San Fernando Road, making sidewalks wider, and encouraging a pedestrian experience.

- Identify potential trouble spots for pedestrians. One is located at Van Nuys Boulevard and the San Fernando Road railroad tracks
- Provide pedestrian priority at traffic signals
- Create a TAP card that can run a card over the traffic signal to bring up an early walk light so buses don't pass/leave
- Interface of stops per route with pedestrian access is important
- Make wider sidewalks for pedestrians
- Encourage pedestrian experience

Supporting Local Businesses (4)

Van Nuys Boulevard needs transit that is business-friendly. One comment asked that Metro work with the Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) working along the corridor. Another comment suggests frequent stops so riders can support local businesses.

- Collaborate with BID's that are currently working on revitalizing Van Nuys Boulevard
- Ensure frequent transit stops allowing riders to stop into local businesses

Eco-friendly/Sustainability (3)

Eco-friendly options are important for Van Nuys Boulevard transit options. Comments encourage sustainable measures, fuel efficient vehicles, eco-driving and parks/open space.


- Keep all changes/improvements as eco-friendly as possible. These changes must be sustainable in order for them to be improvements at all.
- Encourage eco-driving, fuel-efficient driving among motorists.
- Include more parks and open space along the corridor
- Consider the environment and economics and choose what makes most sense

General Comments

General comments made include:

- Consider carpool buses for school children
- Provide additional transit opportunities in Pacoima
- Make TAP cards accessible at local community colleges
- Build a sense of place - name the drainage channel stream/tributary
- Connect to Santa Clarita
- Requests to be added to the project mailing list to receive updates (8 via email and 55 via sign-in sheets at community events)

Following is a matrix for all comments received during the pre-scoping phase of the outreach program. The matrix lists all comments in alphabetical order and numbers of comments received via the oversize maps and easel pads.



Introduction


The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), in collaboration with the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) and input from the City of San Fernando, is identifying viable north-south transit opportunities that will improve local and regional connections.

In October 2011, Metro in coordination with LADOT held three (3) community meetings introducing the Van Nuys Boulevard corridor between Ventura Boulevard and Interstate 210. At the meetings, which were held in the communities of Van Nuys, Pacoima, and Panorama City, the study team received comments urging Metro and LADOT to explore Sepulveda Boulevard as an alternative to Van Nuys Boulevard and extend the northern terminus /origination point to the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station.

As a result of numerous comments received during the October 2011 meetings that voiced strong support for including Sepulveda Boulevard as a potential transit corridor, the study area has been updated to include Sepulveda Boulevard as a possible viable option for a new north-south transit system and Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station as a potential northern terminus/origination point. Since the original technical study parameters have been expanded and evolved in order to better meet community needs, an additional round of community meetings were held by Metro to introduce the expanded study area to interested stakeholders and share a project overview and next steps in the study process. This report documents all of the outreach activities that were completed to support the four meetings held:

- Thursday, April 12, 2012 at the San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
- Tuesday, April 17, 2012 at the St. Mary Byzantine Catholic Church
- Wednesday, April 18, 2012 at the Valley Presbyterian Hospital
- Tuesday, May 1, 2012 at the Mission Community Police Station





The meetings were focused around the Sepulveda Boulevard corridor area to ensure area residents, businesses and key organizations were aware that the Project was also considering Sepulveda as a viable option for a new north-south transit system.

Various key activities were completed that are summarized below to support these meetings:

- All East San Fernando Valley area elected officials staff members were briefed
- An extensive mailing and e-mailing program to notify residents and businesses along Sepulveda Boulevard
- Presentations and announcements about the meetings were made to key area groups
- Newspaper Advertisements
- Participated in community events to inform stakeholders of the project and upcoming meetings


Alternatives Analysis Phase

Currently, the study team is conducting an Alternatives Analysis (AA) Report which requires analyzing a range of new public transit service alternatives. This analysis includes, but is not limited to, looking at future population growth and the accompanying increase in transit demand, while being compatible with existing land uses and future development opportunities. In early 2013, the environmental documentation phase of the work will be launched with another series of community Scoping meetings.

Elected Officials Briefing

On March 29, 2012, Metro held a second Elected Officials' Staff Briefing to provide an update and the findings of the first round of community meetings.





During this briefing, Metro introduced the project to 12 elected official staff members in attendance via a power point presentation. For detailed meetings notes, see the “Elected Officials Briefing” tab. Staff members in attendance welcomed improved public transit opportunities in the Valley and offered to assist in engaging their constituents regarding the upcoming community (pre-scoping) meetings. Some requested project information materials to distribute among their constituents. Meeting notices were provided to the following offices:


- Councilman Tony Cardenas
- Councilman Richard Alarcon
- Councilman Paul Krekorian
- Assemblyman Felipe Fuentes
- Assemblyman Bob Blumenfeld
- Assemblyman Mike Feuer
- Senator Alex Padilla
- Senator Carol Liu
- Congressman Brad Sherman
- Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa
- City of San Fernando

Community Meetings

Four community meetings were hosted by Metro and the City of Los Angeles held at:

- Thursday, April 12, 2012 at the San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
- Tuesday, April 17, 2012 at the St. Mary Byzantine Catholic Church
- Wednesday, April 18, 2012 at the Valley Presbyterian Hospital






- Tuesday, May 1, 2012 at the Mission Community Police Station

Notification

The community meetings were noticed via:

- A mailer to 82,815 occupants within the project area and key stakeholder groups
- Take-ones on selected San Fernando Valley Bus routes
- E-mail blasts sent to the stakeholder database on:
 - April 4
 - April 12
 - April 18
 - April 23
 - April 30
- Drop-ins and material distribution to key groups in the project area, including:
 - Valley Alliance of Neighborhood Councils, April 12
 - Arleta Neighborhood Council, April 17
 - Pacoima Chamber of Commerce, April 18
 - Pacoima Neighborhood Council, April 18
- Elected officials offices and their website calendars
- Online media channels, including:
 - Facebook at MetroVanNuys





East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor


- Twitter @metrovanuys
- Metro.net/vanuys
- The Source Blog
- LA Streets blog
- Transit Coalition Blog
- Daily News Blog
- Every Block Blog
- Newspaper Display Ads in:
 - [Los Angeles Daily News](#)
 - [San Fernando Valley Business Journal](#)
 - [La Opinion](#) (Spanish-language)
 - [El Sol](#) (Spanish-language)
 - [Azbarez](#) (Armenian-language)

Format

The meetings were conducted utilizing an open house format allowing participants to drop in at any time and learn about the project. Project team members were available to walk attendees through a series of information boards, answer questions and receive feedback. The open house had several stations:

- Interactive Map –allowing attendees to show where they live, work and play by placing dots on the study area map
- Project Overview – provided a video overview of the project
- Purpose & Need / Screening Criteria – highlighted the project’s goals and criteria for screening down the alternatives presented






- Study Area Characteristics – provided demographics information about the corridor
- Mode Options – showcased the proposed modes: Light Rail Transit, Bus Rapid Transit and Streetcar
- Corridor Map –allowed participants to write their comments regarding specific areas of the corridor on an oversized map of the corridor area
- Comments – provided various ways for participants to share their comments via:
 - Comment Forms
 - Video Commentary Recordings

Materials

The following materials were provided at the community meetings to inform, educate and engage stakeholders of the new study area. These materials provided background on the project, information on the meeting format, as well as provided avenues for stakeholders to provide their input and ideas to Metro and the City of Los Angeles for consideration in project planning:

- Fact Sheet (bilingual)
- Contact card
- Comment Sheet (bilingual)
- Welcome Sheet /Open House Road Map (bilingual)
- Power Point Presentation (bilingual)



Sign-In Sheets

Attendance at the community meetings were measured by sign-in sheets. Stakeholder contact information provided on these forms was also added to the ongoing project database to provide future project updates to those who attended the meetings.


- San Fernando Regional Pool Facility – April 12, 2012
 - 43 stakeholders signed in
- St. Mary Byzantine Catholic Church – April 17, 2012
 - 36 stakeholders signed in
- Valley Presbyterian Hospital - April 18, 2012
 - 22 stakeholders signed in
- Mission Community Police Station – May 1, 2012
 - 38 stakeholders signed in
- Total Number of Sign-Ins: 139

Summary of Comments Received by Mode

398 comments were received regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project. The open house format and social media platforms allowed stakeholders to provide comments via a wide range of methods:

- Comment Forms (hardcopy and online)
- E-mail
- Mail






- Hotline
- Easel Pads located at each station during the open houses
- Oversize maps of the corridor at each open house
- Facebook
- Twitter

The following is a summary of all comments received. [Full written comments are provided in the Comments section along with copies of sign-in sheets, meeting materials, and newspaper advertisements.](#)

Light Rail Transit (65)

Sixty-five comments received relating to a Light Rail Transit (LRT) alternative for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor (ESFVTC). The public overwhelmingly prefers a LRT alternative be tied to the Van Nuys Blvd Corridor for economic benefits. Ten comments said LRT option should be tied to the I-405 Sepulveda Pass project to connect to UCLA, Westwood, and LAX. Other comments include:

- Tie LRT option to the Sepulveda Pass Project
- LRT is an efficient, inviting mode for tourists and is a tourist attraction in itself
- LRT is faster and carries more people in one trip than other modes of transit
- Other comments stated that the LRT option should:
 - Increase rail options for the Valley
 - Provide better transit options for seniors
 - Ensure a comfortable safe option for riders that includes capacity for bicycles and wheelchairs
 - LRT should be extended north on Sepulveda Blvd to San Fernando Rd




East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

- Include station stops at San Fernando Road, Glenoaks, Laurel Canyon, and Arleta
- Ensure that the north terminus reaches Panorama Mall at Chase St and Van Nuys Blvd for a 1st phase

Red Line / Heavy Rail / Subway (27)

Twenty-seven comments were received relating to a Rail line such as Metro Red Line, Heavy Rail, or a Subway. Sixteen comments support rail, specifically, an alignment from Sylmar/San Fernando road to Westwood via I-405 Sepulveda Pass. Eleven comments support a subway alternative in the San Fernando Valley to connect with the West Los Angeles with a rail stop at UCLA. One comment said a rail line from Sylmar to LAX is needed and notes Panorama City has the densest housing tract in all of San Fernando Valley. Other comments include:

- Provide one rail line connecting Sylmar to LAX via 405 Corridor
- Use Van Nuys alignment to connect to the Orange, Red and Purple Lines, Metrolink, High Speed Rail (HSR), and Amtrak
- A rail connection to UCLA, Westwood, and LAX
- Loop Sepulveda and Van Nuys Blvds like the Line #2 of Beijing Subway
- Must be constructed to connect with the City of San Fernando to Burbank
- Rail serves as the best option for businesses
- Rail provides an opportunity to connect to the lower part of the Valley to Mission College and Olive View
- Rail must connect to the Orange Line
- Rail must be constructed underground along the entire alignment
- Provide a rail connection to LAX and to future HSR system in Sylmar/San Fernando
- Provide a subway tunnel under the I-405



Bicycles/Bike Lanes (18)

Eighteen comments received relating to bicycles and/or bike lanes. Nine comments said to make available bike lanes, paths, and/or infrastructure and bike parking. Two comments said to provide bike racks to all transportation modes. One comment said to ensure that security is provided at each station location to monitor bicycles. Other comments include:


- Include bicycle buffered/protected lanes along the route
- Provide infrastructure for bikes like the Orange Line
- Integrate transit with bike options
- Include bike racks to all transportation modes
- Provide secured bike parking

Bus Rapid Transit (23)

Twenty-three comments received relating to Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) alternative for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor project. One comment said to extend the Metro Orange Line on to Lankershim Boulevard up to the Sun Valley Metrolink stop. Other comments include:

- BRT is least expensive and more efficient
- Prefer bus only lanes similar to Wilshire Blvd
- Build BRT like the Orange Line
- Provide a bus route to UCLA
- Sepulveda works for connecting to the I-405 Sepulveda Pass project

Other general comments mention no toll tunnel under the I-405 freeway, station designs and locations.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

Bus Operations (18)


Eighteen comments received relating to Bus Operations. More specifically, comments request Bus Operations to improve current bus routes, schedules, and bus frequencies. In particular, one comment said the East San Fernando Valley buses run sporadic specifically the Reseda line 420 and Roscoe line 152 or Woodman bus that runs 45 minutes to an hour. Other comments included:

- Too many routes that run every hour and ends early at 7:00 P.M.
- 734 and 234 buses needs to run later and longer to serve students and staff at Mission College
- Provide stops that will connect to buses services to the VA-SACC North Hills Hospital
- Consider curb-running buses to improve local and rapid bus services

Streetcar (17)

Seventeen comments were in favor of the Streetcar option along Van Nuys Boulevard connecting to the VA West Los Angeles Medical Center. Two comments expressed that a Streetcar option, similar to the one in Portland, OR, would provide a silent and efficient mode of transportation. Other comment includes:

- Streetcar (or Light Rail) along Van Nuys Boulevard and/or Sepulveda
- Streetcar should use the original Pacific Electric Right of Way (also for Light Rail option)
- Include bike racks on the Streetcar
- Streetcar for an alignment along Van Nuys Boulevard and Light Rail for an alignment along Sepulveda Boulevard
- Provide Streetcar routes as a possible replacement of existing bus lines
- Utilize the Streetcar on original Pacific-Electric Right-of-Way



Monorail (2)


Two comments received relating to Monorail option. One comment suggests a suspended Monorail, like the ones in Germany, be built on Ventura Blvd. The other comment said to consult with the City of Berkley regarding new light weight materials for the Monorail cars.

- Support for LRT or a suspended Monorail (similar to the one in Germany) along Ventura Boulevard
- Monorail with one track on dual column
- Consult with Berkley regarding new light weight materials for cars

No Build (15)

Fifteen comments were received relating to the No Build option. Nine comments stated not to build anything on Brand Blvd, while four comments stated not to build anything in the community of Mission Hills. One comment stated that an attempt should be made to remove the gangs and clean up the graffiti first. Another commenter stated they do not want this project and prefer only mixed-flow lanes. Other comments include:

- No build
- Not-in-my-backyard (NIMBY)
- Use mixed-flow lanes
- Anything but Brand Blvd
- A disaster, bad idea all the way around
- Stay out of Mission Hills



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

Transportation Systems Management (7)

Seven comments were received relating to Transportation System Management (TSM) option. Four comments are directed to Bus Operations requesting additional buses and increase the time schedule. Other comments include:


- Provide more transportation from the City of San Fernando to Burbank
- Improve bus services to run more often during the day
- Provide bus to Porter Ranch
- The designed should be like the Wilshire project or the Orange Line
- Include Bike Lanes and parking
- Improve the bus stops amenities, such as shade trees and bus shelters and benches

General Support for Any Improvements (11)

Eleven comments were received pertaining to General Support favoring the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project. Five comments support LRT to the San Fernando Valley and North County with connections to Metro Expo Lines via I-405 Sepulveda Pass. Others support the project on Van Nuys Blvd because of its connection to destination places and the perception of increased density on Van Nuys Blvd.

Other Mode-Type Comments

Other Mode-Type comments received suggests building the project grade-separated or underground. One comment said that articulated buses are over-burdened from the heavy ridership, multiple wheelchairs and bicyclists using them during peak hours.



Summary of Comments Received by Corridor

Van Nuys Boulevard Corridor (55)

Fifty-five comments received relating to the Van Nuys Boulevard Corridor: six comments received in favors the various destination points along Van Nuys Boulevard. Ten comments prefer the project to avoid Brand Blvd as an alignment. Other comments include:


- Van Nuys Boulevard offers a higher potential of ridership
- There is more activity along Van Nuys Blvd. such as government facilities & commercial areas
- Utilize LRT to mitigate congestion on Van Nuys Blvd.
- Utilizing Brand Boulevard as a corridor would degrade the aesthetics of single family residential community

Other comments include combining this corridor with the Sepulveda Pass to have one continuous route from the Sylmar/San Fernando Station to LAX.

Sepulveda Boulevard Corridor (24)

Twenty-four comments received relating to the Sepulveda Boulevard Corridor: Seven comments are in favor of LRT on Sepulveda as a direct connection with the I-405 Sepulveda Pass, Metrolink and UCLA, Westwood, and LAX. One comment said using Sepulveda Pass will get more people out of their cars. Other comments include:

- Utilize the existing medians on Brand and Sepulveda Blvd
- Use Sepulveda Blvd to connect to I-405 Sepulveda Pass Corridor Project, West LA, UCLA, and LAX
- Provide a u-turn at San Fernando Mission Blvd from Sepulveda Blvd



Other general comments include favoring Streetcar along Van Nuys; congestion on I-405 in the Burbank area and one comment does not want a bus route on Brand Blvd.

I 405 Sepulveda Pass Corridor Project (22)

Twenty-two comments received relating to the I-405 Sepulveda Pass Corridor Project. Ten comments support a LRT mode. More specifically, to combine the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor project with the I-405 Sepulveda Pass Corridor project that will connect UCLA, Westwood, the VA Hospital, LAX and Metro Orange, Red, Purple, and Expo Lines to have regional access to Los Angeles and the South Bay. Additionally, thirty-five comments overwhelmingly express “Not on Brand Blvd,” for concerns of family safety due to traffic congestions, accidents and fatalities, neighborhood pride and beautification of its medians. Other comments include:

- Combine the Sepulveda Pass Study as a single Corridor Study and Phase out construction
- Provide one rail line from Sylmar to LAX
- Connect to Metro Orange Line, Metrolink and Amtrak to have regional access


Summary of Comments by Alignment(s)

Sylmar/San Fernando (13)

Thirteen comments were received relating to the Sylmar/San Fernando alignment. Six comments are in favor of a LRT alignment with connections to Van Nuys Metrolink station and termination at LAX via I-405 Sepulveda Pass, UCLA, and Westwood. Other comments include:

- Make the northern terminus at Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station
- Consider a connection to the Metro Purple Line





- Consider a continuous mode from Sylmar to UCLA (West LA)
- Connect project to the proposed High Speed Rail station in Sylmar

Connect to Mission College (10)

Ten comments received relating to transit connection to Mission College. Three comments directed to Bus Operations to extend bus service hours to the College to accommodate students and staff that work late hours. One commenter requested that the alignment not to run on Brand Boulevard due to the existing traffic conditions. Other comments include:


- Transportation to Mission College
- Extend hours to assist CSUN Students, specifically during final exams
- Extend bus #234 and 734 needs to run later and longer to serve students and staff
- No alignment on Brand Blvd
- More transportation connections to Olive View Medical Center, Lakeview Terrace, and Eldridge and Hubbard

Other general comment relates to installing synchronize signal lights near Mission College that will allow traffic lights to change green more frequently.

Connect to UCLA/Westwood (34)

Thirty-four comments received relating to a connection to UCLA/Westwood and LAX. Seven comments favored an LRT alternative, while seven others preferred any rail that will connect Sylmar/San Fernando to Westwood and continue to LAX. In addition, one comment requested bicycle lanes along the alignment. Other comments include:

- Combine the ESFVTC project with the I-405 Sepulveda project
- Ensure the alignment provides a connection to Amtrak and/or Metrolink



- Provide an underground segment to UCLA, Westwood, and LAX
- Project should serve the densest neighborhoods and top destination location

Other comments include tunneling under the I-405 Freeway: ten opposes toll tunneling, eight favors toll tunneling, and one at-grade through the I-405 Sepulveda Pass.

Connect to Metrolink (17)

Seventeen comments received support a connection to Metrolink. Comments overwhelmingly support the ESFVTC project connects to Metrolink. In addition to connecting to Metrolink, comments also supports connections to Amtrak, Metro Orange and Metro Rail Lines. Fourteen comments overwhelmingly support rail on Van Nuys connecting to the Sylmar Metrolink Station. The Transit Coalition is advocating a light rail line at-grade along San Fernando Road and Van Nuys Blvd from the Sylmar Metrolink Station to the Metro Orange Line.


- Provide a rail connection to the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink station
- Provide an alignment along Van Nuys Blvd connecting Metrolink/future HSR station with Van Nuys Amtrak/Metrolink, Metro Orange, Purple, Red, and Expo Lines to LAX via I-405 Sepulveda Pass Corridor
- Provide LRT for Van Nuys Blvd to Pacoima San Fernando/Sylmar Metrolink Station
- Use Van Nuys Blvd From Metrolink Station to busway to Sepulveda Then south
- Design the project to connect with Amtrak and Metrolink to enable more access in Southern California to rail lines
- Provide LRT on Sepulveda to San Fernando Metrolink

Other Alignment Comments

Other alignment comments included various alternatives to the to the Sepulveda Blvd. corridor. The alignment comments included:

- Considering utilizing Rinaldi St. instead of Brand Blvd to avoid impacting the primarily single family residences.





- Using Brand Blvd. and San Fernando Mission as a turn around to connect back to Sepulveda
- Utilize San Fernando Mission instead of Brand Blvd.
- Laurel Canyon Blvd instead of Sepulveda Blvd to San Fernando Mission Blvd.

Other Types of Comments Summary

Desired Transit Stops

Many comments were made on the large corridor maps provided at the community meeting. Many of the comments focused on identifying areas where station stops should be considered. Civic centers, educational facilities, businesses, places of employment, health care facilities and retail locations are desired destinations for transit riders. Several of the desired transit stops would be in the Sepulveda Pass. The following is a list of transit stops requested in comments received:

Van Nuys Civic Center

West Los Angeles VA Medical Center

Mission College – intersection of Eldridge and Hubbard

Sherman Oaks Galleria

UCLA


Purple line terminus

Van Nuys Metrolink Station

Olive View Medical

Van Nuys Blvd. and Plummer St.





Van Nuys Blvd and Sepulveda Blvd.

Pedestrian Issues

Comments received related to pedestrian and multi-modal riders suggested that a BRT alternative limits the capacity of bicyclist and those on wheelchairs. An LRT alternative would increase the availability of spaces for said users.

Hybrid Comments

Seven comments received relates to a Hybrid alignment. Comments suggest an alignment along Van Nuys Blvd to the Metro Orange Line cross over to Sepulveda Blvd to connect to the I-405 Sepulveda Pass in the south and in reverse to connect to the 118 Freeway in the north.

Following is a matrix for all comments received during this pre-scoping phase of the outreach program. The matrix lists all comments in alphabetical order and numbers of comments received via the oversize maps and easel pads.

Background

The East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study began in Fall 2011 as the Van Nuys Boulevard Transit Corridor Study. The objective of the study is to evaluate options for improving north-south transit opportunities in the East San Fernando Valley. Based on comments received during and following community meetings in October 2011, the study expanded to also examine the possibility that Sepulveda Boulevard may present a viable option for a new north-south transit project. The study was also expanded to evaluate the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station as a potential northern terminus/origination point.

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) is conducting the study in collaboration with the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), and is also coordinating with the City of San Fernando. Three rounds of community meetings have been held so far: October 2011, April 2012 and October 2012. The first two rounds of meetings occurred prior to the start of the official environmental review process. The most recent meetings held in October 2012 occurred during the preparation of the Alternatives Analysis (AA) for the project. At all stages, outreach activities have focused on engaging and informing stakeholders about the overall project and study process.

Leading up to the last round of meetings, the outreach team re-activated a robust public participation program to educate interested stakeholder groups and individuals throughout the study area to:

- Update them on the proposed project, as well as mode and alignment alternatives being considered
- Encourage them to participate in the study process

Additionally, on the social media front, the outreach team has quantifiably grown its stakeholder "reach" by exponentially increasing followers from less than 100 on Facebook to nearly 600 followers since April 2012.

Community Meetings – October 2012

During the Alternative Analysis phase, Metro, LADOT and the City of San Fernando have elicited feedback from stakeholders regarding which alternatives they prefer for the Van Nuys Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard Corridor in the San Fernando Valley. The meetings were held on:

Tuesday, October 2 – Sepulveda Middle School in Mission Hills

Thursday, October 4 – San Fernando High School in San Fernando

Saturday, October 6 – Panorama High School in Panorama City

Tuesday, October 9 – Marvin Braude Civic Center in Van Nuys

The meeting on October 4th was also available live via web stream. The link to that meeting was posted on the internet that same evening.

At these meetings the Study team presented a no-build alternative, a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) alternative, two light rail transit (LRT) alternatives, and four bus rapid transit (BRT) alternatives for public review and comment. The comments received during and following the meetings are assisting the team in further screening the eight alternatives. It is anticipated that a subset of these eight alternatives will be carried forward for further study in the Project's Environmental Impact Study/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR). These fewer number of alternatives, will be shared during the scoping period at the beginning of the Draft EIS/EIR, anticipated for early 2012.

The following Outreach Documentation Report provides a summary of:

- The various activities that were completed to engage stakeholders in the study process in anticipation of the meetings
- Meeting notification activities
- Meeting details/logistics
- Summary of comments received

Outreach Activities

Elected Officials Briefing

In advance of the October 2012 community update meetings, a briefing was held at the Van Nuys Civic Center to update of all elected officials in the East San Fernando Valley area. Conducted on September 28, 2012, Metro re-introduced the project to the 14 staff members in attendance and presented them with the 8 alternatives under consideration. For detailed meetings notes and sign-in sheets, see Appendix 1. Elected Officials staff members in attendance welcomed improved public transit opportunities in the Valley and offered to assist in spreading the word regarding the upcoming community meetings. Some requested project information materials to distribute among their constituents. Per requests made, meeting notices were provided to the following offices:

- Los Angeles City Councilman Tony Cardenas
- Los Angeles City Councilman Richard Alarcon

- Los Angeles City Councilman Paul Krekorian
- Los Angeles City Councilman Paul Koretz
- Los Angeles City Councilman Tom LaBonge
- California State Senator Alex Padilla
- California State Assemblyman Bob Blumenfield
- Los Angeles Unified School District Board Member Tamar Galatzan
- City of San Fernando

Meeting Notification Activities

The meetings were noticed in the various ways. For a detailed list where notices were distributed, please see Appendix 2.

- Mailed to more than 500 interested individuals within the project area and key stakeholder groups.
- Take-1 notices were printed and placed on Metro buses and trains in the study area.
- Hand delivered meeting notices door-to-door to 15,000 households within northern Mission Hills and throughout City of San Fernando focused around the Brand Avenue/San Fernando Road alignments.
- Delivered 1,000 Posters to area businesses and centers of activity along the Van Nuys and Sepulveda Boulevard corridors.
- Distributed 10,000 flyers throughout the study area.
- Sent e-mail blasts to the stakeholder database with the following response rates:
 - September 18, 2012 - opened by 33% of recipients
 - September 27, 2012 - opened by 27% of recipients
 - October 1, 2012 - opened by 25% of recipients
 - October 3, 2012 - opened by 23% of recipients

- October 5, 2012 - opened by 19% of recipients
- October 8, 2012 - opened by 20% of recipients
- Collaborated with elected officials offices to share meeting information to their constituents via their website calendars
- Posted information via online media channels, including:
 - Facebook at eastsfvtransit
 - Twitter @eastsfvtransit
 - Metro.net/eastsfvtransit
 - The Source Blog
- Shared information about the project and upcoming meetings at the following community events:

Community Presentations

To ensure, key area groups and organizations are aware of the Project and study process, the outreach team coordinated **presentations to key groups** within the project study area. At these meetings, Metro representatives shared a brief project overview presentation and answered questions from participants. For detailed meeting notes that reflect the types of questions asked and answers provided, please see Appendix 3. Between July - November 2012, presentations were made to the following groups:

- Valley Economic Alliance -7/19/12
- Pacoima Neighborhood Council – 8/15/12
- Panorama Neighborhood Council – 8/23/12
- Sylmar Neighborhood Council – 8/23/12
- Mission Hills Neighborhood Watch - 8/28/12
- Sherman Oaks Chamber of Commerce - 8/29/12
- Mission College Student Body- 9/10/12
- Encino Neighborhood Council Transportation Committee – 9/11/12
- San Fernando City Council - 9/17/12

- Arleta Neighborhood Council – 8/21/12 and 9/18/12
- Pacoima Beautiful – 8/14/12 and 9/21/12
- Pacoima Neighborhood Council - 9/19/12
- Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association – 9/19/12
- Encino Neighborhood Council - 10/24/12
- VICA Transportation Committee - 11/12/12

Meeting Logistics

The meetings were conducted utilizing an open house and presentation format allowing participants to learn and speak directly to study team members and get an overview regarding the project during the meeting timeframe. During the first and last 30 minutes of the meeting, Project team members were on hand to walk attendees through a series of information boards, answer questions and receive feedback one-on-one. The open house portion of the meeting had several stations:

- Sign-in/Registration
- Project Overview – Where are we in the process? What is being studied? What is the study area?
- Alternatives Under Consideration – What type of system is being considered? How do they compare against each other? What do you think makes more sense?
- Screening Process – How will a decision be made as to what is further studied? What is an EIS/EIR? How do my comments help that process?
- Comments – provided various ways for participants to share their comments, via:
 - Comment Forms
 - Surveys
 - Video Commentary Recordings
 - Easel pads at each of the stations

During the presentation portion of the meetings, participants heard from Metro representatives about the overall study process, community input opportunities, how and who to contact for additional information, and answered questions from participants in attendance.

Meeting Materials

The following materials were created to inform, educate and engage stakeholders at the meetings and beyond. These provided background on the project, information on meeting format, as well as provided avenues for stakeholders to provide their input and ideas to Metro for consideration. The materials that were available at the meetings included:

- Fact Sheet (bilingual)
- Frequently Asked Questions (bilingual)
- Contact card
- Comment Sheet (bilingual)
- Survey (bilingual)
- Welcome Road Map (bilingual)
- PowerPoint Presentation (bilingual)

Meeting Participation

Attendance at the meetings was measured by the number of participants who signed-in at the welcome station. Stakeholder contact information provided was also added to the ongoing project database. The participation at these meetings is as follows:

- Tuesday, October 2, 2012 at Sepulveda Middle School
 - 35 Stakeholders signed in
- Thursday, October 4, 2012 at San Fernando High School
 - 44 Stakeholders signed in
- Saturday, October 6, 2012 at Panorama High School
 - 40 Stakeholders signed in
- Tuesday, October 9, 2012 at Van Nuys Civic Center
 - 56 Stakeholders signed in
- **Total Number of Sign-Ins: 175**

Appendix 4 of this report, includes copies of all sign-in sheets received and collateral materials available at the community meetings.

Comments

More than 118 comments were received at the four meetings regarding the Study. Following is a summary of all comments received. Full written and video comments are provided in the Appendix 5 and have been collected through a variety of formats, from written, verbal, visual and online methods.

Each of these distinct formats are summarized and recorded in Appendix 5:

- Summary of themes in comments provided matrix
- Notes on easel pads capturing many stakeholder questions, comments and concerns expressed at information stations as well as captured during the question and answer session following the presentation
- Comment forms
- Survey forms
- Video booth (footage of interviews and release forms)
- E-mailed comments
- Comments posted to social media sites
- Comments made on the project hotline

Summary of Comments Received

Mode

Light Rail Transit

Initial comments focus around the two Light Rail Transit Alternatives. Majority of the 118 comments received focus on this mode option specifically. Based on comments, it is evident that the public overwhelmingly prefers a Light Rail Transit (LRT) option. Comments favoring these alternatives included the following sentiments:

- Ensure and LRT connection to Mission College
- Ensure an LRT connection with future Sepulveda Pass Project
- LRT is the fastest mode for transportation
- Removing vehicular lanes and replacing them with LRT will ease congestion
- LRT is better for businesses and the local communities

- Stakeholders and the East San Fernando Valley deserve the best and most efficient mode
- LRT brings better opportunities and a sense of prosperity for members of the community
- Bikes and wheelchairs are best accommodated by LRT
- LRT is the best mode for the regional transit connectivity web
- Equity issues because the rest of the region already has an LRT or will soon have one include:
 - Dissent over the San Fernando Valley getting a second BRT over LRT
 - Comparing other regions that have LRT
 - Worries over money spent from San Fernando Valley projects to other LRT projects in the region
- Want the beauty and successes of the Expo Line to be recreated here on LRT
- Area built upon the Red Car (rail), want to see LRT back in the area
- Combine LRT-1 (southern portion) with LRT-2 (northern portion) for a new hybrid LRT alternative
- Put the maintenance facility for LRT in Panorama City

While majority of the comments relating to LRT focus on supporting this mode, there were specific comments that emerged from those who shared concerns, including:

- Do not run LRT down Brand Boulevard as it will destroy Brand's historic area
- Do not run LRT south of Orange Line along Van Nuys Boulevard due to access challenges for auto dealerships in the area
- Danger of accidents with LRT's faster speed along heavily residential areas
- Do not run LRT up Sepulveda due to better ridership along Van Nuys Boulevard
- Develop better LRT options
- LRT is too expensive

BRT

Of the comments received, nineteen comments focused on supporting a BRT system similar to the Orange Line on Van Nuys Bl. Comments favoring this mode included:

- BRT is a safe, low cost option
- BRT has the ability to be more flexible than an LRT system

- A BRT system will support local businesses and provide more direct routes than rail
- Need an Orange Line-like mode of transportation
- BRT provides more opportunities in general
- BRT best meets the goals of handling high ridership along Van Nuys

Comments were also received that shared the following concerns regarding a BRT option:

- BRT is a “band-aid;” is not faster or will it increase capacity
- BRT is a waste of money
- Impacts of increased bus use is detrimental to road surfaces, like on Ventura Boulevard
- Do not build dedicated lanes for BRT south of the Orange Line along Van Nuys Boulevard

Bicycles/Bike Lanes

Nineteen comments were related to bicycles and bicycle lanes. Many commented that LRT is a better option for transporting bicycles. There is a need to accommodate more than 2-3 bikes on transit options on Van Nuys Bl. No comments were made negatively concerning bicycles or bike lanes. When given the option, most comments indicated preference for bicycle lanes instead of parking lanes.

- Bike lanes must be included with any project moving forward
- Bicycles and wheelchairs are better accommodated on LRT
- Bikeway is preferred versus street parking if having to make a choice

Buses

Twenty comments were made concerning current bus routes and frequency.

- Do not cut current local bus routes
- Do not eliminate local bus line stops – we do not want to walk farther to ride the bus
- Fix the current bus routes

Alternatives

No Build

Ten comments received were specifically related to the No Build Alternative. Through the survey distributed and comment forms received it was determined that seven support this option, none are neutral and forty-four are opposed.

Comment citing support for a No Build alternative include:

- There is already lots of traffic on Van Nuys Bl. and another mode of transit would just increase traffic hazards.
- Transit options will only bring crime to businesses and residences nearby.
- New modes will take away lanes for cars and add to traffic
- If you build, it will only increase crime for businesses and bring eminent domain to local property owners
- General opposition to overall study efforts in general

Those sharing opposition to the No Build Alternative stated:

- The No Build option will bring civil unrest
- The No Build options is not an option - the East San Fernando Valley deserves a new public transit system.
- There is a need to build something along Van Nuys and/or Sepulveda Boulevard

Transportation Systems Management (TSM)

Through survey and comments it was determined that three attendees support this option, four are neutral and thirty-two are opposed. Eleven comments were made supporting the use of TSM.

Streetcar

The streetcar option was eliminated in this round of meetings. One person concurred with that decision by stating that the streetcar is the wrong vehicle given the length of the corridor.

Specific to Six Build Alternatives

LRT-1

As noted above, various comments were received sharing preference for an LRT due to the speed and mobility options offered by an LRT system. Nevertheless, when given a choice between LRT-1 and LRT-2, there seems to be more preference to LRT-2. Comments associated with this alternative include:

- Leaves out major ridership connections on Van Nuys Boulevard
- Speed and mobility will be best with this alternative
- Likes the southern portion of this alternative
- Southern portion of alternative offers best connection to the Sepulveda Pass Project
- A hybrid between LRT-1 and LRT-2 would better serve the ridership needs of the study area
- Follows the old Pacific Electric (Red Car) Line which makes sense
- Would really assist to reduce traffic congestion in the study area
- San Fernando Valley deserves a faster way to travel the North/South corridor and this alternative does it

LRT-2

Comments favoring this option specifically noted the view that it offers connection with other transit options such as the Orange Line, Amtrak, and Metrolink. Specific comments include:

- Van Nuys Boulevard would have more ridership than Sepulveda alignment.
- Avoids Brand Boulevard, which contains single-family housing, and are opposed
- Majority of the neighborhood councils in the study area favor this alternative
- Needs to connect to the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station and to Westwood
- Best for connection to High Speed Rail throughout California
- Would be the best option for moving residents locally and beyond
- Best suited to meet greenhouse gas reduction mandates, AB 32 and SB 375.
- Connects to Panorama City, which has the highest density in the San Fernando Valley

BRT-1

In meetings, it was noted that this alignment would assist in saving money for the project due to its shared route on part of the current Orange Line busway. Other comments included:

- Support it along Sepulveda south of Orange line and north of Parthenia

BRT-2

Residents found the alignment of interest due to its ability to operate in mixed flow traffic in some areas as well as connect to other existing transit options along the corridor (i.e. Orange Line, Amtrak, Metrolink). The noted theme of the comments reflected:

- Preferred for cost, speed of construction, and flexibility

BRT-3

This alternative received the most support compared of the four BRT alternatives that were shared. Stakeholders liked its combination of mixed-flow and dedicated-lane operations, and shared route with the current Orange Line busway to transition between Sepulveda and Van Nuys Boulevards.

- Most economical and quick option to develop
- Connect a Rapid Bus to the Sylmar/Metrolink station
- Add new Metrolink stop at Van Nuys Blvd or extend Van Nuys Blvd service there to meet all trains
- Needs a terminus at Sepulveda and Ventura for future connections through Sepulveda Pass

BRT-4

The alignment option was favored by residents that wanted a transit project to extend to Foothill Bl. Comments included:

- Cost efficient with shared-use of Metro Orange Line
- Connect to Sylmar/Metrolink to make it faster to get to work
- Service Mission College and connect with Metro Orange/Red Lines to access Hollywood and Los Angeles
- Has shortest end to end travel time between
- Like BRT-4 route, but want it to be LRT

Other Comments

Other alignment comments include extending the route to the north side of the Foothill Freeway, allowing for future connections to the Westside, removing on-street parking and driving lanes to make way for transit, and choosing transit options that are business or residential friendly.


- Anything built must include connections to a future Sepulveda Pass project to ensure transit service from the Valley to the Westside
- Ensure a connection hub in San Fernando for Amtrak/Metrolink and future high-speed rail.
- Having LRT or BRT on Van Nuys will increase crime for businesses nearby
- Capacity is more important than cost
- Do not raise fares to cover the price of this project

Specific to Van Nuys Boulevard

- Van Nuys Boulevard needs transit that is business-friendly.
- Stopping along Van Nuys will be good for businesses.
- Pacoima, Panorama City, and Van Nuys constitute a “Historic Business Corridor,” therefore, public transit needs to serve them better.
- Special interests that are averse to having transit along Van Nuys should not be dictating route options.
- Best ridership is on Van Nuys.
- Do not build on Van Nuys Boulevard because it will only increase traffic.
- Do not build a dedicated lane for transit south of the Orange Line along Van Nuys Boulevard.

Specific to Brand Boulevard

- A public transit system along Brand Boulevard will destroy the historic character.
- A Brand Boulevard alignment will destroy the beautiful historic trees along the median.
- Brand Boulevard is single-family residential community.
- Do not build a dedicated lane along Brand Boulevard in San Fernando.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Appendix 2: Scoping Meeting Notification Locations Listing

March - May 2013



NOTICE OF PREPARATION/INTENT ISSUED
FOR THE EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT

[Español](#)

In collaboration with the Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando, Metro is identifying north-south transit opportunities to improve local and regional connections, enhance access to jobs, education, cultural, recreational and other opportunities – without a car – in the East San Fernando Valley corridor.

Metro, in collaboration with the Federal Transit Administration, issued a [Notice of Preparation/Intent](#) that a Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (EIS/EIR) will be prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project.

Public input is an important part of this process. Therefore, Scoping Meetings to learn about alternatives to be studied and share your thoughts for this project are being planned for March 16, 19, 21 and 27, 2013. Stay tuned for information regarding the Scoping Meetings that will be provided in the coming days.

East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study Overview

The Study is evaluating the following alternatives:

No Build: Establishes a baseline for comparison with the other alternatives being evaluated. It represents conditions predicted for the year 2035 if no new project is constructed. It does incorporate other new projects that are already included in adopted plans

Transportation System Management (TSM): Evaluates the benefits of lower cost operational improvements including enhanced bus frequencies for Van Nuys Rapid Bus

761 or other bus lines, traffic signal synchronization, off-board fare collection, bus stop amenities/improvements, bus schedule restructuring, intersection and road improvements, etc.

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT): Similar to the Metro Orange Line, BRT would generally operate in dedicated lanes with some portions operating in mixed-flow traffic. BRT typically provides higher frequency, speed and reliability when compared to standard Rapid or Local Bus service. The BRT route being evaluated for this project would travel from the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station southeast along San Fernando Road and then south on Van Nuys Bl with three possible options for the project's southern terminus.

Light Rail Transit (LRT): Similar to the Metro Gold, Blue, Green, and Expo Lines, LRT operates with standard gauge passenger railcars, on exclusive right-of-way with overhead electric power. A two-car train set can carry approximately 300 passengers. Stations are typically spaced about one mile apart. Under this Alternative, Metro would also need to build a new LRT maintenance facility. The LRT Alternative route would travel from the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station southeast along San Fernando Road and then south on Van Nuys Bl to Ventura Bl.

[follow on Twitter](#) | [friend on Facebook](#) | [forward to a friend](#)

Copyright © 2013 Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) in Coordination with the City of Los Angeles, All rights reserved. You are receiving this email because you are a stakeholder in the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study (formerly Metro Van Nuys Bl Rapidway Study)

Our mailing address is:

Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) in Coordination with the City of Los Angeles
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

[Add us to your address book](#)



[unsubscribe from this list](#)



You are invited to our first formal Scoping Meeting for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project.

[Español](#)

In collaboration with the Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando, Metro is identifying north-south transit opportunities to improve local and regional connections, enhance access to jobs, education, cultural, recreational and other opportunities – without a car – in the East San Fernando Valley corridor.

You are invited to join us as we begin the formal environmental review process for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project. Public input is an important part of this process.

At these Scoping Meetings you will be able to:

- Learn about the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study;
- Learn about the environmental review process and project schedule;
- Find out about the alternatives planned for analysis; and
- Provide input about the scope of the analysis that should be considered in the environmental review.

The first meeting is:

Saturday, March 16, 2013, 10am-12pm

Panorama High School

8015 Van Nuys Bl

Panorama City, CA 91402

Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 & Metro Local Lines 233 & 656; DASH Route - Panorama City/Van Nuys.

Additional Meetings will be held as follows:

Tuesday, March 19, 2013, 6-8pm

The City of San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
208 Park Av

San Fernando, CA 91340

Served by Metro Rapid Lines 794 and Metro Local Lines 224 and 234

Thursday, March 21, 2013, 6-8pm

Arleta High School
14200 Van Nuys Bl

Arleta, CA 91331

Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 and Metro Local Lines 158 and 233

Wednesday, March 27, 2013, 4-6pm

Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center
6262 Van Nuys Bl

Van Nuys, CA 91401

Served by Metro Orange Line, Metro Rapid Line 761, Metro Local Lines 154, 156, 164, 233 and 237 and DASH Routes Panorama City/Van Nuys and Van Nuys/Studio City
Validated Parking available at City Hall Parking Lot (Sylvan/Sylmar Av Entrance)

Meeting content will be identical so choose the meeting most convenient to you. Can't make it in-person? Then join us via the internet as we webcast the March 21st meeting. See it live beginning at 6:30pm or on demand after that date at:

<http://www.ustream.tv/channel/eastsfv>.

Please join us to learn about the project, the evaluation process, and the alternatives being studied

For more information, visit metro.net/EastSFVTransit or E-mail your comments to EastSFVTransit@Metro.net.

Spanish translation will be provided as well as additional languages upon request. Special accommodations and information in alternative formats are available to the public. All requests for reasonable accommodations must be made three working days (72 hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. Please call the Project Hotline at 818.276.3233 or the California Relay Service at 711.

Public Comments regarding the scope of the Study will be accepted until May 6, 2013 via e-mail, post mail and on Facebook and Twitter.

Mail to:

Mr. Walt Davis

Project Manager
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

E-Mail to: eastsfvtransit@metro.net

Metro is pleased to announce that this is the first time that the agency will receive official formal comments through Facebook and Twitter.

Facebook: www.facebook.com/eastsfvtransit

Please click on the "Submit Scoping Comments" tab at the top of the page.

Twitter: [@eastsfvtransit](https://twitter.com/eastsfvtransit) using #ESFVscoping

[follow on Twitter](#) | [friend on Facebook](#) | [forward to a friend](#)

Copyright © 2013 Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)
in Coordination with the City of Los Angeles, All rights reserved.
You are receiving this email because you are a stakeholder in
the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study (formerly
Metro Van Nuys BI Rapidway Study)
Our mailing address is:
Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) in Coordination
with the City of Los Angeles
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

[Add us to your address book](#)



[unsubscribe from this list](#)



You are invited to our second formal Scoping Meeting tomorrow at the City of San Fernando Regional Pool Facility.

[Español](#)

You're invited to a series of formal scoping meetings for the ESFV Transit Corridor Project, the second of which will be held:

Tuesday, March 19, 2013, 6-8pm

The City of San Fernando Regional Pool Facility

208 Park Av

San Fernando, CA 91340

Served by Metro Rapid Lines 794 and Metro Local Lines 224 and 234

Meetings will also be held:

Thursday, March 21, 2013, 6-8pm

Arleta High School

14200 Van Nuys Bl

Arleta, CA 91331

Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 and Metro Local Lines 158 and 233

Can't make it in-person? Then join us via the internet as we webcast the March 21st meeting. See it live beginning at 6:30pm or on demand after that date at:

<http://www.ustream.tv/channel/eastsfv>.

Wednesday, March 27, 2013, 4-6pm

Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center

6262 Van Nuys Bl

Van Nuys, CA 91401

Served by Metro Orange Line, Metro Rapid Line 761, Metro Local Lines 154, 156, 164, 233 and 237 and DASH Routes Panorama City/Van Nuys and Van Nuys/Studio City
Validated Parking available at City Hall Parking Lot (Sylvan/Sylmar Av Entrance)

At these Scoping Meetings you will be able to:

- Learn about the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study;
- Learn about the environmental review process and project schedule;
- Find out about the alternatives planned for analysis; and
- Provide input about the scope of the analysis that should be considered in the environmental review.

For more information, visit metro.net/EastSFVTransit or E-mail your comments to EastSFVTransit@Metro.net.

Spanish translation will be provided as well as additional languages upon request. Special accommodations and information in alternative formats are available to the public. All requests for reasonable accommodations must be made three working days (72 hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. Please call the Project Hotline at 818.276.3233 or the California Relay Service at 711.

Public Comments regarding the scope of the Study will be accepted until May 6, 2013 via e-mail, post mail and on Facebook and Twitter.

Mail to:

Mr. Walt Davis
Project Manager
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

E-Mail to: eastsfvtransit@metro.net

Metro is pleased to announce that this is the first time that the agency will receive official formal comments through Facebook and Twitter.

Facebook: www.facebook.com/eastsfvtransit

Please click on the "Submit Scoping Comments" tab at the top of the page.

Twitter: [@eastsfvtransit](https://twitter.com/eastsfvtransit) using #ESFVscoping

[follow on Twitter](#) | [friend on Facebook](#) | [forward to a friend](#)

Copyright © 2013 Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)
in Coordination with the City of Los Angeles, All rights reserved.
You are receiving this email because you are a stakeholder in
the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study (formerly
Metro Van Nuys BI Rapidway Study)

Our mailing address is:

Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) in Coordination
with the City of Los Angeles

One Gateway Plaza

Mail Stop 99-22-3

Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

[Add us to your address book](#)



[unsubscribe from this list](#)



You are invited to our third formal Scoping Meeting tomorrow at Arleta High School.

[Español](#)

You're invited to a series of formal scoping meetings for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project, the third of which will be held:

Thursday, March 21, 2013, 6-8pm

Arleta High School

14200 Van Nuys Bl

Arleta, CA 91331

Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 and Metro Local Lines 158 and 233

Can't make it in-person? Then join us via the internet as we webcast the March 21st meeting. See it live beginning at 6:30pm or on demand after that date at: <http://www.ustream.tv/channel/eastsfv>.

The final meeting will be held:

Wednesday, March 27, 2013, 4-6pm

Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center

6262 Van Nuys Bl

Van Nuys, CA 91401

Served by Metro Orange Line, Metro Rapid Line 761, Metro Local Lines 154, 156, 164, 233 and 237 and DASH Routes Panorama City/Van Nuys and Van Nuys/Studio City
Validated Parking available at City Hall Parking Lot (Sylvan/Sylmar Av Entrance)

At these Scoping Meetings you will be able to:

- Learn about the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study;
- Learn about the environmental review process and project schedule;

- Find out about the alternatives planned for analysis; and
- Provide input about the scope of the analysis that should be considered in the environmental review.

For more information, visit <http://www.metro.net/projects/east-sfv/> or E-mail your comments to EastSFVTransit@Metro.net.

Spanish translation will be provided as well as additional languages upon request. Special accommodations and information in alternative formats are available to the public. All requests for reasonable accommodations must be made three working days (72 hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. Please call the Project Hotline at 818.276.3233 or the California Relay Service at 711.

Public Comments regarding the scope of the Study will be accepted until May 6, 2013 via e-mail, post mail and on Facebook and Twitter.

Mail to:

Mr. Walt Davis
Project Manager
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

E-Mail to: eastsfvtransit@metro.net

Metro is pleased to announce that this is the first time that the agency will receive official formal comments through Facebook and Twitter.

Facebook: www.facebook.com/eastsfvtransit

Please click on the "Submit Scoping Comments" tab at the top of the page.

Twitter: [@eastsfvtransit](https://twitter.com/eastsfvtransit) using #ESFVscoping

[follow on Twitter](#) | [friend on Facebook](#) | [forward to a friend](#)

Copyright © 2013 Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) in Coordination with the City of Los Angeles, All rights reserved. You are receiving this email because you are a stakeholder in the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study (formerly Metro Van Nuys BI Rapidway Study) Our mailing address is: Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) in Coordination with the City of Los Angeles One Gateway Plaza

Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

[Add us to your address book](#)



[unsubscribe from this list](#)





You are invited to our final formal Scoping Meeting tomorrow at the Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center.

[Español](#)

You're invited to the last of the formal scoping meetings for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project, it will be held:

Wednesday, March 27, 2013, 4-6pm

Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center

6262 Van Nuys Bl

Van Nuys, CA 91401

Served by Metro Orange Line, Metro Rapid Line 761, Metro Local Lines 154, 156, 164, 233 and 237 and DASH Routes Panorama City/Van Nuys and Van Nuys/Studio City
Validated Parking available at City Hall Parking Lot (Sylvan/Sylmar Av Entrance)

Can't make it in-person? Then watch our March 21st meeting on demand at: <http://www.ustream.tv/channel/eastsfv>.

At these Scoping Meetings you will be able to:

- Learn about the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study;
- Learn about the environmental review process and project schedule;
- Find out about the alternatives planned for analysis; and
- Provide input about the scope of the analysis that should be considered in the environmental review.

For more information, visit <http://www.metro.net/projects/east-sfv/> or E-mail your comments to EastSFVTransit@Metro.net.

Spanish translation will be provided as well as additional languages upon request.

Special accommodations and information in alternative formats are available to the public. All requests for reasonable accommodations must be made three working days (72 hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. Please call the Project Hotline at 818.276.3233 or the California Relay Service at 711.

Public Comments regarding the scope of the Study will be accepted until May 6, 2013 via e-mail, post mail and on Facebook and Twitter.

Mail to:

Mr. Walt Davis
Project Manager
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

E-Mail to: eastsfvtransit@metro.net

Metro is pleased to announce that this is the first time that the agency will receive official formal comments through Facebook and Twitter.

Facebook: www.facebook.com/eastsfvtransit

Please click on the "Submit Scoping Comments" tab at the top of the page.

Twitter: [@eastsfvtransit](https://twitter.com/eastsfvtransit) using #ESFVscoping

[follow on Twitter](#) | [friend on Facebook](#) | [forward to a friend](#)

Copyright © 2013 Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) in Coordination with the City of Los Angeles, All rights reserved. You are receiving this email because you are a stakeholder in the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study (formerly Metro Van Nuys BI Rapidway Study)
Our mailing address is:
Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) in Coordination with the City of Los Angeles
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

[Add us to your address book](#)



[unsubscribe from this list](#)



[Español](#)

EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR HOW TO PROVIDE COMMENTS DURING SCOPING

On March 1, 2013, Metro, in collaboration with the Federal Transit Administration, issued a [Notice of Preparation/Intent](#) that a Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (EIS/EIR) will be prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project.

Public input is an important part of this process. You are invited to submit OFFICIAL FORMAL SCOPING COMMENTS that will help shape the study. This is your opportunity to let us know the issues you would like the EIS/EIR to evaluate.

Formal Scoping Comments can be submitted via the following official channels:

Mail to:

Mr. Walt Davis

Project Manager

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-3

Los Angeles, CA 90012

E-Mail to: eastsfvtransit@metro.net

Metro is pleased to announce that this is the first time that the agency will receive official formal comments via Facebook and Twitter.

- Via Facebook at: www.facebook.com/eastsfvtransit

Please click on the "Submit Scoping Comments" tab at the top of the page.

- Via Twitter: @eastsvtransit using #ESFVscoping

At Scoping Meetings that will be held on:

Saturday, March 16, 2013, 10 am-12 pm

Panorama High School

8015 Van Nuys Bl

Panorama City, CA 91402

Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 & Metro Local Line 233; DASH Route - Panorama City/Van Nuys

Tuesday, March 19, 2013, 6-8 pm

The City of San Fernando Regional Pool Facility

208 Park Av

San Fernando, CA 91340

Served by Metro Rapid Lines 794 and Metro Local Lines 224 and 234

Thursday, March 21, 2013, 6-8 pm

Arleta High School

14200 Van Nuys Bl

Arleta, CA 91331

Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 and Metro Local Lines 158 and 233

Wednesday, March 27, 2013, 4-6 pm

Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center

6262 Van Nuys Bl

Van Nuys, CA 91401

Validated Parking available at City Hall Parking Lot (Sylvan/Sylmar Av Entrance)

Served by Metro Orange Line, Metro Rapid Line 761, Metro Local Lines 154, 156, 164, 233 and 237 and DASH Routes Panorama City/Van Nuys and Van Nuys/Studio City

Can't make it in-person? Then, view and comment via a live-stream of the presentation beginning at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2013 or on-demand at: <http://ustream.tv/channel/eastSFV>.

To learn more about the four alternatives being considered, please visit the study website at: www.metro.net/eastsvtransit.

[follow on Twitter](#) | [friend on Facebook](#) | [forward to a friend](#)

Metro Van Nuys BI Rapidway Study)
Our mailing address is:
Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) in Coordination
with the City of Los Angeles
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

[Add us to your address book](#)



[unsubscribe from this list](#)



[Español](#)

HELP US PLAN MORE TRANSIT FOR THE EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY
PLEASE JOIN US AT SCOPING MEETINGS TO DISCUSS ALTERNATIVES
BEING STUDIED

In collaboration with the Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando, Metro and the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA), are identifying north-south transit opportunities to improve local and regional connections, enhance access to jobs, education, cultural, recreational and other opportunities – without a car – in the East San Fernando Valley corridor.

The formal environmental review process for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study began on March 1, 2013 when the FTA and Metro issued a [Notice of Intent/Preparation](#) to draft an Environmental Impact Statement/Report. Public input is an important part of the environmental review process and we invite you to attend upcoming Scoping Meetings to learn about the alternatives being studied and to share your thoughts for this project.

Meeting Dates, Locations, and Information

Saturday, March 16, 2013, 10 am-12 pm

Panorama High School

8015 Van Nuys Bl

Panorama City, CA 91402

Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 & Metro Local Line 233; DASH Route -

Panorama City/Van Nuys

Tuesday, March 19, 2013, 6-8 pm

The City of San Fernando Regional Pool Facility

208 Park Av

San Fernando, CA 91340

Served by Metro Rapid Lines 794 and Metro Local Lines 224 and 234

Thursday, March 21, 2013, 6-8 pm

Arleta High School

14200 Van Nuys Bl

Arleta, CA 91331

Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 and Metro Local Lines 158 and 233

Wednesday, March 27, 2013, 4-6 pm

Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center

6262 Van Nuys Bl

Van Nuys, CA 91401

Validated Parking available at City Hall Parking Lot (Sylvan/Sylmar Av Entrance)

Served by Metro Orange Line, Metro Rapid Line 761, Metro Local Lines 154, 156, 164, 233 and 237 and DASH Routes Panorama City/Van Nuys and Van Nuys/Studio City

Unable to attend in-person? The public is invited to view the presentation via live-stream beginning at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2013 or on-demand at: <http://ustream.tv/channel/eastSFV>.

During the first half-hour of each Scoping Meeting, attendees will be able to visit information stations and learn about the project and study process in an open house format.

Information shared at each meeting will be identical.

Special accommodations and information in alternative formats are available to the public. All requests for reasonable accommodations must be made three working days (72 hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. Please call the Project Hotline at 818.276.3233 or the California Relay Service at 711.

At these meetings you will be able to:

- Learn about the [East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study](#)
- Learn about the environmental review process and project schedule;
- Find out about the alternatives planned for analysis and
- Provide FORMAL SCOPING COMMENTS that will help shape the study.

This is your opportunity to let us know the issues you would like the EIS/EIR to

evaluate. Formal Scoping Comments can be submitted via the following official channels:

Mail to:

Mr. Walt Davis
Project Manager
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

E-Mail to: eastsfvtransit@metro.net

Metro is pleased to announce that this is the first time that the agency will receive official formal comments through Facebook and Twitter.

Facebook: www.facebook.com/eastsfvtransit

Please click on the "Submit Scoping Comments" tab at the top of the page.

Twitter: @eastsfvtransit using #ESFVscoping

Public Comments regarding the scope of the Study will be accepted until May 6, 2013.

[follow on Twitter](#) | [friend on Facebook](#) | [forward to a friend](#)

Copyright © 2013 Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) in Coordination with the City of Los Angeles, All rights reserved. You are receiving this email because you are a stakeholder in the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study (formerly Metro Van Nuys BI Rapidway Study)
Our mailing address is:
Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) in Coordination with the City of Los Angeles
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

[Add us to your address book](#)



[unsubscribe from this list](#)

Thank You!



Prefiere email en español? [Oprima aqui](#)

Thank you for joining us!



Metro would like to thank those of you who attended our most recent scoping meetings. Your feedback and participation are invaluable to our study effort, which aims to evaluate ways to improve north-south transit opportunities in the east San Fernando Valley. In case you were not able to attend our meetings, you can find a copy of the PowerPoint presentation given at each of the meetings by clicking [here](#). You may also view a video of the meeting held on March 21 [here](#).

We urge you to continue to learn about the project, the evaluation process and the

options being studied including different routes and transportation modes. We will be incorporating any comments we receive by Monday, May 6, 2013 into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (EIS/R).

Please continue to voice your opinion by submitting a comment via email to EastSFVTransit@Metro.net. Facebook, Twitter or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, 1 Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

Email: eastsfvtransit@metro.net

Facebook: [facebook.com/eastsfvtransit](https://www.facebook.com/eastsfvtransit)

Twitter: [@eastsfvtransit](https://twitter.com/eastsfvtransit)

Mail: Mr. Walt Davis, Project Manager
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012

[forward to a friend](#)

Copyright © 2013 Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) in Coordination with the City of Los Angeles, All rights reserved. You are receiving this email because you are a stakeholder in the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study (formerly Metro Van Nuys BI Rapidway Study)

Our mailing address is:

Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) in Coordination with the City of Los Angeles
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

[Add us to your address book](#)



[unsubscribe from this list](#)

Reminder: Still Accepting Formal Scoping Comments.



Prefiere email en español? [Oprima aqui](#)

Please Submit Your Comments by May 6th!

Metro and the City of Los Angeles still welcome your input on the study evaluating various public transit alternatives for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project. The alternatives being considered include:

- No Build
- Transit System Management – which include improvements such as traffic signal synchronization, street re-stripping, intersection widenings, etc.
- Bus Rapid Transit – building a new system similar to the Metro Orange Line.
- Light Rail Transit – building a new system similar to the Metro Gold, Green, Blue and Expo lines

Please let us know what issues are most important to you as we evaluate these different alternatives. We urge you to continue to learn about the project, the evaluation process and the options being studied including the different routes and transportation modes. In case you were not able to attend our scoping meetings, you can find a copy of the PowerPoint presentation given at each of the meetings by clicking [here](#). You may also view a video of the meeting held on March 21 [here](#).

Please continue to voice your opinion by submitting a comment via email to EastSFVTransit@Metro.net. [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#) or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, 1 Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

Thank you again for your participation

[forward to a friend](#)

Copyright © 2013 Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)
in Coordination with the City of Los Angeles, All rights reserved.
You are receiving this email because you are a stakeholder in
the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study (formerly
Metro Van Nuys BI Rapidway Study)

Our mailing address is:

Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) in Coordination
with the City of Los Angeles

One Gateway Plaza

Mail Stop 99-22-3

Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

[Add us to your address book](#)



[unsubscribe from this list](#)

Reminder: The Final Day to Submit Comments is May 6th!



Prefiere email en español? [Oprima aqui](#)

Reminder: The Final Day to Submit Comments is May 6th!

Metro and the City of Los Angeles still welcome your input on the study evaluating various public transit alternatives for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project. The alternatives being considered include:

- No Build
- Transit System Management – which include improvements such as traffic signal synchronization, street re-stripping, intersection widenings, etc.
- Bus Rapid Transit – building a new system similar to the Metro Orange Line.
- Light Rail Transit – building a new system similar to the Metro Gold, Green, Blue and Expo lines

Please let us know what issues are most important to you as we evaluate these different alternatives. We urge you to continue to learn about the project, the evaluation process and the options being studied including the different routes and transportation modes. In case you were not able to attend our scoping meetings, you can find a copy of the PowerPoint presentation given at each of the meetings by clicking [here](#). You may also view a video of the meeting held on March 21 [here](#).

Please continue to voice your opinion by submitting a comment via email to EastSFVTransit@Metro.net. [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#) or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, 1 Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

Thank you again for your participation

[forward to a friend](#)

Copyright © 2013 Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)
in Coordination with the City of Los Angeles, All rights reserved.
You are receiving this email because you are a stakeholder in
the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study (formerly
Metro Van Nuys BI Rapidway Study)

Our mailing address is:

Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) in Coordination
with the City of Los Angeles
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

[Add us to your address book](#)



[unsubscribe from this list](#)

Community Meetings

Please visit information stations during the first half-hour to learn about the project and study process. Information shared at each meeting will be identical.

Saturday, March 16, 2013, 10am-12pm

Panorama High School
8015 Van Nuys Bl
Panorama City, CA 91402
*Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 & Local Line 233;
& DASH Route - Panorama City/Van Nuys*

Tuesday, March 19, 2013, 6-8pm

The City of San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
208 Park Av
San Fernando, CA 91340
*Served by Metro Rapid Line 794 & Local
Lines 224 & 234*

Thursday, March 21, 2013, 6-8pm

Arleta High School
14200 Van Nuys Bl
Arleta, CA 91331
Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 & Local Lines 158 & 233

Wednesday, March 27, 2013, 4-6pm

Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center
6262 Van Nuys Bl
Van Nuys, CA 91401
*Served by Metro Orange Line, Rapid Line 761, & Local
Lines 154, 156, 164, 233 & 237, & DASH Routes
Panorama City/Van Nuys & Van Nuys/Studio City.
Validated Parking available at City Hall Parking
Lot (Sylvan/Sylmar Av Entrance)*

Can't make it in-person? Then, view and comment via a live-stream of the presentation beginning at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2013 or on-demand at <http://ustream.tv/channel/eastSFV>.

Special accommodations and information in alternative formats are available to the public. All requests for reasonable accommodations must be made three working days (72 hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. Please call the Project Hotline at 818.276.3233 or the California Relay Service at 711.

En colaboración con las Ciudades de Los Ángeles y San Fernando, Metro está identificando oportunidades de transporte de norte a sur para mejorar las conexiones locales y regionales, fortalecer el acceso a empleos, centros educacionales, culturales y recreacionales además de otras oportunidades – sin el uso de un vehículo – en el corredor del este del Valle de San Fernando.






La participación del público es importante en este proceso. Por lo tanto, mientras empezamos formalmente la revisión ambiental, le invitamos a que asista a unas de nuestras reuniones de alcance, para que aprenda sobre las alternativas que se estudiarán y comente sobre el proyecto.

Durante las reuniones, usted podrá:

- > Aprender sobre el estudio del Corredor de Transporte del lado este del Valle de San Fernando;
- > Aprender sobre el proceso de revisión ambiental y la cronología del proyecto;
- > Aprender sobre las alternativas que se estudiarán a fondo; y
- > Darnos sus comentarios formales sobre el alcance del análisis que se debe considerar en la revisión ambiental

Se preparará un Borrador de Declaración de Impacto Ambiental/Informe (EIS/EIR) de acuerdo a el Acta Nacional de Política Ambiental y el Acta de Calidad Ambiental de California. Metro y la Ciudad de Los Ángeles están sirviendo como co-líderes en la preparación del documento en conjunto con la Ciudad de San Fernando y la Administración Federal de Transporte.

Contáctenos

-  818.276.3233
-  eastsftransit@metro.net
-  metro.net/eastsftransit
-  [@eastsftransit](https://twitter.com/eastsftransit)
-  [eastsftransit](https://www.facebook.com/eastsftransit)

Reuniones Comunitarias

Durante la primer media hora de cada reunión, por favor visite las estaciones de información y aprenda sobre el proyecto y el proceso del estudio. La información compartida en cada reunión será idéntica.

Sábado, 16 de marzo de 2013, 10am-12pm

Panorama High School
8015 Van Nuys Bl
Panorama City, CA 91402
*Las líneas rapid 761 y local 233 de Metro; y ruta DASH
Panorama City/Van Nuys llegan a este lugar.*

Martes, 19 de marzo de 2013, 6-8pm

The City of San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
208 Park Av
San Fernando, CA 91340
*Las líneas rapid 794 y líneas locales 224 y 234
de Metro llegan a este lugar.*

Jueves, 21 de marzo de 2013, 6-8pm

Arleta High School
14200 Van Nuys Bl
Arleta, CA 91331
*Las líneas rapid 761 y locales 158 y 233 de Metro
llegan a este lugar*

Miércoles, 27 de marzo de 2013, 4-6pm

Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center
6262 Van Nuys Bl
Van Nuys, CA 91401
*Las líneas Orange, rapid 761, y locales 154, 156, 164,
233 y 237 de Metro; y rutas DASH Panorama City/Van
Nuys y Van Nuys/Studio City llegan a este lugar.
Hay estacionamiento disponible en el lote de City Hall
(por la entrada de Sylvan y Sylmar Av).*

¿No puede participar en persona? Vea la presentación en vivo y comente por Internet el jueves, 21 de marzo del 2013 a las 6:30pm en <http://ustream.tv/channel/eastSFV>. También estará disponible después de la reunión.

Facilidades especiales e información en formatos alternativos están disponibles al público. Todos los pedidos para adaptaciones razonables deben ser sometidos tres días hábiles (72 horas) antes de la fecha de la reunión programada. Favor de llamar a la línea del proyecto al 818.276.3233 o el Servicio de retransmisión de California al 711.

Información General Sobre el Proyecto

El estudio evalúa las siguientes alternativas:

- > No Construcción: Establece una línea base para comparación con las otras alternativas que están siendo evaluadas. Representa las condiciones estimadas para el año 2035 si ningún proyecto es construido. Incorpora otros proyectos nuevos que ya están incluidos en los planes aprobados.
- > Administración de Sistemas de Transporte (TSM): Evalúa los beneficios de mejoras operacionales de menor costo incluyendo mejoramiento en la frecuencia de autobuses para la línea Metro Rapid 761 de Van Nuys Bl u otras líneas de autobús, sincronización de semáforos, colección de tarifas fuera del autobús, amenidades/mejoras en las estaciones/paradas de autobús, reestructuración de horarios de autobuses, mejoras a intersecciones y calles, etc.
- > Tránsito de Autobús Rápido (BRT): Similar a la Línea Metro Orange, BRT generalmente operaría en carriles dedicados con algunas porciones operando en tráfico mixto. BRT típicamente provee mayor frecuencia, velocidad y confiabilidad, en comparación con el servicio estándar de Metro Rapid y el servicio de autobús local. La ruta BRT siendo evaluada para este proyecto, viajaría sureste desde la Estación Metrolink Sylmar/San Fernando sobre San Fernando Road y después hacia el sur sobre Van Nuys Bl con tres posibles opciones para la terminal sur.
- > Tránsito de Tren Ligero (LRT): Similar a la líneas Metro Gold, Blue, Green, y Expo, el LRT operaría con calibrador de vagones de pasajeros sobre carriles exclusivos, con línea de electricidad aérea. Un tren de dos vagones puede transportar aproximadamente 300 pasajeros. Las estaciones están típicamente separadas a una milla de distancia. Bajo esta alternativa, Metro tendría que construir una nueva instalación de mantenimiento para los trenes. La ruta de la Alternativa de LRT, viajaría entre la Estación Metrolink de Sylmar/San Fernando sureste sobre San Fernando Rd y después hacia el sur sobre Van Nuys Bl hasta terminar en Ventura Bl.

Overview

The Study is evaluating the following alternatives:

- > No Build: Establishes a baseline for comparison with the other alternatives being evaluated. It represents conditions predicted for the year 2035 if no new project is constructed. It does incorporate other new projects that are already included in adopted plans
- > Transportation System Management (TSM): Evaluates the benefits of lower cost operational improvements including enhanced bus frequencies for Van Nuys Rapid Bus 761 or other bus lines, traffic signal synchronization, off-board fare collection, bus stop amenities/improvements, bus schedule restructuring, intersection and road improvements, etc.
- > Bus Rapid Transit (BRT): Similar to the Metro Orange Line, BRT would generally operate in dedicated lanes with some portions operating in mixed-flow traffic. BRT typically provides higher frequency, speed and reliability when compared to standard Rapid or Local Bus service. The BRT route being evaluated for this project would travel from the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station southeast along San Fernando Rd and then south on Van Nuys Bl with three possible options for the project's southern terminus.
- > Light Rail Transit (LRT): Similar to the Metro Gold, Blue, Green, and Expo Lines, LRT operates with standard gauge passenger railcars, on exclusive right-of-way with overhead electric power. A two-car train set can carry approximately 300 passengers. Stations are typically spaced about one mile apart. Under this alternative, Metro would also need to build a new LRT maintenance facility. The LRT Alternative route would travel from the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station southeast along San Fernando Rd and then south on Van Nuys Bl to Ventura Bl.

In collaboration with the Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando, Metro is identifying north-south transit opportunities to improve local and regional connections, enhance access to jobs, education, cultural, recreational and other opportunities – without a car – in the East San Fernando Valley corridor.

Public input is also an important part of this process. Therefore, as we begin the formal environmental review, please attend upcoming Scoping Meetings to learn about alternatives to be studied and share your thoughts for this project.

At these meetings you will be able to:

- > Learn about the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study;
- > Learn about the environmental review process and project schedule;
- > Find out about the alternatives planned for analysis; and
- > Provide formal comments regarding the scope of the analysis that should be considered in the environmental review.

A Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (EIS/EIR) will be prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Metro and the City of Los Angeles are serving as co-leads in preparing these reports in conjunction with the City of San Fernando and the Federal Transit Administration.

Contact Us

- ☎ 818.276.3233
- ✉ eastsftransit@metro.net
- 🌐 metro.net/eastsftransit
- 🐦 [@eastsftransit](https://twitter.com/eastsftransit)
- 📘 [eastsftransit](https://www.facebook.com/eastsftransit)



Metro

One Gateway Plaza
99-13-1
Los Angeles, CA 90012

metro.net

Help us plan more transit for the San Fernando Valley.

Ayúdenos a planear más tránsito para el Valle de San Fernando.

Scoping Meetings March 16, 19, 21 & 27
Reuniones comunitarias 16, 19, 21 y 27 de marzo



What's next for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

¿Qué sigue para el Estudio del Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando?

In collaboration with the Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando, Metro is identifying north-south transit opportunities to improve local and regional connections, enhance access to jobs, education, cultural, recreational and other opportunities – without a car – in the East San Fernando Valley corridor.

En colaboración con las Ciudades de Los Ángeles y San Fernando, Metro está identificando oportunidades de transporte de norte a sur para mejorar las conexiones locales y regionales, fortalecer el acceso a empleos, centros educativos, culturales y recreacionales además de otras oportunidades – sin el uso de un vehículo – en el corredor del este del Valle de San Fernando.

Public input is an important part of this process. Therefore, as we begin the formal environmental review, please attend upcoming Scoping Meetings to learn about alternatives to be studied and share your thoughts for this project.

La participación del público es importante en este proceso. Por lo tanto, mientras empezamos formalmente la revisión ambiental, le invitamos a que asista a unas de nuestras Reuniones de Ámbito, para que aprenda sobre las alternativas que se estudiarán y comente sobre el proyecto.

At these meetings you will be able to:

- Learn about the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study
- Learn about the environmental review process and project schedule
- Find out about the alternatives planned for analysis
- Provide formal comments regarding the scope that should be considered in the environmental review analysis


Durante las reuniones, usted podrá:

- Aprender sobre el Estudio del Corredor de Transporte del este del Valle de San Fernando
- Aprender sobre el proceso de revisión ambiental y la cronología del proyecto
- Aprender sobre las alternativas que se estudiarán a fondo
- Darnos sus comentarios formales sobre el alcance que se debe considerar en el análisis de la revisión ambiental

Can't make it in-person? Then, view and comment via a live-stream of the presentation beginning at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2013 or on-demand at:
<http://ustream.tv/channel/eastSFV>.

¿No puede participar en persona? Vea la presentación y comente por medio de internet el jueves, 21 de marzo, 2013 a las 6:30 p.m.:
<http://ustream.tv/channel/eastSFV>. La presentación será transmitida en vivo y también estará disponible para su revisión después de la reunión.

 metro.net/eastsfvtransit

 818.276.3233

 eastsfvtransit@metro.net

 facebook.com/eastsfvtransit

 [Twitter @eastsfvtransit](https://twitter.com/eastsfvtransit)



Meeting Dates, Locations, and Information

Fechas, Lugares e Información de Cada Reunión

Saturday, March 16, 2013, 10 am-12 pm

Panorama High School
8015 Van Nuys Bl
Panorama City, CA 91402

*Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 and Metro Local Line 233;
DASH Route - Panorama City/Van Nuys*

Tuesday, March 19, 2013, 6-8 pm

The City of San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
208 Park Av
San Fernando, CA 91340

*Served by Metro Rapid Lines 794 and Metro
Local Lines 224 and 234*

Thursday, March 21, 2013, 6-8 pm

Arleta High School
14200 Van Nuys Bl
Arleta, CA 91331

Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 and Metro Local Lines 158 and 233

Wednesday, March 27, 2013, 4-6 pm

Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center
6262 Van Nuys Bl
Van Nuys, CA 91401
Validated Parking available at City Hall Parking Lot
(Sylvan/Sylmar Av Entrance)

*Served by Metro Orange Line, Metro Rapid Line 761, Metro
Local Lines 154, 156, 164, 233 and 237, DASH Routes
Panorama City/Van Nuys and Van Nuys/Studio City*

* Information shared at each meeting will be identical.

Sábado, 16 de marzo del 2013, 10 am-12 pm

Panorama High School
8015 Van Nuys Bl
Panorama City, CA 91402

*Servido por la Línea Metro Rapid 761, Línea Local de Metro 233; Ruta
DASH - Panorama City/Van Nuys*

Martes, 19 de marzo del 2013, 6-8 pm

Instalación Acuática Regional de la Ciudad de San Fernando
208 Park Av
San Fernando, CA 91340

*Servido por la Línea Metro Rapid 794 y las Líneas
Locales de Metro 224 y 234*

Jueves, 21 de marzo del 2013, 6-8 pm

Arleta High School
14200 Van Nuys Bl
Arleta, CA 91331

*Servido por la Línea Metro Rapid 761 y las Líneas
Locales de Metro 158 y 233*

Miércoles, 27 de marzo del 2013, 4-6 pm

Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center
6262 Van Nuys Bl
Van Nuys, CA 91401
Estacionamiento será validado – Entrada por las Calles
Sylvan/Sylmar

*Servido por la Línea Metro Orange; Línea Metro Rapid 761,
Líneas Locales de Metro 154, 156, 164, 233, 237; y las Rutas
DASH Panorama City/Van Nuys y Van Nuys/Studio City*

* La información compartida en cada reunión será idéntica.



Can't make it in-person? View and comment via a live-stream of the presentation beginning at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2013 or on-demand at:

<http://ustream.tv/channel/eastSFV>.

¿No puede participar en persona? Vea la presentación y comente por medio de internet el jueves, 21 de marzo, 2013 a las 6:30 p.m.:

<http://ustream.tv/channel/eastSFV>.

La presentación será transmitida en vivo y también estará disponible para su revisión después de la reunión.



 *metro.net/eastsfvtransit*



818.276.3233

 *eastsfvtransit@metro.net*

 *facebook.com/eastsfvtransit*

 *Twitter @eastsfvtransit*



What's next for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

In collaboration with the Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando, Metro is identifying north-south transit opportunities to improve local and regional connections, enhance access to jobs, education, cultural, recreational and other opportunities – without a car – in the East San Fernando Valley corridor.

Public input is also an important part of this process. Therefore, as we begin the formal environmental review, please attend upcoming Scoping Meetings to learn about alternatives to be studied and share your thoughts for this project.

At these meetings you will be able to:

- Learn about the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study
- Learn about the environmental review process and project schedule
- Find out about the alternatives planned for analysis
- Provide formal comments regarding the scope of the analysis that should be considered in the environmental review

Meeting Dates, Locations, and Information

Saturday, March 16, 2013, 10 am-12 pm

Panorama High School
8015 Van Nuys Bl
Panorama City, CA 91402

Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 & Metro Local Line 233; DASH Route - Panorama City/Van Nuys

Tuesday, March 19, 2013, 6-8 pm

The City of San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
208 Park Av
San Fernando, CA 91340

Served by Metro Rapid Lines 794 and Metro Local Lines 224 and 234

Thursday, March 21, 2013, 6-8 pm

Arleta High School
14200 Van Nuys Bl
Arleta, CA 91331

Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 and Metro Local Lines 158 and 233

Wednesday, March 27, 2013, 4-6 pm

Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center
6262 Van Nuys Bl
Van Nuys, CA 91401
Validated Parking available at City Hall Parking Lot (Sylvan/Sylmar Av Entrance)

Served by Metro Orange Line, Metro Rapid Line 761, Metro Local Lines 154, 156, 164, 233 and 237 and DASH Routes Panorama City/Van Nuys and Van Nuys/Studio City

* Information shared at each meeting will be identical.

Can't make it in-person? Then, view and comment via a live-stream of the presentation beginning at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2013 or on-demand at:
<http://ustream.tv/channel/eastSFV>.



 metro.net/eastsfvtransit

 818.276.3233

 eastsfvtransit@metro.net

 [facebook.com/eastsfvtransit](https://www.facebook.com/eastsfvtransit)

 Twitter @eastsfvtransit



¿Qué sigue para el Estudio del Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando?

En colaboración con las Ciudades de Los Ángeles y San Fernando, Metro está identificando oportunidades de transporte de norte a sur para mejorar las conexiones locales y regionales, fortalecer el acceso a empleos, centros educacionales, culturales y recreacionales además de otras oportunidades – sin el uso de un vehículo – en el corredor del este del Valle de San Fernando.

La participación del público es importante en este proceso. Por lo tanto, mientras empezamos formalmente la revisión ambiental, le invitamos a que asista a unas de nuestras Reuniones de Ámbito, para que aprenda sobre las alternativas que se estudiarán y comente sobre el proyecto.

Durante las reuniones, usted podrá:

- Aprender sobre el Estudio del Corredor de Transporte del este del Valle de San Fernando
- Aprender sobre el proceso de revisión ambiental y la cronología del proyecto
- Aprender sobre las alternativas que se estudiarán a fondo
- Darnos sus comentarios formales sobre el alcance del análisis que se debe considerar en la revisión ambiental

Fechas, Lugares e Información de Cada Reunión

Sábado, 16 de marzo del 2013, 10 am-12 pm

Panorama High School

8015 Van Nuys Bl

Panorama City, CA 91402

Servido por la Línea Metro Rapid 761, Línea Local de Metro 233; Ruta DASH - Panorama City/Van Nuys

Martes, 19 de marzo del 2013, 6-8 pm

Instalación Acuática Regional de la Ciudad de San Fernando

208 Park Av

San Fernando, CA 91340

Servido por la Línea Metro Rapid 794 y las Líneas Locales de Metro 224 y 234

* La información compartida en cada reunión será idéntica.

Jueves, 21 de marzo del 2013, 6-8 pm

Arleta High School

14200 Van Nuys Bl

Arleta, CA 91331

Servido por la Línea Metro Rapid 761 y las Líneas Locales de Metro 158 y 233

Miércoles, 27 de marzo del 2013, 4-6 pm

Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center

6262 Van Nuys Bl

Van Nuys, CA 91401

Estacionamiento será validado – Entrada por las Calles Sylvan/Sylmar


Servido por la Línea Metro Orange; Línea Metro Rapid 761, Líneas Locales de Metro 154, 156, 164, 233, 237; y las Rutas DASH Panorama City/Van Nuys y Van Nuys/Studio City

¿No puede participar en persona? Entonces, vea la presentación y comente por medio de internet el jueves, 21 de marzo, 2013 a las 6:30 p.m.: <http://ustream.tv/channel/eastSFV>.

La presentación será transmitida en vivo y también estará disponible para su revisión después de la reunión.



 metro.net/eastsfvtransit

 818.276.3233

 eastsfvtransit@metro.net

 [facebook.com/eastsfvtransit](https://www.facebook.com/eastsfvtransit)

 Twitter @eastsfvtransit



Sign Up


Email or Phone

Password

Log In

Keep me logged in

[Forgot your password?](#)



Draft EIS/EIR Public Scoping Meeting #1

Public · By East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

Going (1)




Jody Litvak

Export · Report

Saturday, March 16, 2013

10:00am until 12:00pm in PDT

Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 & Metro Local Line 233; DASH Route - Panorama City/Van Nuys



RECENT POSTS



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study is going.

[Like](#) · [Comment](#) · [Follow Post](#) · March 4 at 9:32am



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study updated the event photo.



[Like](#) · [Comment](#) · [Follow Post](#) · March 2 at 7:18am



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study created the event.

[Like](#) · [Comment](#) · [Follow Post](#) · March 2 at 7:17am

Sign Up

Email or Phone

Password

Log In

Keep me logged in


[Forgot your password?](#)



Draft EIS/EIR Public Scoping Meeting #2

Public · By East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

Going (5)



Maybe (1)



Arek Soulahian

Invited (30)




Export · Report

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

6:00pm until 8:00pm in PDT

Served by Metro Rapid Lines 794 and Metro Local Lines 224 and 234



RECENT POSTS



Chris Shows is going.

Follow Post · March 19 at 1:21pm



Tony Waree is going.

Follow Post · March 19 at 12:04am



Steven Harris is going.

Follow Post · March 16 at 10:14pm



Jack Lindblad is going.

Follow Post · March 16 at 4:01pm



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study is going.

Like · Comment · Follow Post · March 4 at 9:32am

Jack Lindblad likes this.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study updated the event photo.





[Like](#) · [Comment](#) · [Follow Post](#) · March 2 at 7:21am

[José Eduardo Palma](#) likes this.



[East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study](#) created the event.

[Like](#) · [Comment](#) · [Follow Post](#) · March 2 at 7:21am

Sign Up

Email or Phone

Password

Log In

Keep me logged in

[Forgot your password?](#)



Draft EIS/EIR Public Scoping Meeting #3

Public · By East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

Going (1)




Jody Litvak

Export · Report

Thursday, March 21, 2013

6:00pm until 8:00pm in PDT

Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 and Metro Local Lines 158 and 233



RECENT POSTS



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study is going.

Like · Comment · Follow Post · March 4 at 9:32am



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study updated the event photo.



Like · Comment · Follow Post · March 2 at 7:24am



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study created the event.

Like · Comment · Follow Post · March 2 at 7:23am

Sign Up

Email or Phone

Password

Log In

Keep me logged in


[Forgot your password?](#)



Draft EIS/EIR Public Scoping Meeting #4

Public · By East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

Going (2)



Maybe (1)



Tony Waree


Export · Report

📅 Wednesday, March 27, 2013

🕒 4:00pm until 6:00pm in PDT

☰ Validated Parking available at City Hall Parking Lot (Sylvan/Sylmar Av Entrance)

Served by Metro Orange Line, Metro Rapid Line 761, Metro Local Lines 154, 156, 164, 233 and 237 and DASH Routes Panorama City/Van Nuys and Van Nuys/Studio City



RECENT POSTS



Rolando Chavarria is going.

Follow Post · March 19 at 9:44pm



Rolando Chavarria is going.

Follow Post · March 5 at 12:49am



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study is going.

Like · Comment · Follow Post · March 4 at 9:32am



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study updated the event photo.



Like · Comment · Follow Post · March 2 at 7:27am




East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study created the event.

Like · Comment · Follow Post · March 2 at 7:26am

Sepulveda Pass Subway likes this.

[Mobile](#) [Find Friends](#) [Badges](#) [People](#) [Pages](#) [Places](#) [Apps](#) [Games](#) [Music](#)
[About](#) [Create Ad](#) [Create Page](#) [Developers](#) [Careers](#) [Privacy](#) [Cookies](#) [Terms](#) [Help](#)

Facebook © 2013 · [English \(US\)](#)



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Appendix 3: Digital Engagement Reports

March - May 2013



Memorandum

To: W. Davis and J. Litvak
From: Lilian De Loza
Subject: ESFV Transit Study Social Media Monitoring Report for February 28, 2013 – March 13, 2013
Date: March 15, 2013

Summary of Observations and Next Steps

- The digital engagement team has created engaging content for posting on our project social media platforms of Twitter and Facebook. Along with Metro's social media efforts, we have together formed an effective way to educate members of the public about the issues, needs and opportunities to help us discover efficient transit solutions for the east San Fernando Valley.

*The following is a summary of digital engagement efforts and responses during **February 28 – March 13, 2013**. Note: grammar and spelling corrections of comments posted by others are not made in this section.*

Facebook

Followers: 874 total page-likes to date.

People Talking About This: 35 unique users have created a story about our page. This includes liking our page, posting on our page's wall, liking, commenting on or sharing one of our posts or mentioning our page.

Average Weekly Reach: The average number of people who have seen any content associated with our page per week is 368 people.

February 28 – March 6



Date ?	Post ?	Reach ?	Engaged Users ?	Talking About This ?	Virality ?
3/6/13	House adopts six month spending bill th...	184	7	1	0.54%
3/6/13	D.C. area's first bus-only lanes under co...	205	8	2	0.98%
3/5/13	Reminder: why Election Day in Los Ang...	199	10	2	1.01%
3/2/13	East San Fernando Valley Transit Corrid...	--	--	--	--
3/2/13	East San Fernando Valley Transit Corrid...	--	--	--	--
3/2/13	East San Fernando Valley Transit Corrid...	--	--	--	--
3/2/13	East San Fernando Valley Transit Corrid...	--	--	--	--
3/2/13	East San Fernando Valley Transit Corrid...	--	--	--	--
3/1/13	Metro, in collaboration with the Federal ...	377	35	13	3.45%
3/1/13	Reminder I-405 lane reduction starts ton...	157	7	--	--
3/1/13	Sequester Would Cut New Starts By \$1...	155	7	1	0.65%
2/28/13	A subway makes a family. Don't know if...	194	7	--	--
2/28/13	The Great Los Angeles Train Resurgence	174	11	1	0.57%
2/28/13	Rockefeller, Lautenberg Re-Introduce I...	169	2	1	0.59%

March 7 – March 13



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

New Likes Talking About This Weekly Total Reach
7 **21** +90.9% **416** +26.1%

[See All Insights](#) • [Promote Page](#)



Date ?	Post ?	Reach ?	Engaged Users ?	Talking About This ?	Virality ?
3/13/13	Metro and other agencies urge feds to r...	189	9	2	1.06%
3/13/13	Senate Restores MAP-21 Transportation ...	287	10	5	1.74%
3/13/13	Taking the Guesswork Out of Rating BR...	211	17	6	2.84%
3/13/13	Talking America Fast Forward, among ...	173	10	2	1.16%
3/11/13	Busway or Light Rail on Van Nuys? Metr...	553	73	20	3.62%
3/11/13	Public transportation surges as America...	344	18	5	1.45%
3/11/13	What Transportation Stakeholders Need...	182	8	1	0.55%
3/11/13	Metro's Van Nuys Boulevard, Sherman ...	445	27	10	2.25%
3/8/13	Upcoming public meetings to discuss Ea...	210	16	3	1.43%
3/7/13	East SFV friends: We love your input a...	228	39	2	0.88%
3/7/13	Maximizing the Value of Infrastructure	208	5	1	0.48%

Twitter

Followers: 7 new Twitter followers; 109 total Twitter followers to date

Retweets: 1 @EastSFVTransit tweets were reposted.

@Replies: The @EastSFVTransit Twitter feed received 0 comments.



Online Advertising

Our current ad campaign began on March 6, 2013 and will conclude in late April of 2013. So far, the page has received a steady incline of new likes, unique visitors, and daily impressions.



East San Fernando Valley



Share your vision for improving transit service in the east San Fernando Valley

Like · 1,019 people like East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study



Ashley Meachem likes East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

Like





Memorandum

To: W. Davis and J. Litvak
From: Lilian De Loza
Subject: ESFV Transit Study Social Media Monitoring Report for March 14, 2013 – March 27, 2013
Date: March 29, 2013

Summary of Observations and Next Steps

- The digital engagement team has created engaging content for posting on our project social media platforms of Twitter and Facebook. Along with Metro's social media efforts, we have together formed an effective way to educate members of the public about the issues, needs and opportunities to help us discover efficient transit solutions for the east San Fernando Valley.

*The following is a summary of digital engagement efforts and responses during **March 14 – March 27, 2013**.
Note: grammar and spelling corrections of comments posted by others are not made in this section.*

Facebook

Followers: 959 total page-likes to date.

People Talking About This: 217 unique users have created a story about our page. This includes liking our page, posting on our page's wall, liking, commenting on or sharing one of our posts or mentioning our page.

Average Weekly Reach: The average number of people who have seen any content associated with our page per week is 10,735 people.

March 14 – March 20



Date ?	Post ?	Reach ?	Engaged Users ?	Talking About This ?	Virality ?
3/20/13	Toronto is looking to LA.	263	26	6	2.28%
3/20/13	Report gives America's infrastructure a s...	201	11	3	1.49%
3/19/13	Our second meeting is going on now at...	332	10	5	1.51%
3/19/13	Civil Engineers Echo Obama Calling for ...	363	13	5	1.38%
3/19/13	Our 2nd Scoping Meeting is tonight at 6...	271	14	5	1.85%
3/18/13	Blog: Repeal SB 221 Robbins' Bill for Pos...	445	59	20	4.49%
3/18/13	Good, Bad News in Senate 2013 Transp...	196	6	3	1.53%
3/18/13	New Zealand noticing what's going on i...	536	31	12	2.24%
3/18/13	Metro studying north-south transit corri...	304	24	8	2.63%
3/16/13	Good Morning! Doors are open for our ...	361	16	4	1.11%
3/14/13	Be sure to click through these. Good st...	358	23	3	0.84%
3/14/13	Making new connections in the Valley	200	16	1	0.5%
3/14/13	The Limits of Bus Rapid Transit: A Cape ...	205	16	2	0.98%

March 21 – March 27



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

New Likes Talking About This Weekly Total Reach

48 **117** *+6.4%* **7,923** *-41.5%*

[See All Insights](#) · [Promote Page](#)

Date ?	Post ?	Reach ?	Engaged Users ?	Talking About This ?	Virality ?
--------	--------	---------	-----------------	----------------------	------------



3/27/13	We're setting up for our final scoping m...	366	22	3	0.82%
3/27/13	Valley Transit Dreams: Subway to Bob ...	153	20	3	1.96%
3/27/13	Metro Board to consider change to Mea...	324	13	2	0.62%
3/26/13	New transportation bill, same old fundin...	123	5	1	0.81%
3/26/13	How about a mass-transit lobby? — MS...	146	9	1	0.68%
3/26/13	Details of Senate's \$100 Billion Transport...	253	12	4	1.58%
3/26/13	Here's the slide presentation on the East ...	221	22	3	1.36%
3/21/13	From our scoping meeting at Arleta Hig...	326	48	14	4.29%
3/21/13	Home Values Performed 42 Percent Bett...	173	13	6	3.47%
3/21/13	Today is the day of our third Scoping ...	356	25	8	2.25%
3/21/13	Today is the day of our third Scoping ...	102	1	--	--

Twitter

Followers: 7 new Twitter followers; 109 total Twitter followers to date

Retweets: 1 @EastSFVTransit tweets were reposted.

@Replies: The @EastSFVTransit Twitter feed received 0 comments.



Online Advertising

Our current ad campaign began on March 6, 2013 and will conclude in late April of 2013. So far, the page has received a steady incline of new likes, unique visitors, and daily impressions.



East San Fernando Valley



Share your vision for improving transit service in the east San Fernando Valley

Like · 1,019 people like East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study



Ashley Meachem likes East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

Like





Memorandum

To: W. Davis and J. Litvak
From: Lilian De Loza
Subject: ESFV Transit Study Social Media Monitoring Report for March 28, 2013 – April 10, 2013
Date: April 12, 2013

Summary of Observations and Next Steps

- The digital engagement team has created engaging content for posting on our project social media platforms of Twitter and Facebook. Along with Metro's social media efforts, we have together formed an effective way to educate members of the public about the issues, needs and opportunities to help us discover efficient transit solutions for the east San Fernando Valley.

*The following is a summary of digital engagement efforts and responses during **March 28 – April 10, 2013**.
Note: grammar and spelling corrections of comments posted by others are not made in this section.*

Facebook

Followers: 1,014 total page-likes to date.

People Talking About This: 154 unique users have created a story about our page. This includes liking our page, posting on our page's wall, liking, commenting on or sharing one of our posts or mentioning our page.

Average Weekly Reach: The average number of people who have seen any content associated with our page per week is 19,020 people.

March 28 – April 3



Date ?	Post ?	Reach ?	Engaged Users ?	Talking About This ?	Virality ?
4/3/13	A bit of interesting LA history.	1,147	75	9	0.78%
4/3/13	Infrastructure bank would fund more t...	71	10	--	--
4/2/13	We're almost to 1,000 likes! Thank you a...	178	12	2	1.12%
4/2/13	Authority votes to look at L.A. County t...	138	10	4	2.9%
4/2/13	Here Are the 'Hoods You Can Blame Fo...	132	24	2	1.52%
4/1/13	Minority of L.A. County voters quashed...	790	60	13	1.65%
4/1/13	Public Transportation Does Relieve Traff...	622	33	4	0.64%
3/29/13	While we're planning for the future of tr...	678	38	13	1.92%
3/29/13	The "Rebuild America Partnership": The...	135	14	2	1.48%
3/28/13	Metro Goes to Plan B to Deliver Transit ...	128	19	3	2.34%
3/28/13	Compare the neighborhood density of ...	151	14	4	2.65%
3/28/13	10 of the Grandest, Busiest Train Station...	148	13	3	2.03%
3/28/13	New study of five metro areas finds ho...	210	15	4	1.9%

April 4 – April 10



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

New Likes Talking About This Weekly Total Reach
44 **90** +63.6% **24,830** +123.5%

[See All Insights](#) • [Promote Page](#)

Date ?	Post ?	Reach ?	Engaged Users ?	Talking About This ?	Virality ?
4/10/13	New artist opportunities at El Monte Station	48	1	--	--
4/10/13	Bill Boyarsky thinks LA's Mayoral candidat...	58	4	--	--
4/9/13	This is fun.	78	6	--	--
4/8/13	Moscow traffic rated worst in world — RT...	66	4	--	--
4/5/13	Save America's Infrastructure » DeFazio T...	53	11	2	3.77%



Twitter

Followers: 7 new Twitter followers; 109 total Twitter followers to date

Retweets: 1 @EastSFVTransit tweets were reposted.

@Replies: The @EastSFVTransit Twitter feed received 0 comments.



Online Advertising

Our current ad campaign began on March 6, 2013 and will conclude in late April of 2013. So far, the page has received a steady incline of new likes, unique visitors, and daily impressions.





Memorandum

To: W. Davis and J. Litvak
From: Lilian De Loza
Subject: ESFV Transit Study Social Media Monitoring Report for April 11, 2013 – April 24, 2013
Date: April 26, 2013

Summary of Observations and Next Steps

- The digital engagement team has created engaging content for posting on our project social media platforms of Twitter and Facebook. Along with Metro's social media efforts, we have together formed an effective way to educate members of the public about the issues, needs and opportunities to help us discover efficient transit solutions for the east San Fernando Valley.

*The following is a summary of digital engagement efforts and responses during **April 11 – April 24, 2013**.
Note: grammar and spelling corrections of comments posted by others are not made in this section.*

Facebook

Followers: 1,014 total page-likes to date.

People Talking About This: 35 unique users have created a story about our page. This includes liking our page, posting on our page's wall, liking, commenting on or sharing one of our posts or mentioning our page.

Average Weekly Reach: The average number of people who have seen any content associated with our page per week is 792 people.

April 11 – April 17



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

New Likes	Talking About This	Weekly Total Reach
1	21 -76.7%	1,193 -95.2%

[See All Insights](#) • [Promote Page](#)

Date ?	Post ?	Reach ?	Engaged Users ?	Talking About This ?	Virality ?
4/15/13	Just a reminder that you are able to subm...	379	26	12	3.17%
4/12/13	Read a bit about 1970's rail plans in LA.	97	11	1	1.03%
4/12/13	Obama wants \$50B for roads, \$40B for ra...	78	9	3	3.85%
4/11/13	A little bit of LA transportation history for ...	929	61	16	1.72%
4/11/13	Building America's Future Applauds Presid...	77	2	1	1.3%

April 18 – April 24



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

New Likes: **0**
 Talking About This: **14** -33.3%
 Weekly Total Reach: **391** -67.2%

[See All Insights](#) • [Promote Page](#)

Date ?	Post ?	Reach ?	Engaged Users ?	Talking About This ?	Virality ?
4/24/13	Study: Yes, L.A. has the worst traffic in t...	90	12	2	2.22%
4/23/13	Today's Transportation Headlines on The ...	78	9	1	1.28%
4/18/13	Busway on Sunset? Metro Studying Citywi...	97	6	--	--
4/18/13	What Corridors Could Be Best for BRT? M...	121	7	--	--












Twitter

Followers: 3 new Twitter followers; 130 total Twitter followers to date

Retweets: 0 @EastSFVTransit tweets were reposted.

@Replies: The @EastSFVTransit Twitter feed received 10 comments.



-  **Transit Coalition** @Transit_Co 25 Apr
All comments re: @EastSFVTransit must be submitted by midnight May 6, 2013.
Expand
-  **Transit Coalition** @Transit_Co 25 Apr
Have a comment on the @EastSFVTransit project? You can submit a formal comment via social media. Use #EastSFVscoping.
Expand
-  **Transit Coalition** @Transit_Co 24 Apr
Still time to register for tomorrow's #TransitDinner! Join us in discussing the @eastsfvtransit project: ow.ly/jX44V
Expand
-  **Jason Burns** @jasonburns 23 Apr
@PaulKrekorian Terrific! Now, let's talk about that #405subway connecting Valley to Westside... @EastSFVTransit
View conversation
-  **andrew seely** @andrewseely 23 Apr
@jasonburns @EastSFVTransit YEP. NEED a #405subway from orange line in van nuys to the expo rail.
Expand
-  **Jason Burns** @jasonburns 23 Apr
You guys think we should have a #405subway from Valley to Westside? Metro wants your input. Tell them at @EastSFVTransit.
Expand
-  **Transit Coalition** @Transit_Co 20 Apr
Register for next Thursday's #TransitDinner to discuss the @eastsfvtransit project: ow.ly/jX3XE
Expand
-  **StudsandStripes, John Kaliski and HiltonWoodlandHills** 20 Apr
followed you

-  **Transit Coalition** @Transit_Co 16 Apr
Register for our April 25th #TransitDinner to discuss the @eastsfvtransit project: ow.ly/jX3TE
Expand
-  **Transit Coalition** @Transit_Co 13 Apr
Register for our April 25th #TransitDinner to discuss the @eastsfvtransit project: ow.ly/jX3S5
Expand

Online Advertising




Our current ad campaign occurred began on March 6, 2013 and concluded on April 27, 2013. During that period, the page has gained 202 likes and generated 228,222 impressions among Facebook users in the Greater Los Angeles Area. Although the campaign has reached completion, the page continues to receive a steady stream of activity though the remainder of the scoping period.

East San Fernando Valley




Share your vision for improving transit service in the east San Fernando Valley

Like · 1,019 people like
East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study



Ashley Meachem likes East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

Like





Memorandum

To: W. Davis and J. Litvak
 From: Lilian De Loza
 Subject: ESFV Transit Study Social Media Monitoring Report for April 25, 2013 – May 8, 2013
 Date: May 10, 2013

Summary of Observations and Next Steps

- The digital engagement team has created engaging content for posting on our project social media platforms of Twitter and Facebook. Along with Metro’s social media efforts, we have together formed an effective way to educate members of the public about the issues, needs and opportunities to help us discover efficient transit solutions for the east San Fernando Valley.

*The following is a summary of digital engagement efforts and responses during **April 25 – May 8, 2013**.
 Note: grammar and spelling corrections of comments posted by others are not made in this section.*

Facebook

Followers: 1,017 total page-likes to date.

People Talking About This: 18 unique users have created a story about our page. This includes liking our page, posting on our page's wall, liking, commenting on or sharing one of our posts or mentioning our page.

Average Weekly Reach: The average number of people who have seen any content associated with our page per week is 288 people.

April 25 – May 1

East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

New Likes	Talking About This	Weekly Total Reach
0	9 -35.7%	348 -14.3%

See All Insights • Promote Page

Date ?	Post ?	Reach ?	Engaged Users ?	Talking About This ?	Virality ?
--------	--------	---------	-----------------	----------------------	------------

N/A

May 1 – May 8



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

New Likes: **2** Talking About This: **9** Weekly Total Reach: **228** -35.2%

[See All Insights](#) • [Promote Page](#)

Date ?	Post ?	Reach ?	Engaged Users ?	Talking About This ?	Virality ?
5/8/13	Metro to receive more than \$390 million to...	64	5	1	1.56%
5/6/13	Mayors across the United States show th...	57	6	3	5.26%
5/6/13	Today, Monday May 6th, is the last day t...	55	9	2	3.64%
5/3/13	Don't miss the opportunity to comment on...	61	7	1	1.64%
5/2/13	From Measure R Success to Measure J Fai...	74	6	—	—

Twitter

Followers: 7 new Twitter followers; 109 total Twitter followers to date

Retweets: 1 @EastSFVTransit tweets were reposted.

@Replies: The @EastSFVTransit Twitter feed received 0 comments.



Robert Tinker and 8 others followed you 2 Feb

Online Advertising

Our last ad campaign occurred from March 6 through April 27, 2013. During that time, the page gained 201 new likes and generated 228,222 impressions. Although the campaign has reached completion, the page has continued to receive a steady stream of activity through the remainder of the scoping period.



East San Fernando Valley



Share your vision for improving transit service in the east San Fernando Valley

Like · 1,019 people like East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study




Ashley Meachem likes East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

Like





East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Appendix 4: Scoping Meeting Materials

March - May 2013



Let's stay in touch.

-  818.276.3233
-  text "esfvtransit" to 25827
-  eastsvtransit@metro.net
-  metro.net/eastsvtransit
-  [@eastsvtransit](https://twitter.com/eastsvtransit)
-  facebook.com/eastsvtransit





Formal Scoping Meetings

Welcome!

Thank you for taking the time to join us at the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study Scoping Meetings where you will be able to:

- Learn more about what is being considered to improve north-south transit service in the east San Fernando Valley.
- Provide formal comments to Metro and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regarding what you think is important to consider as they prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Study/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR).
- Better understand the key milestones in the environmental review process that encourage public participation.

Thank you! Your participation today helps us shape the future of transportation and mobility in your community!



What is an EIS/EIR?

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) define the steps that Metro and FTA must follow in preparing a Federal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and State Environmental Impact Report (EIR). To streamline the environmental review process, Metro and the FTA will prepare a joint EIS/EIR document.

What is Scoping?

Opportunities for public participation are required throughout the environmental review process at key milestones. The first key milestone in the environmental review process begins with a “scoping” period that allows for public input on the issues that should be addressed in the EIS/EIR. Comments regarding the “scope” of the analysis may be sent to Metro via mail, e-mail, Facebook, Twitter and/or provided at public scoping meetings verbally or in writing.

To Submit Comments by May 6, 2013:

Visit our website: www.metro.net/eastsfvtransit

Send an email: eastsfvtransit@metro.net

Call: (818) 276.3233

Twitter: @eastsfvtransit – using #ESFVscoping

Facebook: [eastsfvtransit](https://www.facebook.com/eastsfvtransit) – click on "Formal Scoping Comments"





MEETING ROAD MAP

Use this “Meeting Road Map” to guide your experience.

The Agenda for Today’s Meeting:

1. Registration & Open House (first 30 minutes).
2. Brief presentation by: Walt Davis (Metro Project Manager) and Jody Litvak (Metro Community Relations Director).
3. Formal Public Comment - Comments and questions will not be responded to by study team members today. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement/ Report (EIS/EIR) will analyze project alternatives, including comments/ questions received during the scoping period. Please share your ideas and suggestions. All verbal comments will be transcribed by certified court reporters and given to the study team for analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR.

During the Open House portion of the meeting, you will have an opportunity to:

- 1) Learn more about each of the the four alternatives being discussed
- 2) Submit formal written and private verbal comments directly to the court reporter

Open House Stations

1

Sign-In/Registration

2

Environmental Review Process

What is a NOI/NOP? What is an EIS/EIR? How do my comments help shape the project?

3

Alternatives Under Consideration

What are the four alternatives being considered? What should be considered in the EIS/EIR?

4

Next Steps

What are the various milestones? What's next in the process?

5

Comments


Provide your ideas, suggestions and comments on the scope of the Draft EIS/EIR directly to the court reporter. Provide comments in writing by completing a comment form. Or, register to provide verbal comments by completing a speaker card. All speakers will have two minutes to share comments.

Tell us what you think!



Metro





Reuniones de **Ámbito** Formales

¡Bienvenido!

Gracias por tomar el tiempo de acompañarnos en las reuniones de ámbito para el Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando donde usted podrá:

- Aprender más sobre lo que se está considerando para mejorar el servicio de transporte entre norte y sur en el este del Valle de San Fernando.
- Proveer sus comentarios formales a Metro y la Administración de Transporte Federal (FTA) sobre lo que usted piensa debe considerarse al preparar un(a) Declaración/Reporte de Impacto Ambiental Borrador (EIS/EIR – por sus siglas en inglés).
- Mejor entender las etapas del proceso ambiental que animan la participación del público.

¿Qué es un EIS/EIR?

El Acta Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA) y el Acta de Calidad Ambiental de California (CEQA) definen los pasos que Metro y la FTA deben seguir al preparar una Declaración de Impacto Ambiental (EIS) federal y un Reporte de Impacto Ambiental (EIR) estatal. Para racionalizar el proceso entre ambas agencias, se preparará un documento combinado EIS/EIR.

¿Qué es **Ámbito**?

Oportunidades para la participación del público son requeridas durante el proceso de revisión ambiental en etapas claves. La primera etapa comienza el proceso de revisión ambiental con un periodo de “**ámbito**” que anima al público a que someta comentarios sobre lo que se debe considerar al preparar el alcance del EIS/EIR. Comentarios sobre el “**ámbito**” del análisis pueden ser sometidos por medio de correo, email, Facebook, Twitter y/o en persona en las reuniones de ámbito comunitarias.

¡Gracias! ¡Su participación de hoy nos ayuda a darle forma al futuro de transporte y movilidad en su comunidad!

Para someter comentarios antes del 6 de Mayo del 2013:

Visite nuestra página en internet:

www.metro.net/eastsfvtransit

Mande un email: *eastsfvtransit@metro.net*

Llame: (818) 276.3233

Twitter: *@eastsfvtransit* – use *#ESFVscoping*

Facebook: *eastsfvtransit* – haga clic en

"Formal Scoping Comments"



Metro



MAPA DE LA REUNIÓN

Use esta “Mapa de la Reunión” para guiar su experiencia.

El Agenda de la Reunión de Hoy:

1. Registración y Taller Abierto (primeros 30 minutos)
2. Presentación breve por Metro: Walt Davis (Gerente del Proyecto) y Jody Litvak (Directora de Relaciones Comunitarias)
3. Comentarios del Público Formales – Se analizarán los comentarios y preguntas recibidas durante el periodo de ámbito en la/el Declaración/Reporte de Impacto Ambiental. Por favor comparta sus ideas y sugerencias. Todos los comentarios verbales serán documentados por un(a) reporter(o/a) certificado(a) por la corte y entregados al equipo de estudio para su análisis en el EIS/EIR.

Durante el Taller Abierto de la reunión, usted tendrá la oportunidad de:

- 1) Aprender más sobre cada una de las cuatro alternativas que se están estudiando
- 2) Someter comentarios formales por escrito o directamente al reporter(o/a) de la corte.

Estaciones del Taller Abierto

1

Registración

2

Proceso de Revisión Ambiental

¿Qué es un NOI/NOP? ¿Qué es un EIS/EIR? ¿Cómo mis comentarios ayudan a formar este proyecto?

3

Alternativas Bajo Consideración

¿Cuáles son las cuatro alternativas que se están considerando? ¿Qué se debe considerar al preparar el EIS/EIR?

4

Pasos a Seguir

¿Cuáles son las etapas del estudio? ¿Qué sigue en este proceso?

5

Comentarios

Someta sus ideas, sugerencias y comentarios sobre el alcance del EIS/EIR Borrador directamente al reporter(o/a) de la corte. Provee comentarios por escrito al completar una forma de comentarios. O, regístrese para dar sus comentarios verbalmente durante la sesión de audiencia. Complete una tarjeta de testimonio formal. Todas las personas tendrán dos minutos para compartir sus comentarios verbalmente.

¡Díganos lo que piensa!



Metro



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Metro and the City of Los Angeles, in coordination with the City of San Fernando and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), are studying options for improving north-south transit service in the east San Fernando Valley.



Where we've been and what we've learned so far:

After significant analysis and community input during 2011 and 2012, an Alternatives Analysis (AA) Report recommended that four alternatives be further studied through the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR). These include two required alternatives – No Build and Transportation System Management (TSM) – and two build alternatives – Light Rail Transit (LRT) and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT).

In January 2013, the Metro Board of Directors received the AA and a report that identified the alternatives that are moving forward for further analysis in the environmental clearance phase.

Proposed Alternatives

No Build

This alternative includes existing transit and highway networks and improvements funded through the year 2035. It includes projects specified in the financially constrained element of Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan and the Southern California Association of Governments 2012 Regional Transportation Plan.

Transportation System Management

This alternative represents lower cost capital and operational improvements to roadways including restriping, signal synchronization and enhanced bus services designed to improve bus speeds. It would include enhanced bus frequencies in the corridor including the existing Metro Rapid 761 that operates on Van Nuys Bl and connects the east San Fernando Valley with Westwood.

Light Rail Transit (LRT) Alternative

Information & Assumptions

- > Travels from the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station south/east along San Fernando Road to Van Nuys Bl and then south to Ventura Bl
- > Operates in the median in a fully dedicated guideway
- > 37,500 average weekday boardings projected in 2035
- > 13 Stations (approximate)
- > 36 minutes end to end travel time (est.)
- > Cost estimate: \$1.8-2.3 billion (in 2018 dollars)
- > Connections to: Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station, Van Nuys Metrolink/Amtrak Station, Metro Orange Line
- > Travel over the Sepulveda Pass possible via a transfer to Metro Rapid Line 761
- > Possible connection to the future Sepulveda Pass Corridor project
- > Requires construction of a rail maintenance and storage yard – approximately 10 acres

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Alternative

Information & Assumptions

- > Route Option 1: Travel on San Fernando Rd from the Sylmar Metrolink station in mixed-flow traffic and then in a fully dedicated lane on Van Nuys Bl to the Metro Orange Line (MOL) Van Nuys station in the south. There is an option for this route to continue south in mixed-flow traffic on Van Nuys Bl to Ventura Bl where it could turn to reach Ventura and Sepulveda
- > Route Option 2: Identical to Option 1 but from the Metro Orange Line Van Nuys Station, would continue west on the Metro Orange Line to the Sepulveda Station
- > Route Option 3: Identical to Option 2, but from the Metro Orange Line Sepulveda Station would continue south on Sepulveda Bl to Ventura Bl in either a dedicated lane or in mixed flow traffic
- > 33,600 average weekday boardings projected in 2035
- > 13-14 stations (approximate)
- > 40-45 minutes end to end travel time (est.)
- > Cost estimate: \$250-\$520 million (in 2018 dollars)
- > Connections to: Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station, Van Nuys Metrolink/Amtrak Station, Metro Orange Line
- > Possible direct or transfer service for travel over the Sepulveda Pass via Metro Rapid Line 761
- > Possible connection to the future Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor
- > New vehicles could be stored and maintained at existing Metro bus operating divisions



What is an EIS/EIR?

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) define the steps that Metro must follow in preparing a Federal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and State Environmental Impact Report (EIR). To streamline the environmental review process, Metro and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) will prepare a joint EIS/EIR document. Opportunities for public participation are required throughout the environmental review process at key milestones:

Key Milestones

- > **EIS/EIR Scoping – March 1-May 6, 2013:** Environmental review begins with a "scoping period" to allow for input on the issues that should be addressed in the EIS/EIR. Input may be sent to Metro or provided at public scoping meetings. Information is provided below on how to send input. Please check our website for information on meetings or send us your contact information so we can notify you.
- > **Scoping Report – Summer 2013 (est.):** At the conclusion of the scoping period, Metro prepares a Scoping Report summarizing the input received and identifying any changes that result to the scope of the Draft EIS/EIR.
- > **Draft EIS/EIR – Early 2014 (est.):** The Draft EIS/EIR will identify the potential environmental

impacts and benefits associated with the project alternatives. The document will also recommend measures to reduce and/or avoid impacts where necessary.

Once the draft EIS/EIR is complete, it will be made available for review. During a 45-day public comment period, the public is encouraged to submit written and verbal comments regarding the findings of the Draft EIS/EIR at the public hearings.

- > **Selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) – 2014 (est.):** Following the public comment period, the Draft EIS/EIR along with the input received will be presented to the Metro Board of Directors. They will be asked to select a "Locally Preferred Alternative" (LPA) for further analysis in the Final EIS/EIR.
- > **Final EIS/EIR – 2015 (est.):** The Final EIS/EIR will further analyze the selected LPA. It will also include responses to all the comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR. This document will be made available to the public. It will be taken to the Los Angeles City Council and San Fernando City Council for approvals. The Metro Board of Directors will then be asked to certify the document and select the project that will be built.
- > **Record of Decision – 2015 (est.):** Following action by the Metro Board of Directors, the FTA will be asked to issue a Record of Decision (ROD) signifying the conclusion and approval of federal environmental review.

EIS/EIR Process Diagram



Learn more and stay connected:


- 818.276.3233
- text "esfvtransit" to 25827
- esfvtransit@metro.net
- metro.net/eastsvtransit
- @eastsvtransit
- facebook.com/eastsvtransit



PLEASE RECYCLE THIS MATERIAL
11/13/10 © 2013 LACMTA

East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

Scoping Fact Sheet



MARCH 2013

¿Qué es un EIS/EIR?

El acta de política nacional medioambiental (NEPA) y el acta de calidad medioambiental de California (CEQA) definen los pasos que Metro tiene que seguir al preparar una declaración de impacto ambiental federal (EIS) y un reporte de impacto ambiental estatal (EIR). Para simplificar el proceso de revisión ambiental, Metro y la administración federal de transporte (FTA) preparará un documento conjunto de EIS/EIR. Oportunidades para la participación del público son requeridas en varias etapas clave del proceso como parte de la revisión ambiental.

Etapas claves:

- > **Período de alcance del EIS/EIR – marzo 1 a 6 de mayo, 2013:** La revisión ambiental comienza con un "período de alcance" para recibir comentarios sobre que temas se deben considerar en el EIS/EIR. Los comentarios pueden ser enviados a Metro o sometidos en las reuniones de alcance. A continuación se proporciona información sobre cómo someter sus comentarios. Por favor visite nuestra página Web para información sobre las reuniones o como proporcionar su información de contacto para que podamos mantenerlo al tanto sobre este estudio.
- > **Reporte de alcance – verano 2013 (estimado):** Al concluir el periodo de alcance, Metro preparará un reporte de alcance que resumirá los comentarios recibidos e identificará cualquier cambio al alcance del borrador EIS/EIR.
- > **Borrador EIS/EIR – principios del 2014 (estimado):** El borrador EIS/EIR identificará los posibles impactos ambientales y los beneficios asociados con cada alternativa

del proyecto. El documento también recomendará medidas de cómo reducir y/o evitar algún impacto cuando sea necesario.

Una vez finalizado, el borrador EIS/EIR estará disponible para su revisión durante un período de 45 días en los cuales se pedirán comentarios del público por escrito y verbalmente en audiencias públicas.

- > **Selección de una alternativa preferida localmente (LPA) – 2014 (estimado):** Siguiendo el período de comentarios públicos, el borrador EIS/EIR junto con los comentarios recibidos serán presentados a la Junta Directiva de Metro. Se le pedirá a la Junta Directiva que seleccione una LPA para su posterior análisis en el EIS/EIR Final.
- > **EIS/EIR Final – 2015 (estimado):** El EIS/EIR Final seguirá analizando la LPA seleccionada. El documento incluirá respuestas a los comentarios recibidos sobre el borrador EIS/EIR. Este documento estará disponible para la revisión del público y será llevado al concilio municipal de las ciudades de Los Ángeles y San Fernando para su aprobación. Después, se le pedirá a la Junta Directiva de Metro que certifique el documento y seleccione el proyecto que será construido.
- > **Registro de decisión – 2015 (estimado):** Siguiendo la acción de la Junta Directiva de Metro, se le pedirá a la FTA que certifique un registro de decisión (ROD) significando la conclusión y aprobación de la revisión ambiental federal.

Diagrama del proceso del EIS/EIR



Para aprender más y mantenerse conectado:


- ☎ 818.276.3233
- ✉ mande un texto a "esfvtransit" al 25827
- ✉ eastsvtransit@metro.net
- 🌐 metro.net/eastsvtransit
- 🐦 @eastsvtransit
- 📘 facebook.com/eastsvtransit



PLEASE RECYCLE THIS MATERIAL. 1-800-833-6347

Corredor de Transporte del lado Este del Valle de San Fernando

Hoja de alcance



MARZO 2013

Proyecto de Transporte para el Corredor del Este del Valle de San Fernando

Metro y la Ciudad de Los Angeles, en coordinación con la Ciudad de San Fernando y la Administración Federal de Transporte (FTA), están estudiando opciones para mejorar el servicio de transporte entre norte y sur en el este del Valle de San Fernando.



Donde hemos estado y que hemos aprendido hasta la fecha:

Después de un análisis significativo y de recibir comentarios de la comunidad durante el 2011 y 2012, un Reporte de Análisis de Alternativas (AA) recomienda que cuatro alternativas sean estudiadas más a fondo por medio de la preparación de una Declaración/Reporte de Impacto Ambiental (EIS/EIR). Esto incluye dos alternativas requeridas – no construir y administración de sistemas de transporte (TSM). Además, incluye dos alternativas de construcción – transporte de tren ligero (LRT) y transporte de autobús rápido (BRT).

En enero del 2013, la Junta Directiva de Metro recibió el AA y un reporte que identificó las alternativas que serán estudiadas más detalladamente durante la fase de revisión ambiental.

Alternativas propuestas

No construir

Esta alternativa incluye la red de transporte y autopistas/carreteras actuales y mejoras programadas hasta el año 2035. Incluye los proyectos especificados en el elemento financiero constreñido del Long Range Transportation Plan (plan de transporte de largo plazo) de Metro y el plan de transporte de la Asociación de Gobiernos del Sur de California, 2012.

Administración de sistemas de transporte

Esta alternativa representa mejoras de costo de capital bajo y de operaciones a las carreteras incluyendo re-franjar carriles, sincronización de semáforos y servicios de autobús mejorados para aumentar la velocidad de viajes. También incluye mejorar las frecuencias de autobuses dentro del corredor como la línea 761 de Metro Rapid que viaja por Van Nuys Bl y conecta el este del Valle de San Fernando con Westwood.



Alternativa de transporte de tren ligero (LRT)

Información y suposiciones

- > Viaja desde la Estación Metrolink de Sylmar/San Fernando sur/este sobre San Fernando Rd a Van Nuys Bl y después hacia el sur hasta Ventura Bl
- > Opera en medio de la calle dentro de un carril completamente dedicado
- > 37,500 abordajes por medio semanales proyectados para el año 2035
- > 13 estaciones (aproximadamente)
- > 36 minutos de viaje de orilla a orilla (estimado)
- > Costo estimado: \$1.8-2.3 mil millones (en dólares del 2018)
- > Conexiones con: la estación Metrolink de Sylmar/San Fernando, estación Metrolink/Amtrak de Van Nuys, y Metro Orange Line
- > Viaje sobre el Paso Sepulveda posible vía un transbordo a la línea 761 de Metro Rapid
- > Conexión posible al futuro proyecto del Corredor del Paso Sepulveda
 - quiere construcción de una instalación de mantenimiento y almacenamiento para los trenes – aproximadamente 10 acres



Alternativa de transporte de autobús rápido

Información y suposiciones

- > Ruta opción 1: Viaja sobre San Fernando Rd desde la Estación Metrolink Sylmar/San Fernando en tráfico mixto y después en un carril dedicado sobre Van Nuys Bl hasta llegar a la Estación Van Nuys de Metro Orange Line (MOL) en el sur. Hay una opción para que esta ruta continúe sur en tráfico mixto sobre Van Nuys Bl hasta Ventura Bl donde daría vuelta hasta llegar a Sepulveda Bl
- > Ruta opción 2: Idéntica a la Opción 1 pero desde la estación Van Nuys de MOL, seguiría hacia el oeste sobre el MOL hasta llegar a la estación Sepulveda
- > Ruta opción 3: Idéntica a la Opción 2, pero desde la estación Sepulveda de MOL continuaría sur sobre Sepulveda Bl hasta llegar a Ventura Bl en carril dedicado o en tráfico mixto
- > 33,600 abordajes por medio semanales proyectados para el año 2035
- > 13 a 14 estaciones (aproximadamente)
- > 40-45 minutos de viaje de orilla a orilla (estimado)
- > Costo estimado: \$250-520 millones (en dólares del 2018)
- > Conexiones a: estación Metrolink de Sylmar/San Fernando, estación Amtrak/Metrolink de Van Nuys, MOL
- > Servicio directo posible o transbordo para viajar sobre el Paso Sepulveda vía línea 761 de Metro Rapid
- > Conexión posible con el futuro proyecto del Corredor del Paso Sepulveda
- > Nuevos vehículos podrían almacenarse y recibir servicio en instalaciones de mantenimiento existentes de Metro

East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

Scoping Meetings – March 2013



Metro



Purpose of Meeting

- Provide overview and background
- Describe alternatives to be studied
- Obtain public input on study




How We Got Here

- **2011-12**

- Alternatives Analysis (AA) Study
- 10 Community Meetings
- Considered 30 Alternatives; narrowed to six build alternatives

- **January 2013**

- Alternatives to be studied
 - No-Build
 - Transportation System Management (TSM)
 - Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
 - Light Rail Transit (LRT)




Purpose and Need of the Project


1. Improve north-south mobility
2. Provide more reliable operations and connections between key transit hubs/routes
3. Enhance transit accessibility/connectivity to local and regional destinations
4. Provide additional transit options in a largely transit dependent area
5. Encourage mode shift to transit

Project Development Process

Five phases of project development:



EIS/EIR Process



EIS/EIR Purpose

- **Draft EIS/EIR:**
 - Define/refine alternatives
 - Study potential benefits/impacts
 - Select a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)
- **Final EIS/EIR:**
 - Further Analyze LPA
 - Respond to comments on Draft EIS/EIR
 - Recommend mitigation program
 - Recommend project for construction

What is Scoping

- **Scoping is the process of determining the scope, focus and content of an EIS/EIR**
- **All interested parties are invited to comment on:**
 - The purpose and need for a project
 - Alternatives to be studied
 - Impacts to be evaluated
 - Possible mitigations

Environmental Issues to be Studied

- Transportation
- Land Use & Development
- Real Estate & Acquisitions
- Communities & Neighborhoods
- Visual & Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Noise & Vibration
- Ecosystems & Biological Resources
- Geotechnical / Subsurface / Seismic / Hazardous Materials
- Water Resources
- Energy
- Historical, Archaeological & Paleontological Resources
- Parklands & Community Facilities
- Economic & Fiscal Development
- Safety & Security
- Construction Impacts
- Growth Inducing Impacts
- Environmental Justice
- Climate Change
- Cumulative Impacts

Screening Criteria

Travel and Mobility Benefits and Impacts

Regional Connectivity

Cost-Effectiveness

Environmental Benefits and Impacts

Economic and Land Use Considerations

Community Input

Financial Capability

Alternatives Required for Further Study



No Build

- 2035 study area without project:
 - Existing highways, transit services and facilities
 - Funded projects



Transportation System Management (TSM)

- Lower cost improvements to increase efficiency
 - Intersection widenings
 - Signal timing
 - Enhanced bus service
 - Other
- Increases transportation system efficiencies

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)



Cleveland, Ohio

- Mostly exclusive Right-of-Way
- Up to 75 passengers per bus
- 6-12 minute frequency
- Stations approximately one-mile apart
- Clean fuel (CNG) power
- Share existing maintenance facilities
- Possible single ride over Sepulveda Pass
- Either on-street parking or bicycle lane

BRT Alternative

- Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station south to Ventura Bl.
 - San Fernando Rd. (Mixed-flow lane)
 - Van Nuys Bl. to the Metro Orange Line (MOL) (Dedicated lane)
 - Option 1 - Terminates at MOL. Mixed-flow traffic south
 - Option 2 - Terminates at Sepulveda MOL Station
 - Option 3 - Dedicated lane via Sepulveda Blvd. to Ventura Blvd.
- End to end:
 - 12 miles and 14 Potential Stations
 - +/- 41 min travel time
 - +/- 33,600 weekday boardings
- Cost: \$250 - \$520 million (2018\$)
 - **L RTP commits \$170.1 million**



Light Rail Transit (LRT)



- Exclusive Right-of-Way
- Overhead electrical power
- Over 300 passengers per train set
- 6-12 minute frequency
- Stations typically one-mile apart
- New maintenance facility required
- Transfer for travel over Sepulveda Pass
- Either on-street parking or bicycle lane

LRT Alternative

- Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station south to Ventura Bl.
 - All dedicated Right-of-Way
- End to end:
 - 11.2 miles
 - +/- 36 min travel time
 - 13 potential stations
 - +/- 37,500 weekday boardings
- Cost: \$1.8 - 2.3 billion (2018\$)
- **L RTP commits \$170.1 million**



Help Shape The Study

What Issues are Most Important to You?

- Mode (BRT, LRT, other)
- Travel Speed
 - For transit
 - For cars
- Reliability
- Station Locations
- Maintenance Yard Location
- Connections
- Parking
- Bicycles
- Construction Impacts
- Other

We Want to Hear from You

- **US Mail:**
Walt Davis, Project Manager
One Gateway Plaza - MS 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012
- **Phone:** (818) 276-3233
- **E-mail:** eastSFVtransit@metro.net
- **Submit comments by May 6, 2013**
- www.metro.net/eastSFVtransit
- **Facebook:** EastSFVtransit
- **Twitter:** @eastSFVtransit
Use: #EastSFVscoping
- **Text** “ESFVtransit” to 25827 for updates



Scoping Meetings

- **March 16, 2013 (Saturday) at 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM**
 - Panorama High School, 8015 Van Nuys Blvd, Panorama City
- **March 19, 2013 (Tuesday) at 6:00 PM – 8:00 PM**
 - San Fernando Aquatic Center, 208 Park Ave, San Fernando
- **March 21, 2013 (Thursday) at 6:00 PM – 8:00 PM**
 - Arleta High School – Cafeteria, 14200 Van Nuys Blvd, Arleta
 - Webcast <http://ustream.tv/channel/eastsv>
- **March 27, 2013 (Wednesday) at 4:00 PM – 6:00 PM**
 - Van Nuys Civic Center – Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center, 6262 Van Nuys Blvd, Van Nuys

Same information will be presented at all meetings



Public Comments

2-Minutes / Speaker



Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando

Reuniones de Ámbito – Marzo 2013



Propósito de la Reunión

- Proveer un resumen e historial
- Explicar las alternativas que se están considerando
- Obtener comentarios sobre el estudio



Historial del Estudio

- **2011-12**

- Estudio de Análisis de Alternativas (AA)
- 10 Reuniones Comunitarias
- Se consideraron 30 alternativas que fueron reducidas a seis

- **Enero 2013**

- Alternativas Que Serán Estudiadas
 - No-Construir
 - Manejo del Sistema de Transporte (TSM)
 - Transporte de Autobús Rápido (BRT)
 - Tren Ligero (LRT)




Propósito y Necesidad del Proyecto

1. Mejorar la movilidad entre norte y sur
2. Proveer operaciones y conexiones más confiables entre rutas y centros de transporte
3. Mejorar el acceso/conectividad a destinos locales y regionales
4. Proveer opciones de transporte adicionales en un área donde hay una alta dependencia del transporte publico
5. Animar el cambio hacia el uso de transporte publico

Proceso de Desarrollo del Proyecto

Cinco fases de desarrollo:



Participación del Público Continua



Proceso del EIS/EIR

Diagrama del proceso del EIS/EIR



Propósito del EIS/EIR

- **EIS/EIR Borrador:**
 - Define/Refine Alternativas
 - Estudia impactos/beneficios posibles
 - Selecciona Alternativa Localmente Preferida (LPA)
- **EIS/EIR Final:**
 - Analiza aun mas la LPA
 - Responde a comentarios recibidos en el EIS/EIR Borrador
 - Recomienda un programa de mitigación programa
 - Recomienda un proyecto para su construcción

Que es **Ámbito**

- **Ámbito es el proceso de determinar el alcance, enfoque, y contenido del EIS/EIR**
- **Todas las personas interesadas están invitadas a someter comentarios sobre:**
 - El propósito y necesidad del proyecto
 - Alternativas que serán estudiadas
 - Impactos que serán evaluados
 - Mitigaciones posibles

Temas Ambientales que serán Estudiados

- Transportación
- Uso de Terreno y Desarrollo
- Bienes Raíces y Adquisiciones
- Comunidades y Vecindarios
- Visuales y Estética
- Calidad de Aire
- Ruido y vibración
- Ecosistemas y Recursos Biológicos
- Geotécnica / Subsuperficie / Sísmico / Materiales Peligrosos
- Recursos de Agua
- Energía
- Recursos Históricos, Arqueológicos y Paleontológicos
- Parques e instalaciones comunitarias
- Desarrollo Económico y Fiscal
- Seguridad
- Impactos de Construcción
- Impactos de Crecimiento
- Justicia Ambiental
- Cambio de Clima
- Impactos Cumulativos

Criterios de Evaluación

Beneficios e Impactos de Viajes y Movilidad

Conectividad Regional

Efectividad de Costo

Beneficios e Impactos Ambientales

Consideraciones Económicas y de Uso de Terreno

Comentarios del Público

Capacidad Financiera

Alternativas Requeridas



No Construir

- Área de estudio sin el proyecto en el año 2035:
 - Carreteras, servicio de transporte e instalaciones actuales
 - Proyectos programados



Manejo del Sistema de Transporte (TSM)

- Mejoras de bajo costos para aumentar eficiencia
 - Ensanchamiento de Intersecciones
 - Sincronización de semáforos
 - Mejor servicio de autobús
 - Otro
- Aumenta la eficiencia del sistema de transporte

Transporte de Autobús Rápido (BRT)



Cleveland, Ohio

- Mayormente corre en carriles exclusivos (en derecho-de-paso)
- Hasta 75 pasajeros por autobús
- Frecuencia de 6-12 minutos
- Estaciones aproximadamente en cada milla de distancia
- Usa combustible limpio (CNG)
- Comparte instalaciones de mantenimiento
- Posible de poder viajar en un solo viaje sobre el Pase Sepúlveda
- Carril de bicicleta o estacionamiento

Alternativa BRT

- Estación Metrolink de Sylmar/San Fernando sur hasta Ventura Bl.
 - San Fernando Rd. (Carril de trafico mixto)
 - Van Nuys Bl. hasta Metro Orange Line (MOL) (Carril dedicado)
 - Opción 1 – Termina en la MOL. Trafico mixto sur
 - Opción 2 – Termina en la Estación Sepúlveda del MOL
 - Opción 3 – Carril dedicado vía Sepúlveda Bl. a Ventura Bl.
- Terminal a Terminal:
 - 12 millas y 14 Estaciones potenciales
 - +/- 41 minutos de tiempo de viaje
 - +/- 33,600 pasajeros semanales
- Costo: \$250 - \$520 millones (2018\$)
 - **L RTP programó \$170.1 millón**



Tren Ligero (LRT)



- Derecho-de-Paso exclusivo
- Líneas aéreas de transmisión de electricidad
- Mas de 300 pasajeros en cada tren
- Frecuencia de 6-12 minutos
- Estaciones típicamente una milla de distancia
- Instalaciones de mantenimiento son necesarias
- Transferencia necesaria para seguir sobre el Pase Sepúlveda
- Carril de bicicleta o estacionamiento en la calle

Alternativa LRT

- Estación Metrolink de Sylmar/San Fernando sur hasta Ventura Bl.
 - Completamente en derecho de paso
- Terminal a Terminal:
 - 11.2 millas
 - Tiempo de viaje +/- 36 minutos
 - 13 estaciones potenciales
 - +/- 37,500 pasajeros semanales
- Costo: \$1.8 - 2.3 billones (2018\$)
- **LRTP programó \$170.1 millones**



Ayude a Darle Forma Al Estudio

¿Que temas son mas importantes para usted?

- Modo (BRT, LRT, otro)
- Velocidad de Viaje
 - Para transporte publico
 - Para vehículos
- Confiabilidad
- Ubicación de Estaciones
- Ubicación de Instalaciones de Mantenimiento
- Conexiones
- Estacionamiento
- Bicicletas
- Impactos de Construcción
- Otro

Queremos oír de usted

- **Correspondencia:**
Walt Davis, Gerente del Proyecto
Metro
One Gateway Plaza - MS 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012
- **Teléfono:** (818) 276-3233
- **E-mail:** eastSFVtransit@metro.net
- **Someta comentarios antes del 6 de mayo del 2013**
- www.metro.net/eastSFVtransit
- **Facebook:** EastSFVtransit
- **Twitter:** @eastSFVtransit
Use: #EastSFVscoping
- **Texto** “ESFVtransit” a 25827



Reuniones Comunitarias de Ámbito

- **16 de marzo 2013 (sábado) de 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM**
 - Panorama High School, 8015 Van Nuys Blvd, Panorama City
- **19 de marzo, 2013 (martes) de 6:00 PM – 8:00 PM**
 - San Fernando Aquatic Center, 208 Park Ave, San Fernando
- **21 de marzo, 2013 (jueves) de 6:00 PM – 8:00 PM**
 - Arleta High School – Cafetería, 14200 Van Nuys Blvd, Arleta
 - Transmitido en vivo: <http://ustream.tv/channel/eastsfv>
- **27 de marzo, 2013 (miércoles) de 4:00 PM – 6:00 PM**
 - Van Nuys Civic Center – Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center, 6262 Van Nuys Blvd, Van Nuys

Same information will be presented at all meetings



Comentarios del Público

2-Minutos / Persona





REQUEST TO SPEAK



**EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS**

Please print.

Date: _____

Name: _____

Organization: _____

Address: _____

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Draft EIR. The formal public comment portion of the Scoping Meeting will be held the Open House period and a presentation. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



**EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT**

Please print.

Date: _____

Name: _____

Organization: _____

Address: _____

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Draft EIR. The formal public comment portion of the Scoping Meeting will be held the Open House period and a presentation. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



TESTIMONIO FORMAL



REUNIONES COMUNITARIAS DE ÁMBITO ESTUDIO DEL CORREDOR DE TRANSPORTE DEL ESTE DEL VALLE DE SAN FERNANDO

Por favor escriba de una forma legible.

Fecha: _____

Nombre: _____

Organización: _____

Domicilio: _____

POR FAVOR ENTREGUE ESTA FORMA A UN MIEMBRO DEL EQUIPO DE METRO ANTES DE QUE COMIENZE LA SESIÓN DE COMENTARIO/TESTIMONIO FORMAL.

Por favor someta su comentario o pregunta acerca el Proyecto del Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando Declaración/Reporte de Impacto Ambiental Borrador. Comentarios formales y de manera pública, se recibirán durante de la reunión de ámbito tiempo y presentación. Cada persona tendrá dos minutos para hacer sus comentarios.

**Nota: Personas con permiso para hablar no pueden ceder su tiempo a otras personas para que hablen de su parte.*



TESTIMONIO FORMAL



REUNIONES COMUNITARIAS DE ÁMBITO PROYECTO DEL CORREDOR DE TRANSPORTE DEL ESTE DEL VALLE DE SAN FERNANDO

Por favor escriba de una forma legible.

Fecha: _____

Nombre: _____


Organización: _____

Domicilio: _____

POR FAVOR ENTREGUE ESTA FORMA A UN MIEMBRO DEL EQUIPO DE METRO ANTES DE QUE COMIENZE LA SESIÓN DE COMENTARIO/TESTIMONIO FORMAL.

Por favor someta su comentario o pregunta acerca el Proyecto del Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando Declaración/Reporte de Impacto Ambiental Borrador. Comentarios formales y de manera pública, se recibirán durante de la reunión de ámbito tiempo y presentación. Cada persona tendrá dos minutos para hacer sus comentarios.

**Nota: Personas con permiso para hablar no pueden ceder su tiempo a otras personas para que hablen de su parte.*



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

Frequently Asked Questions (March 2013)

Metro and the City of Los Angeles, in coordination with the City of San Fernando and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), are currently studying options for improving north-south transit service in the East San Fernando Valley. This set of Frequently Asked Questions is designed to provide you with basic information about the planning effort for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor project. It will be updated periodically.

- [Overview](#)
- [Modes and Routes](#)
- [Costs and Funding](#)
- [Regional Connectivity](#)
- [Project-Specific](#)
- [Public Participation](#)

Overview

1. *What is the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor?*

Measure R, approved by Los Angeles County voters in 2008, allocated funding for a variety of transportation purposes including 12 transit projects. One of these is the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor that was also adopted into Metro's 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan for Los Angeles County. The project is currently going through environmental analysis to evaluate options for improving north-south transit service in this area. See question 8 for a study area map.

2. *What is the process for studying this project?*


Like most projects, the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor must go through an environmental analysis consistent with state and federal guidelines. This is the process that will eventually determine the project that will be built. For the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor, this process began with an Alternatives Analysis (AA), and is continuing with the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR).

At each stage of the study process, the findings and staff recommendations will be presented to the Metro Board of Directors. The AA Study concluded in January 2013 when staff presented the Metro Board of Directors with the alternatives that are continuing for further analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR. At the end of the Draft EIS/EIR, the

Board will be asked to select a “Locally Preferred Alternative” (LPA) for further study during the Final EIS/EIR. At the end of the Final EIS/EIR, the Board will be asked to certify the Final EIR and approve the project for design and construction.

The project is also following federal procedures for environmental analysis so the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is involved throughout the analysis and approves the EIS/EIR. The federal environmental analysis concludes when the FTA grants the project a Record of Decision (ROD). The FTA will consider that after the Metro Board of Directors certifies the Final EIR.

See questions 4, 6 & 7 for more information on the different study phases.



3. The project is located within the City of Los Angeles and also in the City of San Fernando. What role will each City play?

Unlike the Metro Orange Line, where Metro owns the right-of-way, this project is planned to operate on city streets. Therefore, the City of Los Angeles and the City of San Fernando are involved in the planning for this project.

The City of Los Angeles is serving as the project’s “co-lead” with Metro for this study. The City of San Fernando is also actively participating in the study effort. As the project advances, both the Los Angeles City Council and the San Fernando City Council will be asked for their support and concurrence.

4. When will this study be completed?

The full study is scheduled to conclude in 2015. The components of the study are discussed above in Question 2, and are estimated to occur as follows:

- Calendar year 2013/2014: Draft EIS/EIR
- Calendar year 2014/2015: Final EIS/EIR

5. When will I be able to ride the new service?

This project is on a very short schedule. According to Metro’s currently adopted Long Range Transportation Plan, it is scheduled to be built and open for service in 2018.

6. *What is an Environmental Impact Statement/Report (EIS/EIR)?*

A combined EIS/EIR is prepared to satisfy both federal and state requirements for environmental review. The combined EIS/EIR identifies and analyzes the potential social, economic, transportation and environmental benefits and impacts associated with the construction and operation of the project's "build" alternatives. It also analyzes and compares those to a "No-Build" alternative that assumes no changes beyond those already planned, and a "Transportation System Management" (TSM) alternative that incorporates low-cost capital and operational improvements to the existing transportation system such as improved bus service and signal timing. During the development of the Final EIS/EIR, it also identifies mitigations, if any, needed to address impacts.

7. *What factors will be used to evaluate the various alternatives for this project?*

Consistent with federal and state requirements for environmental review, the alternatives will be evaluated using the following criteria:

- Mobility Benefits and Impacts
- Regional Connectivity
- Cost-Effectiveness (such as capital and operating costs)
- Environmental Benefits and Impacts
- Land Use Considerations (such as job creation, development opportunities, and quality of life improvements)
- Community Input
- Financial Capability

8. *Where will the project be located?*

The study will evaluate a project that will mostly travel along Van Nuys Boulevard between the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station and Ventura Boulevard. See question 12 for more information on the different routes being considered.

9. *How was the study area determined?*

Initially, various north-south routes in the San Fernando Valley were considered. It was decided to focus on the Van Nuys Boulevard corridor since it is the busiest north-south bus line the San Fernando Valley, and the seventh busiest in the entire Metro system. Based on input received in early 2012, Sepulveda Boulevard was also evaluated since it is only about one mile west of Van Nuys Boulevard. Input also resulted in including the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink



Station as a potential northern origination/terminus for the project as it provides a connection to regional commuter rail service.

Modes and Routes

10. Will this be a bus project, a rail project or something else?

We don't know yet. That's part of what the study will evaluate utilizing the criteria discussed in Question 7.

11. What is the difference between Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and Light Rail Transit (LRT)?

Both of these options are being evaluated for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project.

- **Bus Rapid Transit (BRT):** This option could be similar to the Metro Orange Line where the service runs in its own exclusive right-of-way. BRT can also be designed as an exclusive lane either in the middle of the street or along the curb. It can also operate in mixed-flow traffic. Either way, this would be premier, clean fuel, compressed natural gas (CNG) bus service.
- **Light Rail Transit (LRT):** This is an overhead electric-powered rail system that runs in an exclusive right-of-way, similar to the Metro Blue, Green, Gold and Expo Lines.

See question 12 for information on the routes being studied for the BRT and LRT alternatives.

12. What are the routes and characteristics being evaluated for the BRT and LRT alternatives in the Draft EIS/EIR?

The Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Alternative is considering the following:

- **Alignment:** Travel from Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station south/east in mixed-flow traffic to Van Nuys Bl. Then south in dedicated right-of-way. Three options are being considered for a southern terminus:
 - End travel in a dedicated right-of-way at the Van Nuys Metro Orange Line (MOL) Station. Buses could continue south via Van Nuys Bl to Ventura Bl in mixed flow traffic
 - From the Van Nuys MOL Station, turn west on the MOL and terminate at the Sepulveda MOL Station.
 - From the Sepulveda MOL Station, continue via Sepulveda Bl in a dedicated lane to Ventura Bl.
- **Configuration:** Median-running, at-grade in dedicated right-of-way combined with mixed flow traffic.

The Light Rail Transit (LRT) Alternative is considering the following:

- Alignment: Travel from Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station south/east to Van Nuys Bl and then south to Ventura Bl.
- Configuration: Median-running, at-grade in dedicated right-of-way.

See page 6 to view the BRT alignment map and page 7 to view the LRT alignment map.

13. What about a Streetcar for this project?

Streetcars were evaluated and eliminated from further study. They are an overhead, electric-powered rail system, similar to the one in Portland, Oregon. Typically, streetcars run in mixed flow traffic, but can operate in an exclusive right-of-way. They are generally smaller and slower than LRT with more frequent stops. They did not offer significant improvement over existing bus service or perform well compared to BRT and LRT alternatives in this corridor.

14. Did you look at any other alternatives?

As a part of the process, the study must also evaluate two other options:

- No Build: This looks at the study area in 2035 without any new project. It incorporates existing roads, highways, transit services and facilities, as well as any other future projects that are included in the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan for implementation by 2035.
- Transportation System Management (TSM): This option considers low-cost capital and operations improvements to the transportation system such as improvements to signal timing, enhancing existing bus service, widening targeted intersections, etc.

Cost and Funding

15. How much money is available for the Project and what are the funding sources?

\$170.1 million has been identified for this project in Metro's 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for Los Angeles County. These funds come primarily from the State of California's Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) and Measure R. The TCRP provided money for Metro to "build a north/south corridor transit project that would interface with the East/West Burbank-Chandler corridor project (later named the Metro Orange Line) and with the Ventura Boulevard Rapid Bus project." See Question 19 for more information about Measure R.

16. How much does each build alternative cost?

Based on the very preliminary analysis completed thus far, the BRT options are projected to cost \$280-520 million. The LRT options are projected to cost \$1.8-2.3 billion. These numbers all assume a planned opening date of 2018 for the project. They will be refined as the study progresses.

East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Light Rail Transit Alternative for Further Study



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Alternative for Further Study



17. Why is there such a wide variation in the cost numbers?

LRT is generally more expensive to build than BRT due to the costs associated with constructing tracks and overhead power lines. Further, since this would be the first light rail project in the San Fernando Valley, projections also assume the costs to acquire land and build a storage and maintenance yard for the rail cars. The cost ranges for each travel mode are largely due to the variation in lengths, number of stations, forecasted right-of-way acquisition needs, and the very preliminary stage of the planning process. With additional project analysis, the cost projections will be refined further.

18. The LRT and BRT alternatives both cost more than \$170.1 million. How are you going to build the project if you don't have the money?

Like all of the other Measure R transit projects, the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor will likely need to seek additional funding to be able to be built in full. The project may also be built in phases to match available funding. These options will all be evaluated as the study progresses. As we get a better definition of the project, we may be better able to identify additional funding sources.

19. What is Measure R?

Measure R is the half-cent sales tax that was approved by Los Angeles County voters in 2008. The funds are being collected over 30 years for transportation purposes including several new transit and highway projects around the County, as well as bus and rail operations. The East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor is one of the new transit projects included in Measure R. Measure R also provides funding to cities in Los Angeles County for transportation purposes.

20. I understand that the Canoga Extension of the Metro Orange Line was delivered under-budget. Can those funds be allocated to this project?

The Metro Board of Directors has the responsibility to decide how to reallocate additional funds that may remain once a project has been completed. In June 2012, the Board transferred some of the remaining funds from the Canoga Extension of the Orange Line to the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor. This did not increase the overall funding for this project but, instead, replaced funds that are no longer available due to the State budget shortfall.

Regional Connectivity

21. How will the proposed East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project improve transit connections to the entire region?

The East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor intersects with the Metro Orange Line that connects to the Metro Red Line in North Hollywood. It also connects with Metrolink and Amtrak stations that provide linkages to regional destinations. The corridor connects with the Metro Rapid 750 (Ventura Bl) and the Metro Rapid 794 (San Fernando Bl).

22. Is Metro determining where the greatest number of people need to – or want to – travel?

Yes, one aspect of the analysis will be to determine travel patterns in the study area, including travel to key destinations in the corridor and beyond. Community input from individuals and organizations will provide important information about key destinations. The study will also complete a “trip distribution analysis” to better understand travel characteristics within the study area

23. How will the proposed East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project work with the Sepulveda Pass Study/Project?

The Sepulveda Pass Project is another one of the Measure R projects. This future project is intended to improve connections between the San Fernando Valley and the Westside of Los Angeles. Based on the current funding schedule in the Long Range Transportation Plan, the Sepulveda Pass Project is not planned until 2039. However, Metro is exploring alternate funding scenarios that may allow a project to be completed sooner. It is not yet known what kind of project this future improvement would be. Regardless, planners for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor and the Sepulveda Pass Project are working together to ensure coordination between the two projects.

24. Will the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project look at connections beyond the San Fernando Valley into West Los Angeles and/or LAX?

Yes, the study will evaluate travel patterns beyond the Corridor itself. By evaluating travel demand outside of the Corridor, Metro will have a better understanding of the number of riders that would be attracted to the new service. Metro will be conducting a separate study to evaluate possible improvements for the Sepulveda Pass Corridor, also a Measure R project (see Question 23). The East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor is considering this future project in its planning effort.

25. Will the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project look at connections into Downtown Burbank?

In the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan, the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor is focused on improving north-south travel. A connection further east to Burbank would have to be studied separately. This would require direction from the Metro Board of Directors and funding would need to be identified.

Project-Specific

26. Once the project is built, who will operate it?

Metro will operate the new project.

27. Will bike lanes and other bike facilities be included along the Corridor as part of this project?

As a part of the environmental study, we will look for opportunities to integrate bike facilities.

28. How will the location of stops or stations be determined?

Several factors are considered when determining station locations. BRT and LRT generally space stations approximately one mile apart. This improves overall travel times by allowing for greater travel speeds between stations, and less time stopped at stations. Locating stations to facilitate transfer opportunities to east-west bus lines is also important, as is serving key destinations and activity centers to maximize ridership potential.

29. Will on-street parking be affected?

Some of the options being evaluated may impact on-street parking in areas though it is too early in the process to identify specific locations or impacts, if any. This will be evaluated in detail as a part of the project's environmental analysis.

30. Will corridor businesses be affected?

Similar to the previous answer on parking, it is too early in the process to identify the effects, if any, that the project will have on businesses. The EIS/EIR will analyze impacts of the project for businesses in the area.

31. Will a new storage and maintenance facility be needed?

If a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project is selected, the service could likely be supported with Metro's existing bus maintenance facilities though they may need some modifications. If a Light Rail Transit (LRT) alternative is selected, a new facility would be needed to store and maintain the rail cars. This will be evaluated as a part of the environmental study.

32. Where would a rail storage and maintenance yard be located and how big would it be?

The environmental analysis will evaluate possible locations for a rail storage and maintenance yard. It would need to be located within a quarter mile of the route in an area zoned for industrial use. It would be 10-15 acres in size.

33. How will a new transit system help the area economically?

A new transit system has the ability to create new development opportunities along the corridor because it will provide increased regional connectivity as well as increased travel options. It will also allow riders to conveniently access retail centers along the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor, thereby stimulating increased sales revenues for local businesses. Opportunities for Transit Oriented Development (TOD) around stations can lead to providing service to residential and commercial projects, which in turn create job opportunities.

Public Participation

34. Why is it important that I participate in this study?

Community participation is a key component in planning any new transportation project. The environmental review process requires that public input and suggestions are

evaluated. Your input will help us better understand the community's transportation needs and priorities. Please make sure your voice is heard by attending one of our community meetings, joining the dialogue online, or sending us your comments by US Mail or e-mail. See question 38 for more information on how to do that.

35. How will public input be reflected in the study?

Public input is one of the factors that will be used to analyze the various alternatives being evaluated for this project. As discussed in question 10, public comments have already resulted in expanding the study area. Public input will be summarized and documented. It will also be shared with the Metro Board of Directors. Public input will be gathered throughout the study effort which also includes two "formal" public comment periods.

- Scoping: The work on the Draft EIS/EIR began with a "scoping period" from March 1-May 6, 2013. During this time, the public is invited to provide input on the issues they would like the study to analyze. Input can be provided in person during Scoping meetings or in writing.
- Draft EIS/EIR: Prior to consideration and action by the Metro Board of Directors, the Draft EIS/EIR will be released for a 45-day public review period. This is the time when the public can submit comments and questions for the record for further consideration by the Metro Board and for further analysis during development of the Final EIS/EIR, the next phase of analysis. Comments and questions may be submitted in writing and at public hearings that will be scheduled during this time. It is anticipated that the Draft EIS/EIR will be available for public review in Summer 2014.

See Question 2 for more information on the study process. See question 38 below for how to provide input.

36. What can I do to help spread the word?

There are several things you can do:

- Join our mailing list by sending your contact information to eastsfvtransit@metro.net.
- Follow us on Twitter (www.Twitter.com/EastSFVTransit) and Facebook (www.Facebook.com/EastSFVTransit)
- Share project information with your network of friends, neighbors, colleagues and family


37. Can you make a presentation to my community group?

We would be happy to schedule a presentation for your organization. Please contact us through any of the methods discussed in Question 36.

38. How can I contact you to ask a question, provide input or participate?

There are many public participation opportunities throughout this process. You can e-mail us at eastsfvtransit@metro.net to ask a question, provide input or send us your contact information.

- Please attend any meetings we host in the community at key milestones. We will let you know when those dates are if you send your contact information to eastsfvtransit@metro.net.
- Follow us and participate on Twitter (www.Twitter.com/EastSFVTransit) and Facebook (www.Facebook.com/EastSFVTransit)
- Call us at (818) 276-3233
- Text us at “ESFVTransit” to 25825
- Send a letter to: Walter Davis, Project Manager; Metro; 1 Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012



Preguntas Frecuentes (Marzo 2013)

Metro y la Ciudad de Los Ángeles, en coordinación con la Ciudad de San Fernando y la Administración Federal de Transporte (FTA), están estudiando opciones para mejorar el servicio de transporte de norte a sur en el este del Valle de San Fernando. Las siguientes preguntas frecuentes están diseñadas para proveer información básica sobre los esfuerzos de planeación del Proyecto del Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando. Este documento será actualizado periódicamente. Las preguntas están organizadas en los siguientes temas.

- Resumen del Estudio
- Modos y Rutas
- Costos y Financiamiento
- Conectividad Regional
- Específicos del Proyecto
- Participación del Público

Resumen del Estudio

1. *¿Qué es el Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando?*

La Medida R, aprobada por votantes del Condado de Los Angeles en el 2008, programó fondos para una variedad de propósitos de transportación incluyendo 12 proyectos de transporte. Uno de estos proyectos es el Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando que también fue adoptado en el Plan de Transportación de Largo Plazo de Metro en el 2009 para el Condado de Los Angeles. Este proyecto está actualmente bajo revisión ambiental para analizar y evaluar opciones para mejorar el transporte entre norte y sur en el área. Vea la pregunta 8 para ver el mapa del área de estudio.

2. *¿Cuál es el proceso para estudiar este proyecto?*

Como la mayoría de proyectos, este estudio debe pasar por un análisis que considera como el medioambiente será afectado consistente con leyes estatales y federales. Este es un proceso que eventualmente determinará qué proyecto será construido. Para el Corredor de Transporte del este del Valle de San Fernando, este proceso comenzó con un Análisis de Alternativas (AA), y continua con la preparación de un(a) Declaración/Reporte de Impacto Ambiental (EIS/EIR – por sus siglas en ingles).

En cada paso del proceso de estudio, los descubrimientos y recomendaciones serán presentados a la Junta Directiva de Metro. El Estudio AA concluyó en enero del 2013 cuando el personal de Metro le presentó a la Junta Directiva las alternativas que continuarán para análisis más detallado en el Borrador EIS/EIR. Al final del Borrador EIS/EIR, la Junta Directiva seleccionará una “Alternativa Localmente Preferida (LPA)” para aún más estudio durante el EIS/EIR Final. Por último, el EIS/EIR Final será certificado por la Junta Directiva y un proyecto para diseño y construcción será aprobado.

El proyecto también sigue el procedimiento federal para análisis ambiental así que la Administración de Transporte Federal (FTA) también está involucrado en el proceso de análisis y aprueba el EIS/EIR. El análisis ambiental federal concluye cuando la FTA otorga al proyecto un Registro de Decisión (ROD – por sus siglas en inglés). La FTA considerará esto después de que la Junta Directiva de Metro certifique el EIR Final.

Vea las preguntas 4, 6 y 7 para más información sobre las diferentes fases del estudio.



3. *El proyecto está ubicado dentro de las Ciudades de Los Angeles y San Fernando. ¿Qué participación tendrá cada ciudad?*

No como la Metro Orange Line, donde Metro es dueño del derecho de paso, este proyecto está planeado de operar en calles de la ciudad. Así pues, las Ciudades de Los Angeles y San Fernando están participando en la planeación de este proyecto.

La Ciudad de Los Angeles está sirviendo como “colíder” del proyecto junto con Metro para este estudio. La Ciudad de San Fernando también participa activamente en los esfuerzos del estudio. Cuando el proyecto avance, se le pedirá a los concilios municipales de ambas ciudades que apoyen y concurran con este proyecto.

4. ¿Cuándo se completará este estudio?

El estudio completo está programado para concluir en el 2015. Los componentes del estudio se discuten en la pregunta 2 arriba y se estima que ocurrirán en la siguiente manera:

- Año calendario 2013/2014: EIS/EIR Borrador
- Año calendario 2014/2015: EIS/EIR Final

5. ¿Cuándo podré viajar en este servicio nuevo?

Este proyecto tiene una cronología bien corta. De acuerdo con el Plan de Transporte de Largo Plazo de Metro, este proyecto está programado de ser construido y operando para el año 2018.

6. ¿Que es un(a) Declaración/Reporte de Impacto Ambiental?

Un documento EIS/EIR combinado es preparado para satisfacer leyes federales y estatales sobre el medioambiente. El EIS/EIR identifica y analiza efectos y beneficios sociales, económicos, de transportación, y el medioambiente asociados con la construcción y operación de cualquier alternativa de proyecto. También analiza y compara estas alternativas con la alternativa de “No Construcción” que asume no cambios excepto los que ya están planeados. Además, se comparan con la alternativa de “Sistema de Manejo de Transporte” que incorpora mejoras de capital y operacionales de bajo costo al sistema de transporte actual como mejorar el servicio de autobuses, sincronización de semáforos, etc. Durante el desarrollo del EIS/EIR Final, el documento también identifica mitigaciones necesarias para responder a cualquier impacto.

7. ¿Qué factores se usarán para evaluar las varias alternativas para este proyecto?

Consistente con requisitos federales y estatales para revisión ambiental, las alternativas serán evaluadas usando los siguientes criterios:

- Beneficios e Impactos de Movilidad
- Conectividad Regional
- Efectividad de Costos (como los costos de capital y operaciones)
- Beneficios e Impactos Ambientales
- Consideraciones de Uso de Terreno (como la creación de empleos, oportunidades de desarrollo, y mejoras a la calidad de vida)
- Comentarios de la Comunidad



Corredor de Transporte del este del Valle de San Fernando – Área de Estudio

- Capacidad Financiera

8. *¿Dónde se construirá el proyecto?*

El estudio evalúa un proyecto que viajará en mayor parte sobre el Bulevar Van Nuys entre la Estación Metrolink de Sylmar/San Fernando y el Bulevar Ventura. Vea la Pregunta 12 para más información sobre las rutas que se están considerando.

9. *¿Cómo se determinó este estudio?*

Inicialmente, varias rutas entre norte y sur en el Valle de San Fernando fueron consideradas. Se decidió enfocar el estudio al corredor del Bulevar Van Nuys porque las rutas de autobús que viajan sobre este corredor son las más usadas y el corredor es el séptimo más usado en todo el sistema de Metro. Basado en comentarios recibidos a principios del 2012, el Bulevar Sepúlveda también fue evaluado ya que esta solamente como a una milla al oeste del Bulevar Van Nuys. También comentarios del público resultaron en agregar la Estación de Metrolink en Sylmar/San Fernando como la terminal norte para este proyecto ya que provee conexión con el servicio regional de tren de cercanías.

Modos y Rutas

10. *¿Será un proyecto de autobús, tren, o algún otro modo?*

Aún no sabemos. Esto es parte de lo que se está evaluando en el estudio utilizando los criterios descritos en la Pregunta 7.

11. *¿Cuál es la diferencia entre el Transporte de Autobús Rápido y un Tren Ligero?*

Se están evaluando las dos opciones para el Proyecto del Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando.

- Transporte de Autobús Rápido (BRT – pos sus siglas en inglés): Esta opción puede ser similar al de la Línea Metro Orange donde el servicio corre dentro de su carril exclusivo. BRT también puede ser diseñado para correr dentro de un carril exclusivo en medio de la calle o a un lado. También puede operar en tráfico mixto. De todas formas, sería un servicio de autobús premier, limpio usando gas natural comprimido (CNG).
- Tren Ligero (LRT): Este es un sistema de riel que utiliza electricidad para poder correr. El tren ligero viaja en un carril exclusivo dentro de su derecho-de-paso, similar a las Líneas Metro Blue, Green, Gold y Expo.

Vea la Pregunta 12 para más información sobre las rutas que se están estudiando para las alternativas de BRT y LRT.

12. ¿Cuáles son las rutas y características que se están evaluando para las alternativas de BRT y LRT en el EIS/EIR Borrador?

Para la Alternativa de BRT, se está considerando lo siguiente:

- Ruta: Viajar desde la Estación Metrolink en Sylmar/San Fernando sur/este en tráfico mixto hacia Van Nuys BI. Después, seguir hacia el sur en derecho de paso dedicado. Se están considerando tres opciones para la terminal sur:
 - Terminar en derecho de paso dedicado en la Estación del Metro Orange Line (MOL). Autobuses pudieran continuar hacia el sur vía Van Nuys BI a Ventura BI en tráfico mixto.
 - Desde la Estación MOL de Van Nuys, seguir hacia el oeste sobre la ruta de MOL y terminar en la estación Sepulveda.
 - Desde la Estación MOL de Sepulveda, continuar via Sepulveda BI en un carril dedicado hasta terminar en Ventura BI.
- Configuración: En medio y sobre la calle combinando derecho de paso dedicado y tráfico mixto.

Para la Alternativa de Tren Ligero, se está considerando:

- Ruta: Viajar desde la Estación Metrolink de Sylmar/San Fernando sur/este hasta Van Nuys BI seguir sur hasta Ventura BI.
- Configuración: En medio y sobre la calle en derecho de paso dedicado.

Vea la Pagina 7 para ver el mapa de la ruta BRT y la Pagina 8 para ver el mapa de la ruta LRT.

13. ¿Porque no un Tranvía para este Proyecto?

Tranvías fueron evaluados y eliminados del estudio. Estos corren bajo electricidad, similares a los que operan en Portland, Oregón. Típicamente, tranvías viajan en tráfico mixto, pero pueden también viajar en carriles exclusivos. Generalmente son más pequeños y más lentos que un tren ligero con paradas más frecuentes. Estos no ofrecieron mejoras significantes sobre el servicio de autobús existente ni se comparó tan bien como las alternativas de BRT y LRT para este corredor.

14. ¿Se están considerando otras alternativas?

Como parte del proceso, el estudio evalúa otras dos opciones:

- No Construir: Analiza el área de estudio en el año 2035 sin ningún proyecto. Incorpora las calles, carreteras, servicios de transporte e instalaciones actuales,

además de proyectos en el futuro que están incluidos en el Plan de Transporte de Largo Plazo y programados para el 2035.

- Manejo del Sistema de Transporte (TSM): Esta opción considera mejoras de capital y operaciones de bajo-costos y al sistema de transporte, como sincronización de semáforos, mejor servicio de autobuses, mejoras a calles e intersecciones, etc.

Costo y Financiamiento

15. ¿Cuánto dinero está disponible para este Proyecto y cuáles son los fondos de financiamiento?

\$170.1 millones han sido identificados para este proyecto en el Plan de Transporte de Largo Plazo adoptado por Metro en el 2009 para el Condado de Los Angeles. Estos fondos mayormente vienen del Programa de California para Mejorar la Congestión de Tráfico (TCRP) y la Medida R. El TCRP provee dinero a Metro para “construir un corredor de transporte norte/sur que debe conectarse con el proyecto del corredor Este/Oeste de Burbank-Chandler (después nombrado Metro Orange Line) y con el Autobús Rápido que corre a lo largo de Ventura Bl.” Vea la Pregunta 19 para más información sobre la Medida R.

16. ¿Cuánto cuesta cada alternativa de construcción?

Basado en análisis muy preliminar completado hasta la fecha, se estima que las opciones de BRT cuesten entre \$280-520 millones. Las opciones de LRT se estiman a un costo de \$1.8-2.3 billones. Estas cifras asumen la operación de este proyecto en el año 2018 y serán actualizadas durante el proceso de estudio.

Corredor de Transporte del lado Este del Valle de San Fernando

Alternativa de transporte de tren ligero para más estudio



Corredor de Transporte del lado Este del Valle de San Fernando

Alternativa de transporte rápido de autobús para más estudio



17. ¿Porque hay tanta variación entre los costos?

Generalmente es más costoso construir un LRT que un BRT por los costos asociados con la construcción de riel y líneas de electricidad sobre los trenes. Además, porque este es el primer proyecto de tren ligero en el Valle de San Fernando, las cifras de costo toman en cuenta el adquirir propiedad y construir instalaciones de mantenimiento para los trenes. La variación en costos para cada opción incluye la distancia del proyecto, el número de estaciones, adquisición de propiedades, y el hecho de que aún estamos en la etapa preliminar del análisis. Al seguir analizando este proyecto, los presupuestos de costo serán refinados aún más.

18. ¿Las Alternativas de LRT y BRT cuestan más de \$170.1 millones que están programados? ¿Cómo construirán el proyecto si no hay suficientes fondos?

Como todos los proyectos de transporte financiados por la Medida R, se necesitará buscar fondos adicionales para poder construir este proyecto. El proyecto se puede construir en fases de acuerdo con los fondos disponibles. Estas opciones serán evaluadas en el estudio. Mientras mejor definimos el proyecto, podremos mejor identificar recursos financieros adicionales.

19. ¿Qué es la Medida R?

La Medida R es un impuesto de venta de medio-centavo que fue aprobado por los votantes del Condado de Los Angeles en el 2008. Estos fondos serán colectados a través de los próximos 30 años para el propósito de mejorar la transportación en el condado e incluye varios proyectos de transporte nuevos, carreteras, y mejoras al sistema de autobuses y riel. El Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando es uno de los proyecto de transporte incluidos en la Medida R. La Medida R también provee fondos a las Ciudades de Los Angeles para propósitos de transporte.

20. Entiendo que el Proyecto de la Extensión Canoga del Metro Orange Line fue construido abajo de su presupuesto original. ¿Se pueden usar los fondos restantes para este proyecto?

La Junta Directiva de Metro tiene la responsabilidad de decidir como re-alocar fondos adicionales que restan de un proyecto cuando es completado. En Junio del 2012, la Junta Directiva, transfirió algo de los fondos restantes de la Extensión Canoga a este proyecto. Esto no subió los fondos disponibles para este proyecto, si no que reemplazó los fondos que el Estado no pudo proporcionar a causa del presupuesto estatal que los elimino.

Conectividad Regional

21. ¿Cómo puede este proyecto mejorar las conexiones de transporte a la región entera?

El este del Valle de San Fernando se conecta con la Línea Metro Orange que se conecta con la Línea Metro Red en North Hollywood. También se conecta con las estaciones de Metrolink y Amtrak con rumbo a destinos en toda la región. El corredor también se conecta con la Línea Metro Rapid 750 (Ventura Bl) y la Metro Rapid 794 (San Fernando Bl).

22. ¿Metro está determinando donde la mayoría de personas necesitan o quieren viajar?

Si, un aspecto del análisis es el de determinar los patrones de viaje en el área de estudio, incluyendo viajes a destinos claves en el corredor y más allá. Comentarios de la comunidad también provee información importante sobre destinos claves. El estudio también completará un “análisis de distribución de viajes” para mejor entender las características de viajes dentro del área de estudio.

23. ¿Cómo trabajara este proyecto con el Estudio/Proyecto Sepulveda Pass?

El Proyecto Sepulveda Pass es otro proyecto programado en la Medida R. El futuro proyecto mejorará conexiones entre el Valle de San Fernando Valley y el Oeste de Los Angeles. Basado en el Plan de Transporte de Largo Plazo, el proyecto Sepulveda Pass no está programado hasta el año 2039. Sin embargo, Metro está explorando escenarios de financiamiento alternativos que puedan avanzar el proyecto más rápido. Aun no se sabe qué tipo de proyecto será construido. De todas maneras, los planeadores para el Corredor de Transporte del Valle de San Fernando y el Proyecto Sepulveda Pass están trabajando juntos para asegurar coordinación entre los dos proyectos.

24. ¿Se evaluará como se conectará este proyecto más allá del Valle de San Fernando hacia el Oeste de Los Angeles y/o con el Aeropuerto Internacional?

Si, este estudio evaluará patrones de viajes más allá del corredor. Al evaluar demanda de viajes fuera del corredor, Metro tendrá una mejor idea del número de pasajeros que estarían atraídos a este servicio nuevo. Metro completará un estudio separado para evaluar posibles mejoras para el Corredor Sepulveda Pass, también un proyecto de la Medida R (vea la pregunta 23). El Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando está considerando este proyecto en sus esfuerzos de planeación.

25. *¿Se considera que este proyecto se conecte con el Centro de Burbank?*

En el Plan de Transporte de Largo Plazo, el corredor del Este del Valle de San Fernando se enfoca en mejorar viajes entre norte y sur. Una conexión en el este hacia Burbank tendría que estudiarse por separado. Esto requeriría dirección de la Junta Directiva de Metro y fondos deberían ser identificados para su estudio.

Específicos del Proyecto

26. *¿Cuándo el proyecto sea construido, quien lo operará?*

Metro operará el proyecto nuevo.

27. *¿Se incluirán carriles para bicicletas y otras instalaciones a lo largo del Corredor del Proyecto?*

Como parte del estudio ambiental, analizaremos como podemos integrar instalaciones para bicicletas.

28. *¿Cómo se determinarán las paradas o estaciones del proyecto?*

Varios factores son considerados al determinar la ubicación de estaciones. BRT y LRT generalmente ubican estaciones en cada milla. Esta distancia entre estaciones reduce el tiempo de viaje y aumenta la velocidad de autobuses/trenes. Ubicando estaciones para facilitar oportunidades de transferencia entre rutas este-oeste también es importante, al servir destinos claves y centros de actividad para aumentar el número de pasajeros.

29. *¿El estacionamiento en la calle será afectado?*

Algunas de las opciones que se están evaluando podrían afectar espacios de estacionamiento en la calles. Aún es muy temprano en el estudio para identificar específicamente que lugares o impactos, si los hay. Esto será evaluado en detalle como parte del estudio ambiental.

30. *¿Se afectarán los negocios a lo largo del corredor?*

Similar la respuesta previa sobre estacionamiento, aún es muy temprano para identificar cualquier impacto a negocios que el proyecto pueda causar. El EIS/EIR analizara impactos del proyecto a negocios dentro del área de estudio.

31. *¿Se necesitará una instalación de mantenimiento y almacenamiento?*

Si un proyecto de Autobús Rápido es seleccionado, este servicio se podría apoyar por instalaciones de Metro actuales o con alguna modificación. Si un tren ligero es

seleccionado, una instalación nueva deberá ser construida. Esto será evaluado como parte del estudio ambiental.

32. ¿Dónde se ubicará la instalación de mantenimiento y almacenamiento y que tan grande será?

El análisis ambiental evaluará ubicaciones posibles para instalaciones de mantenimiento y almacenamiento. Estaría ubicado dentro un cuarto de milla de la ruta y en un área industrial. Se necesitan entre 10 a 15 acres para su construcción.

33. ¿Cómo un sistema de transporte nuevo ayudará la economía del área?

Un sistema nuevo de transporte tiene la habilidad de crear nuevas oportunidades de desarrollo a lo largo del corredor porque aumenta la conectividad regional y las opciones para viajar. Además, ayuda a que pasajeros puedan convenientemente acudir a los centros comerciales sobre el corredor, a su vez, estimulando más ventas a negocios locales. Oportunidades para Desarrollo Orientado al Transporte (TOD) alrededor de estaciones también pueden proveer servicio residencial y comercial, y en turno crear oportunidades de empleo.

Participación Pública

34. ¿Porque es importante que participe en este estudio?

La participación de la comunidad es una parte importante al planear este proyecto de transporte Nuevo. El proceso de revisión ambiental requiere que los comentarios y sugerencias del público sean evaluados. Sus comentarios no ayudaran a mejor entender las necesidades y prioridades de la comunidad. Por favor haga que su voz se escuche al participar en alguna reunión comunitaria, dialogar a través de internet, o al enviar sus comentarios por correo o email. Vea la Pregunta 39 para más información de cómo hacer esto.

35. ¿Cómo se refleja la participación del público en este estudio?

Los comentarios del público es un factor que será analizado al evaluar cada alternativa que se está considerando para este proyecto. Como explicado en la Pregunta 10, se expandió el área de estudio por los comentarios que se recibieron del público. Todos los comentarios recibidos serán resumidos y documentados y serán compartidos con la Junta Directiva de Metro. Comentarios del público serán recibidos durante el proceso de estudio que también incluye dos periodos donde estos comentarios son hechos de manera “formal.”

- Periodo de Ámbito: El Borrador EIS/EIR comenzó con un periodo de “ámbito” entre el 1 de marzo hasta el 6 de mayo del 2013. Durante este periodo, el público está invitado a someter sus comentarios sobre los asuntos que se deben

analizar en el estudio. Comentarios pueden ser sometidos en persona durante reuniones de ámbito o por escrito.

- Borrador EIS/EIR: Antes de que la Junta Directiva de Metro considere y actúe sobre el proyecto, un Borrador EIS/EIR estará disponible para revisión y comentarios por un periodo de 45 días. Durante este tiempo, el público podrá someter comentarios y preguntas formales que deberán ser consideradas por la Junta Directiva para sus análisis más detallado en un EIS/EIR Final en la fase siguiente del proyecto. Comentarios y preguntas podrán ser sometidas por escrito o verbalmente en las audiencias públicas que se llevaran a cabo durante este periodo. Se anticipa que el EIS/EIR Borrador esté disponible en el verano del 2014.

Vea la Pregunta 2 para más información sobre el proceso de estudio. Vea la Pregunta 38 para aprender como someter sus comentarios.

36. ¿Qué puedo hacer para informar a otras personas sobre este estudio?

Hay varias cosas que puede hacer:

- Regístrese para recibir información al mandar un email a: eastsvtransit@metro.net.
- Síguenos en Twitter (www.Twitter.com/EastSFVTransit) y/o en Facebook (www.Facebook.com/EastSFVTransit)
- Comparta información con sus amigos, vecinos, colegas y familiares.

37. ¿Pueden presentar información a mi grupo comunitario?


Nos complacemos en poder presentar a su organización. Por favor contáctenos para programar una presentación a través de cualquier modo explicado en la Pregunta 36 y 38.


38. ¿Cómo me puedo contactar para hacer preguntas, dar mis comentarios, o participar?

Hay varias oportunidades para participar en este estudio. Usted puede enviar un correo electrónico a eastsvtransit@metro.net para hacer preguntas, comentarios y darnos su información de contacto para recibir actualizaciones.

- Por favor asista nuestras reuniones públicas. Le enviaremos información sobre estas cuando se registre al mandar un email a: eastsvtransit@metro.net.
- Síguenos y participe a través de Twitter (www.Twitter.com/EastSFVTransit) y/o Facebook (www.Facebook.com/EastSFVTransit)
- Llámenos al: (818) 276-3233
- Envíe un texto "ESFVTransit" a 25825
- Envíe correspondencia a: Walter Davis, Project Manager; Metro; 1 Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012

EIS/EIR Process





East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Appendix 5: Scoping Meeting Sign-In Sheets

March - May 2013

East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 16, 2013 – Panorama High School

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	
Kenneth	SILK	KENSILK10@gmail.com	5255 ZELZAH AVE #106 BURBANK 91316	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Glen	Gomez	ggomez66@yahoo.com	740 S. San Fernando Blvd #101 Burbank, CA 91302	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Work
TONY	WARRE	TONYWARRE@YAHOO.COM	14437 MERCER STREET ARLETA, CA 91331	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Ana Sosa	Herrera		8790 Van Nuys Bl. Panorama, CA 91402	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Jack	Waizenegger	jack.waizenegger@gmail.com	POB 4652 Panorama CA, CA 91402-4652	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Cesar	De La Cruz	Cesar@AGORA2ptd.NET	8610 V.N.	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Michelle	Santillan	m.davis2916@sbcglobal.net	9318 Van Nuys Blvd #20 Panorama City, CA 91402	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
RON	COLLINS	RON.COLLINS@MACERICH.COM	8461 VAN NUYS BLVD #9 PANORAMA CITY, CA 91402	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
BART [Signature]	Reid [Signature]			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 16, 2013 – Panorama High School

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	
DENNIS	HINDMAN	DENNIS.HINDMAN@ATT.NET	4406 CAIRNGLOA BLVD.	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
ROW	ZIFF	RZBIZ@PACBELL.NET	14939 SUTTON ST. S.O. 91403	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Work
Dug	Eutierrez	verved97@hotmail.com	13560 Hamlin St. valley Glen, 91401	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Zara	Gomez	zloc21@yahoo.com	940 S. San Fernando Blvd. Burbank Ca. 91502 #101	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Maria	Yerena		8834 Cedros ave. Apto. 10 Panorama city 91402	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Lorenzo	Mutia	lmutia@yahoo.com	8400 Snowden Avenue Panorama City, CA 91402	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Mike	Bernstein	mbbernstein@yahoo.com	4457 Beck Ave Studio City, CA 91602	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Victor	Scuttkern	stargazer78@yahoo.com	9318 Van Nuys Blvd #26 Panorama City, CA 91402	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
JACK	LINDBLAD	jplindblad@gmail.com	8211 Shadyglade Av ESFV Transit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 16, 2013 – Panorama High School

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address
Jan	Brown	JBTJasper@aol.com	7822 Broadleaf Ave. P.C. 91402 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
CHRISTINA	COOLIDGE	coolidgechristina2@gmail.com	14161 Riverside Dr. S.O. 91423 <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Work
GREGORY WRIGHT		greg@newciv.org AM ON LIST	14161 RIVERSIDE DR #3 SHERMAN OAKS 91423 <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Sakara Bernal			8530 Burnet North Hills <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Douglas	Bernal	dougbernal@yahoo.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Ryan	Gutierrez	domo4dunnick@yahoo.com	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Danny	Horn	static.couture@gmail.com	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 16, 2013 – Panorama High School

Elected Officials & Staff ONLY

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address
Noel	Barajas	noel.barajas@sen.ca.gov	
Gabriela	Marquez	gabriela.marquez@mail.house.gov	



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 19, 2013 – San Fernando Aquatics Center

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
PAUL	LUNA	PLUNAH01@YAHOO.COM	551 FERRADORE ST S.F.	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Maria	Carrillo		1333 Hewitt St. SF	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Work
Kevin	Davis	lifesaver1985@yahoo.com	12145 Clermont	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
LYDIA	MATHIAS	LDMATHIAS@PACBELL.NET	14628 HAMMILL ST.	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
				<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
				<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
				<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
				<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
				<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 19, 2013 – San Fernando Aquatics Center

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Robert	Gardner	Robertgardner1012@gmail.com	12207 Chandler Blvd Arth Valley Village 91607	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
ILACOS.	TAPIA	TAPDAS TRANSPORT@MSW.COM	13612 DROWNFIELD AVE Sylmar	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Work
JESUS	Ochoa	SFVGC-MTA		<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Polo	Corona	PCORONA@PACIFICMAbeautiful.org	11243 Glenoak St Blvd Pacifica, CA	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
TONY	WARRE	TONYWARRE@yahoo.com	14437 Meeker St ARLINGTON, CA 91331	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Ian	Fitzsimmons	ian@aszkenazy.com	333 Kalisher St # 213 San Fernando, CA 91340	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
LIZA	Wright	LIZAWRIGHT42@yahoo.com	17220 SUPERIOR ST. 313 NORTHridge Ca 91325	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Linda Stanton	Jauron	LCampa5000@aol.com	319 N Workman St San Fernando	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
S. Michelle	Klein-Hass	msgtek703@gmail.com	8820 VN Blvd. #2 Panorama City, CA 91402	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 19, 2013 – San Fernando Aquatics Center

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address
Angel Joy	Estrada	ricebowl34@yahoo.com	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Julio	Hernandez	catracho@outlook.com	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Work
Franklin	Ochoa		<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Bart	Reed		<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Rafael	GARCIA		<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
JACK	LINDBERG	jplindbergl@gmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Numan	Parada	bennyp81@yahoo.com	13636 Eldridge Ave. Sylmar CA 91342 <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Jonathan	Klein	Jonathan.klein@dot.gov	888 S. Figueroa St. #2170 Los Angeles CA 90017 <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
JOHN	ULLOTH		PO BOX 7232 VAN NUYS, CA 91409 <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 19, 2013 – San Fernando Aquatics Center

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address
Stacy	Siegel	SSiegel@Keyescars.com	5855 Van Nuys Blvd Van Nuys, CA 91411 <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Work
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 19, 2013 – San Fernando Aquatics Center

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address
Mais	Sagradyan	maisagradyan@yahoo.com	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Imelda	Padilla	ipadilla@paromabeautiful.org	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Work
Alvin	Estrada	kidrebl@aol.com	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
JULIAN	RUELAS	JULIANRUELAS@YAHOO.COM	653 N. HUNTINGTON ST SAN FERNANDO <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Ryan	Markey	ryan_markey@yahoo.com	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Eddi	Zepeda	eddzepeda@gmail.com	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
JESSE	AVILA	SF CITY COUNCIL	319 N. WORKMAN ST 91340 <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Christine	Estrada	christineestrada@gmail.com	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
FEDERICO	RAMIREZ	framirez@sfcity.org	CITY OF SAN FERNANDO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor



March 19, 2013 – San Fernando Aquatics Center

Elected Officials & Staff ONLY

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

First Name	Last Name	Email	Address
Noel	Barajas	noel.barajas@sen.ca.gov	6150 Van Nuys Blvd #400
Gibson	Nyambura	gmn67163@gmail.com	6150 Van Nuys Blvd #400
Robert	Gonzales	Rgonzales@sfcity.org	1333 Hewitt St San Fernando CA 91340
ANTONIO	LOPEZ	AGLOPEZ@SFCITY.ORG	117 MACNEIL ST. SF 91340



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 21, 2013 – Arleta High School

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	
Jason	Ackerman	ENC Jason.Ackerman@gmail.com	16718 Addison St, Encino CSUN Student	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
BRIAN	PATTON	GRAN.PATTON@YAHOO.COM	9225 pehr Ave North Hills CA 91347	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Work
Robert Gardner		Robertgardner6012@gmail.com	12207 Chandler Blvd Art 4 Valley Village CA 91607	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Israel Herrera		israel.herrero.85e@my.csun.edu		<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Polo Corona	Corona	pcorona@paraimabeautiful.org		<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Philip	Clarke		15232 Burton St Panorama City 91402-4439	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Eduardo	Arias	eduardo.ariasramos.423@gmail.com		<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Jose	ALENVALO	JCA Polo @GMAIL.COM		<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
JACK	LINDBLAD	jplindblad@gmail.com	8211 Shadyglade NH 91605	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 21, 2013 – Arleta High School

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address
Krystal	Korhonen	Latsyrk_k@yahoo.com	12222 youngdale Ave Sylmar CA 91342 <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Miriam Fogler	Fogler	Miriam@fahotmail.com	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Work
PETER FOGLER		Peterfogler@hotmail.com	P O BOX 4746 PARAMOUNT CITY 91412 <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Miguel	Romero	michaelromero@gmail.com	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Jack	Waizenegger	jack.waizenegger@gmail.com	POB 4652, P.C., CA 91412 <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Jose	Juarez	jose7juarez@gmail.com	14700 Hubbard St Apt #5 Sylmar CA 91342 <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
John	HERNANDEZ	John@insurancecenter.net	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
FREDDY	CORTES	cortefreddy@yahoo.com	17331 Sherman Way Van Nuys CA. 91406 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 21, 2013 – Arleta High School

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	
DONNA	GOOLEY			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Bart	Reed			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Work
Donna	Pearmant			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Sergio	Ibarr n		Arleta NC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
DAW	Rosales	daw.rosales@lacity.org	(CO)	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Magnolo	Bugarin	magnolob@me.com	Arleta.	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
				<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
				<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
				<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 21, 2013 – Arleta High School

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address
Celia	Vasquez	i-teach2020@yahoo.com	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Wette	Lopez	Wlopez@pacimabeautiful.org	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Work
Sofia Ramirez			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Jose Palma	Palma	palma818@gmail.com	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Darrell	Clarke	darrell@dclarke.org	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Tony	WAREE	TONYWAREE@yahoo.com	14437 MERCER STREET ARLETA, CA 91331 <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Lorena	Bernal	lorena.bernal@lacity.org	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Noel	BARAJAS		10352 RINCON AVE PACOIMA CA 91331 <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Faramarz	Naberi		<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 21, 2013 – Arleta High School

Elected Officials & Staff ONLY

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address
Wesly	Hernandez	wesly.hernandez@lacity.org	822. S. Robertson Blvd, Los Angeles, 90035
Noel	Barajas	noel.barajas@sen.ca.gov	
Caesar	Huerta	caesar.huerta@sm.ca.gov	9300 Laurel Cyn. Blvd. #1 fl Arleta 91331



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 27, 2013 – Marvin Braude Constituent Center

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address
Lynn	Branstein	tanyzare@earthlink.net	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Robert	Prutchen	bobprutcher@hotmail.com	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Work
Miriam	Foster		<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Beth	Brody	betha@bwb.com	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Ron	Ziff	SONC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Kevin	Laszlo		<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
CHUCK	BETZ	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Chris	Carrera	Carrera01@verizon.net	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Jose	Palma		6706 Bowman Ave. Apt #1 N. Hollywood CA 91606 <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 27, 2013 – Marvin Braude Constituent Center

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address
JONATHAN	DIZON	JONATHAN.DIZON@GMAIL.COM	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Pat	O'Connor	<i>[Signature]</i>	Box # 330333 Pasadena, Ca <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Work
Eduardo	Arias	eduardo.ariasramos.923@gmail.com	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Antonio	Sanchez	sanchantonio@gmail.com	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
DONNA	GOOLEY		<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
JACK	LINDBLAD	8211 Shadyglade AV	8211 Shadyglade jplindblad@gmail.com <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
NATE	ZABLEN		<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Glenn	Bailey	GlennBaileySFV@yahoo.com	PO Box 19172 Encino 91416 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Caesar	Huerta	Caesar.Huerta@asm.ca.gov	9300 Laurel Lynn Bvd. 1st Fl Arleta 91331 <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.




East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 27, 2013 – Marvin Braude Constituent Center

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	
DENNIS	HINDMAN	DENNIS.HINDMAN@ATT.NET	4406 CATTUENGA BLVD	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
MALCOLM	KLUGMAN		 Malcolm Klugman 109 N. Screenland Dr., #D Burbank, CA 91505-4310	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Work
Bob	Anderson	Bob.HillsideOrdinance@roadrunner.com	Sherman Oaks 4050 Woodcroft Rd	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
TERRANCE	ROSS		21410 WESTERN ST TORRANCE CA 90501	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
RAY D.	LOPEZ	lopez ray d @ gmail.com	9243 N. SHIRLEY ST. #271 RESEDA, CA. 91335	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
DAVID R.	GARFINKLE	DR.GARFINKLE@SBCGLOBAL.NET	6073 CALVIN AVE TARZANA, CA 91356	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Robert	Crabtree	robertcrabtree012@gmail.com	17207 chandler Blvd Apt 41 91607	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Eric	Castellanos	ERIC1027@AOL.COM		<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
ERIC	CASTELLANOS	CASTELLANOS.ERIC1@gmail.com		<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 27, 2013 – Marvin Braude Constituent Center

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	
Jerry	Martin	M_martin48@yahoo.com	5700 Etiwanda Ave 91356	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Dolores	Tukich	greenleaf@att.net	14937 Greenleaf St S.O. 91403	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Work
Ayda	Memary	ayda.memary.152@my.csun.edu	17331 Sherman Way	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
FREDDY	CORTES	conefreddy@yrlm.com	17331 Sherman Way Lake Balboa CA. 91406	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Doug	ARSENEAULT	doug@vica.com	5121 VAN Noys Blvd. Suite 208 LA, CA 91403	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Ismael	Aerera	israel.herrera.85@my.csun.edu		<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
JENNIFER	CHARLES	jbcharles@hotmail.com	4518 VISTA DEL MONTE #1 S.O. 91403	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
TAMMY	WALSH	TAMMYWALSH@YAHOO.COM	14437 MONCOE ST ARLEN, CA 91331	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Wm.	ROONEY		8719 Matitija P.C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 27, 2013 – Marvin Braude Constituent Center

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address
MATT	MEALEY	MATT MEALEY 1@GMAIL.COM	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Sergio	Ibarra	Sergio.Ibarra.94@my.csun.edu	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Work
GREGORY	WRIGHT	greg@newcity.org I AM ON THE LIST!	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other

ARLITA NC

14161 RIVERSIDE DR #3
SHERMAN OAKS 91423

Participate
Survey



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 27, 2013 – Marvin Braude Constituent Center

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address
Rolando	Chararriy	roland2174@yahoo.com	14139 CALVERT STREET VAN NUYS <input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Angel	Barnuevo	Angel.Barnuevo@sen.ca.gov	<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Work
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other
			<input type="checkbox"/> NC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Other



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 27, 2013 – Marvin Braude Constituent Center

Elected Officials & Staff ONLY

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY



First Name	Last Name	Email	Address
Ruben	Zaragoza	Ruben.zaragoza@lacity.org	_____
Jonathan	Navarro	Jonathan.navarro@lacity.org	_____
Edwards Martinez	Martinez	edwards.martinez@lacity.org	14410 Sylvan St #215 Van, CA 91401
Am	Am		
Noel	Barajas	noel.barajas@sen.ca.gov	
Alexander	Friedman	On file	on file
Gabriela Marquez		gabriela.marquez@mail.house.gov	
Juan Barajas	GUZMAN	juan.guzman.46@my.csun.edu	N. Hills



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.



East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

March 27, 2013 – Marvin Braude Constituent Center

Elected Officials & Staff ONLY

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY




First Name	Last Name	Email	Address
Wesly Wesly	Hernandez	wesly.hernandez@lacity.org	822 S. Robertson Blvd., Los Angeles, 90035
Suarita	Palma		91606 6204 Bakman Ave #1 N.H. 91606
Alejandra	Palma	alejandra23palma@hotmail.com	6706 Bakman Ave Apt #1 N.H. 91606
Rafaela	Partida	rafaela.partida.31@gmail.com	13990 Astoria St. apt 210 Sylmar CA 91342
Quirwa	de la Cuesta	quanticdesign@yahoo.com	6511 Matilija Ave, Van Nuys 91405
Jonathan	Brand	jonathan.brand@lacity.org	200 N. Spring St CA 90012
Raul	Bozaviera		
FRE Jason	delete Ackerman	EMC Jason Ackerman@gmail.com	16718 Addison St Encino, CA, 91436



Email and postal addresses are to be used for periodic project updates.





East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Appendix 6: Scoping Comments Received

March - May 2013



Memorandum

To: Jody Litvak
From: Lilian De Loza
Subject: Accepting Official Comments through Social Media
Date: March 1, 2013

Given the wide scope of the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study, digital media like Facebook and Twitter are ideal platforms to engage the public in an open forum and encourage “peer-to-peer” communication. Interactive Facebook and Twitter forums will provide the technical team with a community feedback mechanism and a channel to communicate information about the project. Facebook and Twitter are also excellent platforms in which to receive official comments from the public during the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report scoping period. Recognizing that this will be Metro’s first time that formal comments will be submitted via Facebook and Twitter, below are the best-practices and protocols that Consensus Inc. will follow throughout the scoping period that will end on May 6, 2013.

Facebook

- **Create an Application** that makes it easy for stakeholders to comment on
 - We have developed a Facebook application that allows stakeholders to submit comments through an online form that will be directly sent to *eastsfvtransit@metro.net* as soon as the comment is submitted.
 - All comments submitted will be viewed by the technical team only and not available to stakeholders at large.
 - Comments will be collected daily and forwarded to the technical team by close of business. This option eliminates the “conversations” that can occur on the general Facebook page.
 - Please log on to view a working sample of the Facebook online comment form:
 - Link: <http://www.shortstackapp.com/member>
 - Email: Ashley.meachem@consensusinc.com
 - Password: cpg1000

- Proposed Post for Formal Comment Application:

Please Submit An Official Comment.

Metro and the Federal Transit Administration, in coordination with the City of Los Angeles, are conducting an analysis to evaluate ways to improve north-south transit opportunities in the east San Fernando Valley that offer connections to the regional transportation network.

Public input is also an important part of this process. Through this electronic form, you can easily submit a formal comment regarding the scope of the analysis that should be considered in the environmental review. This application will be available beginning Friday, March 1, 2013, until Monday, May 6, 2013 at 5PM PST. Please complete all the required information below and instantly submit your comments to Metro's study team.

- Proposed General Post on Facebook:

Metro, in collaboration with the Federal Transit Administration, issued a Notice of Preparation/Intent that a Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (EIS/EIR) will be prepared for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project. This important milestone marks the beginning of the Public Scoping Period that will last until May 6, 2013.

Public input is an important part of this process. You are invited to submit OFFICIAL FORMAL SCOPING COMMENTS through this Facebook Study Page. Click the Submit Scoping Comments Tab on the timeline above to submit your comments on the scope, focus and content for the EIS/EIR.

Metro is pleased to announce that this is the first time that the agency will receive official formal comments via Facebook.

In the event that stakeholders comment on the general Facebook study page, a message will be posted to alert the "commenter" that official comments need to be submitted via the "submit official comments" link on the page. Nevertheless, Consensus Inc. will take a screen shot of the comment, print it and log it into a "scoping comments" folder that will be provided to the Study Team for inclusion in the Scoping Report.

Using Twitter for Comments

■ Recommended Option for @EastSFVTransit: Create Hashtag

- By using the recommended Hashtags below, stakeholders will have the option of sending shorthand versions of their comments. Comments are monitored daily.
- Proposed Hashtag: #ESFVScoping

Facebook Application Comments

ESFV COMMENTS: Submitted by Facebook Application					
Date	First Name	Last Name	Zip	Email	Comment
5/6/2013	Jay	Williams	91605	netwrk4graduate@yahoo.com	<p>The alternatives I am considering for both Van Nuys and Sepulveda Boulevards:</p> <p>Build These Alignments:</p> <p>I. Van Nuys Corridor - Light Rail - Higher capacity cars for the current & near future high, mid, low-rise developments in the area. Better with ADA requirements & mobility. Separate cars (it stops conflicts of space & time) for Wheelchairs & Bikes.</p> <p>II. Sepulveda Corridor - BRT - Seems the 405 crowd can't get away from gasoline. Having BRT most likely mitigate or moderate some of \$100 Million US Dollar disastrous cost overrun. It can calm community anger by making better usage of the money already spent on HOV/Express Lane. Electrify the buses later or later run rail.</p> <p>I understand the different the Modes of Transportation.</p> <p>BRT - similar to the Metro Orange Line</p> <p>LRT - similar to the Metro Gold, Blue, Green, and Exposition Lines</p> <p>Street Car - similar to the City of Portland,OR</p>
5/6/2013	Anthony	Day	91324	irtonyday@gmail.com	<p>The SFV wants, needs, and has already paid for rail (through inequitable returns on transportation specific taxation). To recommend a bus over rail & say: its the better alternative, or to say its "rail on wheels" or somehow equivalent to rail, is a separate but equal argument. Separate but equal is inherently unequal. The inequality has been proven by the Orange Lines VERY slow travel times, LIMITED ridership potential, and ZERO economic stimulus. The nearly 2 million people who live in the SFV and the hundreds of thousands who travel Van Nuys and the Sepulevda Pass each day don't want to be separate. We need, want, and deserve a high capacity rail line.</p> <p>If our taxes have already been spent on giving rail lines to every other corner of the County except north, then wait until there is more money and do it right. In terms of opportunity cost, another BRT route on an even more crowded road then where the Orange Line is would be a political, economic, & transportation disaster.</p>
5/6/2013	Dwight	Stureteant	90045	tyman@mapinternet.com	<p>This Is My Idea for a I-405 Subway and My Recomendation on the Stops</p> <p>http://www.flickr.com/photos/expoline-part-2/8709985007/sizes/o/in/photostream/</p>
5/6/2013	Tony	Waree	91331	TonyWaree@yahoo.com	<p>As a daily rider on Metro, which includes the 233/761 buses, Metro Orange Line, and Metro Red Line, and having been tracking other regional projects, seeing the shortcomings of the Metro Orange Line busway as it was not originally conceived, I want to fully support the Light Rail Transit (LRT) alternative on Van Nuys Boulevard/San Fernando Road. This should be LRT not just to plan ahead for a potential line to Westwood via a rail tunnel, but also serve the needs within the community as a backbone rail line that ties all the bus lines together. It should be LRT not just for those who can access Metro with their own two feet, but also multi-modal riders, like bicyclists, and those on wheelchairs, who will welcome a quick "roll-on" to the train rather than wait for a ramp to flip and then struggle their way to their only means of conveyance. LRT for the East SFV Transit Corridor will change the way people get around!</p>
5/5/2013	Prasad	Kulkarni	90034	prasad.comp@gmail.com	<p>I am a resident of Los Angeles living in the Westside area. I am watching closely the progress/updates on East San Fernando Valley transit study. Personally, I believe the corridor should be Light Rail Transit which would possibly connect to Sepulveda Pass corridor. I like LRT better than BRT because of speed and capacity. The benefits of having LRT simply out-weigh that of BRT. I live close to Culver City and have taken the Expo line several times to get to the downtown. I am thrilled by the existing Metro rail lines plus the under-development lines.</p> <p>LRT would be the answer for future transit problems as well. I would love to see rail service between San Fernando valley and LAX. 405 fwy is in mess right now and has already reached saturation. If we have good rail service between valley and LAX that would really ease the congestion on 405. Metro should make efforts on securing additional funds to build rail service.</p>
5/3/2013	Paul	Whittemann	91344	pjwhittemann@yahoo.com	<p>I support a Light Rail transit system rather than more Bus Lines, however, not the proposed LRT alternative running parallel to Van Nuys Boulevard, but rather on the projected route parallel to Sepulveda Boulevard. I would like also to see "Express Trains" that could shorten the estimated 37 minute travel time from beginning to end significantly. Also, I would like this project to be linked to a new LRT running through the West Valley, Burbank area, and eventually connecting to the Sepulveda pass, Burbank Airport, and to a line running straight to downtown Los Angeles. Good luck and thanks for your efforts!</p>
5/2/2013	Robert	Meinert		eclecticexplorer@gmail.com	<p>I support light rail along Van Nuys Blvd. from Ventura Blvd., an elevated station there, to Roscoe Blvd only. BRT connection north of there to San Fernando. I agree with a previous commenter: is it possible to convert part of the Orange Line to light rail, when the Van Nuys line is constructed? Light rail from North Hollywood sta to Van Nuys, turning north on Van Nuys to Roscoe.</p>

Facebook Application Comments

4/29/2013	Lorenzo	Mutia	91402	lrmutia@yahoo.com	<p>I urge Metro to pursue a light-rail build and consider ways to make the line flexible to some changes, in particular changing the Orange Line into a light-rail system and the creation of a tunnel for light-rail and automobiles. Please consider underground or elevated sections and do not keep the line completely street running. I'm no expert but if it's possible to build an underground section after Sherman Way station and have the line emerge after Van Nuys Orange Line or find a way to elevate the line in some aestically pleasing way through the Van Nuys shopping district please do so. Vehicle traffic there is a mess already. Lastly, consider the potential for commercial development if Metro were to invest in some sort of commercial business along the corridor. Create a place to go to using the line to make the area more than just some passing place that is constantly congested. The more people that stay and linger in the businesses is better for everyone.</p>
4/28/2013	Craig	Walnut	91789	clyn1980@yahoo.com	<p>Please build this as a light rail line and NOT a bus line. There needs to be consideration to link this line to a future Sepulveda Pass corridor line so that it's a one seat ride from East San Fernando Valley down through West Los Angeles. A fixed rail line like light rail will more likely be the catalyst for future transit oriented development around the LRT stations than a bus line.</p> <p>Additionally, I think the average speed of the LRT line should be as fast as possible (eg. roughly 30 mph like the Red/Purple and Green line). The Gold Line Eastside Extension and Expo Lines are so slow. It's very frustrating that the Red/Purple Lines cover so much more distance than the Gold and Expo Lines. We need to strive to keep the average speed up to make the LRT as attractive as possible. With this in mind, I think doing grade separation as much as possible is most ideal.</p> <p>So to sum up, build LRT, focus on speed by grade separating as much as possible. Thanks! And go Metro!! =)</p>
4/28/2013	Alexander	Friedman	90028	alek3000@sbcglobal.net	<p>I believe, Light-Rail should be the option to choose, due to capacity, speed, reliability, appeal, and safety, all of which makes LRT the most cost-effective option.</p> <p>Also, the southern terminus of the LRT line should extend west to Sherman Oaks Galleria, to provide much better connectivity. The best way to achieve it is to go underground (due to density along Ventura Blvd.) with a sharp turn to the west. It is very possible, and simple, to accomplish sharp turns; the East LA Gold Line extension has clearly demonstrated the success of sharp turns.</p> <p>Finally, if Metro decides BRT to be the alternative, then Electric Trolleybuses should be chosen, not CNG buses. Trolleybuses have been used in LA County up until the 1960's. Trolleybuses offer a much smoother ride, with faster acceleration and braking, they're 100% pollution-free and offer much lower operating costs.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>
4/24/2013	Jason	Burns	91604	jasonburns.la@gmail.com	<p>This corridor is the most important project of this generation. It offers us the unique opportunity to not only bridge the Valley with Westside, but to build a vital artery in our growing rail network. This MUST be a rail line, connecting Metrolink/future HSR in Sylmar, Van Nuys Metrolink, Orange, Purple, Expo and on to LAX. It should be a hybrid corridor running down Van Nuys Boulevard to a tunnel under the Sepulveda Pass.</p> <p>405 Subway. Valley to the Westside. Any other alternative will viewed by history as a huge political blunder and failure of current Los Angeles leadership.</p>
4/24/2013	Sean	Healy	90045	seanhhealy@gmail.com	<p>Yes please! We need this.</p>
4/18/2013	Scott	Epstein	90048	scottevanepstein@gmail.com	<p>I support light rail on Van Nuys Blvd! LA needs a world class transit system. If this project is implemented as BRT, there is a much higher risk that its efficiency will be watered down through concessions to automobiles. In addition, this corridor should connect directly to an extension through the Sepulveda Pass to the Westside, which would not be possible with BRT. This is an important project for all of LA. I am a board member on the Mid City West Community Council. With the completion of the Purple Line and the continuation of the Van Nuys Light rail south to the basin, residents in our community will be able to reach important job centers in the Valley quickly without the use of a car. SF Valley residents could also easily reach employment, shopping and cultural destinations in the basin, improving quality of life for residents and economic vitality for the region. Finally LRT would remove cars from the road, alleviating congestion, conserving energy, and making our air cleaner.</p>
4/18/2013	Deborah	LaTorre Matundola	91604	hi_deborah@yahoo.com	<p>As someone who lives in the southern part of the Valley, it's easy to say that there aren't enough public transportation options along my area of the Valley or to the Westside, where I happen to work. Having a light rail line would be a great benefit to an overly congested area.</p>
4/16/2013	Tom	Olsen	91411	thosolsen@mac.com	<p>A Bus only lane on Van Nuys would be a good first solution, followed by a busway. Has a traffic impact study been done yet to find out the implication to car traffic on Van Nuys and on the streets adjacent to the boulevard?</p>

Facebook Application Comments

3/28/2013	Luis	Vargas	91331	luispacoima2010@gmail.com	The best option would light rail station between Sylmar and Ventura Boulevard, light rail would be better if it were lifted should be extended between Glenoaks Blvd and San Fernando Sylmar Station.
3/27/2013	Katherine	Munro	91403	katforhair@yahoo.com	Please go for the light rail!! it is better for the envirmant and for the riders you can add or subtract cars depening on use. look at the bule line with three cars and the gold line, and green line using two. you will also be able in time conect this light rail with others making the valley more conected to the city and a more of a destantion.
3/21/2013	Regina	Lowery	91601	reginagayle1954@gmail.com	I would suggest a stop at Burbank Blvd. I think that not having a stop there would be a mistake. Also I would like to see a underground terminus when approaching Ventura just like the Orangeline does at the 7th street station. That way, we can have a future connection underground with the sepulveda pas project
3/19/2013	Douglas	Neslund	91342	anon10@mac.com	If you had this in place already, I would not have retired, as it was the damned commute from Sylmar to Beverly Hills that finally was too much for a 60s-something driver to take. But instead of Van Nuys Blvd., why not take it down the 405 Fwy and over the hill to the West side? You would not have any right-of-way or ecological issues, and you would avoid the high crime areas of so much of Van Nuys that would definitely negatively suppress ridership. BTW, I vote for light rail over buses. Light rail is so much faster!
3/19/2013	Alek	Bartosouf	90014	alek@la-bike.org	I would like to know how the proposed transit corridor will integrate with the proposed bike lanes (per the 2010 Bicycle Master Plan) and the proposed bike enhanced network along Van Nuys Blvd (per the draft city Mobility Element).
3/19/2013	Ryan	Nachowicz	91405	ryansuchor@gmail.com	We want to be sure to connect people to places and (buses and trains) conveniently. One of the ways in doing so is providing an adequate bicycle infrastructure for short range and long range trips. Both bicycling and transit options are sorely needed in the Valley and do not want one to compromise the other.
3/19/2013	David	Sokolove	91401	david.sokolov@gmail.com	I vote for the light rail option.
3/19/2013	David	Sokolove	91401	david.sokolov@gmail.com	Please build the light rail option. I can assure you from my personal experience as both a passanger and an abutter to the Orange Line right-of-way that the Bus Rapid Transit is running at or very near full capacity much of the time. If Metro or the City/County decide to build out the Bus Rapid Transit option on the north-south Van Nuys Blvd corridor, this new line will be fuctioning at or near full capacity from the day it opens. Instead of spending millions building a system which will be functionally obsolete and unable to offer adaqueate capacity from the day it opens, this Van Nuys resident strongly recommends building infrastructure and a system which will remain effective for years into the future, even if the costs are significantly higher today (the higher initial capital costs of light rail might also be able to be distributed over the much longer effecive life of such a system, perhaps by bonding or other means).
3/18/2013	Joel	Epstein	90049	joel.epstein@gmail.com	Whatever gets built should seamlessly integrate with the Orange Line, Metrolink and the shamefully overdue train or BRT through the Sepulveda Pass. The 761 "Rapid" is a poor excuse for a major city's transit line. Let's not let the NIMBYs stall a critical piece of the region's transit infrastructure.
3/18/2013	Joshua	Insel	91604	joshinsel@sbcglobal.net	I think that this line should definitely be built as light rail. Light rail is the fastest and most energy efficient option. Also, I do not understand why the route up Van Nuys Blvd. to San Fernando Rd. is the preferred alternative for both LRT and BRT. North of Parthenia St., Van Nuys Blvd. gets narrower, so that route would require extensive widening, would it not? I think the other alternative, the route up Van Nuys Blvd., Parthenia St., Sepulveda Blvd., Brand Blvd., and San Fernando Rd. would be easier to construct, as this was the former route of the Pacific Electric Red Car line to San Fernando, and these streets were specifically built to accomodate trains running in their center medians. The Pacific Electric was once the greatest and most extensive public transportation system in the world. The point of Metro is to rebuild this system, and improve it over the original as much as we can. Building it as BRT is simply impeding progress.
3/17/2013	Zachary	Pitts	90068	zacharypitts@yahoo.com	I support using a bus only lane because of the greater affordability compared to rail. The bus only lane must be similar to the Orange Line with dedicated "stations" and fully traffic separated lanes or else it won't work. I'm sure rail would be slightly faster, but with the tremendous savings of a bus only line, I feel we could dedicate more of the money to a greater expansion of the area covered or more frequent and later in the evening transit service.
3/16/2013	John	Lopez	91403	jedgarlopez@gmail.com	Please select the light rail option for the transit corridor along Van Nuys Blvd. A) Especially north of Magnolia, Van Nuys is particularly wide and ugly, so I would hope the landscaping and aesthetic improvements that would accompany it would beautify this dense and essential transit corridor. B) While the Orange line is nice and useful, it doesn't generate the same excitement and community effect as a rail line would. Van Nuys is a more central spine for the Valley that could really be used to build a workable and highly used transit system for the Valley, which is still far more car dependent than Los Angeles over the hill. Hopefully you could link it up to an eventual extension of the red line north from North Hollywood to San Fernando. Frankly, it would be wonderful if the Van Nuys option included a subway component--in my mind, Van Nuys and Ventura Blvd. will both have to be the loci of future development as the Valley grows and it would be more far sighted to build a subway.

Facebook Application Comments

3/13/2013	Nick	Strobl	91601	nstrob13@gmail.com	The East SFV corridor would be best served by light rail. The SFV is home to close to 2 million people and is steadily growing. Van Nuys Blvd. is one the busiest corridors in the nation. The orange line bus-way is reaching capacity much sooner than projected and should have originally been built as rail to fill the void of mass transit in the valley. Metro should be planning for the future and not pushing outdated models of transportation in the 21st century. The increasing connectivity and functionality of the city of LA depends on reliable rapid transportation. The people of the city need more public transit options and another bus cannot satisfy the people's needs now, or in years to come. Light rail is quicker than a bus and will be less expensive in the long run. The ridership of the red line to Noho is a prime example of how much demand there is for adequate mass transit in the San Fernando Valley.
3/13/2013	Jeffrey	Yu	91324	jeffrey.d.yu@gmail.com	My personal preference is for a LRT line; however, if the projected density does not justify the cost of a light rail line, then I can accept a BRT line that can seamlessly connect with the Orange Line. Whatever the decision, I definitely support a subway/heavy rail through the Sepulveda Pass, and it may be cheaper to just have an LRT route from the start instead of a BRT that may eventually need to be upgraded to LRT. But since I do not have any financial or density numbers to justify either decision, I remain ambivalent on the issue, pending those statistics.
3/13/2013	Jeremy	Barofsky	90017	jeremybarofsky@gmail.com	I writing to strongly recommend that the scope of the analysis should include the entire 405 corridor from LAX to Sylmar. The key reason that this corridor is so important is the connection between the Valley and West LA's job-rich areas. I also strongly encourage the scope of the analysis to focus on either a light rail or even heavy rail option in this corridor to reduce the likelihood of capacity constraints being reached quickly and spur dense, transit-oriented development in the Valley, West LA, and South LA toward the airport. I also strongly encourage this analysis of either light rail or heavy rail (and not a bus way) to include a tunnel through the mountain areas. Thank you for your time and effort. Regards, Jeremy
3/13/2013	Christopher	Gerstle	91401	mrgerstle@gmail.com	I would really like to see the light rail come through. It would be a great efficient alternative to local transportation. Ultimately would like to see it connect to a Westside North/Side connector.
3/12/2013	Zachary	Rynew	91607	zr10sw@yahoo.com	As someone who takes the 405 everyday into work, a rail line would be a much better long term investment than a busway especially if it were to connect to the westside someday. In my mind, a busway would be a waste if we're looking down the line.
3/13/2013	Vito	Grillo	90057	vito.grillo@gmail.com	I feel strongly that the line should be a rail line that connects thru the Sepulveda Pass to the new Purple line in Westwood. LA would be short sighted not to give people in the valley a connection into LA. That will help traffic on the 405 AND get many UCLA employees/students off the road. Tha would do wonders for traffic. Do it right metro! Think about the future!
3/13/2013	Reuben	Duarte	90046	Duarte2586@gmail.com	Regarding Van Nuys busway/LRT/impovements: I would argue that it should be a busway like the Orange Line. However, the bus on this line should be able to use the Orange Line ROW to get riders to the Red Line station. Nothing could be more deleterious to the effective use of this potential route than asking commuters going to the basin to pay three times for three transfers going one way. People hate transfers and I think would prefer fewer transfers over a faster ride.
3/12/2013	Thomas	Obed	90027	tmobed@gmail.com	I believe LRT would be a huge boost to this part of town. Ridership will only increase, as long as people feel comfortable riding, and no matter how you slice it, light rail is infinitely more comfortable than any type of bus.
3/12/2013	Matthew	Arias	91106	matteoarias@gmail.com	anything less than a fixed rail system would be a waste of time no one wants to sit on a bus that looks like a train. buses are loud and noisy and pollute the air. In a first class city like Los Angeles we should have a first class transportation system. why half-ass it?
3/12/2013	Julio	Carrera		carrera11@verizon.net	Please select the rail line along Van Nuys Blvd. My wife and I believe that this is best option today and for tomorrow.
3/12/2013	Cyrus	Rafael		cyrusrafael@gmail.com	Light rail option please. Although it may cost more to build, rail ridership will increase well above bus ridership over time and it has been shown that light rail can will spur development along the route whereas busways generally do not (please see development along Expo line stops as evidence).
3/12/2013	Tricia	Benson	91406	tbenson@speakeasy.net	Hello there. I just wanted to state that I believe that light rail is the way to go for the Van Nuys corridor transportation project. As a resident of the area for more than a decade I can see how it would help the transportation issue that we have here. If this light rail would connect to a light rail or subway going through the sepulveda pass that would be ideal. Thanks.

Facebook Application Comments

3/12/2013	Guadalupe	Gonzalez	91340	lupe.glez10@gmail.com	<p>Light rail!</p> <p>A busway is probably most economic, but the light rail will provide better, faster, more reliable transport in the long run. Light rail is more roomy and can accommodate more passengers as well as what they are carrying: bicycles, shopping bags, and strollers. A light rail will also provide a more comfortable ride down the Van Nuys corridor, encouraging shopping down the boulevard. Hopefully the light rail will provide a designated space for bicycle riders; one bus can only carry three busses. I have experienced having to take the next bus because there is no space on the bike rack, and it is very annoying and, most importantly, discouraging to use public transportation.</p> <p>One more thing I think the light rail will provide is a sense of luxury, which the Valley needs, more parts more than others. The light rail will give us a full sense of belonging to the MTA system, instead of just throwing us a bus!</p>
3/12/2013	Spencer	Gross	20052	gross91@gwu.edu	<p>As someone who used to live at the Southern end of the project area I cannot stress enough how important it is that this project is built as an LRT project and not as BRT. While it is significantly more expensive, the opportunities a rail line will bring, both for development along the project corridor, and for a future rail connection to the West side are too important to ignore. If Metro is serious about building a comprehensive public transportation system in LA county, this project should be built as LRT.</p> <p>-Spencer Gross</p>
3/12/2013	John	Kerr	90026	john.eugene.kerr@gmail.com	<p>I support light rail on this corridor so it can connect to the Sepulveda Pass project to connect the Valley to the Westside.</p>
3/12/2013	Amanda	Irvine	90016	ahirvine@gmail.com	<p>A bus only-route like the orange line or a light rail are by far the best options for Van Nuys Blvd. By utilizing one of these instead of increasing regular bus routes, you increase the amount and range of people willing to use the service. Regular bus services, with small signs that only display route numbers, won't be used by a large demographic of commuters. A dedicated busway or light rail generally comes with better signage, route maps, seating, and perceived reliability by commuters. Additionally, light rail would be the best option for a long-term solution. Not only is there less maintenance costs with light rail than a bus, but there is an even high perception of safety and reliability by commuters than with the dedicated busway. It may be more costly to implement, but the long-term benefits need to be considered here.</p>
3/12/2013	Ray	Simmons	90036	RAYINLA@aol.com	<p>I urge you to adopt the "light rail" option and connect it to Metrolink in San Fernando and (hopefully) a light rail line under the SM mountains to Westwood as part of the Sepulveda Pass project.</p>
3/12/2013	Daniel	Hesketh	90034	drhesketh@gmail.com	<p>I hope that Metro would seriously consider Light Rail for the Van Nuys corridor versus a busway. Given that the usual argument for a busway is that it could eventually be converted to light rail, why wait? Why pay twice? Invest in the future of the valley and build it right the first time. Conversion will only lead to further disruptions in traffic down the line causing local businesses to suffer the effects of major construction twice instead of once.</p>
3/12/2013	Luke	Klipp		lukehklipp@gmail.com	<p>Metro,</p> <p>I know that a light-rail option is more expensive upfront, but in terms of the livability and sustainability of that option, it'll last much longer than a busway option. You already know it's faster and would bring in increased ridership. Can you borrow some of the needed additional costs against anticipated ridership numbers? Or do you need that ridership to pay for operations?</p> <p>Regardless, as a frequent light-rail traveler who has also ridden Metro's bus network, I would much prefer the light-rail option and would be far more likely to take that.</p> <p>Thanks for reading my comments.</p>
3/12/2013	Oscar	Hernandez	90020	oscar.nmi.hernandez@gmail.com	<p>I believe if you have ever ridden the Orange line, you would know that it is an awful experience. All ready crowded with inexact timetables. Van Nuys Blvd., I'm sure is surrounded by very dense neighborhoods. Neighborhoods that all ready rely on public transportation and walking - much more so that the neighborhoods surrounding the Orange Line.</p> <p>In regards to future growth - light rail will be able to accommodate the expected increase in ridership. The Orange Line will not - it will have to convert to Light rail - seems like it would be logical to start with light rail from the beginning. Lastly, in terms of connecting it with the rest of the Los Angeles, LRT is of course the only choice. I imagine this line to one day reach the airport - and this should never be done via bus. I strongly feel that the people that will vocalize the loudest against LRT in the Valley are people that rarely use public transportation. Again, please remind yourself of the mistake that is the Orange Line.</p>

Facebook Application Comments

3/12/2013	Toby	Contarsy		tecontarsy1@gmail.com	I hope Metro decides to build a light rail line and avoids building another orange line. The bus lines use just as much right-of-way, station infrastructure, and environmental review, so building a rail line makes much more sense. As a long time valley resident, I truly hope that Metro builds an efficient, connected, and fast high speed rail that can ease the gridlock that has plagued our area. Thank You, Toby Contarsy
3/12/2013	Justin	Levy	91302	spamsam470@gmail.com	The valley could really use more rail transit. Please try to make the new north-south san fernando valley transit line a rail one. It would also attract more people as rail lines in the valley are rare, and many people find them much more appealing than the bus. Finally if you could as convert the orange line to rail that would be great as well.
3/12/2013	Ly	Hoang	91324	Ms.lyhoang@gmail.com	I fully support rail for the ESFVTC. This project is phase 1 of the sepulveda pass project which will carry over 100k people per day over the most congested road in North America. The price tag of this rail project (~2 million) is approximately equal to the amount of Measure R funds which the SFV had been denied. Further, a large portion of the LRT cost is for a rail yard which will be used by future projects. Expo, Green, Blue, Gold all have rail yards. A rail yard is not a reason to deny tax paying citizens the transit they want, need, and paid for. BRT is a major, multi-generational mistake that should be avoided. NO BUILD is better than BRT, because no build leaves the possibility of one day having mass transit whereas BRT prevents further transit discussion and investment. The SFV has nearly 2 million people. Smaller cities with less traffic have seen the need and constructed rail lines; why should we be subjected to inferior transit infrastructure?
3/12/2013	Daniel	Fabiano		dfabiano87@gmail.com	If we are going to do this, we must do it right the first time. A bus line is not an answer for middle class riders, and represents a step down from the light rail/subway system that LA needs to realize its potential. The Orange Line is utterly miserable to ride due to the smaller volume of even the largest of buses (cramped ride!), frequent acceleration and deceleration, and slow transit time. Keep the transit momentum going with light rail, and solve our problems NOW.
3/12/2013	Andrew	Galambos	90066	Galambos@hotmail.co	Light rail:)
3/12/2013	Anthony	Lopez		alopez@gmail.com	LRT is the most viable option for the future of Valley transit. It has a higher capacity (Orange Line is nearing capacity and has little room for bikes! Plus, disabled entry is easier on LRT), is cheaper in the long run, and will be easier to connect with the Purple Line if a Valley-Westside rail connection is made. BRT is great but Van Nuys Blvd is a dense and growing corridor, and needs a 1st world, civilized transit option to ensure its future success.
3/12/2013	Jin	Mitchem	91402	jinmitchem12@gmail.com	Building a busway instead of a light rail line on perhaps the busiest corridor in the whole country would be a serious missed opportunity. Buses are noisy, bumpy, unreliable, slower, and are at the mercy of traffic conditions. These issues impact ridership numbers, especially for people that have a car, and would be willing to give them up if they felt doing so wasn't too much of a drastic change in comfort or convenience. The increased ridership of light rails attracts transit-oriented development and encourages smart growth, which further increases future ridership numbers/fares. Choosing to build light rail may seem expensive now, but in the future our city will be kicking itself for not doing so back when it was a real bargain. Although it's easy to just look at the upfront price tag, we need to consider how this decision will impact the next 20,30, and even 50 years. Building a busway instead of a light rail line on such a vital corridor is penny wise, pound foolish.
3/12/2013	Andrew	Crane	90046	andrew.crane@sbcglobal.net	I am pushing for the light-rail option as it's quicker, more modern and could hopefully pull more people onto public transit who don't normally use it.
3/12/2013	Edward	Holzer	91601	edwardholzer@gmail.com	This needs to be light rail so it can connect to the 405 line.
3/12/2013	Edward	Holzer	91606	edwardholzer@gmail.com	This needs to be light rail so it can connect to the 405 line at some point in the future. It needs to be built right the first time. If the money can not be found, a busway will suffice.

Facebook Application Comments

3/12/2013	James	Arnold	91405	heyman25@gmail.com	If the cost/benefit analysis demonstrates rail is least expensive over 30 year model. Go with rail. CNG buses I would imagine would be less expensive over that time period because of the abundance of natural gas.
3/12/2013	Al	Pavangkanan	91411	mewtwosama@yahoo.com	I would like to see a bus only roadway for Van Nuys Blvd
3/12/2013	Joel	Rane	90043	joel@joelrane.com	This should eventually be the north/south light rail that tunnels under the Sepulveda Pass and eventually might go across the Westside and connect to the Green Line in Westchester. Think big
3/12/2013	Adam	Garrett	90042	adam.garrett.30@my.csun.edu	A LRT line for Van Nuys is the best and only option for the Valley's future. BRT is cheap but as we all know, the Orange Line is almost at capacity, and its a nightmare for bicycle commuters who have to wait for two, three, or four busses at peak hours! A LRT line will ensure a steady future for the transit corridor, will be cheaper to maintain, and will attract more riders. Plus, if this ever connects to the LA Basin/Purple Line extension, an LRT would be a much easier connection, and just makes sense. GOOD LUCK!
3/12/2013	R	L		j1998@sbcglobal.net	is there a way to make the light rail elevated or completely grade separated? there is no way people will ride an expensive light rail that takes 35 minutes to travel from the top of the valley to the bottom...if this is all Metro can do for a light rail, then just build the bus.
3/12/2013	Armen	Fetulagian	91605	armenfetulagian@sbcglobal.net	I am writing to you in regard to the proposed plan to add either a light rail or a busway public transit line on Van Nuys Blvd. I would like to offer my support for the light rail option. I have lived in the Valley, more specifically three different locations east of the 405, west of Whitsett, south of Plummer and North of Oxnard, my entire life and can tell you with no pretention and judgment that the Valley needs to shed the ever expansive and damaging suburban personality. Although I greatly enjoy the Orange Line busway and ride whenever convenient, a busway emphasizes the image of suburbia. A light rail option would not only add much needed public transit to the area, it could also possibly bring in development to the area, something that is also much needed. The addition of any public transit, especially a light rail line, would help the Valley, and more specifically, Van Nuys, feel just a bit more like the rest of Los Angeles.
3/12/2013	Aram	Hacobian	91501	aramhacobian@yahoo.com	Please make this light rail. We want as much rail as possible. And please make it grade separated or at least have crossing gates at street crossings so that the trains don't have to stop for street traffic. I would like to ask why is this specific project being built as opposed to other more desired options. I also personally believe that the money being spent on this project would be better spent on either a direct grade separated rail link between LAX and Union Station or a subway tunnel under the 405 that connects with the Crenshaw Line.
3/12/2013	Courtland	Noble	90028	cblandlife@gmail.com	Light Rail
3/12/2013	Joshua	Nickel	90405	nickeljoshua@yahoo.com	This project should be LRT and be combined with the Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor. This would allow more riders to use the project and also make the project more cost effective. The study done for the P3 opportunity showed that light rail along this corridor would serve upwards of 80-100,000 people a day. This would rival even the blue line, currently the most popular light rail line in the county. There is proof that shows that people in the valley do travel to the west side. That is why the 405 is the most congested freeway in the region. You can also refer to the news articles that show how the people riding on the expo line originate in the SFV. They take the orange line to the red line to the expo line because it is quicker than the 405. If you look at this project by its self, the data will tell you to go with BRT even though the comments have mostly been on favor of LRT. Don't make the same mistake you did with the orange line. The SFV deserves LRT along this corridor.
3/12/2013	Carlos	Cordoba	91423	clcordoba@sbcglobal.net	Whether an Orange line type N/S system, or light rail, we need to support and reinforce the strong commercial aspect of Van Nuys Blvd. north of the 101. This is an area with a strong small business presence - I don't think there's any chain stores the whole length of Van Nuys. Whatever the approach it should take into account what will make the area continue to flourish. I frequently run and bike the pathway next to the Orange Line and it is quite empty. Would hate to see VN Blvd. bisected the same way. Good luck!
3/12/2013	Abad	Hernandez	91405	heyabad@gmail.com	I would LOVE rail going up on Van Nuys. The Orange line is embarrassingly overcrowded already and is a clear example of the demand that is within the area. And I'm sure we can easily imagine the revitalization of Van Nuys Blvd with the introduction of rail which is currently full of empty store fronts or stores that sell cheap goods. I understand that rail will come at a heavy price but it'll surely pay off in many other ways. I cannot overestimate my support for the rail option.

Facebook Application Comments

3/12/2013	Siam	Pewsawang	91306	sbpewsawang@gmail.com	Whatever you do, be it busway or LRT should integrate well with the Orange Line and whatever becomes of the Sepulveda Pass project. BRT would probably be best for Orange Line integration (you could run buses to San Fernando/Chatsworth from NoHo and vice versa. From a geopolitical stand point, I think the Valley deserves LRT more so than the super distant Gold Line extension towards the less dense, far flung suburbs of the San Gabriel Valley. Van Nuys is a major boulevard, and with already high bus ridership, there is a natural transit ridership to improve service for.
3/12/2013	Ivan	Shchelkunov	90038	ivanshchelkunov@gmail.com	i vote for a bus way on van nuys blvd with right of the way and minimal stops at any intersections along the route. the valley doesn't need a light rail/subway yet. Thanks
3/12/2013	James	Askew	91601	askew1975@yahoo.com	I am pro-light rail; it's a costlier option but the investment sends a better message to the community, business owners and other stakeholders about Metro's commitment to mass transit in this part of the SFV.
3/12/2013	Gary	Fox		garyfox@gmail.com	It seems clear that this, if it is to truly offer connections to a regional transportation network, must be light rail and connect (without transfer) to the 405 light rail subway. It would be extremely short-sighted to instead proceed as it seems now, with a BRT on Van Nuys and a transfer to the 405 project. Please, we want ONE light rail line connecting the valley to the westside!
3/12/2013	Derek	Powell	90068	derepowell@outlook.com	This project should absolutely be a light rail. Experience with the Orange Line proves that demand outstrips capacity quite quickly. A rail line would be much more capable of transporting people than a dedicated busway, and capacity can be added to cope with increased demand far better than the buses.
3/12/2013	Laurie	Liao	91344	laurie.liao@gmail.com	Please, consider a light rail! It is much more suited for the long-term than a bus line.
3/12/2013	Laurie	Liao	91344	laurie.liao@gmail.com	I would like more light rail transportation to be built throughout the San Fernando valley to connect it directly to downtown Los Angeles as well as other surrounding areas such as West LA, Pasadena, and Santa Clarita.
3/8/2013	Jose	Escobar	90016	jose.escobar.220@gmail.com	I would like to see Metro plan something bold and visionary. Think ahead. I agree BRT is cheaper, but if you are considering building a tunnel underneath the Sepulveda Pass for a possible LRT route, then it would make sense to connect these two projects together. I think about the Regional Connector being built soon, and wonder if someone could have had the vision to see all 3 LRT routes connected one day. That's the type of vision and planning we need now. We need things to connect better and seamlessly. So I am in favor of the LRT route. People enjoy taking the train. I've ridden the Expo Line since it first opened and have seen people get excited about riding the train. It's less of a bumpy ride than a bus and follow a set schedule so you get used to planning your day at around that schedule.
3/8/2013	Dayle	Diamond	90066	dayle.diamond@gmail.com	Please consider a light rail option that's anticipates a future North/South rail in the Sepulveda pass!
3/4/2013	Ronny	Rueda	91331	ronrueda@gmail.com	I hope considers a phased implementation for the LRT alternative Phase 1: Van Nuys Orange Line Station to Van Nuys/San Fernando Road with Maintenance Facility in Pacoima along San Fernando Road. Phase 2: Van Nuys Orange Line Station to Ventura/ Van Nuys with direct connections to the Sepulveda Pass Project. Phase 3: Van Nuys/San Fernando to the the San Fernando/Sylmar Metrolink Station Hopefully the budget gap for the Phase 1 implementation can be covered with some combination of state and federal funds. Phase two funding could be included with the Sepulveda pass project. Phase 3 would be completed when more funding becomes available.

Twitter Comments

ESFV COMMENTS: Submitted by Twitter				
Date	First Name	Last Name	Twitter Handle	Comment
5/5/2013	Jack	Lindblad	@jacklindblad	#ESFVScoping AFF expands TIFIA federal loan program offering low-interest, govt backed loans for Van Nuys Light Rail! http://alturl.com/jheyf
5/5/2013	Jack	Lindblad	@jacklindblad	#ESFVScoping Stop hillside/beach fortress elitists/corporations profiting off extinction hawking cars on Van Nuys Bl! http://alturl.com/tnmqr
5/5/2013	Jack	Lindblad	@jacklindblad	Has anyone besides myself taken the opportunity submit comments "by twitter, Include the hashtag #ESFVScoping '... http://fb.me/1jGyWDQkS
5/5/2013	buspassrick		@buspassrick	EastSFVTransit #EastSFVScoping we need a light rail line no busway that proved to be a E5mistake for F6 orange line please don't repeat it.
5/4/2013	Jack	Lindblad	@jacklindblad	#ESFVScoping America Fast Forward FIRPTA Public/private partnerships on Federal, State, County, City levels funds LRT http://alturl.com/64nxy
5/4/2013	Jack	Lindblad	@jacklindblad	#ESFVScoping Hillside Dwellers and Flats Dwellers take note! Home prices fared better when homes were near transit! http://alturl.com/wbiz7
5/4/2013	Jack	Lindblad	@jacklindblad	#ESFVScoping America Fast Forward bond program facilitates Mission, Vision and Plan for Light Rail on Van Nuys Blvd http://alturl.com/8kbft
5/3/2013	Jack	Lindblad	@jacklindblad	#ESFVScoping Stop BRT creep of 1000 cuts! Select Light Rail to See Our Communities Get Our Fair Share of the Transit http://alturl.com/syia3
5/1/2013	Jack	Lindblad	@jacklindblad	#ESFVScoping 2013: Light Rail again on Van Nuys Bl 100 years ago Pacific Electric Street Car 1st reached Van Nuys http://alturl.com/zt9js
4/29/2013	Jack	Lindblad	@jacklindblad	#ESFVScoping Los Angeles is kicking its bad reputation [with Light Rail on Van Nuys Bl] to become a worldwide... http://fb.me/2DwVorsgK

Twitter Comments

4/28/2013	Jack	Lindblad	@jacklindblad	#ESFVScoping Artists will have opportunities at Twelve Stations along the Light Rail on Van Nuys Boulevard! http://fb.me/1PsZRQjAB
4/28/2013	Jack	Lindblad	@jacklindblad	#ESFVScoping This is the path to finance Light Rail on Van Nuys Boulevard! http://fb.me/25ZDUa7le
4/28/2013	Jack	Lindblad	@jacklindblad	#ESFVScoping More reason for Light Rail on Van Nuys Bl rather than losing 'bus rapid transit' in the Worst Traffic http://fb.me/1KlrbQAaM
4/28/2013	Jack	Lindblad	@jacklindblad	All rapid transit starts local with Light Rail Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard http://fb.me/HdXiDcdE #ESFVScoping
3/6/2013	Jason	Burns	jasonburns	#405subway - Valley to Westside. MT @EastSFVTransit Scoping comments will now be accepted via Facebook and Twitter. http://ow.ly/ik6ch
3/8/2013	Dan	Wentzel	danwentzel	EastSFVTransit We need a rail line from Sylmar to LAX. The southern end of this corridor is not Ventura Blvd. It is LAX, or Long Beach.

ESFV COMMENTS: Submitted by Email				
Date	First Name	Last Name	Email	Comment
5/13/2013	Harold	Berreondo	haroldb0916@yahoo.com	<p>I'm glad to hear that valley residents are being heard to help create easier mass transit systems. I have been wanting to help and finally have sat down to write. As a long time resident of the San Fernando Valley (going back to the RTD) and having lived or traveled through major traffic spots in the valley, I would like to bring to you a few ideas that can help your goal in connecting the outer reaches of the valley...</p> <p>The proposed line(s) would:</p> <p>#1 -- connect ALL the major hospitals in the San Fernando Valley. From Sylmar (Olive View) to Mission Hills (Holy Cross) to Van Nuys (Valley Presbyterian) to North Hollywood (Kaiser) east of the 405 freeway.</p> <p>#2 -- Use a monorail system (like in Oakland, CA by the stadiums) so that traffic on the major streets (Roscoe, Sepulveda, Van Nuys) would not be affected after opening.</p> <p>#3 -- connect the rest of Los Angeles to more historical points in the valley (San Fernando Mission, Los Angeles Aqueduct) and at the same time designating more points of interest.</p> <p>#4 -- connects to the Orange Line making sure it extends to major east/west streets like Ventura Blvd, Victory, Sherman Way, Roscoe, ; and north/south streets like San Fernando Road, Lankershim, Laurel Canyon, Van Nuys, Sepulveda...</p> <p>Along these same streets, there are areas of land not being used that can be used for Park & Ride points, stations, etc.</p> <p>I hope and cant wait for this project(s) to begin to materialize.</p>
5/13/2013	Robert	Wilcox	RobKWilcox@aol.com	<p>I strongly protest any plans to have elevated high speed rail on Van Nuys Blvd to Ventura Blvd.</p> <p>Ventura Blvd is a storied and exulted showcase of our city. It has been heralded in movies, books, and songs, "I love LA" being the most recent. Van Nuys Blvd is not far behind in that exaltation.</p> <p>To put an elevated train right up to Ventura Blvd would destroy the entire small town atmosphere of Ventura Blvd. To do so down Van Nuys to Ventura Blvd would devastate Sherman Oaks, the community I live in.</p> <p>Have you ever been to the areas around elevated trains like in New Jersey or New York City. These are slums. They are crime ridden. They are graffiti plastered. They are hellholes. They destroy the neighborhoods they run through and adjoin. Goodbye home investment, beauty, peace of mind and safety. Did I mention the noise?</p> <p>This is a ridiculous. It disrespects the neighborhoods and the people who pay the taxes with which such an idea could materialize. The people who use this kind of transportation do so to come to nice neighborhoods. Elevated high speed rail will destroy that for them.</p> <p>We have several corridors which are already changed for our highway system. Use those. They will accommodate any new transportation construction. Sepulveda is the nearest. There are others, I believe, east of Sherman Oaks and Studio City where it is more industrialized. Use one of those.</p> <p>Abandon this idea. We, the residents who will lose tremendously if this ever gets traction, will fight it with everything we have. We are not going to allow our tax money to be used to destroy our neighborhood.</p> <p>No elevated rail down Van Nuys Blvd to Ventura Blvd.</p>
5/6/2013	Gregory D.	Wright	bg534@lafn.org	See Appendix Attachment
5/6/2013	Jack	Lindblad	jlindblad@gmail.com	See Appendix Attachment
5/6/2013	Kevin	Lasala	kevin.lasala@yahoo.com	<p>I have been living in the San Fernando Valley for a few years now and I support the light rail option of the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project. I agree with the light rail option because the carrying capacity of buses will be reached faster than the carrying capacity of the light rail. Before living in the San Fernando Valley I have been living in the San Gabriel Valley. In the San Gabriel there are already more rail projects than there are in the San Fernando Valley.</p> <p>I concede that the light rail option is the more expensive option, but if the public is willing to fund it then there should be fewer problems. In the San Gabriel Valley there is already plans of extending the Gold Line past Azusa into Montclair. Yet the San Fernando Valley only has a rail station in North Hollywood. If there is a light rail option in the San Fernando Valley, it could lead to the light rail system being connected to other parts of Los Angeles.</p> <p>The west side of Los Angeles is one such region that can be better connected to the San Fernando Valley. So far the only options to connect to the west side are to drive on the 1-405 freeway and the Rapid Bus Line 761 along Sepulveda Blvd. Neither is a good option as both are slowed down significantly by traffic and the Rapid Bus must make a loop around the UCLA Campus.</p> <p>The light rail option is my preferred option for East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project. It can be used as a base to create a better transportation option to the west side. If the light rail is a better option because it has a better carrying capacity than a bus. If a bus line were to do the job, it would not be as well done as a dedicated light rail.</p>
5/6/2013	David	de la Cruz	ddelacruz92@gmail.com	<p>I am David de la Cruz, a student of Urban Planning and Chicano Studies at California State University, Northridge. I am also an intern with The Transit Coalition, and will continuously follow this project as a Los Angeles dweller. As an interdisciplinary student of fields relating to social and environmental justice as well as regional planning, I am writing a letter in support of both the Light Rail and Bus Rapid Transit Option.</p> <p>In my opinion, I prefer the light rail option because it has the capacity to take many more residents throughout the San Fernando Valley within a smaller time frame. Needless to say, I definitely support both options, and I understand the potential for economic and respective community development as either of these options is pursued.</p> <p>Though some of my concerns lie within the construction of a maintenance yard for the Light Rail Option, I am eager to read the EIR and mitigations for the implications of this yard. Especially since many of the affected areas hold communities of color, and low income communities.</p> <p>I support both options fully, but express a stronger expectation of having the Light Rail option pursued compared to the BRT option because of efficiency and potential attendance of ridership for project transit uses among the San Fernando Valley.</p>

<p>5/6/2013</p>	<p>Saud</p>	<p>Alsair</p>	<p>saud.alsair.895@my.csun.edu</p>	<p>I am a senior student at California State University Northridge and I'm also an ADA Specialist at The Transit Coalition. My involvement with the Coalition has led my interest and support for the light rail proposal for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor.</p> <p>As a legally blind resident of the San Fernando Valley, I favor efficient and ecological public transportation. The light rail project would allow me and countless other residents to be able to have access to other parts of the city in short periods of travel time.</p> <p>Moreover, the light rail system would have less impact on the environment compared to automobiles and rapid buses due to reduced emissions. Additionally, more residents will be encouraged to use this system rather than their privately owned automobiles due to several reasons: the location of the project, served areas and the continually rising costs of gasoline.</p> <p>Although, at face value the light rail project is more costly, in the long run it is cost effective in many aspects: environmentally, economically and the fact that it will serve larger populations of riders within one trip.</p> <p>In addition, throughout different cities around the world I have experienced audio speaker systems that not only call out the stops but also describe the scenery and times of departures and arrivals. I recommend, as a legally blind person, that the light rail be equipped with state of the art audio speaker systems with the capability of various languages to help the diverse ridership. Also, the audio system will benefit and guide visually impaired riders to navigate the areas of their travel.</p>
<p>5/6/2013</p>	<p>Israel</p>	<p>Herra</p>	<p>conquistador_iz89@yahoo.com</p>	<p>I recently attended one of the East SFV Transit Corridor Meetings and I left very informed. After watching the presentation by the Metro officials and listening to public comments, I full support the light rail proposal. At first I was on the fence about light rail because the difference in ridership from light rail to rapid bus did not seem like a major difference. Light rail seemed like a much bigger investment, but little return. The gap in cost for light rail from rapid bus seemed enormous and unnecessary. I can see why some people would be opposed to it, since for a minute I was too.</p> <p>However, after further discussion and analysis, I came to the conclusion that light rail is definitely the way to proceed with this project. Not only would light rail accommodate almost three times the amount of riders as rapid bus with one train, but it is a more highly effective form of transportation. Not only is light rail more effective and efficient, but also more environmentally friendly since light rail would not release as many emissions as a fleet of rapid buses. The speed at which light rail would transport people is also one of the bigger advantages it has over rapid bus.</p> <p>My only problem with light rail is how would the addition of 2 corridors for light rail (one going North and the other south) affect traffic and congestion on Van Nuys Blvd.? I'm assuming that by adding light rail down the middle of Van Nuys would require the removal of 2 traffic lanes since I don't see how the street can be widened with all the properties in place along the boulevard. While the addition of this light rail may convince some people to use public transportation as opposed to driving, I think that traffic will still be prevalent down this street. Therefore, I believe that the removal of two lanes down one of the busiest streets in the valley does not seem wise or effective. However, I am sure that Metro has done sufficient analysis on this issue and I hope that they will address this in future meetings.</p> <p>Otherwise, this project has my approval as a member of the Van Nuys community. I was born and raised in this city and this project will hopefully revitalize the city. It is about time Van Nuys received a makeover. The addition of new technology and efficient transportation should be an exciting venture. Also, I want to applaud Metro for the timeframe that has been proposed for the completion of this project. I look forward to attending more meetings as this project continues to develop.</p>
<p>5/6/2013</p>	<p>José Eduardo</p>	<p>Palma</p>	<p>palma818@gmail.com</p>	<p>I am very pleased that progress towards a new transportation system in the East San Fernando Valley is moving forwards and involving community outreach towards potential construction.</p> <p>The alternatives presented to community demonstrate a potential for a real change in movement for San Fernando Valley as a whole. Based on both alternatives, Light Rail Transit (LRT) and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), I personally believe that LRT would be the best fit for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor.</p> <p>As an urban planning student and anthropologist, I have been able to study different BRT and LRT systems, including the Orange Line. What I have learned is that planning for LA transportation and transit projects need to remember that more people ride transit than expected. For example, when planning the Red Line, Metro failed to make boarding platforms longer and underestimated the amount of people that used it.</p> <p>Now, I think Metro is doing a good job and communicating with the community, but they really need to explain both these alternatives, so people would understand what best fits their needs. Based on meeting I attended, I can see that more people want a LRT running down the suggested path that you have established. This is the BEST choice because it runs faster than a BRT, cuts cost on CO2 and allows for more people to board than the BRT (allowing more than 3,900 extra riders). Granted, it would be more costly, but it would benefit SF Valley in the long run. Building of facility storage would mean jobs for people in SF Valley and needed areas like the City of San Fernando, Pacoima, Arleta and Panorama City.</p> <p>Born in LA and raised in the SF Valley, I can see LRT as the greatest alternative for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor. It would make life in SF a lot cleaner and give a chance for an economic boom that will help out many people who like to travel over the Sepulveda Pass and into the Westside. And as a student, I can see this benefiting many CSUN, community college and UCLA students. Let's make LRT happen!</p>
<p>5/6/2013</p>	<p>Liza</p>	<p>Wright</p>	<p>lizawright42@yahoo.com</p>	<p>The East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study has a strong vision and I believe that the goals proposed will be met by this project. With the proposed alternatives, the light rail option along Van Nuys Boulevard is the correct choice for the San Fernando Valley communities. This north/ south connection will prove to be a valuable asset for those living and commuting in this area.</p> <p>Giving greater access to families and businesses, this project will help provide greater mobility for the surrounding areas, connecting to regional transportation services. With the implementation of this future project, it will increase access to jobs, schools, and recreational activities within the San Fernando Valley. This is why I believe that the no build and the transportation system management alternatives should not be considered.</p> <p>The overall end result should be a light rail transit system, eventually connecting to the Westside. I strongly support this alternative for the corridor project, and believe it will be the most effective for the San Fernando Valley.</p> <p>Thank you for reading my comments for the project.</p>

<p>5/6/2013</p>	<p>Ayda</p>	<p>Memery</p>	<p>ayda.memery.152@my.csun.edu</p>	<p>I am an Urban Planning senior at the Cal State University, Northridge and passionate about public transportation as an urban planner and a resident of City of Los Angeles. I attended one of the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study Meetings on Wednesday, March 27, 2013 at the Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center and I left the meeting very informed. After watching the PowerPoint presentation, listening to the Metro official's speech and other public comments, and evaluating the mentioned alternatives, I believe that the Light Rail Transit (LRT) would be the best alternative for the East SFV Transit Corridor Project.</p> <p>In order for Metro and the City of Los Angeles to come up with a successful plan to improve North-South transit service in the East San Fernando Valley, proposed alternatives such as No Build, and Transportation System Management are not an option. The other two proposed alternatives that remain considerable are the Light Rail Transit (LRT) and the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) alternative. I fully support the Light Rail Transit as the best solution for the East SFV Transit Corridor Project which will connect diverse communities to their destinations, eliminate traffic congestion, and decrease noise pollution and air pollution. The Van Nuys and Sepulveda Boulevard Corridors run through the heart of the eastern San Fernando Valley and the home to several major destinations including hospitals, schools, different businesses, the Van Nuys Civic Center, Auto Row, Sherman Oaks Galleria, various shops and restaurants, and other large employers. Therefore, a logical and effective mode of transportation is crucial to improve North-South transit service in the East San Fernando Valley and accommodate the needs of those residents in the area.</p> <p>By comparing the two alternatives, I believe that that the Light Rail Transit has many advantages over the Bus Rapid Transit. The Light Rail Transit operates in the median in a fully dedicated guideway in contrast to the Bus Rapid Transit that operates in mixed flow traffic. LRT operates with standard gauge passenger railcars, on exclusive rich-of-way with overhead electric power. A two-car train set can carry about 300 passengers, an average of 37,500 weekday boardings projected in 2035. The end to end travel time for LRT is 36 minutes which is less than the travel time of BRT. LRT operates with electric power which has zero gas emission and less impact on the environment. The Light Rail System also has other benefits such as mobility, regional connectivity, opportunities for job creation, development and quality of life improvements. As a resident of the San Fernando Valley community, and a rider of public transportation, I believe that the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor is going to be a very successful and efficient project that will help revitalize the community. This will also encourage many citizens to use public transportation more conveniently. The completion of this massive project will move Angelenos a step closer to a greener and more environmentally-friendly Los Angeles.</p>
<p>5/6/2013</p>	<p>Ryan</p>	<p>Holman</p>	<p>ryan.holman.422@my.csun.edu</p>	<p>I am writing to express my support and enthusiasm for the light rail option for the East SFV Transit Corridor. As an urban planning student, I am well aware of the benefits of both bus rapid transit and light rail. While BRT certainly has its place in a comprehensive transit system, light rail is better suited to this corridor.</p> <p>In addition to the well studied capacity and operational benefits of light rail over BRT, light rail generates greater interest in transit and has higher success and converting drivers to riders. Light rail also fosters transit oriented development and has enlivened neighborhoods all over the nation and world. I want to see the same happen for Van Nuys corridor, returning it to its former glory as a thriving mixed-use destination.</p> <p><u>I will continue to follow this project and look forward to the development of a light rail line on Van Nuys Boulevard.</u></p>
<p>5/6/2013</p>	<p>Rawan</p>	<p>Al-jamal</p>	<p>rawanrj5@gmail.com</p>	<p>I support the Light Rail alternative from Sylmar to Sherman Oaks. The light rail option, primarily along San Fernando Road and Van Nuys Boulevard from the Sylmar Metrolink Station to the Metro Orange Line for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project is necessary because it will increase ridership, improve connectivity, and can reduce long-term operating costs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Light rail has promotes compact, pedestrian-oriented revitalization. • Rail transit is better for the environment. • Light Rail transit is most cost-effective. <p>Due to these factors, light rail is important to the future of public transportation in the San Fernando Valley. Public ridership at the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor already has high ridership, which shows the need for a light rail system, which would ultimately increase ridership by 4000 more riders per week. Cost wise this would be efficient because the increase in ridership will contribute to overall costs of the light rail project. The light rail option would also be more efficient as a trip would average only 35 minutes. The light rail is important in this particular area as well due to its diverse community. The light rail alternative is desired because it is efficient and it is the environmentally viable option.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
<p>5/6/2013</p>	<p>Alvin</p>	<p>Estrada</p>	<p>kidrebl@aol.com</p>	<p>It is the hope of the Transit Coalition to assist with input and be an active participant in all matters that deal with transportation. As a member of The Transit Coalition and an individual that participated in the meeting of the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study on March 26, 2013, I would like give some suggestions on the project that I hope can be useful to you and your associates on the development of this project.</p> <p>As the project is still in its research phase, it would be a good to move away from the idea of installing another rapid bus. Although the construction cost benefits look better than an installation of a light rail, on the long run it would become costly. This is due to the fact that the operational cost and the maintenance over time will led to a greater amount of financial loss. To add to this, by having these buses, there will still be a direct introduction of fossil fueled burned in our urban environment, which is harmful to our health none the less.</p> <p>If we go with the light rail system, it would cut down on the emissions and help to alleviate our dependence on fossil fuel. The input that I would like to give with the light rail is that if it does get chosen as the mode of transit, that research should be made to see if the projected East San Fernando Valley Corridor can be connected to the projected Sepulveda pass Corridor to form one line. By having these two lines become one, the accessibility to and from the valley would be increased while not contributing to pollutants and traffic. At the same time ridership would go up, which would then feed the maintenance that would be more affordable than a rapid bus.</p> <p>I hope that the input that was written here is helpful in the development of this project. The Transit Coalition will continue to follow up with the development of this project and would be more than happy to give future input, if requested. I would like to thank you Mr. Davis for taking the time to read this letter and I hope it aides you in your decisions of development.</p>
<p>5/6/2013</p>	<p>Mitchell</p>	<p>Yahata</p>	<p>emteewhy@gmail.com</p>	<p>After researching the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor, I wanted to inform you that I fully support the light rail transit alternative. I believe LRT is definitely the route to take given the increased capacity, scheduling reliability, and lowered emissions of LRT over BRT.</p> <p>As a frequent LRT rider in and around Los Angeles, I believe the SFV would greatly benefit from this project. Just as the Expo Line is revitalizing and attracting more transit oriented development along its route, I believe the construction of a LRT through the San Fernando Valley will bring similar benefits to residents across the city.</p> <p>As a commuter from West Los Angeles to the Valley, the construction of such a line would greatly benefit commuters from Los Angeles who would like to visit and travel between the two cities. I look forward to updates on this and many other Metro projects.</p>

<p>5/6/2013</p>	<p>Eduardo</p>	<p>Arias-Ramos</p>	<p>eduardo.ariasramos.823@my.csun.edu</p>	<p>Last Thursday, I attended the Metro Van Nuys Boulevard corridor project, which focused on Van Nuys Boulevard in the San Fernando Valley and what should be implemented on that boulevard in terms of transit. Metro provided the audience with various options as well as what routes Metro is considering, whether if it should end with the Orange Line at Sepulveda or go all the way down Van Nuys and end at Sherman Oaks at Ventura/Sepulveda.</p> <p>One good thing about the meeting is the high support of a light rail project. The supporters see the project as an opportunity to brighten up the corridor and bring a lot of opportunities with it (businesses and maybe development). Even the supporters wanted to extend the line all the way to the Westside (which I'm for as well) or a connection with whatever is going to be built on the Sepulveda Transit Corridor that Metro is studying.</p> <p>Also worth mentioning is that there was a rail line created on Van Nuys Boulevard in the first half of the 20th Century and operated between Parthenia and Chandler, I believe. However with support comes opposition, since these two women were opposing with since they claim that using Van Nuys Boulevard for such projects was eminent domain, which didn't make any sense since the boulevard is a public entity.</p> <p>My opinion on the project is that I'm for it one hundred percent. Even though the bus rapid transit option is given, I think a light rail line should be implemented considering the high volume of passengers using this corridor to get from point A to B. Yes it's more expensive than bus; but it's more cost-effective and reliable.</p> <p>Despite a maintenance facility that needs to be built (if the light rail project happens), at least if could handle a high-volume of passengers versus an articulated bus. Also consider the time frequencies too since the 761 Rapid operates every 20 minutes on weekdays and half an hour on weekends, and the 233 Local every 15 minutes everyday but Sundays, which is every 20 minutes I believe. With the light rail, the frequencies would be about 12 minutes and trips would be a lot shorter versus the buses that currently travel along this road.</p>
<p>5/6/2013</p>	<p>Gloria</p>	<p>Giraldo</p>	<p>miss_multicultural@hotmail.com</p>	<p>My name is Gloria Giraldo, a student of Urban Studies and Planning at California State University Northridge. I totally support the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project because this project will not only benefit people living in the San Fernando Valley but also benefit the San Fernando Valley as a whole.</p> <p>For a long time people of Sylmar, Ventura County, and Antelope Valley have been waiting for their regions to have better connectivity within them throughout the transportation service networks such as Amtrak, Metrolink, and the Metro Orange Line. Additionally a connection of these regions will facilitate future projects which involve connections to universities such as CSUN and UCLA. In my opinion those connections and services should have been done long ago.</p> <p>Metrolink Station facilitates the Light Rail line connection along San Fernando Road and Van Nuys Boulevard to the Metro Orange Line. Regarding cost, we are supposed to be one of the most developed countries with all the financial resources to construct the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project. I have personally seen the least developed countries in South America that have a more developed and robust transportation systems than that of North America. Therefore, this project has to be successfully completed in order to contribute to the future progress of Los Angeles as a leading world city.</p>
<p>5/6/2013</p>	<p>Rafaela</p>	<p>Partida</p>	<p>rafaela.partida.31@my.csun.edu</p>	<p>This letter serves the purpose of showing support for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor project. The Northeast San Fernando Valley is home to many people that do not have the means to purchase a vehicle. This makes it difficult for travel. Residing in the area, in addition to not driving, I have personally been witness to the deficiencies in public transportation. Not making it to class on time due to delayed buses. Having to calculate how much time is needed in order to arrive at a location on time. It is as though, one must plan around transportation. It is time Metro makes it a more efficient ride for patrons in the East San Fernando Valley.</p> <p>I strongly believe that the Light Rail system suggested as part of the scoping period is most beneficial to the community. As this would be the fastest connection one would have to other rail lines. Making travel times shorter, which would make people, want to ride on public transportation.</p> <p>In addition, I believe this is a way to start changing what people know of Metro. For many, Metro transit lines are meant for people of limited means. Light Rail would potentially change people's perceptions of what public transportation is. It would also give them insight of what public transportation COULD be.</p> <p>Now more than ever, it is time to think of what Los Angeles could be like, if Angelinos were not too preoccupied with their vehicles and sitting behind the wheel in traffic. Perhaps you already have that vision in mind, now let the rest of Los Angeles see it. The Light Rail would most definitely let them see.</p>
<p>5/6/2013</p>	<p>Peter</p>	<p>Hofer</p>	<p>peterhofer864@gmail.com</p>	<p>I would like to express my support for the BRT alternative. BRT will offer more frequent service than light rail, and will tie in better with the Orange Line and our existing streets. New York and Chicago are doing great things with BRT--why can't we? We need better transit now, not years into the future.</p>
<p>5/6/2013</p>	<p>Joyce</p>	<p>Dillard</p>	<p>dillardjoyce@yahoo.com</p>	<p>We are concerned with MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS. Issues we are concerned about are AIR QUALITY, WATER QUALITY, and NOISE on humans, plants and wildlife. This is in the LA River Watershed with Federal requirements such as Total Daily Maximum Load compliance.</p> <p>Road conditions and its ongoing operation and maintenance need to be addressed.</p> <p>Commuting lanes are not properly identified to land uses. Frequency of trips needs an analysis.</p> <p>Safety issues regarding bicyclists who ignore traffic signals or bicyclists who share bus lanes and car lanes as marked (painted), need to be addressed.</p> <p>Roads, whether for automobiles, trucks, bicycles, buses or pedestrians are generally in poor shape. The LA Times has published an interactive map showing the road conditions in the City:</p> <p>http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-pavement-20130505,0,4119436.story and http://graphics.latimes.com/la-streets-map/#11/34.0475/-118.5754</p> <p>This is a hidden cost of commuting. Please address.</p>

<p>5/6/2013</p>	<p>Ronald</p>	<p>Ziff</p>	<p>rbiz@pacbell.net</p>	<p>Please consider the following issues in studying this project:</p> <p>1) Building a Light Rail system on Van Nuys Blvd. may not be cost effective and may even be counter-productive. The estimated cost of a light rail system is \$2.5 Billion. In the information presentations it was indicated that the system would reduce the current travel time from the Sylmar Transit Center to Ventura Blvd from 46 minutes to a new 41 minutes. The possibility of a 5 minute saving in travel time does not seem to be worth that amount of money.</p> <p>2) Building a Light Rail system or Bus Rapid Transit system on Van Nuys Blvd and fencing it in would severely constrict all other transit on the blvd. It requires a minimum 30 foot right of way. The remaining portion of the street would have to handle autos, bicycles, other buses, and emergency vehicles. All of these other vehicles would be forced into a narrower transit corridor in order to set aside the 30 feet necessary for the rail or bus right of way. Of particular concern are buses and emergency vehicles. The several other bus lines using the street might be slowed to a crawl in the resulting constricted traffic. Ambulances would have to maneuver through the constricted traffic. A fence might make the ambulance trip even more difficult. Lives could be lost in delays. The Fire Department operates the largest of the emergency vehicles and requires up to a 28 foot wide path to travel through. The placement of the fence could leave the path at less than the minimum 28 feet and Fire trucks may not be able to pass through stopped traffic and certainly could not pass through streets that have a severely constricted flow. In addition the Fire trucks may not even be able to service buildings if a fence is in the way or they cannot get close enough to the buildings.</p> <p>3) The narrowest street width is a limiting factor. The narrowest width on Van Nuys Blvd is 73 feet. This width would have to accommodate all types of transit. The narrowest width on Sepulveda is 90 feet. Sepulveda may be a better choice.</p> <p>4) It seems a case of "putting the cart before the horse" to plan a local transit system without first planning the major system that it will connect with. There are no firm plans as to where the Sepulveda Pass project will be placed. At present we have heard possibilities that it may go over the #405, under the #405, under Bel Air, or somewhere else. The vehicles have not been chosen. Will they be light or heavy rail, monorail, bus, or what? How can this be planned without any idea where and how it will connect or where the stations will be placed? If the transit corridor is placed on Van Nuys Blvd and doesn't seamlessly connect with the Sepulveda Pass Project, it could cost millions or billions more than necessary, inconvenience riders needlessly, and could even result in our own \$2.5 Billion "Bridge to Nowhere."</p> <p>Please consider all of the above in your study. If it turns out a lesser project, or even No-Build is better, then that may be the way to go and should be given serious thought.</p>
<p>5/6/2013</p>			<p>pgs.services@att.net</p>	<p>As a Valley resident for my entire life (50+ years) I have seen the valley get the short end of the transit improvement projects. Now that we have the opportunity to get a north-south transit system, we need to make sure it will serve the valley residence and the commuters from outside the valley that travel to or through the valley. I believe a LRT system is the only choice there is. It will have the capacity need to handle the present and future growth. It should be designed for expansion in service capacity;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stations need to be designed to handle 4 or 5 car sets weather built now or later. • Third tracks at station or passing tracks need to be designed in so that express trains can be run between key stations. (i.e. Sylmar, Ventura Metrolink / LAX Flyaway, Orange Line/ 101, West LA / Expo Line, LAX (if the Sepulveda Pass Corridor System goes that far) • Whatever route is finally decided on it needs to tie into the Sepulveda Pass Corridor System to make a complete transit system that is not a mishmash of a bunch of small systems. With 61% of the Sepulveda Pass commuters coming through the valley (20% from or north of Santa Clarita, 11% coming for Simi Valley and north San Fernando Valley, and 30% from East San Fernando Valley north of the 101) the potential of commuter that would be using the ESFV Corridor System to connect to the Sepulveda Pass Corridor System is high with the potential of future growth and expansion being needed. And the future coming of the California High Speed Rail with a potential Sylmar Station will add additional commuters to the system, both for those that want to connect to valley locations and those who will be heading to West LA and beyond. A Heavy Rail System would serve the through commuters to the West side better but I believe a properly designed Light Rail System that connect to the Westside with the potential for service expansion will be the most economical transit solution for now and the future.
<p>5/6/2013</p>	<p>Len</p>	<p>Talan</p>	<p>talan77@aol.com</p>	<p>Please work to connect a train to the airport. We need a route to and from LAX that doesn't stop before getting there and force us to disembark and take a bus!</p>
<p>5/6/2013</p>	<p>Rolando</p>	<p>Chavarria</p>	<p>roland2174@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Hi My Name is Rolando and I Live At 14139 Calvert St in Van Nuys and I Live one Block way From the Orange Line when it Open in fall of 2005 and three blocks way from Van Nuys BLVD where is Going to be the Project I really like to see a LRT because it is Faster Many People can get there to work, School and there Favorite Destination on time and With out Having to wait on the traffic Lights and Traffic as well For the Light Rail Vehicle In stead of three Cars of 6 It would be Great if you add one More Car of 4 in Total of 8 So Like this We can Have More Room For More Passenger's during the Peak hours on Monday through Friday and the Expansion for of the Sepulveda Pass Corridor From the Valley To UCLA and LAX. Also For Van Nuys BLVD On Ventura BLVD to Vanown St This Should Convert to a Underground Because of the Follow of Traffic Between Ventura BLVD the 101 Freeway and Orange Line Station from there The Train would Come out of the Tunnel from a Regular Level to a Second Elevation Like the Expo Line on Culver City Station and Keep that Second Elevation Because of Van Nuys Amtrak, Metrolink Station to Rosco BLVD and back to a Normal Level and add a Big Fence with Landscape Like the Expo Line on USC and Western Station form There add another Second Elevation Getting to Arleta BLVD To the Connection Of Metrolink and San Fernando Road, going back down to a normal level Next to Tracks of Metrolink all the way to the Last stop of San Fernando/Sylmar Station afterward Hopefully If you can Add More Bike Paths, Landscapes and More Trees on San Fernando Road to Look Much Nicer, Safer for the Residence of Pacoima and The City Of San Fernando, So the Residence can Ride there Bikes, Jogging and Walking So that's why I have Choose Light Rail for Van Nuys BLVD Thank you .</p>
<p>5/4/2013</p>	<p>Pamela</p>	<p>Gibberman</p>	<p>pggibberman@gmail.com</p>	<p>I recommend the Light Rail Transit option for the East SFV Transit Corridor. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
<p>5/4/2013</p>	<p>Roger</p>	<p>Christensen</p>	<p>rog4rail@aol.com</p>	<p>I lived in Sherman Oaks for over 30 years. I worked in West LA. I am now retired and my condo is two blocks from Van Nuys Blvd and Riverside Drive. I am a driver but have used transit whenever possible. I have sat many hours on the 405 either in my car or on the bus. I support the light rail option for Van Nuys Blvd and am opposed to the BRT. I have used the Orange Line many times to the Red Line. But most of the time, getting on Van Nuys Blvd, the bus is already standing room only. BRT lacks capacity and usurps the chance of rail to the Purple Line and Expo. It is worth it to think long range here and protect the future.</p>

5/3/2013	Dennis	Hindman	dennis.hindman@att.net	<p>There must be a continuous minimum width of 10-feet reserved between intersections along Van Nuys Blvd in order to meet the requirements for bicycle lanes. A bicycle lane by definition is not a bus lane, nor mixed traffic.</p> <p>A bicycle lane cannot be truncated to only include part of the length of the street any more than it would be alright to do this for motor vehicles, trains or sidewalks. If this was allowed, then you could have stripes five-feet apart on either side of Van Nuys Blvd that are a total of six-feet long out of the entire length of this street and then state that the intent of the bicycle plan for having bicycle lanes has been fulfilled (which this would not).</p> <p>If you cannot meet these minimum widths for bike lanes on Van Nuys Blvd, then you need to go back to the alternative idea of having this project only as far north on Van Nuys Blvd as the Orange Line, then via way of the Orange Line right-of-way and continue northward along Sepulveda Blvd.</p> <p>The upcoming mobility element update for the city has Van Nuys Blvd as a key north-south corridor for improved bikeways above and beyond the minimums. Which means that if the city includes protected bicycle lanes on this street they would probably need at least 16-feet (two five-foot lanes and two three-foot buffers to keep the bicyclist away from the dangers of parked car doors opening in front of them).</p> <p>The vast majority of responses that you have received for having a train run down Van Nuys Blvd were coming from people who don't even ride transit--if the community outreach meetings were representative of most people who gave comments--and they most certainly were not people who are versed in transit planning. Most of these people simply want a light-rail train. They wouldn't be terribly upset if it was put along the Sepulveda Blvd alternative rather than mainly on Van Nuys Blvd.</p> <p>Not having a complete and useable bikeway right-of-way on Van Nuys Blvd would be not acceptable for those that now use a bicycle for transportation or for bicycling organizations in this city. This would effectively exclude bicycling along this corridor for all but the fearless. Bicycling needs to be all inclusive to be a form of transportation for the masses and not exclusive to only the few.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration,</p>
5/3/2013	Josh	Josa	josh.josa@gmail.com	<p>At first glance, both the BRT and the NO BUILD options look attractive because they are monumentally cheaper than the LRT option.</p> <p>That isn't the point of public transportation. The point is to provide to the public an ALTERNATIVE to the conventional means of getting around. The goal should be to make the public transit option equal to, if not faster, than the commute time of conventional means.</p> <p>Both the BRT and NO BUILD options would ADD to traffic issues, exasperating Angelinos living in the ESFV corridor as well as those trying to transit across the valley West to East. This is already evident in the daily commute in and around the Orange Line with additional traffic signals and wait times as the Orange Line is a part of the traffic system, not removed from it.</p> <p>The LRT option, if it is like the Gold Line, would completely remove thousands of vehicles from the daily commute. In effect, this would be lessening the traffic strain that is now increasingly evident on the streets.</p> <p>Give Angelinos living in the SFV the transit they deserve. Remove Metro commuters ENTIRELY from the commute and give them sensible options.</p>
5/3/2013	Mike	Kadlec	kadlecsmike@yahoo.com	<p>Two things:</p> <p>When will we know the final decision: light rail or bus way; start and finish date; route?</p> <p>If you haven't made a decision on the route, I would like you to consider using Sepulveda Blvd on the north end of the valley. From Van Nuys Blvd going north, veer west on Parthenia to Sepulveda to Brand Blvd to the Metro Link. Station. Van Nuys Blvd. North of Parthenia is mainly industrial and tire shops. The Sepulveda route on the north I mentioned above would better serve the valley.</p>
5/3/2013	Sergio	Hernandez	shernandez619@me.com	<p>As a fellow user of Metro I am disappointed in second class transit. Light rail lines like the gold expo and blue lines are never fully grade separated, a train can get stuck in traffic, and the orange lines 35 mph speed limit is inefficient, it stops at every intersection! Instead of building a lot of crappy projects build one good one!</p>
5/3/2013	Ankur	Patel	ankur.mayur.patel@gmail.com	<p>Bicycles!</p> <p>Protected route for bicycles the entire path.</p> <p>Bike racks that don't suck!</p> <p>Will there be any staff to maintain a kiosk or something at one of the stations?</p> <p>Is this the stage when exact location (and designs) of stations are discussed?</p>
5/3/2013	Cile	Borman	TPunch1@aol.com	<p>I live in the North East San Fernando Valley. I love to visit and shop in the Crenshaw area, especially on Deegan Street in Leimert Park. To be able to take a train from my SF Valley community leaving my car parked at home, would be a dream come true.</p> <p>It would give African Americans, like myself who live in the Valley the opportunity to have a Afro-centric cultural destination in L. A. like other ethnic Americans have. Examples Korean, Japanese, Filipino, Chinese, Ethiopian, Fairfax, etc. I love America and I want to share my culture with others.</p>
5/2/2013	Laurie	Kelson	pkelsondds@aol.com	<p>The East Valley Transit corridor should be on Van Nuys Blvd. This is the most logical route from the Metrolink train station in the North part of the Valley. The line should be a bus like the Orange Line. The cost would be accomplished much sooner than some of the other alternatives.</p> <p>The Van Nuys Blvd route could later be connected to a subway under the Santa Monica Mountains connecting to the planned subway in Century City. Thousands of Valley residents work in Century City. Currently these workers have to take three buses to Century City. While the East Valley Transit corridor is being decided, a dedicated bus line should be put in service for these workers.</p>
5/1/2013	Linda	Gravani	lgravani@hotmail.com	<p>I oppose any bus or light rail on Van Nuys Blvd. Cars are delivered daily to the approximately 10 car dealerships on Van Nuys Blvd. Taking away lanes for bus/light rail will create a DANGEROUS situation for those truck drivers delivering cars and pedestrians darting around the vehicles wanting to use the bus/rail. Not to mention the traffic jams that it will cause. The streets around the dealerships are ALL RESIDENTIAL and will NOT accommodate trucks making deliveries. Your proposed change will create unnecessary hardship on these dealerships. Many of whom selected their location because of the wide street access. Their business will suffer if they don't have cars to sell. Currently, the truckers use the center lanes while making deliveries. It does NOT affect the flow of traffic. Everyone is happy. Sepulveda is the best option for your plans. If you must use Van Nuys Blvd, have the light rail go UNDERGROUND.</p>

Comments By Email

4/30/2013	Kevin	Burton	kb.wehobc@gmail.com	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I serve on the Metro Bicycle Roundtable and would like to comment in support of bicycle lanes on Van Nuys Blvd. in the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor, whether LRT or BRT is ultimate chosen. Van Nuys Blvd. is a thoroughfare to important destinations which are as important to bicyclists as to motorists, and as such provision should be made for safe bicycle travel there. Likewise, bicycling is increasingly important as a solution to the "first/last mile problem", and so bicycle connectivity to/from the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor will likely be in high demand. For LRT, elimination of on-street automobile parking along Van Nuys Blvd. to provide for bicycle lanes would be justified by the need to make this corridor a more "complete street". In addition, alternative auto parking is available in parking lots and side streets, and parking spaces could be provided by businesses with excess surface capacity, such as automobile dealerships.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration</p>
4/29/2013	Genaro	Mejia	genaro.mejia@arup.com	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I serve on the Metro Bicycle Roundtable and would like to comment in support of bicycle lanes on Van Nuys Blvd. in the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor, whether LRT or BRT is ultimate chosen. Van Nuys Blvd. is a thoroughfare to important destinations which are as important to bicyclists as to motorists, and as such provision should be made for safe bicycle travel there. Likewise, bicycling is increasingly important as a solution to the "first/last mile problem", and so bicycle connectivity to/from the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor will likely be in high demand. For LRT, elimination of on-street automobile parking along Van Nuys Blvd. to provide for bicycle lanes would be justified by the need to make this corridor a more "complete street". In addition, alternative auto parking is available in parking lots and side streets, and parking spaces could be provided by businesses with excess surface capacity, such as automobile dealerships.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration</p>
4/29/2013	Gerhard	Mayer	Gmayer@adamson-associates.com	<p>I am a resident of West Los Angeles, with in-laws living in the San Fernando Valley. As you can imagine, I could not be more excited about improved transit in the valley, or improved connections to the valley from Los Angeles.</p> <p>I am most in favor of the proposed light rail transit. I think that going back to how LA started, with rail, has real opportunities to significantly improve the transportation situation in SoCal in general. I think our street are too wide, and offer plenty of space to include rail ROWs. There should be many more.</p> <p>In that regard, why are we never seeing serious alternatives that are streetcars, like they are running successfully in so many other cities in the world? Streetcars with low floor entries look cutting edge and modern, and are just so much more friendly and easier to integrate into the existing city as your clumsy looking, old fashioned LRT (I'm still glad we have them, however!). Please consider modern streetcars, in earnest.</p> <p>I am against BRT. We are wealthy nation and do not need to resort to low cost means of transit just because we think we cannot afford what we really want. We need to make transit appealing for every income group, not just a means for people who cannot afford cars to get around. I want us to have the best transit in the world; let's beat Paris transit in quality; as you know, their subways famously run on rubber, to keep the noise down for the fashionable Parisians.</p> <p>Finally, I hope you will strongly consider connecting the rail or street car project through the mountains with West Los Angeles. Regardless of the cost (which IMO are really minor for an advanced nation as ours), such a connection - with the purple line, or further south with the airport - would be a game changer for Los Angeles as a whole. I commuted over the 405 for 7 long years; I know you studied this, but I still do not think you can even imagine the ridership you will have if you create the ability to avoid driving over the (\$#%^) pass. Really!</p>
4/26/2013			watchpuppie@aol.com	<p>I have been asking for a wall on the 101 for 26 YEARS. I was told I qualifybut so far and I mean far NO WALL. The traffic is terrible, and is causing sound, fumes, etc. I am asking for your HELP. PLEASE. THE Location is 101 off the WHITE OAK EXIT. WHICH IS VERY VERY BUSY WITH A LONG LINE OF CARS WAITING TO GET ON THE 405. bobbi in Encino.</p>
4/16/2013	David	DeVoss	eastwestnewsserv@aol.com	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>I was unable to attend any of your scoping meetings regarding the proposed light rail corridor along Van Nuys Blvd., but I wanted to express my strong support for this project. The San Fernando desperately needs more light rail transit. In truth, we need more heavy rail, but I understand why this may be cost prohibitive. Van Nuys Blvd. was created with public transit in mind. A light rail system linking Sherman Oaks with the North Valley and, later, Westwood/West Los Angeles is urgently needed. I believe light rail is the wisest choice since construction costs for a similar system may be prohibitive in the future. My family hopes we will enjoy light rail as soon as possible.</p>
3/30/2013	David	Garfinkle	drgarfinkle@sbcglobal.net	<p>I have been to two of your pubic meetings and made the following points that I consider critical no matter which of the transit corridor options is eventually chosen:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make sure that there is a direct connection/continuation between the SFV corridor and whatever option is selected for the Sepulveda Pass Corridor. A majority of the people testifying at the recent Van Nuys hearing made the same point. The connection should be seamless and not require exit, bus connection, crossing streets, or walking some distance to connect. The Orange Line/Red Line connection is a perfect negative example. Passengers must exit one line and cross a busy street to enter the second line. A simple tunnel under the street would have solved the problem. 2. In addition, coordinate with whatever other "improvements" are planned for the route chosen. Are cell towers planned in the future along the route? Underground utility? Planning for the transit corridor should include these construction activities in order to minimize disruption along the route and in the immediate route vicinity. Again, we have a perfect counter-example: why couldn't the current work on the 405 freeway have been coordinated with the Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor? If a similar route adjacent to or near the current effort is selected in the future, it will mean another several years of severely impacted traffic and hardship to the nearby residents. 3. Minimize the time impact of construction on merchants, current transit passengers, and area residents along the corridor. The approximately three year construction plan presented is just not acceptable. A counter example here is the speed with which the freeways were repaired after the Northridge earthquake. The cost per year of an accelerated construction timeline may be higher, but it is not at all clear that the total cost would be higher. And the impact to the communities would certainly be much less. <p>Finally, if I understand the cost/speed of transit/passenger capacity information presented at the hearings, I don't understand why there is still a choice to be made between the two alternatives presented. Is it worth a billion dollars to cut less than five minutes off the time from San Fernando to Ventura Boulevard???</p>
3/28/2013	Nicholas	Simon	nichlassimon@me.com	<p>as a citizen of studio city, ca please implement the LRT with a tunnel to Westwood - it is the fastest, smartest alternative - http://www.thetransitcoalition.us/nationaltc/ntc_valleywestside.html</p> <p>please advise me as to what, as a concerned citizen, i can do to facilitate this project.</p>

Comments By Email

3/27/2013	Beth	Brody	brodybeth@gmail.com	I know a lot of people that use the red line metro station from Van Nuys Blvd and think it'd be great if the new transit line goes down Van Nuys Blvd! There are a lot of new improvements to the Ventura Blvd corridor right by Van Nuys Blvd as well! Thank you for listening to my input!
3/25/2013	Michael	Taylor	michael.j.taylor@live.com	Please don't make the mistake of building more BRT projects in the Valley, the region needs a light rail line to handle the capacity of riders that travel that transit corridor. The proposed transit connection from UCLA to the Valley through Sepulveda Pass should be a continuation of the EAST VALLEY line, allowing a direct connection from San Fernando to the West Side. As someone who just last year gave up my car and started commuting by bus/train and bicycle, I know that LA's car culture is changing. The reason the system will be successful is that the sum is greater than it's parts. Give people an easy commute across the mountains and you'll see they will use it. I commute from Los Feliz to Burbank on the Red line every day, if there were still just bus lines and no metro rail, I probably wouldn't have ever given it a thought.
3/25/2013	Joseph	Ruiz	tkwblckblt5@gmail.com	Hello. I am a firm believer in transit and I think that a dedicated light rail option in the under served San Fernando Valley is the only way to go. The traffic in the valley can be quite heavy and the busses in the valley run every 15-20 min at most. We need a rail system that will cover more ground faster and get us a better option than driving. I stand behind a light rail build option.
3/21/2013	Richard	Close	rclose@gilchristutter.com	Thank you for speaking at the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association Meeting last night. I hope that I did not put you on the spot – too much. Residents are concerned about the possible effects of the project on the community especially south of the 101 Freeway. Both Van Nuys Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard are highly congested as well as Ventura Boulevard. Please put my name and email address on your distribution list. Also the official address for the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association is P.O. Box 5223, Sherman Oaks, California 91413.
3/19/2013 11:32	Bill	Comerford	wcomerford@gmail.com	I'm really interested in seeing this project move forward. As someone who drives the 405 from Northridge to El Segundo every weekday, I would use public transport if the solution provided is as fast or faster than by car. I think this project must be planned with the Sepulveda Corridor project hand-in-hand. If the East SFV project only delivers passengers to Ventura Blvd to the south, then it's of no use to me.
3/18/2013 7:01	Carmela	De Rose	ltalynRose1@aol.com	I cannot attend any of your meetings re East SFV Transit but I hope you will count my vote for light rail rather than bus - every great city in the world has some sort of rapid rail system - Los Angeles City and County must join them and provide citizens with the best long term and permanent option for transportation. That option is light rail.
3/17/2013 0:00	Robert	Wilcox	robkwilcox@aol.com	If this project proceeds with plans to dump all the problems of mass transit on the quiet and beautiful are of Ventura Blvd let this be the first complaint of which there will be many with much more research, thinking and detail put into it.
3/16/2013 0:00	JP	Perry	jpperry@gmail.com	If this is a stand-alone project, then BRT would suffice. If the idea is to be able to take transit through the Sepulveda Pass, then it should be light rail so no transfer is needed. I would take the latter to work every day.
3/11/2013 0:00	Kevin	Kellogg	kevin.kellogg@gmail.com	LRT is faster, brings more choice riders, and is easier to understand from a tourist's point of view. The Orange Line is great but I live next to the Silver Line and I get people asking me where the tracks are all the time. When I point out what the Silver Line is, they take their car instead. LRT or TSM. -Kevin Kellogg
3/10/2013 0:00	Nathanael	Nerode	ncn_politics10@fastmail.fm	This is my formal comment. The "East SFV Transit" project and the Sepulveda Pass Corridor transit project must be considered jointly. If they are considered jointly, it will become clear that the largest ridership and the most cost-effective (dollars per rider) design are achieved with Light Rail Transit. If, however, they are considered separately, this will not be obvious. Since both are being planned, it is essential to consider them jointly in order to get correct results
3/9/2013 0:00	Mark	Johnston	canamnj@yahoo.com	Please select the light rail option. Ridership out of the valley to points south will simply overwhelm any proposed bus service. All you have to do is observe the failure of the Orange Line and know that SFV-405 line will be worse. Please continue to select the Van Nuys Blvd route. Hits all the important places and connecting rail and transit lines. Your route map is perfect and the spacing of the stops is almost exactly what I envisioned. Please continue to run/combine this with the 405/Sepulveda project south to connect with the Purple Line, Expo Line and LAX. Anything less would be a disservice to the valley and west side residents and on a regional basis. Please consider splitting this project into 2 segments, figuring the northern segment will somehow connect with the CHSR and ML station in Sylmar (Unless you know exactly where that station will be). Also figure the northern segment will be where you will have to locate your storage yard. Even though you are street running down the center of Van Nuys Blvd, please consider simple depressed segments to go under some of the very busy east/west streets and congested intersections like Sherman Way. They don't have to be complex. Just like you incorporated stations into the elevated crosses on the Expo Line (La Cienega, Venice Blvd etc), you can do the same thing with depressed segments. The example would be open trench, center platform and simple stairs and elevator to the street level bridge. You could make nice covered shade/roof incorporated into the bridge to make a focal point for the neighborhood.
3/5/2013 13:40	Mike	Kadlec	kadlecsmike@yahoo.com	I am disappointed with your choice for the east valley north/south route. While I understand your choice of running the line through Van Nuys Blvd., I am disappointed that you didn't choose to use Sepulveda Blvd on the north end. You could have used Parthenia to Sepulveda to Brand Blvd just like the old Red Car. After Parthenia going north on Van Nuys, there's really nothing there. If you used Sepulveda from Parthenia, you would have better served the north end of the valley. You would have crossed two freeway interchanges; crossed historical landmarks, went through the heart of San Fernando, and their courthouses and still ended up at the Sylmar/San Fernando MetroLink station. Since I won't be using this line, I will vote NO on any future tax measures to increase funding for public transportation. I am very disappointed in your choice.

ESFV COMMENTS: Letters Received (abridged)					
Date	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Address	Comment
5/6/2013	Tom	LaBonge	City of Los Angeles - Council District 4	200 N. Spring Street, Room 480, Los Angeles, CA, 90012	<p>In Summary, I request that Metro Study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Van Nuys-Sepulveda Alignment, with dedicated right of ways on both of these streets, terminating at Ventura Blvd. • Building this project as a light rail project, or light rail ready, on the Van Nuys-Sepulveda alignment. • Taking the line underground just north of Ventura Boulevard and creating an underground station at Ventura and Sepulveda which would then connect to the Sepulveda Pass rail corridor, and on to UCLA and, one day, Los Angeles International Airport. • Incorporating the 405 Freeway into the alignment as a replacement for some portion of Sepulveda Blvd portion. • The effects of terminating the proposed line at Metro's Orange Line, both on this project as well as future planning efforts for the Sepulveda corridor.
5/6/2013	Carolyn	Casavan	San Fernando Valley Green Team	4335 Van Nuys Boulevard, #296 Sherman Oaks, CA 91403	<p>This email presents the comments of the San Fernando Valley Green Team with regard to the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We strongly support ongoing investment in Public Transportation. Public transportation is essential to improving air quality, reducing greenhouse gas emissions and reducing traffic congestion. As can be seen by the number of riders on the Orange Line during peak periods, people will get out of their cars to take public transit and more people are willing to do so if we build high capacity, convenient, and accessible transit projects. 2. The preferred alternative of those being studied for the East Valley Transit Corridor is Light Rail Transit. The Orange Line BRT is near capacity and is a good example of why light rail is needed. 3. The overall preferred alternative for the East Valley Transit Corridor is a subway that would link up with a subway to the West Side. A subway is the best alternative for meeting future needs and for preserving the business corridors. Van Nuys Boulevard has the highest ridership volume but light rail down Van Nuys would be detrimental to the businesses and the communities along this route. Sepulveda Boulevard is the better choice for light rail physically but would reach fewer riders. A subway is the best. 4. Whichever alternative is chosen, it must link up with the transit solution for the West Side. We have too many people spending hours by transit and auto getting to the west side from the San Fernando Valley. Multiple transfers detract from the feasibility of using public transit and increase the cost. An effective public transit solution is direly needed. 5. We strongly urge you to take into account the needs of local businesses and communities along whichever route is chosen, so that the system improves community character rather than detracting from it. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>
5/6/2013	Jonathan	Nadler	Southern California Association of Governments	818 W. 7th Street, 12th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017	<p>Thank you for submitting the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for review and comment. SCAG is the authorized regional agency for Inter-Governmental Review (IGR) of programs proposed for federal financial assistance and direct development activities, pursuant to Presidential Executive Order 12372. Additionally, SCAG reviews the Environmental Impact Reports of projects of regional significance for consistency with regional plans pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines.</p> <p>SCAG is also the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency under state law, and is responsible for preparation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) including its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) component pursuant to SB 375. As the clearinghouse for regionally significant projects per Executive Order 12372, SCAG reviews the consistency of local plans, projects, and programs with regional plans.1 Guidance provided by these reviews is intended to assist local agencies and project sponsors to take actions that contribute to the attainment of the regional goals and policies in the RTP/SCS.</p> <p>SCAG staff has reviewed the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project. The proposed project includes several transit alternatives to reduce existing and project levels of traffic congestion in the corridor that limits mobility and reduces the reliability of transit services in San Fernando Valley in the County of Los Angeles. As set forth in the attached, SCAG recommends that the draft EIR include a review and consideration of the adopted RTP/SCS goals and that the analyses reflect the most recently adopted growth forecasts.</p> <p>When available, please send environmental documentation to SCAG's office in Los Angeles or by email to leep@scag.ca.gov providing, at a minimum, the full comment period for review. If you have any questions regarding the attached comments, please contact Pamela Lee at (213) 236-1895 or leep@scag.ca.gov.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
5/6/2013			Pettion to Protect Van Nuys Blvd Businesses		45 Signatures and 21 form letters received. See Apendix Attachment
5/6/2013	Bahman	Sadegli	Rob's Car Wash	5300 Van Nuys Blvd	I Bahman Sadegli am a business operator on Van Nuys Blvd for the last 35 years. We love the street exactly the way it is. I don't think it is a good idea to pursue the light rail transit system on Van Nuys Blvd. I beleive strongly this idea would effect my and a lot of other business operators negatively. Please consider other alternatives.

Letters (Organization-Electeds)

5/6/2013	John	Antonellis	Federal Mailbox	Van Nuys Blvd CA 91401	<p>I work at two separate business on Van Nuys Blvd (on opposite sides of the street actually) Everything I've learned about the light rail proposed "improvement" I can assure you from my perspective having worked on this lbrvd for over a dozen years would be ANYTHING BUT! Please record my resounding and enthusiastic opposition to the light rail project. As someone who bussed Van Nuys for over a year when financial times were tight, I'd much prefer to see the city improve the bus system.</p>
5/6/2013	Nick	Grassu	Greco's NY Pizzeria	4572 Van Nuys Blvd Sherman Oaks CA 91403	<p>I feel that building the light rail train down Van Nuys Blvd would not work, it will cause traffic problems and will negatively affect businesses along Van Nuy. Please consider other alternatives.</p>
5/6/2013	Carter	Jessop	United States Environmental Protection Agency - Region IX	75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, CA 94105	<p>The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (NOT) published February 28, 2013, requesting comments on the scope and content of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) to be jointly prepared by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) for proposed transit improvements in the East San Fernando Valley Transit Project Corridor (ESFVT Project). Our comments are provided pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulation (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.</p> <p>EPA appreciates the opportunity to comment on transit projects that can play a part in curtailing air quality impacts in one of our Region's counties in non-attainment. Our detailed comments below include recommendations relating to (1) air quality, (2) sustainable land use and station design, (3) indirect and cumulative impacts (4) green design and construction, (5) environmental justice and community involvement, (6) light rail maintenance and storage facility. Please note that as of October 1, 2012, EPA Headquarters is no longer accepting paper copies or CDs of EISs for official filing purposes. Submissions must now be made through EPA's new electronic EIS submittal tool: e-NEPA. To begin using e-NEPA, you must first register with EPA's electronic reporting site - https://cdx.epa.gov/epahome.asp. Electronic submission does not change requirements for distribution of EISs for public review and comment. EPA requests that the lead agencies still provide one hard copy of each Draft and Final EIS to the EPA Region 9 office in San Francisco (mailcode CED 2) when it is released for public circulation. If you have any questions regarding the recommendations provided, please feel free to contact me, the lead EPA reviewer for this NOI. I can be reached at jessop.carter@epa.gov or (415) 972-3815.</p>
5/6/2013	Ruben	Zaragoza	Pro-Active Democrats	8309 Laurel Canyon Blvd, Suite 287 Sun Valley, CA 91352	<p>I am writing on behalf of the Pro-Active Democrats to register our support for Light Rail Transit (LRT) for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project, along Van Nuys Blvd between Sylmar Metrolink Station to the Orange Line.</p> <p>Light Rail is the best proposed option to address Metro's project criteria of improving north-south mobility. Metro's Ridership studies have shown that current public bus transportation along Van Nuys Blvd is impacted and overcrowded. In order to relieve the overcrowding we need to provide transportation to handle the large demand. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) has the same capacity as the current buses in the corridor of around 75 passengers, while a LRT train would allow for a ridership of over 300 passengers. This would allow the corridor to easily handle the current demands and allow for the increase and expected growth in the region. Additionally by establishing an LRT system in the San Fernando Valley, we will be able to create a base for connectivity that will enhance transit accessibility/connectivity to the rest of Los Angeles County that will benefit thousands of San Fernando Valley residents. LRT is a great foundation for the long range plans in the region that includes the planned transportation projects in the Sepulveda Pass and further points south such as LAX.</p> <p>I urge you to select LRT for it will truly provide long term benefits to the residents of the East San Fernando Valley. I know that this option will improve the mobility in public transportation for all our communities, and help alleviate our streets of traffic congestion.</p>

5/6/2013	Eric	Bruins	Los Angeles County Bike Coalition	634 S. Spring Street, Suite 821, Los Angeles, CA 90014	<p>• LACBC supports the Transit Coalition's JEM line concept, which provides for a one-seat ride on rail from Sylmar to West LA and LAX over the Sepulveda Pass. This will undoubtedly be an expensive project, but one with unparalleled demand compared to other potential lines in LA County. Planning for the East SFV corridor must be coordinated with the Sepulveda Pass transit project and the Westside Mobility Study, which contemplates a continuation of the Sepulveda Pass line into West LA. The current piecemeal planning is underselling demand for a unified project and risks poor decisions being made about any one segment of the regional corridor, undermining the viability of a coherent transit project. Only a single rail corridor provides the one-seat, time-competitive ride needed to achieve substantial mode shift and reduce congestion over the Sepulveda Pass.</p> <p>• Metro has a responsibility to plan for multimodal connectivity to and along the East SFV corridor, including first/last-mile connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians. These improvements must be included in the project scope and environmental clearance, even if construction is paid for with other funds. Metro should follow FTA guidance which provides for including pedestrian projects within 1/2-mile and bicycle projects within 3-miles of the project corridor. LACBC can assist with identifying which specific bicycle projects to include in East SFV planning and environmental, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Bikeway access to East SFV corridor - connecting bikeways extending up to 3 miles from East SFV stations. o San Fernando Road Bike Path o Pacoima Wash Bike Path o Roscoe Bike Lanes o Sherman Way Bike Lanes o Riverside Bike Lanes o LA River Bike Path o Bikeway parallel to East SFV corridor - a continuous Class I or Class II bikeway along the corridor to provide access to destinations between stations and connectivity to the local bike network for short trips. A protected bike lane (a.k.a. cycletrack) would be most cost-effective as the primary expense for such a facility is signaling, which is already part of the broader transit corridor project. o Robust bicycle parking facilities, including secure long-term bike parking at all stations and mobility hubs/bike centers at major stations and near connecting Class I bikeways. We suggest bike centers be evaluated for the following stations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station (proximate to San Fernando Road Bike Path) o Downtown San Fernando and/or Pacoima Station (proximate to San Fernando Road and Pacoima Wash Bike Path) o Van Nuys Metrolink Station and/or Sherman Way Station o Oxnard/Metro Orange Line Station (proximate to Orange Line Bike Path) o Magnolia and/or Ventura Station (proximate to LA River Bike Path) <p>A continuous rail line with robust first/last-mile connectivity for walking and biking will add tremendous value to our regional transit system. Financing such a high-quality project will no doubt be a challenge. Innovative mechanisms such as HOT lanes on the 405 Freeway and tax-increment financing should be explored and pursued legislatively if required. We understand this to be primarily a political challenge and look forward to working like-minded stakeholders to rise to the occasion. It is critical that project planning support the long-term vision so that we can align funding with a project worth paying for.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments. We would like to meet to scope out the bike improvements to be included as part of this project. Please contact me at your earliest convenience.</p>
5/2/2013	Kevin H.	Brogan	Hill, Farrer & Burrill LLP (Keys Automotive)	One California Plaza - 37th Floor 300 So. Grand Avenue Los Angeles, California 90071	
4/6/2013	Bob	Anderson	Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association	Post Office Box 5223 Sherman Oaks, California 91413	<p>by the southern portion of the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor. We have carefully reviewed the referenced report and participated in the community meetings. We strongly support rapid transit across Los Angeles and support Councilmember LaBonge's recommendations for using light rail that could seamlessly connect to rapid transit through the Sepulveda Pass and for taking the light rail underground as it nears Ventura Boulevard in Sherman Oaks. However, we feel that the recommended alternatives in the report do not go far enough to ensure that the project can and will seamlessly connect to a future Sepulveda Pass project, will not detrimentally interrupt traffic flow on major north-south Valley traffic routes, and will solve the real problem. Our position is that Los Angeles is putting the cart before the horse if it builds this rapid transit project in the San Fernando Valley before building the Sepulveda Pass Project, thus ensuring that they will truly seamlessly connect.</p> <p>The real problem is lack of rapid transit connecting the Valley to the West Side through the Sepulveda Pass. There is a single bus line through the pass that serves UCLA and eventually drops passengers at a single stop in Westwood. This is not efficient and effective rapid transit. The solution is simple – the Valley needs light-rail rapid transit through the Sepulveda Pass. One in place, this rapid transit can connect to and service multiple feeders from within the Valley – including a seamless, underground, lightrail connection to the East Valley Rapid Transit Corridor. This is the integrated transit solution that residents of the Valley and West Side need, and SOHA strongly supports such a solution. SOHA has no concerns with the goals of the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor study; we in fact applaud them. However, we have many concerns with its implementation. The intersections of Sepulveda Boulevard at Ventura Boulevard and Van Nuys Boulevard at Ventura Boulevard are some of the most congested in Los Angeles, and both are in Sherman Oaks. They have high traffic volumes all day, gridlock during rush hours, and little available parking. Adding the terminus of a major north-south rapid transit route to either of these intersections will make conditions worse – primarily because there is nowhere for these rapid transit passengers to go except slow-moving buses that are already stuck in traffic. This will negatively impact ridership of the north-south rapid transit route.</p> <p>Our recommendation is straightforward and addresses the real problem. Design and build the Sepulveda Pass Rapid Transit Project first, and then design and build the East San Fernando Valley Rapid Transit Project. This will ensure an integrated South Valley terminus for both projects, and absolutely guarantee a seamless connection between the two. It will also ensure that construction activities on the South Valley terminus only occur once, thereby reducing detrimental construction impacts on local traffic and commerce. We understand that Measure R funding is limited for early projects that must be completed by 2018, and that the Sepulveda Pass Project is designated as a Decade Three project that would be built far in the future. However, we feel that this is not sufficient reason to build the projects in the wrong order. We also have a fallback recommendation. Instead of building the complete East Valley Rapid Transit Project from the North Valley to Ventura Boulevard, instead initially build it from the North Valley to the existing Orange Line under Measure R early funding. This provides much-needed north-south rapid transit in the Valley and also a direct connection and access to the Orange Line, but does not require an immediate South Valley terminus. This recommendation provides time to develop the Sepulveda Pass Project and know exactly where its South Valley terminus will be located. Then, the final design and</p>

4/26/2013	Barbara	Nance	Midtown North Hollywood Neighborhood Council	<p>Reference: Suggestions for future public transit in San Fernando Valley and Los Angeles(I attended the April 25, meeting)</p> <p>Saving money and expanding the reach of Transportation is the goal if am thinking in the future. Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Prefer modern light rail(built here in USA, if possible or a combination that includes USA jobs > Please add solar panels to the roof of these cars to promote their own power. > Clean bus system may be necessary for adjacent routes > Using Van Nuys Blvd for the Public Transport is better than Sepulveda. Use Sepulveda Blvd. for the Bike Lanes, Sepulveda has more room Do not try and move Car dealerships, they bring in most of the money and we need money.
4/23/2013	Brian	Cummings	City of Los Angeles Fire Department	<p>The following comments are furnished in response to your request for this Department to review the proposed development:</p> <p>A. Fire Flow The adequacy of fire protection for a given area is based on required fire-flow, response distance from existing fire stations, and this Department's judgment for needs in the area. In general, the required fire-flow is closely related to land use. The quantity of water necessary for fire protection varies with the type of development, life hazard, occupancy, and the degree of fire hazard. Fire-flow requirements vary from 2,000 gallons per minute (G.P.M.) in low density residential areas to 12,000 G.P.M. in high-density commercial or industrial areas. A minimum residual water pressure of 20 pounds per square inch (P.5.1.) is to remain in the water system, with the required gallons per minute flowing. Improvements to the water system in this area may be required. The cost of improving the water system may be charged to the developer. For more detailed information regarding water main improvements, the developer shall contact the Water Services Section of the Department of Water and Power.</p> <p>B. Response Distance, Apparatus, and Personnel The Fire Department has existing fire stations along the proposed route for initial response into the area of the proposed development: Fire Station No. 88, Fire Station No. 39, Fire Station No. 90, Fire Station No. 7, Fire Station No. 98, Fire Station No. 75, Based on these criteria (response distance from existing fire stations), fire protection would be considered (adequate). The proposed project would have a cumulative impact on fire protection services. At present, there are no immediate plans to increase Fire Department staffing or resources in those areas, which will serve the proposed project.</p> <p>C. Firefighting Personnel Access No building or portion of a building shall be constructed more than 150 feet from the edge of a roadway of an improved street, access road, or designated fire lane.</p> <p>D. Firefighting Apparatus Access Access for Fire Department apparatus and personnel to and into all structures shall be required. The width of private roadways for general access use and fire lanes shall not be less than 20 feet, and the fire lane must be clear to the sky. Fire lanes, where required and dead ending streets shall terminate in a cul-de-sac or other approved turning area. No dead ending street or fire lane shall be greater than 700 feet in length or secondary access shall be required. Fire lane width shall not be less than 20 feet. When a fire lane must accommodate the operation of Fire Department aerial ladder apparatus or where fire hydrants are installed, those portions shall not be less than 28 feet in width. Where access for a given development requires accommodation of Fire Department apparatus, overhead clearance shall not be less than 14 feet. All access roads, including fire lanes, shall be maintained in an unobstructed manner, removal of obstructions shall be at the owner's expense. The entrance to all</p>

				<p>2714 MEDIA CENTER DRIVE LOS ANGELES, CA 90065</p>	<p>south transit connection between key transit hubs/routes. The Bureau of Sanitation has conducted a preliminary evaluation of the potential impacts to the wastewater and stormwater systems for the proposed project.</p> <p><u>WASTEWATER REQUIREMENT</u> The Bureau of Sanitation, Wastewater Engineering Services Division (WESD) has reviewed your request and found the project to be related to providing new rail service only. Based on the project description, we have determined that the project is unrelated to sewer capacity availability and therefore do not have sufficient detail to offer an analysis at this time. However, as you develop your project alignment please keep us updated in order to ensure that you put in place mitigation measures whenever your project comes near, in contact or interfere with a sewer infrastructure to guarantee the continued safe operation of such structures. Should the project description change, please continue to send us information so that we may determine if a sewer assessment is required in the future. If you have any questions, please call Kwasi Berko of my staff at (323) 342-1562.</p> <p><u>STORMWATER REQUIREMENTS</u> The Bureau of Sanitation, Watershed Protection Division (WPD) is charged with the task of ensuring the implementation of the Municipal Stormwater Permit requirements within the City of Los Angeles. We anticipate the following requirements would apply for this project.</p> <p><u>POST-CONSTRUCTION MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS</u> The project requires implementation of stormwater mitigation measures. These requirements are based on the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) and the recently adopted Low Impact Development (LID) requirements. The projects that are subject to SUSMP/LID are required to incorporate measures to mitigate the impact of stormwater runoff. The requirements are outlined in the guidance manual titled "Development Best Management Practices Handbook — Part B: Planning Activities". Current regulations prioritize infiltration, capture/use, and then biofiltration as the preferred stormwater control measures. The relevant documents can be found at: www.lastormwater.org. It is advised that input regarding SUSMP requirements be received in the early phases of the project from WPD's plan-checking staff.</p> <p><u>GREEN STREETS</u> The City is developing a Green Street Initiative that will require projects to implement Green Street elements in the parkway areas between the roadway and sidewalk of the public right-of-way to capture and retain stormwater and urban runoff to mitigate the impact of stormwater runoff and other environmental concerns. The goals of the Green Street elements are to improve the water quality of stormwater runoff, recharge local ground water basins, improve air quality, reduce the heat island effect of street pavement, enhance pedestrian use of sidewalks, and encourage alternate means of transportation. The Green Street elements may include infiltration systems, biofiltration swales, and permeable pavements where stormwater can be easily directed from the streets into the</p>
4/11/2013	Ali	Poosti	Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation		
4/10/2013	Matthew	Jear	General Services Administration (GSA)	450 Golden Gate Avenue, 3rd Flr. East (9P2PTC) San Francisco, CA 94102	<p>Dear Mr. Davis, Thank you for contacting us regarding the proposed East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project. We appreciate being brought in early so we may comment on your projects potential impacts to the James C. Corman Federal Building and its tenants at 6230 Van Nuys Boulevard, Van Nuys, CA 91401-2713. We appreciate LACTMA's effort to work with all stakeholders to determine the best alternative for the location of this project. If you have any questions, please contact Maureen Sheehan, NEPA Project Manager at Maureen.Sheehan@gsa.gov, 253-931-7548.</p>
3/28/2013	Barry	Johnson	Studio City Neighborhood Council	4020 rdaford Ave. Edit. Bldg. 2, Suite 6 Studio City, CA 91604	<p>Dear Mr. Davis, I was to deliver the enclosed material from the Studio City Neighborhood Council to yesterday's (3/27/13) Scoping Meeting in Van Nuys. Unfortunately, I was unable to get off work in time for the 4PM to 6PM meeting due to a Northridge kidnapping. So I'm mailing this instead. (But I have attended your other meetings over the last 2-3 years and our Neighborhood Council has been tracking this.) Thanks for accepting this by mail. I would like to pose one question/comment: This project actually lies in the "Central Valley" (Van Nuys for example) and some might also say the "North Valley" (San Fernando/Sylmar for example). Yet you are calling this the "East San Fernando Valley". I beg to differ with you. The project proposal is not in the East San Fernando Valley and those of us who actually live in the East San Fernando Valley continually comment on the misleading location title of this project. We sure wish you would take the word "East" out of the title and let us know when there is a proposed project truly for the East San Fernando Valley.</p>

3/28/2013	Ian	MacMillian	South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD)	21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765	<p><u>East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project</u></p> <p>The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. The SCAQMD's comments are recommendations regarding the analysis of potential air quality impacts from the proposed project that should be included in the draft CEQA document. Please send the SCAQMD a copy of the Draft EIR upon its completion. Note that copies of the Draft EIR that are submitted to the State Clearinghouse are not forwarded to the SCAQMD. Please forward a copy of the Draft EIR directly to SCAQMD at the address in our letterhead. In addition, please send with the draft EIR all appendices or technical documents related to the air quality and greenhouse gas analyses and electronic versions of all air quality modeling and health risk assessment files. These include original emission calculation spreadsheets and modeling files (3 Adobe PDF files). Without all files and supporting air quality documentation, the SCAQMD will be unable to complete its review of the air quality analysis in a timely manner. Any delays in providing all supporting air quality documentation will require additional time for review beyond the end of the comment period.</p> <p><u>Air Quality Analysis</u></p> <p>The Lead Agency should identify any potential adverse air quality impacts that could occur from all phases of the project and all air pollutant sources related to the project. Air quality impacts from both construction (including demolition, if any) and operations should be calculated. Construction-related air quality impacts typically include, but are not limited to, emissions from the use of heavy-duty equipment from grading, earth-loading/unloading, paving, architectural coatings, off-road mobile sources (e.g., heavy-duty construction equipment) and on-road mobile sources (e.g., construction worker vehicle trips, material transport trips). Operation-related air quality impacts may include, but are not limited to, emissions from stationary sources (e.g., boilers), area sources (e.g., solvents and coatings), and vehicular trips (e.g., on- and off-road tailpipe emissions and entrained dust). Air quality impacts from indirect sources, that is, sources that generate or attract vehicular trips should be included in the analysis.</p> <p>The SCAQMD has developed a methodology for calculating PM2.5 emissions from construction and operational activities and processes. In connection with developing PM2.5 calculation methodologies, the SCAQMD has also developed both regional and localized significance thresholds. The SCAQMD requests that the lead agency quantify PM2.5 emissions and compare the results to the recommended PM2.5 significance thresholds. Guidance for calculating PM2.5 emissions and PM2.5 significance thresholds can be found at the following internet address: http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/PM2.5/PM2.5.html.</p> <p>In addition to analyzing regional air quality impacts the SCAQMD recommends calculating localized air quality impacts and comparing the results to localized significance thresholds (LSTs). LST's can be used in addition to the recommended regional significance thresholds as a second indication of air quality impacts when preparing a CEQA document. Therefore, when preparing the air quality analysis for the proposed project, it is recommended that the lead agency perform a localized significance analysis by either using the LSTs developed by the</p>
3/27/2013	David	Adelman	VICA		<p>Dear Mr. Davis,</p> <p>The Valley Industry and Commerce Association (VICA) looks forward to the development of the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor between the City of San Fernando and Sherman Oaks community.</p> <p>We request that the Environment Impact Report address three major aspects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Route: What is the expected ridership of the system, and which route provides the best access for these customers? What is the ridership of existing bus lines along each route? Is there a need to ease crowding? What regional landmarks, government offices or economic centers of activity are along each route? Which route provides the best connectivity to current systems (i.e. Metro Red and Orange Lines) as well as proposed future transit projects (i.e. the Sepulveda Pass corridor)? What are the environmental benefits of higher ridership, reduced crowding and reduced distances for customers to connect to these major centers of activity? 2. Type of Vehicle: What is the ridership capacity of each option, and what are the associated environmental benefits? What is the speed comparison between BRT (including traffic), LRT and HRT along the corridor? At what frequency can each option run? 3. Cost: What is the construction cost of each alternative, and which alternative provides the best cost recovery? Which alternative will be most attractive to riders? Is there potential for a public-private partnership? Which alternative will be most attractive to private investment? <p>We also request that the study compare if each alternative will prevent the issues associated with the San Fernando Valley's only other major transit system, the Metro Orange Line. VICA would like to prevent the East SFV Transit Corridor from the overcrowding, high traffic levels and slow speed that trouble Orange Line riders and discourage ridership.</p> <p>We look forward to answers to these questions of importance to Valley residents and businesses.</p>
3/21/2013	Paul	Koretz	Los Angeles City Councilman, District 5	200 N. Spring Street, Room 440, Los Angeles, CA, 90012	<p>Dear Renee and Walt, I am writing you regarding planning for both the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor and The Sepulveda Pass transit Corridor together as a single project. I do not think Metro would be doing their due diligence if they did not look into seamlessly connecting these two transit projects. These projects are of great interest to me and my constituents because they would provide a desperately needed North-South connection between the San Fernando Valley and LAX. On any given day, 295,000 vehicles travel through the Sepulveda Pass corridor. I believe that we would be doing our community a disservice if we did not look at how those two projects will invariably connect. The Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor, the last of our Measure R projects, would not be completed until 2039. In these tough financial times, we must think outside of the box and look towards innovative modes of transit that can address traffic congestion. We must also look for alternate ways that will help fund the projects in a more expedited manner. Lastly, I commend Metro for the fantastic job you have done in noticing the public for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study, and I hope that this transparency continues. Thank you for your consideration of my views. I look forward to hearing from you.</p>

Letters (Organization-Electeds)

3/4/2013	Dave	Singleton	Native American Heritage Commission	915 Capitol Mall Room 364, Sacramento, California, 95814	<p>The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has reviewed the CEQA Notice regarding the above referenced project. In the 1985 Appellate Court decision (170 Cal App 3rd 604), the court held that the NAHC has jurisdiction and special expertise, as a state agency, over affected Native American resources impacted by proposed projects, including archaeological places of religious significance to Native Americans, and to Native American burial sites.</p> <p>The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) states that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resources, which includes archeological resources, is a significant effect requiring the preparation of an EIR (CEQA guidelines 15064(b)). To adequately comply with this provision and mitigate project-related impacts on archaeological resources, the Commission recommends the following actions be required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ü Contact the appropriate Information Center for a record search to determine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> n If a part or all of the area of project effect (APE) has been previously surveyed for cultural resources, which we know that it has. n The NAHC recommends that known cultural resources recorded on or adjacent to the APE be listed in the draft Environmental Impact Report. ü If an additional archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey. We suggest that this be coordinated with the NAHC, if possible. n The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measurers should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure pursuant to California Government Code Section 6254.10. ü Contact has been made to the the Native American Heritage Commission for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Sacred Lands File Check, and cultural resources have been identified to your agency. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A list of appropriate Native American Contacts for consultation concerning the project site has been provided and is attached to this letter. • Lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence once ground-breaking activity begins. If that occurs, the NAHC suggests that inadvertent discoveries be coordinated with the NAHC;Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archeological resources, per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5(f). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities. n Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the disposition of recovered artifacts, in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans. n Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains in their mitigation plan. Health and Safety Code §7050.5, CEQA §15064.5(e), and Public Resources Code §5097.98 mandates the process to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.
----------	------	-----------	-------------------------------------	--	--

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

915 CAPITOL MALL, ROOM 364
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
(916) 653-6251
ds_nahc@pacbell.net
www.nahc.ca.gov
(916) 657-5390 - Fax



March 4, 2013

Mr. Walt Davis, Project Planner

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: SCH# 2013021064 CEQA Notice of Completion; draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) –
“**East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project;**” located in the Van
Nuys/Sepulveda Boulevards between Ventura Boulevard and San Fernando Road; Los Angeles
County, California

Dear Mr. Davis:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has reviewed the CEQA Notice regarding the above referenced project. In the 1985 Appellate Court decision (170 Cal App 3rd 604), the court held that the NAHC has jurisdiction and special expertise, as a state agency, over affected Native American resources impacted by proposed projects, including archaeological places of religious significance to Native Americans, and to Native American burial sites.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) states that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resources, which includes archeological resources, is a significant effect requiring the preparation of an EIR (CEQA guidelines 15064(b)). To adequately comply with this provision and mitigate project-related impacts on archaeological resources, the Commission recommends the following actions be required:

- ✓ Contact the appropriate Information Center for a record search to determine:
 - If a part or all of the area of project effect (APE) has been previously surveyed for cultural resources, which we know that it has.
 - The NAHC recommends that known cultural resources recorded on or adjacent to the APE be listed in the draft Environmental Impact Report.
- ✓ If an additional archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey. We suggest that this be coordinated with the NAHC, if possible.
 - The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure pursuant to California Government Code Section 6254.10.
- ✓ Contact has been made to the the Native American Heritage Commission for:
 - A Sacred Lands File Check, and cultural resources have been identified to your agency.
 - A list of appropriate Native American Contacts for consultation concerning the project site has been provided and is attached to this letter.
 - Lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence once ground-breaking activity begins. If that occurs, the NAHC suggests that inadvertent discoveries be coordinated with the NAHC;

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

915 CAPITOL MALL, ROOM 364
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
(916) 653-6251
ds_nahc@pacbell.net
www.nahc.ca.gov
(916) 657-5390 - Fax



Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archeological resources, per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5(f). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.

- Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the disposition of recovered artifacts, in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
- Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains in their mitigation plan. Health and Safety Code §7050.5, CEQA §15064.5(e), and Public Resources Code §5097.98 mandates the process to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dave Singleton".

Dave Singleton
Program Analyst
(916) 653-6251

CC: State Clearinghouse

Attachment: Native American Contacts list

**Native American Contacts
Los Angeles County
March 4, 2013**

Beverly Salazar Folkes
1931 Shadybrook Drive
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362
805 492-7255
(805) 558-1154 - cell

Chumash
Tataviam
Fernandeño

San Fernando Band of Mission Indians
John Valenzuela, Chairperson
P.O. Box 221838
Newhall, CA 91322
tsen2u@hotmail.com
(661) 753-9833 Office
(760) 885-0955 Cell
(760) 949-1604 Fax

Fernandeño
Tataviam
Serrano
Vanyume
Kitanemuk

Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians
Ronnie Salas, Cultural Preservation Department
1019 - 2nd Street, Suite #1
San Fernando CA 91340
ortega@tataviam-nsn.gov
(818) 837-0794 Office

Fernandeno
Tataviam

Randy Guzman - Folkes
6471 Cornell Circle
Moorpark, CA 93021
ndnRandy@yahoo.com
(805) 905-1675 - cell

Chumash
Fernandeño
Tataviam
Shoshone Paiute
Yaqui

(818) 837-0796 Fax

LA City/County Native American Indian Comm
Ron Andrade, Director
3175 West 6th St, Rm. 403
Los Angeles, CA 90020
randrade@css.lacounty.gov
(213) 351-5324
(213) 386-3995 FAX

Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation
John Tommy Rosas, Tribal Admin.
Private Address
Gabrielino Tongva

tattnlaw@gmail.com
310-570-6567

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#2013021064; CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor; located in the Van Nuys/Sepulveda Boulevards between Ventura Boulevard and San Fernando Road; Los Angeles County, California.



Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit



Ken Alex
Director

Notice of Preparation

February 28, 2013

To: Reviewing Agencies
Re: East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor
SCH# 2013021064

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.


Please direct your comments to:

Walt Davis
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,


Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Attachments
cc: Lead Agency

**Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base**

SCH# 2013021064
Project Title East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor
Lead Agency Los Angeles County

Type **NOP** Notice of Preparation

Description The project would involve transit improvements along Sepulveda Blvd. and/or Van Nuys Blvd. between Ventura Blvd. on the southern end and the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink station on the northern end. Two build alternatives, a transportation system management (TSM) alternative, and a no-build alternative are being evaluated. The build alternatives include light rail transit (LRT) and bus rapid transit (BRT). The TSM alternative would upgrade existing bus service in the study area without the high-cost investment in a dedicated right-of-way. The LRT alternative would run 11.2 miles, primarily along Van Nuys Blvd. on a dedicated median guideway. The BRT alternative would operate for 9.4 miles within a dedicated busway and as much as 2.6 miles in mixed-flow traffic along San Fernando Rd. and optionally along Van Nuys Blvd. and Sepulveda Blvd.

Lead Agency Contact

Name Walt Davis
Agency Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Phone 213 922 3079 **Fax**
email
Address One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3
City Los Angeles **State** CA **Zip** 90012

Project Location

County Los Angeles
City Los Angeles, City of
Region
Cross Streets Van Nuys/Sepulveda Boulevard between Ventura Boulevard and San Fernando Road
Lat / Long 34° 11' 4.7" N / 118° 26' 55.4" W
Parcel No.

Township	Range	Section	Base

Proximity to:

Highways Hwy 405, 101, 5, 118, 210
Airports Van Nuys and Whiteman
Railways Metrolink, Amtrak
Waterways LA River, Pacoima Diversion Channel and Wash
Schools Various LAUSD
Land Use Transportation right-of-way

Project Issues Aesthetic/Visual; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Drainage/Absorption; Economics/Jobs; Fiscal Impacts; Flood Plain/Flooding; Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Cumulative Effects

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 5; Native American Heritage Commission; CA Department of Public Health; Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 7; Air Resources Board, Transportation Projects; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4; Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy; San Gabriel & Lower Los Angeles Rivers & Mountains Conservancy

Date Received 02/28/2013 **Start of Review** 02/28/2013 **End of Review** 03/29/2013

Resources Agency
 Resources Agency
Nadell Gayou
 Dept. of Boating & Waterways
Nicole Wong
 California Coastal Commission
Elizabeth A. Fuchs
 Colorado River Board
Gerald R. Zimmerman
 Dept. of Conservation
Elizabeth Carpenter
 California Energy Commission
Eric Knight
 Cal Fire
Dan Foster
 Central Valley Flood Protection Board
James Herota
 Office of Historic Preservation
Ron Parsons
 Dept of Parks & Recreation
Environmental Stewardship Section
 California Department of Resources, Recycling & Recovery
Sue O'Leary
 S.F. Bay Conservation & Dev't. Comm.
Steve McAdam
 Dept. of Water Resources
Agency
Nadell Gayou

Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
 RWQCB 1
Cathleen Hudson
North Coast Region (1)
 RWQCB 2
Environmental Document Coordinator
San Francisco Bay Region (2)
 RWQCB 3
Central Coast Region (3)
 RWQCB 4
Teresa Rodgers
Los Angeles Region (4)
 RWQCB 5S
Central Valley Region (5)
 RWQCB 5F
Central Valley Region (5)
Fresno Branch Office
 RWQCB 5R
Central Valley Region (5)
Redding Branch Office
 RWQCB 6
Lahontan Region (6)
 RWQCB 6V
Lahontan Region (6)
Victorville Branch Office
 RWQCB 7
Colorado River Basin Region (7)
 RWQCB 8
Santa Ana Region (8)
 RWQCB 9
San Diego Region (9)
 Other

Native American Heritage Comm.
 Dan Kopulsky
 Caltrans, District 8
 Caltrans, District 9
Gayle Rosander
 Caltrans, District 10
Tom Dumas
 Caltrans, District 11
Jacob Armstrong
 Caltrans, District 12
Marlon Regisford
Cal EPA
Air Resources Board
 Airport/Energy Projects
Jim Lerner
 Transportation Projects
Douglas Ito
 Industrial Projects
Mike Tollstrup
 State Water Resources Control Board
Regional Programs Unit
Division of Financial Assistance
 State Water Resources Control Board
Student Intern, 401 Water Quality Certification Unit
Division of Water Quality
 State Water Resources Control Board
Phil Crader
Division of Water Rights
 Dept. of Toxic Substances Control
CEQA Tracking Center
 Department of Pesticide Regulation
CEQA Coordinator

Business, Trans & Housing
 Caltrans - Division of Aeronautics
Philip Crimmins
 Caltrans - Planning
Terri Pencovic
 California Highway Patrol
Suzann Ikeuchi
Office of Special Projects
 Housing & Community Development
CEQA Coordinator
Housing Policy Division
Dept. of Transportation
 Caltrans, District 1
Rex Jackman
 Caltrans, District 2
Marcelino Gonzalez
 Caltrans, District 3
Gary Arnold
 Caltrans, District 4
Erik Alm
 Caltrans, District 5
David Murray
 Caltrans, District 6
Michael Navarro
 Caltrans, District 7
Dianna Watson

Other Departments
 Food & Agriculture
Sandra Schubert
Dept. of Food and Agriculture
 Dept. of General Services
Public School Construction
 Dept. of General Services
Anna Garbeff
Environmental Services Section
 Dept. of Public Health
Jeffery Worth
Dept. of Health/Drinking Water
 Delta Stewardship Council
Kevan Samsam
Independent Commissions/Boards
 Delta Protection Commission
Michael Machado
 Cal EMA (Emergency Management Agency)
Dennis Castrillo

Conservancy
 SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS
 SAN GABRIEL MOUNTAINS
 Last Updated 01/08/2013

Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613
 For Hand Delivery/Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

2011 3021064

Project Title: East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

Lead Agency: Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Contact Person: Walt Davis
 Mailing Address: One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3 Phone: (213) 922-3079
 City: Los Angeles Zip: 90012 County: Los Angeles

Project Location: County: Los Angeles City/Nearest Community: Los Angeles
 Cross Streets: Van Nuys/Sepulveda Boulevards between Ventura Boulevard and San Fernando Road Zip Code: 91401/91414
 Longitude/Latitude (degrees, minutes and seconds): 34 ° 11 ' 4.7 " N / 118 ° 26 ' 55.4 " W Total Acres: _____
 Assessor's Parcel No.: N/A - transportation right-of-way Section: _____ Twp.: _____ Range: _____ Base: _____
 Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: 405, 101, 5, 118, 210 Waterways: LA River, Pacoima Diversion Channel and Wash
 Airports: Van Nuys and Whiteman Railways: Metrolink, Amtrak Schools: Various LAUSD

Document Type:

CEQA: NOP Draft EIR NEPA: NOI Other: Joint Document
 Early Cons Supplement/Subsequent EIR EA Final Document
 Neg Dec (Prior SCH No.) Draft EIS Other: _____
 Mit Neg Dec Other: FEB 28 2013 FONSI

Local Action Type:

General Plan Update Specific Plan Zone Annexation
 General Plan Amendment Master Plan Prezone Redevelopment
 General Plan Element Planned Unit Development Use Permit Coastal Permit
 Community Plan Site Plan Land Division (Subdivision, etc.) Other: Transportation

Development Type:

Residential: Units _____ Acres _____ Transportation: Type Transit corridor
 Office: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____ Mining: Mineral _____
 Commercial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____ Power: Type _____ MW
 Industrial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____ Waste Treatment: Type _____ MGD
 Educational: _____ Hazardous Waste: Type _____
 Recreational: _____ Other: _____
 Water Facilities: Type _____ MGD _____

Project Issues Discussed in Document:

Aesthetic/Visual Fiscal Recreation/Parks Vegetation
 Agricultural Land Flood Plain/Flooding Schools/Universities Water Quality
 Air Quality Forest Land/Fire Hazard Septic Systems Water Supply/Groundwater
 Archeological/Historical Geologic/Seismic Sewer Capacity Wetland/Riparian
 Biological Resources Minerals Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading Growth Inducement
 Coastal Zone Noise Solid Waste Land Use
 Drainage/Absorption Population/Housing Balance Toxic/Hazardous Cumulative Effects
 Economic/Jobs Public Services/Facilities Traffic/Circulation Other: _____

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

Transportation right-of-way

Project Description: *(please use a separate page if necessary)*

The project would involve transit improvements along Sepulveda Blvd. and/or Van Nuys Blvd. between Ventura Blvd. on the southern end and the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink station on the northern end. Two build alternatives, a transportation system management (TSM) alternative, and a no-build alternative are being evaluated. The build alternatives include light rail transit (LRT) and bus rapid transit (BRT). The TSM alternative would upgrade existing bus service in the study area without the high-cost investment in a dedicated right-of-way. The LRT alternative would run 11.2 miles, primarily along Van Nuys Blvd. on a dedicated median guideway. The BRT alternative would operate for 9.4 miles within a dedicated busway and as much as 2.6 miles in mixed-flow traffic along San Fernando Rd. and optionally along Van Nuys Blvd. and Sepulveda Blvd.

Note: The State Clearinghouse will assign identification numbers for all new projects. If a SCH number already exists for a project (e.g. Notice of Preparation or previous draft document) please fill in.

Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Lead Agencies may recommend State Clearinghouse distribution by marking agencies below with an "X".
If you have already sent your document to the agency please denote that with an "S".


<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Resources Board	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Office of Historic Preservation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Boating & Waterways, Department of	<input type="checkbox"/>	Office of Public School Construction
<input type="checkbox"/>	California Emergency Management Agency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Parks & Recreation, Department of
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	California Highway Patrol	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pesticide Regulation, Department of
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Caltrans District # <u>7</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Utilities Commission
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Caltrans Division of Aeronautics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Regional WQCB # <u>4</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Caltrans Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	Resources Agency
<input type="checkbox"/>	Central Valley Flood Protection Board	<input type="checkbox"/>	Resources Recycling and Recovery, Department of
<input type="checkbox"/>	Coachella Valley Mtns. Conservancy	<input type="checkbox"/>	S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Comm.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Coastal Commission	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	San Gabriel & Lower L.A. Rivers & Mtns. Conservancy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Colorado River Board	<input type="checkbox"/>	San Joaquin River Conservancy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conservation, Department of	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Santa Monica Mtns. Conservancy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Corrections, Department of	<input type="checkbox"/>	State Lands Commission
<input type="checkbox"/>	Delta Protection Commission	<input type="checkbox"/>	SWRCB: Clean Water Grants
<input type="checkbox"/>	Education, Department of	<input type="checkbox"/>	SWRCB: Water Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Energy Commission	<input type="checkbox"/>	SWRCB: Water Rights
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fish & Game Region # <u>5</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
<input type="checkbox"/>	Food & Agriculture, Department of	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Toxic Substances Control, Department of
<input type="checkbox"/>	Forestry and Fire Protection, Department of	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Water Resources, Department of
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	General Services, Department of		Other: _____
<input type="checkbox"/>	Health Services, Department of		Other: _____
<input type="checkbox"/>	Housing & Community Development		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Native American Heritage Commission		

Local Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)

Starting Date March 1, 2013 Ending Date May 6, 2013

Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):

Consulting Firm: <u>ICF International</u>	Applicant: <u>LACMTA</u>
Address: <u>601 W. 5th Street, Suite 900</u>	Address: <u>One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-3</u>
City/State/Zip: <u>Los Angeles, CA 90071</u>	City/State/Zip: <u>Los Angeles, CA, 90012</u>
Contact: <u>Paulette Franco</u>	Phone: <u>(213) 922-3079</u>
Phone: <u>(213) 312-1753</u>	

Signature of Lead Agency Representative:  Date: 2-27-2013

Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 21161, Public Resources Code.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

MAY 6 2013

Walt Davis
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-3,
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Subject: Scoping Comments for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project, Los Angeles, California


Dear Mr. Davis:

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (NOI) published February 28, 2013, requesting comments on the scope and content of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) to be jointly prepared by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) for proposed transit improvements in the East San Fernando Valley Transit Project Corridor (ESFVT Project). Our comments are provided pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulation (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

EPA appreciates the opportunity to comment on transit projects that can play a part in curtailing air quality impacts in one of our Region's counties in non-attainment. Our detailed comments below include recommendations relating to (1) air quality, (2) sustainable land use and station design, (3) indirect and cumulative impacts (4) green design and construction, (5) environmental justice and community involvement, (6) light rail maintenance and storage facility.

Please note that as of October 1, 2012, EPA Headquarters is no longer accepting paper copies or CDs of EISs for official filing purposes. Submissions must now be made through EPA's new electronic EIS submittal tool: *e-NEPA*. To begin using *e-NEPA*, you must first register with EPA's electronic reporting site - https://cdx.epa.gov/epa_home.asp. Electronic submission does not change requirements for distribution of EISs for public review and comment. EPA requests that the lead agencies still provide one hard copy of each Draft and Final EIS to the EPA Region 9 office in San Francisco (mailcode CED-2) when it is released for public circulation. If you have any questions regarding the recommendations provided, please feel free to contact me, the lead EPA reviewer for this NOI. I can be reached at jessop.carter@epa.gov or (415) 972-3815.

Sincerely,



Carter Jessop, Physical Scientist
Environmental Review Office

Enclosures: EPA's Detailed Scoping Comments

Cc Via Email: Ray Sukys, FTA
Ray Tellis, FTA

8105 7 YAM

Air Quality

The proposed East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor project is located in the South Coast Air Basin. This air basin is classified as non-attainment in relation to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone (1-hour and 8-hour standards), particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), and lead. It is important that the emission of these pollutants be reduced and controlled to the maximum extent practicable both regionally and on a project by project basis. The DEIS should provide a detailed discussion of ambient air conditions (baseline or existing conditions), NAAQS, potential air quality impacts of the project (including cumulative and indirect impacts), and the potential impact on criteria pollutant nonattainment status for each fully evaluated alternative.

Recommendations:

- Work with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), Caltrans, and regional planning agencies to ensure that methods to estimate emissions and anticipated emissions values from the proposed project are consistent with Air Quality Management Plan and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) conformity determinations.
- Include an identification of sensitive receptors and/or potential hotspot impacts, especially where parking lots, idling buses, and road modifications are proposed.
- Consider use of the highest efficiency vehicles and equipment available, including those equipped with Tier 4 engines, where possible.
- Disclose the available information about the health risks associated with diesel emissions, sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project area, and how the proposed project will affect current emission levels.
- In comparing project alternatives, consider which alternatives would have the greatest beneficial or deleterious impact upon local and regional air quality.

Transportation Conformity

To the extent that the proposed transit system will require modification of the existing grade crossings or road network, the DEIS should:

- Identify if elements of this project will require funding or approval by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).
- Demonstrate that the project is included in a conforming transportation plan and a transportation improvement program.
- LACMTA and FTA should work with SCAQMD and the regional planning agencies to ensure that applicable elements of the proposed project are consistent with future revisions of the RTP.

Construction Mitigation Measures

The proposed Project will involve construction and staging along populated sections of the corridor. Because of the multiple receptors along the corridor, LACMTA and FTA should identify and commit to specific requirements to reduce emissions. The DEIS should include SCAQMD requirements to reduce emissions. In addition to these measures, EPA recommends the following additional measures to reduce the impacts resulting from future construction associated with this Project.

Recommendations:

In light of the serious health impacts associated with PM_{2.5} (fine particulate matter) and diesel exhaust exposure, we recommend that the best available control measures for these pollutants be implemented at all times and recommend that a Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan be incorporated into the DEIS. We recommend that SCAQMD requirements, and the following additional measures be incorporated into the Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan, where feasible and appropriate, in order to reduce impacts associated with fugitive dust and emissions of PM, diesel exhaust, and mobile source air toxics from construction-related activities:

Fugitive Dust Source Controls:

- Install wind fencing and phase grading operations where appropriate, and operate water trucks for stabilization of surfaces under windy conditions.
- When hauling material and operating non-earthmoving equipment, prevent spillage and limit speeds to 15 miles per hour (mph). Limit speed of earth-moving equipment to 10 mph.

Mobile and Stationary Source Controls:

- Minimize use, trips, and unnecessary idling of heavy equipment.
- Maintain and tune engines per manufacturer's specifications to perform at EPA certification levels, where applicable, and to perform at verified standards applicable to retrofit technologies. Employ periodic, unscheduled inspections to limit unnecessary idling and to ensure that construction equipment is properly maintained, tuned, and modified consistent with established specifications. The California Air Resources Board has a number of mobile source anti-idling requirements which could be employed. See their website at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/truck-idling/truck-idling.htm>
- Prohibit any tampering with engines and require continuing adherence to manufacturer's recommendations.
- If practicable, lease new, clean equipment meeting the most stringent of applicable Federal or State Standards. In general, commit to the best available emissions control technology. Tier 4 engines became available in the 2009-model year and should be used for project construction equipment to the maximum extent feasible. Lacking availability of non-road construction equipment that meets Tier 4 engine standards, LACMTA/FTA should commit to using the best available emissions control technologies on all equipment.
- Utilize EPA-registered particulate traps and other appropriate controls where suitable to reduce emissions of diesel particulate matter and other pollutants at the construction site.

Administrative controls:

- Specify the means by which impacts to sensitive receptors, such as children, elderly, infirm and others identified in the DEIS, will be minimized. For example, locate construction equipment and staging zones away from sensitive receptors and fresh air intakes to buildings and air conditioners.
- Prepare an inventory of all equipment prior to construction and identify the suitability of add-on emission controls for each piece of equipment before groundbreaking. (Suitability of control devices is based on: whether there is reduced normal availability of the construction equipment due to increased downtime and/or power output, whether there may be significant damage caused to the construction equipment engine, or whether there may be a significant risk to nearby workers or the public.) Meet EPA diesel fuel requirements for off-road and on-highway, and, where appropriate, use alternative fuels such as natural gas and electric.

Sustainable Land Use and Station Design

Sustainability Policies

The ESFVT Project provides a great opportunity to plan, construct and operate a new transit system in a way that improves environmental quality while being a catalyst for community development and neighborhood improvement. FTA is directed by Executive Order 13514 to provide an “integrated strategy towards sustainability”. LACMTA and FTA should demonstrate the proposed ESFVTC meets the requirement of Executive Order 13514.

Executive Order on Sustainability (EO 13514)

"In order to create a clean energy economy that will increase our Nation's prosperity, promote energy security, protect the interests of taxpayers, and safeguard the health of our environment, the Federal Government must lead by example. It is therefore the policy of the United States that Federal agencies shall increase energy efficiency; measure, report, and reduce their greenhouse gas emissions from direct and indirect activities; conserve and protect water resources through efficiency, reuse, and stormwater management; eliminate waste, recycle, and prevent pollution; leverage agency acquisitions to foster markets for sustainable technologies and environmentally preferable materials, products, and services; design, construct, maintain, and operate high performance sustainable buildings in sustainable locations; strengthen the vitality and livability of the communities in which Federal facilities are located; and inform Federal employees about and involve them in the achievement of these goals."

In addition, the HUD/DOT/EPA Partnership for Sustainable Communities is an interagency federal partnership established to better coordinate federal housing, transportation, and environmental protection investments. The partnership is based on the following principles:

- Provide more transportation choices
- Promote equitable, affordable housing
- Enhance economic competitiveness
- Support existing communities
- Coordinate and leverage federal policies and investment
- Value communities and neighborhoods

We note that there are multiple resources for integrating sustainability principles into project design and development and we encourage LACMTA and FTA to include a sustainability chapter in the DEIS that outlines measures taken to meet sustainability goals and principles.

Recommendations:

- Identify how LACMTA and FTA are integrating sustainability principles into proposed improvements in the project area, and coordinating with HUD, other modes at DOT, and EPA to ensure that potential improvements reflect the goals of the Partnership for Sustainable Communities. For additional information on the partnership, please visit EPA's website at <http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/partnership/>.
- LACMTA and FTA should refer to the American Public Transportation Association's publication "Transit Sustainability Guidelines - A Framework for Approaching Sustainability

and Overview of Best Practices” as a guide for integrating design, construction, and operation commitments that reduce the project’s environmental footprint as much as possible (<http://www.apta.com/resources/hottopics/sustainability/Documents/Transit-Sustainability-Guidelines.pdf>).

Additional project design recommendations include:

- The DEIS should integrate green technologies into facility designs and identify opportunities for sustainability measures, including energy efficiency and pollution prevention measures.
- The DEIS should demonstrate specific design commitments to reduce environmental impacts associated with the construction of passenger stations and maintenance facilities, such as sharing existing parking as opposed to building new, large expansive parking lots.
- LACMTA and FTA should consider renewable energy generation and water conservation measures at stations with shaded platforms and other amenities.
- LACMTA and FTA should consider policies that will increase density and mixed-uses in and near the station areas.
- EPA supports the statement in the March 2013 FAQ document indicating that the Project would be designed with integration of bike lanes and/or bike-friendly facilities in mind. The DEIS should describe how the proposed stations will link with area bicycle trails and paths. Facilities should be designed to be pedestrian and bicycle-friendly, including secure bicycle parking, and bikes on trains. Some of these uses can be seamlessly integrated with some ADA requirements.

Indirect and Cumulative Impacts

EPA anticipates that the ESFVT Project may encourage a range of indirect and cumulative land use changes and recommends the following considerations be included in the DEIS.

Recommendations:

- The DEIS should identify all transportation improvements proposed to provide access to the proposed Project from anticipated key rider groups along the corridor and surrounding population centers, including bicycle paths, transit connections, new methods to move people while reducing congestion, and increased bus service (express service, increase in service on existing routes, new routes, and BRT).
- Minimize the number of parking spaces to the greatest extent possible at stations in order to encourage the use of transit and pedestrian access;
- The DEIS should identify where proposed stations, parking facilities, and additional required infrastructure will be located in the project corridor, and should disclose the associated impacts from station development on planned and unplanned growth.
- Describe the expected land use changes associated with station locations, including rider access and traffic circulation changes.
- Describe the associated environmental impacts of those land use changes, including indirect and cumulative impacts. EPA recommends the use of the June 2005 *Guidance for Preparers of Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Analysis* developed jointly by Caltrans, FHWA, and EPA [http://www.dot.ca.gov/ser/cumulative_guidance/purpose.htm]. The guidance will assist in identifying cumulative impacts and preparing an analysis that is sound and well documented.
- Identify parties responsible for mitigating the environmental impacts associated with the indirect and cumulative impacts of the projected land use changes.

- The DEIS should analyze and disclose the temporary and permanent environmental impacts of constructing stations, parking facilities, maintenance and storage facilities, power propagation infrastructure, and required road developments and modifications.
- Identify the timeline for any proposed project phasing, as well as future improvements and maintenance.
- Coordinate with other transit providers to maximize intermodal access to the proposed stations;

Green Design and Construction

Stormwater Management

Low Impact Development and other green infrastructure strategies can provide attractive design features that serve a dual purpose as both stormwater treatment and visual enhancements.

Recommendation:

- EPA encourages FTA and LACMTA to implement “green infrastructure,” such as bioretention areas, vegetated swales, porous pavement, and filter strips in any onsite stormwater management features. More detailed information on these forms of “green infrastructure” can be found at http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/home.cfm?program_id=298.

Industrial Materials Reuse and Recycling

Nonhazardous industrial materials, such as coal ash, foundry sand, construction and demolition materials, slags, and gypsum, are valuable products of industrial processes that can be recycled and or reused to serve project goals while minimizing both costs and waste. Industrial materials recycling preserves natural resources by decreasing the demand for virgin materials, conserves energy and reduces greenhouse gas emissions by decreasing the demand for products made from energy intensive manufacturing processes; and saves money by decreasing disposal costs for the generator and decreasing materials costs for end users.

Recommendation:

- For the construction of new infrastructure, EPA recommends industrial materials recycling, or the reusing or recycling of byproduct materials generated from industrial processes. EPA recommends that, for any new construction proposed, the DEIS identify how industrial materials recycling can be incorporated into project design. More information can be found at: <http://www.epa.gov/epawaste/conserv/rrr/inr/index.htm>.

Environmental Justice and Community Involvement

Executive Order 12898 addresses Environmental Justice in minority and low-income populations, and the Council on Environmental Quality has developed guidance concerning how to address Environmental Justice in the environmental review process (<http://ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/regs/ej/justice.pdf>).

Recommendations:

- Future environmental justice analyses for this project and the DEIS should include a description of the area of potential impact used for the analysis and provide the source of the demographic information.

- The DEIS should identify whether the proposed alternatives may disproportionately and adversely affect low-income or minority populations in the surrounding area and should provide appropriate mitigation measures for any adverse impacts.
- The DEIS should identify how the proposed alternatives may affect the mobility of low-income or minority populations in the surrounding areas and provide appropriate mitigation measures for any anticipated adverse impacts.

Light Rail Maintenance and Storage Yard Facility

EPA is concerned about potential impacts associated with the rail maintenance and storage yard required under the Light Rail Transit (LRT) Alternative. Described as 10-15 acres in size and requiring placement within ¼ mile of the route, this facility has the potential to introduce localized health impacts to sensitive and/or environmental justice communities.

Recommendations:

- The DEIS should discuss potential localized health impacts and their mitigation, including noise, air quality, hazardous materials management and pollution prevention, water use and conservation, stormwater management, and changes to traffic circulation.
- LACMTA and FTA should outreach to the community for input on the maintenance and storage yard siting, hours of operation, and the potential localized health impacts from support equipment.
- In analyzing maintenance and storage yard placement, the DEIS should consider the potential for disproportionate impacts to minority and environmental justice communities.

May 2, 2013

PHONE: (213) 620-0460
FAX: (213) 624-4840
DIRECT: (213) 621-0815
E-MAIL: kbrogan@hillfarrer.com
WEBSITE: www.hillfarrer.com

By email, fax (213-922-6358) and U.S. Mail

Walt Davis
Metro Project Manager
Los Angeles County Metropolitan
Transportation Authority
1 Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012.

Re: **East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor**

Dear Mr. Davis:

This firm and the undersigned represent Keyes Automotive which has five of the 13 automobile dealerships along Van Nuys Boulevard southerly of Oxnard Street.

Keyes Automotive supports adequately planned and fiscally responsible public transportation projects. Unfortunately, the current alternatives being considered by Metro staff are neither adequately planned nor fiscally responsible.

In particular, Keyes Automotive objects to Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) or Light Rail Transit (LRT) lines on Van Nuys Boulevard southerly of Oxnard Street. The reasons for the objections include:

1. The construction and use of Bus Rapid Transit or Light Rail Transit lines on Van Nuys Boulevard southerly of Oxnard Street would cause a substantial negative impact on the operations of the Keyes Automotive dealerships, as well as eight other dealerships, located southerly of Oxnard Street. These automotive dealerships employ approximately 2,000 people, provide substantial tax revenue to the City of Los Angeles, and the impact of construction and LRT or BRT operations in front of these facilities will significantly and adversely impact the dealerships, their employees, and tax receipts to the City, county and state.


2. Van Nuys Boulevard is not suited for the construction or use of such facilities, particularly at the 101 Freeway underpass, which is undersized and overly trafficked at the present time, and the loss of lanes for bus or light rail would only exacerbate the gridlock conditions at this key interchange. At Riverside Drive and the 101 Freeway, Van Nuys Boulevard has 73 feet available, and assuming fenced right of way and bike lanes and typical

buffer zones, that would leave only 16 feet for automobile traffic, less than one lane each way. Moreover, the clearance would be inadequate for emergency vehicles or existing buses. Without bike lanes and buffer zones, there would only be 43 feet available for traffic, or two lanes—at most—each way. The reduction from the existing four lanes each way would bring traffic to a standstill.

Keyes Automotive believes that the current alternatives being studied by Metro staff do not constitute a viable alternatives analysis as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). *Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California* (1988) 47 Cal. 3d 376, 404. [“Without meaningful analysis of alternatives in the EIR, neither the courts nor the public can fulfill their proper roles in the CEQA process.”]; *Save San Francisco Bay Assn. v. San Francisco Bay Conservation etc. Com.* (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 908, 919-920 [“[A]n EIR for any project subject to CEQA review must consider a reasonable range of alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, [920] which: (1) offer substantial environmental advantages over the project proposal; and (2) may be 'feasibly accomplished in a successful manner' considering the economic, environmental, social and technological factors involved.”].

Keyes Automotive has, on numerous occasions, expressed its belief that an alternative that anticipates use of Van Nuys Blvd. southerly of Oxnard Street is ill-conceived. As noted in Keyes Automotive's letter of October 16, 2012, a north-south route along Sepulveda Boulevard would be the natural connector between the San Fernando Valley and the Westside through Sepulveda Pass. We urge Metro to reconsider its proposed alternatives before additional public funds are wasted on an ill-conceived project.

Very truly yours,



KEVIN H. BROGAN

OF

HILL, FARRER & BURRILL LLP

CC: MTA Board Members
Los Angeles City Council
Congressman Brad Sherman
Congressman Tony Cardenas
State Senator Alex Padilla
Assembly Member Adrin Nazarian
Council Member-Elect Bob Blumenfield
Council Member-Elect Felipe Fuentes



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

"Parks Make Life Better!"

Russ Guiney, Director

John Wicker, Chief Deputy Director

May 6, 2013

Sent via email: eastsfvtransit@metro.net

Mr. Walt Davis, Project Manager
Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Davis:

**NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) AND NOTICE OF INTENT (NOI)
OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
FOR THE EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the document cited above. We have determined that the proposed project, which consists of transportation improvements for both Van Nuys and Sepulveda Boulevards for the enhancement of north-south transit opportunities in the east San Fernando Valley, will not affect any Departmental facilities.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (213) 351-5129 or by email at: jchien@parks.lacounty.gov.

Sincerely,

Jui Ing Chien, Park Planner
Environmental and Regulatory Permitting

JIC/ Metro East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

c: Parks and Recreation (N. E. Garcia, K. King, J. Rupert, L. Bradley, O. Ruano)

March 28, 2013

Walt Davis, Project Manager
One Gateway Plaza, M/S 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012


Dear Mr. Davis,

I was to deliver the enclosed material from the Studio City Neighborhood Council to yesterday's (3/27/13) Scoping Meeting in Van Nuys. Unfortunately, I was unable to get off work in time for the 4PM to 6PM meeting due to a Northridge kidnapping. So I'm mailing this instead. (But I have attended your other meetings over the last 2-3 years and our Neighborhood Council has been tracking this.) Thanks for accepting this by mail.

I would like to pose one question/comment:

This project actually lies in the **"Central Valley"** (Van Nuys for example) and some might also say the **"North Valley"** (San Fernando/Sylmar for example). Yet you are calling this the **"East San Fernando Valley"**. I beg to differ with you. The project proposal is *not* in the East San Fernando Valley and those of us who actually live in the East San Fernando Valley continually comment on the misleading location title of this project. We sure wish you would take the word "East" out of the title and let us know when there is a proposed project truly for the East San Fernando Valley.

Sincerely,



Barry Johnson
Studio City Neighborhood Council
1. Transportation Committee Member
2. Government Affairs Committee Vice-Chair

SCNC BOARD

Lisa Cahan Davis
Jane Drucker
Remy Kessler
John Lawler
Richard Niederberg
Scott Ouellette
Shoshana Raphael
Lisa Sarkin
Lana Shackelford
Gail Steinberg
Ron Taylor
Pasha Vafae
Rita C. Villa
John T. Walker
Denise Welvang



4024 Radford Ave.
Edit. Bldg. 2, Suite 6
Studio City, CA 91604
(818) 655-5400

PRESIDENT
John T. Walker

VICE PRESIDENT
Lisa Sarkin

TREASURER
Remy Kessler

SECRETARY
Rita C. Villa

**CORRESPONDING
SECRETARY**
Jane Drucker

www.studiocitync.org

October 25, 2011

Walt Davis
Project Manager Metro
One Gateway Plaza – MS 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

SENT VIA EMAIL

Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority
c/o Board of Directors
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Dear Mr. Davis:

At its regular meeting October 19, 2011, the board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council passed the following motion:

MOTION: 10.19.2011.13. The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council requests that the President of the SCNC write a letter in support of a combined study approach to relieve traffic on the I-405 Freeway by merging the Sepulveda Pass/Van Nuys Transit Project with the Van Nuys Corridor Rapid-way Project and that the letter include a request that the study consider a continuous subway alternative (similar to the Red Line) to relieve traffic congestion on the I405 Freeway.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

John T. Walker, President
Studio City Neighborhood Council

JTW/ls

SCNC BOARD

Jeffrey Carter
Ben Di Benedetto
Victor Helo
Wayne Kartin
Remy Kessler
Ben Neumann
Richard Niederberg
Todd Royal
Lisa Sarkin
Lana Shackelford
Gail Steinberg
Ron Taylor
Pasha Vafae
Rita C. Villa
John T. Walker
Denise Welvang



4024 Radford Ave.
Edit. Bldg. 2, Suite 6
Studio City, CA 91604
(818) 655-5400

PRESIDENT
John T. Walker

VICE PRESIDENT
Lisa Sarkin

TREASURER
Remy Kessler

SECRETARY
Rita C. Villa

**CORRESPONDING
SECRETARY**
Lana Shackelford

www.studiocitync.org

October 25, 2011

Walt Davis
Project Manager Metro
One Gateway Plaza – MS 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Via email

Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority
c/o Board of Directors
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, California 90012-2952

Re: Request for Community Input on the Van Nuys Corridor Rapidway

Dear Transit Authority:

The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council supports a combined study approach to relieve traffic on the I405 Freeway by merging the Sepulveda Pass/Van Nuys Transit Project with the Van Nuys Corridor Rapidway Project.

Additionally, the Board supports the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority to consider a continuous subway alternative (similar to the Red Line) to relieve traffic congestion on the I405 freeway.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "John Walker".

John Walker
President

JW/lis

Cc: Councilmember Krekorian, Councilmember Koretz, Councilmember LaBonge, City Council Transportation Committee Members, metro board secretary and Faramarz Nabavi

Help us plan more transit for the San Fernando Valley.

Ayúdenos a planear más tránsito para el Valle de San Fernando.

Scoping Meetings March 16, 19, 21 & 27

Reuniones comunitarias 16, 19, 21 y 27 de marzo



Metro



Community Meetings

Please visit information stations during the first half-hour to learn about the project and study process. Information shared at each meeting will be identical.

Saturday, March 16, 2013, 10am-12pm

Panorama High School
8015 Van Nuys Bl
Panorama City, CA 91402
Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 & Local Line 233 & DASH Route - Panorama City/Van Nuys

Tuesday, March 19, 2013, 6-8pm

The City of San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
208 Park Av
San Fernando, CA 91340
Served by Metro Rapid Line 794 & Local Lines 224 & 234

Thursday, March 21, 2013, 6-8pm

Arieta High School
14200 Van Nuys Bl
Arieta, CA 91331
Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 & Local Lines 158 & 233

Wednesday, March 27, 2013, 4-6pm

Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center
6262 Van Nuys Bl
Van Nuys, CA 91401
Served by Metro Orange Line, Rapid Line 761, & Local Lines 154, 156, 164, 233 & 237, & DASH Routes Panorama City/Van Nuys & Van Nuys/Studio City
Validated Parking Available at City Hall Parking Lot (Sylvan/Sylvan Av Entrance)

Can't make it in-person? Then, view and comment via a live-stream of the presentation beginning at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2013, on-demand at <http://stream.vchicoms/bs23FV>.

Special accommodations and information in alternative formats are available to the public. All requests for reasonable accommodations must be made three working days (72 hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. Please call the Project Hotline at 818.276.3233 or the California Relay Service at 711.

Overview

The Study is evaluating the following alternatives:

- > **No Build:** Establishes a baseline for comparison with the other alternatives being evaluated. It represents conditions predicted for the year 2035 if no new project is constructed. It does incorporate other new projects that are already included in adopted plans.
- > **Transportation System Management (TSM):** Evaluates the benefits of lower cost operational improvements including enhanced bus frequencies for Van Nuys Rapid Bus 761 on other bus lines, traffic signal synchronization, off-board fare collection, bus stop amenities/improvements, bus schedule restructuring, intersection and road improvements, etc.
- > **Bus Rapid Transit (BRT):** Similar to the Metro Orange Line, BRT would generally operate in dedicated lanes with some portions operating in mixed-flow traffic. BRT typically provides higher frequency, speed and reliability when compared to standard Rapid or Local Bus service. The BRT route being evaluated for this project would travel from the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station southeast along San Fernando Rd and then south on Van Nuys Bl with three possible options for the project's southern terminus.
 - > **Light Rail Transit (LRT):** Similar to the Metro Gold, Blue, Green, and Expo Lines, LRT operates with standard gauge passenger railcars on exclusive right-of-way with overhead electric power. A two-car train set can carry approximately 300 passengers. Stations are typically spaced about one mile apart. Under this alternative, Metro would also need to build a new LRT maintenance facility. The LRT Alternative route would travel from the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station southeast along San Fernando Rd and then south on Van Nuys Bl to Ventura Bl.

> SUBWAY - WESTWOOD TO SYLMAR!

In collaboration with the Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando, Metro is identifying north-south transit opportunities to improve local and regional connections, enhance access to jobs, education, cultural, recreational and other opportunities – without a car – in the East San Fernando Valley corridor.

Public input is also an important part of this process. The review process begins in the formal environmental review. Please attend upcoming Scoping Meetings to learn about alternatives to be studied and share your thoughts on the project.

At these meetings you will be able to:

- > Learn about the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study.
- > Learn about the environmental review process and project schedule.
- > Find out about the alternatives planned for analysis, and
- > Provide formal comments regarding the scope of the analysis that should be considered in the environmental review.

A Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (EIS/EIR) will be prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Metro and the City of Los Angeles are serving as co-leads in preparing these reports in conjunction with the City of San Fernando and the Federal Transit Administration.

Contact Us

818-276-3233

eassf@transit.metro.net

metro.net/eassftransit

@eassftransit

eassftransit





March 27, 2013

Walter Davis, Project Manager
Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza, M/S 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

SUBJECT: East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

Dear Mr. Davis,

The Valley Industry and Commerce Association (VICA) looks forward to the development of the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor between the City of San Fernando and Sherman Oaks community.

We request that the Environment Impact Report address three major aspects:

1. *Route:* What is the expected ridership of the system, and which route provides the best access for these customers? What is the ridership of existing bus lines along each route? Is there a need to ease crowding? What regional landmarks, government offices or economic centers of activity are along each route? Which route provides the best connectivity to current systems (i.e. Metro Red and Orange Lines) as well as proposed future transit projects (i.e. the Sepulveda Pass corridor)? What are the environmental benefits of higher ridership, reduced crowding and reduced distances for customers to connect to these major centers of activity?
2. *Type of Vehicle:* What is the ridership capacity of each option, and what are the associated environmental benefits? What is the speed comparison between BRT (including traffic), LRT and HRT along the corridor? At what frequency can each option run?
3. *Cost:* What is the construction cost of each alternative, and which alternative provides the best cost recovery? Which alternative will be most attractive to riders? Is there potential for a public-private partnership? Which alternative will be most attractive to private investment?

We also request that the study compare if each alternative will prevent the issues associated with the San Fernando Valley's only other major transit system, the Metro Orange Line. VICA would like to prevent the East SFV Transit Corridor from the overcrowding, high traffic levels and slow speed that trouble Orange Line riders and discourage ridership.

We look forward to answers to these questions of importance to Valley residents and businesses.

Sincerely,

David Adelman
Chair

Stuart Waldman
President

Petition to Protect Van Nuys Blvd. Businesses

Summary and Background:

Metro is conducting a transit study to evaluate ways to improve transit opportunities in the east San Fernando Valley that offer connections to the regional transportation network. An Alternatives Analysis (AA) Report recommended that four alternatives be further studied through the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR). These include two required alternatives – No Build and Transportation System Management (TSM) – and two build alternatives – Light Rail Transit (LRT) and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). The two build alternatives focus primarily on utilizing Van Nuys Boulevard, and would create a mostly exclusive right-of-way by removing at least one traffic lane in each direction in addition to potentially removing on-street parking to build a bicycle lane.

Petition:

The undersigned urge Metro and its staff to remove all East SFV Transit Corridor Project Alternatives that would include at-grade BRT or LRT on Van Nuys Blvd. south of the Metro Orange Line from further consideration due to the negative impacts construction and operation would have on traffic and businesses along Van Nuys Boulevard. We support Councilmember LaBonge's recommendations to further study alternatives that run on Sepulveda Blvd. south of the Metro Orange Line.

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Business	Date
JESUS GRANERO		5960 VAN NUYS BLVD.		5-3-13
EDWARD WILLIAMS		5636 VAN NUYS BLVD	SPORTSCRAFT	5/3/13
MOSHE NINDO		5632 V.N. BL.	BdE Postal Center	5-3-13
Dr. Alex GOMES		5622 VAN NUYS BLVD	optometry eyecare office/clinic	5/3/13
Bahman Sadeghi		5300 Van Nuys Blvd Van Nuys CA 91401	Car Wash	5/3/13
Christy Rojas		4954 Van Nuys CA 91356	Schwag Sandwiches	5.4.13
Karla Barron		4954 Van Nuys CA 91356	Yogurt Land	5.4.13
Greg Barron		4954 Van Nuys, CA 91356	Papa Johns	5/4/13
Luis GRANAZA		4632 VAN NUYS CA	HAIR ART	5/4/13










Petition to Protect Van Nuys Blvd. Businesses

Summary and Background:

Metro is conducting a transit study to evaluate ways to improve transit opportunities in the east San Fernando Valley that offer connections to the regional transportation network. An Alternatives Analysis (AA) Report recommended that four alternatives be further studied through the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR). These include two required alternatives – No Build and Transportation System Management (TSM) – and two build alternatives – Light Rail Transit (LRT) and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). The two build alternatives focus primarily on utilizing Van Nuys Boulevard, and would create a mostly exclusive right-of-way by removing at least one traffic lane in each direction in addition to potentially removing on-street parking to build a bicycle lane.

Petition:

The undersigned urge Metro and its staff to remove all East SFV Transit Corridor Project Alternatives that would include at-grade BRT or LRT on Van Nuys Blvd. south of the Metro Orange Line from further consideration due to the negative impacts construction and operation would have on traffic and businesses along Van Nuys Boulevard. We support Councilmember LaBonge's recommendations to further study alternatives that run on Sepulveda Blvd. south of the Metro Orange Line.

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Business	Date
Gary Abramsa		5951 Van Nuys Bl.	Hertz Corp	5-3-13
Lupe RENEZ		5727 Van Nuys Blvd	Link Group	5/3/13
Elaine Ieti		5727 "	Employee Subaru	5/3/13
Arthur Albanas		5727 VAN Nuys Blvd	Employee Subaru	5/3/13
Greg Anderson		5727 Van Nuys Blvd.	Subaru Sherman Oaks	5/3/13
NIKO SPASIC		5711 VAN NUYS BLVD	FIAT OF VAN NUYS	5/3/13
Ray Egals		5711 Van Nuys Blvd	Fiat of Van Nuys	5/3/13
Nina Betmleck		5001 VAN NUYS BLVD	CVS Pharmacy	5/3/13
Vidette Schmei		5355 Van Nuys Blvd	Miller Honda	5/3/13

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Organization	Date
ARMON		5160 VAN NUYS BLVD	SMOKE SHOP	05/3/2013
Eduardo Castro		5242 VAN NUYS	Smoked city market	05-3-2013
Robert Casella		5202 VAN NUYS	Air FRENCH TIRE DEPOT	5-3-13
Kamgar Bakhre		5015 Van Nuys Blvd.	Sherman Oaks Tire	5-7-13
Eric Lamano		4969 Van Nuys Blvd	AI & Eds Autosbund	5/4/13
Zavi-elle Walton		4955 Van Nuys Blvd	Sherman Oaks Dentistry	5/4/13
Halley Isman		4955 Van Nuys Blvd	Marin Kolin L.A.C. employee	5/4/13
Anna Sigala		4955 VAN NUYS BLVD	Dr. Ali Namazie	5.4.13
Allan Phillips MD		" " "	Dr. Allan Phillips	5/4/13
Jessica Martinez		4955 Van Nuys Blvd	Dr. Praveen Gupta	5/4/13
Scott Lifschitz		4849 VAN NUYS BLVD	60C Acupuncture	5/4/13
Fritz B...		4835 Van Nuys	Coke Stand	5-4-13
Russ B...		4631 VAN NUYS	PC Hair Salon	5/4/13
Anik Dufour		4621 Van Nuys employee	Karabel Dancewear	5/4/13
MARGARET MAAT		4531 VAN NUYS	TATTOOS DELUXE	5/4/13
HAZAR CHAPRA		4529 Van Nuys	Gift of World	5/4/13



TOM LaBONGE
Councilmember
Fourth District

May 6, 2013

Mr. Walt Davis, Project Manager
East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor
Metro
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Davis,

Please consider these the formal comments on the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor study on behalf of the people of Council District Four in the City Of Los Angeles.

The goal of these comments is to communicate the community's enthusiastic support of the Sepulveda-Van Nuys Hybrid alignment for the project. Our preference for using this hybrid route cannot be overstated. I also ask that you study using light rail as the mode on this alignment, as well as taking the line underground in the vicinity of Ventura Blvd. and building an underground station at that intersection in anticipation of the crucial Sepulveda Pass Corridor Project which should naturally connect to this corridor at this intersection.

It is important to note that business, community, and political leadership all emphatically support using light rail as the mode of transit for this project as well as using the hybrid alignment. All of these parties are prepared to advocate at all levels of government to secure the necessary additional funding.

Focus the Study on the Van Nuys-Sepulveda Blvd. Alignment for Both Modes of Transit

We request that the study focus on the Van Nuys-Sepulveda alignment, with the termination point at Ventura Blvd. The commercial activity, street engineering, proximity to major freeways, and potential for future development based on this transit corridor all strongly support this alignment. The intersection of Sepulveda and Ventura Boulevards represents the commercial center of this portion of the Valley and this project would reinforce and strengthen that center. Sepulveda Blvd. is ripe for the investment that this line will bring. Choosing this alignment would also set this corridor up to be seamlessly connected to the Sepulveda Pass project, which is so urgently needed. The intersection of Ventura and Van Nuys is much more congested and the street widths are much narrower than Sepulveda, and that portion of Ventura Blvd. has little potential for growth. It is not the appropriate terminus for this line.

Study an Underground Station Light Rail Station at Ventura and Sepulveda Blvds.

We believe that this project should be light rail. We also ask that Metro study the costs and effects of taking the line underground at some point on Sepulveda and building an underground station at Ventura and Sepulveda Boulevards. The key north-south connectivity this project will provide in the Valley, and the potential to connect this project with a rail tunnel under the Sepulveda Pass all demand a rail-based solution as well with an underground station at Ventura and Sepulveda Blvds.

We have heard from various sources that it would be challenging for light rail trains to navigate the turns from Van Nuys and Sepulveda Blvds. on to the Orange Line. If this is the case, we ask that the study analyze the difference between these potential turns and the Blue Line turn at Flower and Washington Blvds.

While we support the creation of bus rapid transit corridors around the City, this corridor's unique positioning as the seventh busiest corridor in Metro's system, and a key linkage to the Sepulveda Pass project, make it especially appropriate that it be built as a rail project.

Additionally, a bus rapid transit solution will not be compatible with a rail-based solution under the pass. A one-seat ride from the Los Angeles basin to the northern end of the San Fernando Valley is crucial to the economic success of the San Fernando Valley, and will truly revolutionize mass transit along one of the busiest north-south corridors in the world. This must be studied at this stage in the process.

Study a Light Rail Ready Bus Rapid Transit Corridor

The study should also include an analysis of steps needed to be light-rail ready, if built initially as bus rapid transit. We believe that building the corridor as a rail corridor is the best policy decision for now and the future. If this is not possible at the outset, the corridor should be built entirely rail-ready, so that subsequent modifications can be done as efficiently as possible.

Study an Interstate 405-Sepulveda-Van Nuys Blvd. Hybrid Alignment

We are disappointed that no incorporation of the 405 freeway appears to have been studied as part of this corridor in the alternatives analysis phase, as community leaders have called for it. As one of the most congested freeways in the country, we believe that using the air rights above the 405 freeway should be studied. This version of the Sepulveda-Van Nuys alignment could use the 405 right of way—either adjacent to or above the freeway—up to the Orange Line right of way, and then connect to Van Nuys Boulevard using that alignment.


Study Terminating the Line at Metro's Orange Line

We request that the study analyze the effects of terminating this corridor at the Orange Line. While this would not create a dedicated corridor from Ventura Blvd. to the north end of the Valley in the near term, it would allow maximum flexibility for the planning and design of the Sepulveda Corridor project in the future. It is crucial that this corridor and the Sepulveda Corridor projects connect seamlessly in the future, and this study should analyze whether it makes sense to terminate north of Ventura Blvd now to ensure that connection in the future.

In Summary, I request that Metro Study:

- The Van Nuys-Sepulveda Alignment, with dedicated right of ways on both of these streets, terminating at Ventura Blvd.
- Building this project as a light rail project, or light rail ready, on the Van Nuys-Sepulveda alignment.
- Taking the line underground just north of Ventura Boulevard and creating an underground station at Ventura and Sepulveda which would then connect to the Sepulveda Pass rail corridor, and on to UCLA and, one day, Los Angeles International Airport.
- Incorporating the 405 Freeway into the alignment as a replacement for some portion of Sepulveda Blvd portion.
- The effects of terminating the proposed line at Metro's Orange Line, both on this project as well as future planning efforts for the Sepulveda corridor.

Sincerely,



TOM LABONGE
Councilmember, 4th District

cc:

Congressman Brad Sherman
Senator Alex Padilla
Assemblymember Adrin Nazarian
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa
Metro CEO Arthur Leahy

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 7, OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
IGR/CEQA BRANCH
100 MAIN STREET, MS # 16
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-3606
PHONE: (213) 897-9140
FAX: (213) 897-1337



*Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!*

May 6, 2013

Mr. Walt Davis,
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop, 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA, 90012

Re: East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor
Notice of Preparation (NOP) of Draft EIR
SCH # 2013021064, IGR#130141/EA
Vic. LA/101/PM 15.79, LA/ 5/PM45.09

Dear Mr. Davis:

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has received the notice of preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor project. The project may involve a Transportation System Management (TSM) alternative, a Light Rail Transit (LRT) alternative, or a Bus Rapid Transit Alternative. The proposed alignment would extend along Van Nuys Boulevard from Ventura Boulevard to San Fernando Road, then north along San Fernando Road to the Metrolink Station at Sylmar/San Fernando.

Caltrans supports Metro's effort to improve mobility in the eastern San Fernando Valley and provide a reliable alternate mode of transportation. The Environmental Impact Report should provide an analysis of projected benefits of the various alternatives over existing conditions. The alternative with the most benefits in time savings, reliability, and safety would be more attractive and may be more likely to cause the desired mode shift.

As the agency with jurisdiction over operations and maintenance of freeway facilities serving the East San Fernando Valley, Caltrans requests Metro's cooperation in the analysis and mitigation of potential impacts to those facilities. Proposed alignments for the LRT and BRT alternatives would cross US-101, I-5, and SR-118. Caltrans requests early coordination for any modifications on or affecting state right-of-way which will require an encroachment permit.

In an effort to fully evaluate the project's overall impact on the State transportation system a traffic analysis is required. The traffic study should include, but not be limited to:

1. An evaluation of impacts related to transit stations and parking facilities on nearby freeway interchanges US-101/Van Nuys Boulevard, I-5/Van Nuys Boulevard, and SR-118/San Fernando Road.
2. Caltrans requests that nearby freeway off-ramps be analyzed to determine whether existing storage capacity would be adequate to accommodate projected vehicle queues.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

Mr. Walt Davis

May 6, 2013

Page 2 of 2

3. At stations and parking lots near freeway ramp intersections where pedestrian activity is anticipated, Caltrans requests that the freeway ramp intersection be analyzed for pedestrian adequacy, safety, and compliance with the American with Disabilities Act (ADA).
4. Include presentations of assumptions and methods used to develop trip generation, trip distribution, trip assignments, and choice of travel mode. Travel modeling should be consistent with other regional and local modeling forecasts and travel data.
5. Include all traffic volumes including, the existing traffic, traffic generated from the proposed project, cumulative traffic from all future projects that have been approved, cumulative traffic from projects in the area that have not been but are likely to be approved, and traffic from future growth.
6. Analysis of AM, and PM peak-hour volumes for both existing and future conditions in the affected area. Level of Service should be specified (HCM2000 methodology is requested). Future conditions would include build-out of all projects and any plan-horizon years.
7. A discussion of mitigation measures appropriate to alleviate anticipated traffic impacts, including a plan of mitigation measures under the control of the lead agency, project sponsors, or specification percent shares of the costs for various mitigation actions undertaken by other agencies. This discussion should include a description of transportation infrastructure improvements, financial costs, funding sources, sequence and scheduling considerations, implementation responsibilities, and a mitigation monitoring plan.

For additional information on the preparation of the traffic study, please refer the traffic consultant to Caltrans' Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impacts Studies website:

www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/igr_ceqa_files/tisguide.pdf

The lead agency is required to comply with Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP) standards and thresholds of significant. However, Caltrans does not consider the Los Angeles County's CMP criteria alone to be adequate for the analysis of transportation impacts pursuant to a CEQA review. The CMP does not adequately address cumulative transportation impacts and does not analyze for safety, queuing problems, or delay. Caltrans' Guide directs preparers of traffic impact analysis to consult with the local District as early as possible to determine the appropriate requirements and criteria of significance to be used in the traffic impact analysis.

If you have any questions regarding these comments or wish to schedule a meeting, you may contact Elmer Alvarez, project coordinator at (213) 897 – 6696. Please refer to Caltrans IGR #121137/EA.

Sincerely,



DIANNA WATSON
IGR/CEQA Program Manager

cc: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse



South Coast Air Quality Management District

21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4178

(909) 396-2000 • www.aqmd.gov

March 28, 2013

Walt Davis, Project Manager
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Notice of Preparation of a CEQA Document for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. The SCAQMD's comments are recommendations regarding the analysis of potential air quality impacts from the proposed project that should be included in the draft CEQA document. Please send the SCAQMD a copy of the Draft EIR upon its completion. Note that copies of the Draft EIR that are submitted to the State Clearinghouse are not forwarded to the SCAQMD. Please forward a copy of the Draft EIR directly to SCAQMD at the address in our letterhead. **In addition, please send with the draft EIR all appendices or technical documents related to the air quality and greenhouse gas analyses and electronic versions of all air quality modeling and health risk assessment files. These include original emission calculation spreadsheets and modeling files (not Adobe PDF files). Without all files and supporting air quality documentation, the SCAQMD will be unable to complete its review of the air quality analysis in a timely manner. Any delays in providing all supporting air quality documentation will require additional time for review beyond the end of the comment period.**

Air Quality Analysis

The SCAQMD adopted its California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Handbook in 1993 to assist other public agencies with the preparation of air quality analyses. The SCAQMD recommends that the Lead Agency use this Handbook as guidance when preparing its air quality analysis. Copies of the Handbook are available from the SCAQMD's Subscription Services Department by calling (909) 396-3720. The lead agency may wish to consider using land use emissions estimating software such as the recently released CalEEMod. This model is available on the SCAQMD Website at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/models.html>.

The Lead Agency should identify any potential adverse air quality impacts that could occur from all phases of the project and all air pollutant sources related to the project. Air quality impacts from both construction (including demolition, if any) and operations should be calculated. Construction-related air quality impacts typically include, but are not limited to, emissions from the use of heavy-duty equipment from grading, earth-loading/unloading, paving, architectural coatings, off-road mobile sources (e.g., heavy-duty construction equipment) and on-road mobile sources (e.g., construction worker vehicle trips, material transport trips). Operation-related air quality impacts may include, but are not limited to, emissions from stationary sources (e.g., boilers), area sources (e.g., solvents and coatings), and vehicular trips (e.g., on- and off-road tailpipe emissions and entrained dust). Air quality impacts from indirect sources, that is, sources that generate or attract vehicular trips should be included in the analysis.

The SCAQMD has developed a methodology for calculating PM_{2.5} emissions from construction and operational activities and processes. In connection with developing PM_{2.5} calculation methodologies, the SCAQMD has also developed both regional and localized significance thresholds. The SCAQMD requests that the lead agency quantify PM_{2.5} emissions and compare the results to the recommended PM_{2.5} significance thresholds. Guidance for calculating PM_{2.5} emissions and PM_{2.5} significance thresholds can be found at the following internet address: http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/PM2_5/PM2_5.html.

In addition to analyzing regional air quality impacts the SCAQMD recommends calculating localized air quality impacts and comparing the results to localized significance thresholds (LSTs). LST's can be used in addition to the

recommended regional significance thresholds as a second indication of air quality impacts when preparing a CEQA document. Therefore, when preparing the air quality analysis for the proposed project, it is recommended that the lead agency perform a localized significance analysis by either using the LSTs developed by the SCAQMD or performing dispersion modeling as necessary. Guidance for performing a localized air quality analysis can be found at <http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/LST/LST.html>.

In the event that the proposed project generates or attracts vehicular trips, especially heavy-duty diesel-fueled vehicles, it is recommended that the lead agency perform a mobile source health risk assessment. Guidance for performing a mobile source health risk assessment ("Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risk from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis") can be found on the SCAQMD's CEQA web pages at the following internet address: http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/mobile_toxic/mobile_toxic.html. An analysis of all toxic air contaminant impacts due to the decommissioning or use of equipment potentially generating such air pollutants should also be included.

Mitigation Measures

In the event that the project generates significant adverse air quality impacts, CEQA requires that all feasible mitigation measures that go beyond what is required by law be utilized during project construction and operation to minimize or eliminate significant adverse air quality impacts. To assist the Lead Agency with identifying possible mitigation measures for the project, please refer to Chapter 11 of the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook for sample air quality mitigation measures. Additional mitigation measures can be found on the SCAQMD's CEQA web pages at the following internet address: www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/mitigation/MM_intro.html. Additionally, SCAQMD's Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust, and the Implementation Handbook contain numerous measures for controlling construction-related emissions that should be considered for use as CEQA mitigation if not otherwise required. Other measures to reduce air quality impacts from land use projects can be found in the SCAQMD's Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning. This document can be found at the following internet address: <http://www.aqmd.gov/prdas/aqguide/aqguide.html>. In addition, guidance on siting incompatible land uses can be found in the California Air Resources Board's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Perspective, which can be found at the following internet address: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf>. CARB's Land Use Handbook is a general reference guide for evaluating and reducing air pollution impacts associated with new projects that go through the land use decision-making process. Pursuant to state CEQA Guidelines §15126.4 (a)(1)(D), any impacts resulting from mitigation measures must also be discussed.

Data Sources

SCAQMD rules and relevant air quality reports and data are available by calling the SCAQMD's Public Information Center at (909) 396-2039. Much of the information available through the Public Information Center is also available via the SCAQMD's World Wide Web Homepage (<http://www.aqmd.gov>).

The SCAQMD staff is available to work with the Lead Agency to ensure that project-related emissions are accurately identified, categorized, and evaluated. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please call Ian MacMillan, Program Supervisor, CEQA Section, at (909) 396-3244.

Sincerely,



Ian MacMillan
Program Supervisor, CEQA Inter-Governmental Review
Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources

IM
LAC130307-05
Control Number

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA



**ASSOCIATION of
GOVERNMENTS**

Main Office

818 West Seventh Street

12th Floor

Los Angeles, California

90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800

f (213) 236-1825

www.scag.ca.gov

Officers

President

Glen Becerra, Simi Valley

First Vice President

Greg Pettis, Cathedral City

Second Vice President

Carl Morehouse, San Buenaventura

Immediate Past President

Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica

**Executive/Administration
Committee Chair**

Glen Becerra, Simi Valley

Policy Committee Chairs

Community, Economic and

Human Development

Paula Lantz, Pomona

Energy & Environment

Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro

Transportation

Keith Millhouse, Ventura County

Transportation Commission

May 6, 2013

Mr. Walt Davis

Project Manager

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

One Gateway Plaza

Los Angeles, CA 90012

eastsfvtransit@metro.net

RE: SCAG Comments on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project [I20130062]

Dear Mr. Davis:

Thank you for submitting the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for review and comment. SCAG is the authorized regional agency for Inter-Governmental Review (IGR) of programs proposed for federal financial assistance and direct development activities, pursuant to Presidential Executive Order 12372. Additionally, SCAG reviews the Environmental Impact Reports of projects of regional significance for consistency with regional plans pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines.

SCAG is also the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency under state law, and is responsible for preparation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) including its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) component pursuant to SB 375. As the clearinghouse for regionally significant projects per Executive Order 12372, SCAG reviews the consistency of local plans, projects, and programs with regional plans.¹ Guidance provided by these reviews is intended to assist local agencies and project sponsors to take actions that contribute to the attainment of the regional goals and policies in the RTP/SCS.

SCAG staff has reviewed the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project. The proposed project includes several transit alternatives to reduce existing and project levels of traffic congestion in the corridor that limits mobility and reduces the reliability of transit services in San Fernando Valley in the County of Los Angeles. As set forth in the attached, SCAG recommends that the draft EIR include a review and consideration of the adopted RTP/SCS goals and that the analyses reflect the most recently adopted growth forecasts.

When available, please send environmental documentation to SCAG's office in Los Angeles or by email to leep@scag.ca.gov providing, at a minimum, the full comment period for review. If you have any questions regarding the attached comments, please contact Pamela Lee at (213) 236-1895 or leep@scag.ca.gov. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Nadler

Manager, Compliance and Performance Assessment

¹ SB 375 amends CEQA to add Chapter 4.2 Implementation of the Sustainable Communities Strategy, which allows for certain CEQA streamlining for projects consistent with the RTP/SCS. Lead agencies (including local jurisdictions) maintain the discretion and will be solely responsible for determining "consistency" of any future project with the SCS. Any "consistency" finding by SCAG pursuant to the IGR process should not be construed as a finding of consistency under SB 375 for purposes of CEQA streamlining.

**COMMENTS ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE EAST
SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT
[SCAG NO. I20130062]**

CONSISTENCY WITH RTP/SCS

SCAG reviews environmental documents for regionally significant projects for their consistency with the adopted RTP/SCS.

RTP/SCS Goals

The 2012-20135 RTP/SCS links the goal of sustaining mobility with the goals of fostering economic development, enhancing the environment, reducing energy consumption, promoting transportation-friendly development patterns, and encouraging fair and equitable access to residents affected by socio-economic, geographic and commercial limitations (see <http://rtpscs.scag.ca.gov>). The goals included in the 2012 RTP/SCS may be pertinent to the proposed project. These goals are meant to provide guidance for considering the proposed project within the context of regional goals and policies. Among the relevant goals of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS are the following:

SCAG 2012-2035 RTP/SCS GOALS	
RTP/SCS G1:	<i>Align the plan investments and policies with improving regional economic development and competitiveness</i>
RTP/SCS G2:	<i>Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region</i>
RTP/SCS G3:	<i>Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region</i>
RTP/SCS G4:	<i>Preserve and ensure a sustainable regional transportation system</i>
RTP/SCS G5:	<i>Maximize the productivity of our transportation system</i>
RTP/SCS G6:	<i>Protect the environment and health for our residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation (non-motorized transportation, such as bicycling and walking)</i>
RTP/SCS G7:	<i>Actively encourage and create incentives for energy efficiency, where possible</i>
RTP/SCS G8:	<i>Encourage land use and growth patterns that facilitate transit and non-motorized transportation</i>
RTP/SCS G9:	<i>Maximize the security of the regional transportation system through improved system monitoring, rapid recovery planning, and coordination with other security agencies</i>

For ease of review, we encourage the use of a side-by-side comparison of SCAG goals with discussions of the consistency, non-consistency or non-applicability of the policy and supportive analysis in a table format. Suggested format is as follows:

SCAG 2012-2035 RTP/SCS Goals	
Goal	Analysis
RTP/SCS G1: <i>Align the plan investments and policies with improving regional economic development and competitiveness.</i>	<i>Consistent: Statement as to why Not-Consistent: Statement as to why or Not Applicable: Statement as to why DEIR page number reference</i>
RTP/SCS G2: <i>Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region.</i>	<i>Consistent: Statement as to why Not-Consistent: Statement as to why or Not Applicable: Statement as to why DEIR page number reference</i>
RTP/SCS G3: <i>Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region.</i>	<i>Consistent: Statement as to why Not-Consistent: Statement as to why or Not Applicable: Statement as to why DEIR page number reference</i>
etc.	etc.

Regional Growth Forecasts

The Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project should reflect the most recently adopted SCAG forecasts (see <http://scag.ca.gov/forecast/index.htm>), which are the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS population, household and employment forecasts. The forecasts for the region and applicable jurisdictions are below.

Forecast	Adopted SCAG Region Wide Forecasts		Adopted County of Los Angeles Forecasts	
	Year 2020	Year 2035	Year 2020	Year 2035
Population	19,663,000	22,091,000	10,404,000	11,353,000
Households	6,458,000	7,325,000	3,513,000	3,852,000
Employment	8,414,000	9,441,000	4,558,000	4,827,000

MITIGATION

SCAG staff recommends that you review the SCAG 2012-2035 RTP/SCS Final Program EIR List of Mitigation Measures Appendix for additional guidance, as appropriate. The SCAG List of Mitigation Measures may be found here: http://scag.ca.gov/igr/pdf/SCAG_IGRMMRP_2012.pdf

May 6, 2013

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I have followed with great interest the planning process, alternatives analysis and scoping for a possible East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project.

I wanted to take this opportunity to voice my opposition to one of the possible proposals with which I am intimately familiar. I am referring to the portion of the project beginning south of Oxnard Street on Van Nuys Boulevard and continuing south to Ventura Boulevard. I believe using a dedicated bus way on Sepulveda Boulevard is unequivocally a far better alternative than any method of transit line including Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) using Van Nuys Boulevard south of Oxnard Street.

I also oppose any Light Rail Transit (LRT) alternative on Van Nuys Boulevard both because of the negative impact to the surrounding neighborhoods and because of the proposed \$1.8-\$2.3 billion cost of the project. Instead, I would urge the construction of a BRT on Sepulveda Boulevard. I would further encourage that the nearly \$2 billion in cost savings created by implementing a BRT, rather than a LRT be dedicated to extending a transit line south on Sepulveda Boulevard through the Sepulveda Pass Corridor. Furthermore, I would like to join Councilman Tom LaBonge in encouraging the use of Sepulveda Boulevard for the entirety of the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project and the inclusion of this option in the draft environmental statement/report (DEIS/DEIR).

It is for this reason that I am supporting Route Option 3 of the BRT, as detailed in The East San Fernando Valley Corridor Study dated March 21, 2013 if Sepulveda Boulevard cannot be used for the entirety of the project. It is my understanding that Route Option 3 of the BRT excludes any transit line, either BRT, LRT or mixed flow operation on Van Nuys Boulevard south of Oxnard Street. Additionally, as to the proposed mixed flow operation in the North San Fernando Valley, I have no strong preference.

From an integrated transit system standpoint, in consideration of community preference and in order to minimize residential and business dislocations, I believe any southerly alignment on Van Nuys Boulevard should stop at Oxnard Street, head west to Sepulveda Boulevard and continue south to Ventura Boulevard utilizing a dedicated bus lane. The vast amount of increased traffic congestion on Van Nuys Boulevard caused both by temporary construction and permanent location of a transit line, either BRT, LRT or mixed flow operation would cause detrimental effects to both the residents and businesses of my district in North-Central Sherman Oaks.

WASHINGTON, DC OFFICE

2242 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-5911
FAX: (202) 225-5879



SAN FERNANDO VALLEY OFFICE

5000 VAN NUYS BOULEVARD, SUITE 420
SHERMAN OAKS, CA 91403
(818) 501-9200
FAX: (818) 501-1554

Currently, even during off-peak hours, traffic begins to back up on Van Nuys Boulevard on both the north and south sides of U.S. 101 for several miles. The narrowing of Van Nuys Boulevard already causes significant traffic congestion and any further development of a transit line either BRT, LRT or mixed flow operation would amplify this effect. This stretch of Van Nuys Boulevard and the zip code overlying this area also has a higher volume of retail sales than any area in the City of Los Angeles. Van Nuys Boulevard south of Oxnard Street is also home to the largest concentration of new car dealerships in the City of Los Angeles. Twenty-seven percent of all dealerships in the City of Los Angeles are located on this stretch of Van Nuys Boulevard. The tax revenue generated from this stretch would be negatively impacted and cause a permanent decrease in revenue from this source for the City of Los Angeles.

I would ask that any consideration regarding this matter take into account the more feasible and community preferred alternative, Route Option 3 of the BRT alternative using a dedicated bus way on Sepulveda Boulevard south of Oxnard Street to Ventura Boulevard and the inclusion of Sepulveda Boulevard for the entirety of the project in the DEIS/DEIR.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter. I would very much appreciate the opportunity to discuss this project and potential impacts on my district further as the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project progresses.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Brad Sherman', written over a horizontal line.

BRAD SHERMAN
Member of Congress

cc:

Congressman Tony Cardenas
Councilman Tom LaBonge



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

"Parks Make Life Better!"

Russ Guiney, Director

John Wicker, Chief Deputy Director

May 6, 2013

Sent via email: eastsfvtransit@metro.net

Mr. Walt Davis, Project Manager
Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Davis:

**NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) AND NOTICE OF INTENT (NOI)
OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
FOR THE EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the document cited above. We have determined that the proposed project, which consists of transportation improvements for both Van Nuys and Sepulveda Boulevards for the enhancement of north-south transit opportunities in the east San Fernando Valley, will not affect any Departmental facilities.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (213) 351-5129 or by email at: jchien@parks.lacounty.gov.

Sincerely,

Jui Ing Chien, Park Planner
Environmental and Regulatory Permitting

JIC/ Metro East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

c: Parks and Recreation (N. E. Garcia, K. King, J. Rupert, L. Bradley, O. Ruano)



Luis Gonzalez
Hairart Associate

4630 Van Nuys Blvd., 2nd Floor
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403

PHONE: 818.905.7730
TOLL FREE: 800.444.HAIR (4247)
FAX: 818.905.7720
EMAIL: luis@hairartinc.com
WEB: www.hairartinc.com

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley / North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.

The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,

Hairart

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952



Dr. Alex Gomes

5622 VAN NUYS BLVD. VAN NUYS, CA 91401 - 818.988.8744

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.

The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,



Eye Deal Care



Corporate Awards
Appreciation Plaques
Sports Trophies

Custom Engraving
Glass Aluminum
Crystal Brass
Marble Plastics

5636 Van Nuys Blvd
Van Nuys, CA . 91401
1/2 MI North of Burbank Blvd.

TEL 818.994.3543
FAX 818.994.5912
sportscraft@sbcglobal.net

Specializing in

Eddie Williams

Quality & Service

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.

The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,

Sportscraft
5636 Van Nuys Blvd
Van Nuys, CA 91401

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.


The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,



AI ÷ EDS AutoSound

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.

The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,



RC Hair Salon

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.

The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,



Subaru Sherman Oaks

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.


The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,



Link Group

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.

The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,



Miller Hoda

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.

The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,



Smoke shop

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley / North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.

The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,



194E Postal Center
Moshe Nimio

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley /North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.

The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,



Manager

Papa Johns, Sherman Oaks

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.

The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,



Shift Leader of
Yogurtland

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.


The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,


Humphrey Yogart

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.


The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,


Picasso Cleaners

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.

The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,

Almudi
Hair Touch

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.


The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,



LENS CRAFTERS

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley / North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.

The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,



Tailors of Sherman Oaks

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.


The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,


Dr. Blue Teams

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.

The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,

Margaret Maat


TATTOOS DELUXE
4531 VAN NUYS BLVD.

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.

The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,



RC Hair Company

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley/North County Area
Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Re: North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis:

I am writing to you to officially record my opposition to any North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project Alternative that would create any dedicated right-of-way for Light Rail Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on Van Nuys Boulevard south of the Metro Orange Line.

The negative impacts from construction and operation of such a project would be severe for the businesses along the Van Nuys Blvd. corridor. As your own study suggests, traffic along Van Nuys Blvd. is congested enough as it is and this project would take away at least one lane of traffic in each direction and could convert on-street parking into a bicycle lane. Those traffic lanes carry customers and having on-street parking is vital to our businesses in the area. This loss of parking lanes, in addition to the center median, will also negatively impact my businesses operations with regards to the logistics behind receiving deliveries from vendors.

I am also concerned with the visual aesthetics of any project that would place an industrial looking LRT project down our iconic boulevard. Furthermore, many of our businesses have spent considerable investments in creating attractive facades and important signage to attract customers, this project could negatively impact the aesthetics of our properties while at the same time blocking sight lines and impairing the visibility of our business signage.

In addition, I find it troubling that Metro would even consider a Light Rail Transit project down the corridor at a cost of at least \$1.8 billion to support an estimated 37,500 daily boardings when it can spend under \$500 million to build a Bus Rapid Transit project ending at the Metro Orange Line that would support almost 34,000 boardings. How can you rationalize spending \$1.5 billion more for such a minimal increase in ridership? Especially when Metro has only committed \$170 million for the entire project.

Metro's own Alternatives Analysis Report states that the largest portion of boardings along the corridor will occur between the northern communities of San Fernando and Pacoima and the southern communities of Mission Hills and Panorama City, many to and from the Van Nuys Civic Center area (over 50% of all study area trips). This activity all occurs north of the Metro Orange Line, and we understand the need from transit improvements in that area, but please leave Van Nuys Blvd. alone south of the Orange Line and let our businesses continue to thrive.

Sincerely,


Christy Rojas

Att.
Mg. Subway Sandwiches

Dear Mr. Davis

I feel that building the Lightrail train down Van Nuys Blvd would not work, it will cause traffic problems and will negatively affect businesses along Van Nuys. Please consider other alternatives.

Nick Grassu



Greco's NY Pizzeria
4572 Van Nuys Blvd
Sherman Oaks CA 91403

Dear Mr. Davis

I work at two separate
business on Van Nuys Blvd
(on opposite sides of the
street actually)

Everything I've learned about
the Lightrail proposed
"improvement" I can assure
you from my perspective
having worked on this Blvd
for over a dozen years
would be ANYTHING BUT!

Please record my resounding
and enthusiastic Opposition
to the Lightrail project.

As someone who bussed Van
Nuys for over a year when
financial times were tight,
I'd much prefer to see the
city improve the bus system.

With great sincerity
and vehemence,

John Antonellis

Arthur Murray 4633 Van Nuys
Federal Mailbox 4570 Van Nuys

May 3, 2013

Mr. Walt Davis
Transportation Planning Manager
San Fernando Valley / North County Area Planning Team
One Gateway Plaza
Mail Stop: 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

(Re: N. San Fernando Valley
Transit Corridor Project)

Dear Mr. Davis,

H:

I Bahman Sadeghi am a
business operator on Van Nuys Blvd
for the last 35 years. We love
the street exactly the way it is.
I don't think it is a good idea
to pursue the light rail transit
system on Van Nuys Blvd. I believe
strongly this idea would affect my
and a lot of other business operators
negatively. Please consider other
alternatives.

Thank you

Bahman Sadeghi 5/2/13

Rob's Car Wash

5300 Van Nuys Blvd
Van Nuys, Ca. 91401



April 24, 2013

Walt Davis
Project Manager, Metro
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

SUBJECT: San Fernando City Council's East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Ad Hoc Committee Comments Regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project's Transit Alternatives

Dear Mr. Davis:

On April 15, 2013 the San Fernando City Council's East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Ad Hoc Committee ("the Ad Hoc Committee"), consisting of Mayor Antonio G. Lopez and Councilmember Robert Gonzales, directed city staff to provide Metro with comments regarding the public transit alternatives being considered as part of the East San Fernando Valley Corridor Project ("the Project").

The Ad Hoc Committee is interested in having the MTA explore an alternative Light Rail Transit route that would travel from the San Fernando/Sylmar Metrolink Station south/east along San Fernando Road instead of Truman Street within the City of San Fernando to Van Nuys Boulevard, and then south to Ventura Boulevard.

It is important to note that the Ad Hoc Committee's request is made during the current scoping comment period and does not reflect a formal position of the City Council as a whole. It is the intent of the Ad Hoc Committee to provide the MTA with a transit alternative that the Committee feels merits consideration at this stage in the Project's development and the associated environmental review process.

On behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee, I want to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Project and the proposed transit alternatives being considered. The City of San Fernando looks forward to our continued involvement in the planning process. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,


Ron Ruiz
Public Works Director

Cc: // City Council
Donald E. Penman, City Administrator
Fred Ramirez, City Planner

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

April 23, 2013

To: Los Angeles County Metropolitan
Transportation Authority,
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Attention: Mr. Walt Davis, Project Manager

From: Fire Department

Subject: **NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) NOTICE OF INTENT (NOI) OF AN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (ELS)/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
REPORT (EIR)
EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT**

PROJECT LOCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project area is located in the San Fernando Valley in the County of Los Angeles. Generally, the project area extends from Ventura Boulevard in the south in the City of Los Angeles to the City of San Fernando and the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station in the north. The eastern San Fernando Valley includes the two major north-south arterial roadways of Sepulveda and Van Nuys Boulevards, spanning approximately 10 to 12 miles and the major north-west arterial roadway of San Fernando Road.

Several freeways traverse or border the eastern San Fernando Valley. These include the Ventura Freeway (US-101), the San Diego Freeway (I-405), the Golden State Freeway (I-5), the Ronald Reagan Freeway (SR-118), and the Foothill Freeway (I-210). The Hollywood Freeway (SR-170) is located east of the project area. In addition to Metro local and Rapid bus service, the Metro Orange Line (Orange Line) Bus Rapid Transit service, the Metrolink Ventura Line commuter rail service, Amtrak inter-city rail service, and the Metrolink Antelope Valley Line commuter rail service are the major transit corridors that serve interregional trips in the area.

Land uses in the area include neighborhood and regional commercial uses. Numerous car dealerships on Auto Row are located along Van Nuys Boulevard, south of Chandler Boulevard. Other uses in the area include government services at the Van Nuys Civic Center, major shopping and office uses at the Sherman Oaks Galleria, and medium-to high-density residential uses throughout the area. Major activity centers in the eastern San Fernando Valley include: The Village at Sherman Oaks, Panorama Mall, Whiteman Airport, Van Nuys Airport, Mission Community Hospital, Kaiser Permanente Hospital, and several schools, youth centers, and recreational centers.

The following comments are furnished in response to your request for this Department to review the proposed development:

A. Fire Flow

The adequacy of fire protection for a given area is based on required fire-flow, response distance from existing fire stations, and this Department's judgment for needs in the area. In general, the required fire-flow is closely related to land use. The quantity of water necessary for fire protection varies with the type of development, life hazard, occupancy, and the degree of fire hazard.

Fire-flow requirements vary from 2,000 gallons per minute (G.P.M.) in low density residential areas to 12,000 G.P.M. in high-density commercial or industrial areas. A minimum residual water pressure of 20 pounds per square inch (P.S.I.) is to remain in the water system, with the required gallons per minute flowing.

Improvements to the water system in this area may be required. The cost of improving the water system may be charged to the developer. For more detailed information regarding water main improvements, the developer shall contact the Water Services Section of the Department of Water and Power.

B. Response Distance, Apparatus, and Personnel

The Fire Department has existing fire stations along the proposed route for initial response into the area of the proposed development:

Fire Station No. 88
5101 N. Sepulveda Blvd.
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
Task Force,
Paramedic Rescue Ambulance,
Urban Search & Rescue,
Tractor Company,
Assessment Engine,
Water Tender,

Fire Station No. 39
14415 Sylvan Street
Van Nuys, CA 91401
Engine,
Assessment Light Force,
Paramedic Rescue Ambulance

Fire Station No. 90
7921 Woodley Ave.
Van Nuys, CA 91406
Task Force,
Paramedic Rescue Ambulance

Fire Station No. 7
14123 Nordhoff St..
Arleta, CA 91331
Assessment Engine,
Paramedic Rescue Ambulance,

Fire Station No. 81
14355 W. Arminta St.
Panorama City, CA 91402
Assessment Engine,
Paramedic Rescue Ambulance,
BLS Rescue Ambulance,
Rehab Air Tender,

Fire Station No. 98
13035 Van Nuys Blvd.
Pacoima, CA 91331
Engine,
Assessment Light Force,
Paramedic Rescue Ambulance,
BLS Rescue Ambulance,
Decon Tender,
Brush Patrol,

Fire Station No. 75
15345 San Fernando Mission
Mission Hills, CA 91340
Assessment Light Force,
Paramedic Rescue Ambulance,
Haz-Mat Tender,

Fire Station No. 91
14430 Polk St.
Sylmar, CA 91342
Assessment Engine,
Paramedic Rescue Ambulance,
BLS Rescue Ambulance,

Based on these criteria (response distance from existing fire stations), fire protection would be considered **(adequate)**.

The proposed project would have a cumulative impact on fire protection services.

At present, there are no immediate plans to increase Fire Department staffing or resources in those areas, which will serve the proposed project.

C. Firefighting Personnel Access

No building or portion of a building shall be constructed more than 150 feet from the edge of a roadway of an improved street, access road, or designated fire lane.

D. Firefighting Apparatus Access

Access for Fire Department apparatus and personnel to and into all structures shall be required.

The width of private roadways for general access use and fire lanes shall not be less than 20 feet, and the fire lane must be clear to the sky.

Fire lanes, where required and dead ending streets shall terminate in a cul-de-sac or other approved turning area. No dead ending street or fire lane shall be greater than 700 feet in length or secondary access shall be required.

Fire lane width shall not be less than 20 feet. When a fire lane must accommodate the operation of Fire Department aerial ladder apparatus or where fire hydrants are installed, those portions shall not be less than 28 feet in width.

Where access for a given development requires accommodation of Fire Department apparatus, overhead clearance shall not be less than 14 feet.

All access roads, including fire lanes, shall be maintained in an unobstructed manner, removal of obstructions shall be at the owner's expense. The entrance to all required fire lanes or required private driveways shall be posted with a sign no less than three square feet in area in accordance with Section 57.09.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code.

No building or portion of a building shall be constructed more than 300 feet from an approved fire hydrant. Distance shall be computed along path of travel.

Those plot plans be approved by the Fire Department showing fire hydrants and access for each phase of the project prior to the recording of the final map for that phase. Each phase shall comply independently with code requirements.

All street intersections with a level of service of "E" or "F" decreases the level or service of fire protection and emergency medical services provided by this Department.

CONCLUSION

Definitive plans and specifications shall be submitted to this Department and requirements for necessary permits satisfied prior to commencement of any portion of this project.

The Los Angeles Fire Department continually evaluates fire station placement and overall Department services for the entire City, as well as specific areas. The development of this proposed project, along with other approved and planned projects in the immediate area, may result in the need for the following:

1. Increased staffing for existing facilities.
2. Additional fire protection facilities.
3. Relocation of present fire protection facilities.

For additional information and comments contact Metro Rail Project Coordinator Mike Thomas (Battalion Chief) at (213) 922-7269 or Inspector Steve Douglas at (213) 922-7193.

BRIAN L. CUMMINGS
Fire Chief

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Stormes', written over a horizontal line.

Mark Stormes, Fire Marshal
Bureau of Fire Prevention and Public Safety

MIS:RED:vlj



GSA Pacific Rim Region

April 10, 2013

Mr. Walt Davis, Project Manager
LACTMA
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Scoping Comments for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Davis,

Thank you for contacting us regarding the proposed East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project. We appreciate being brought in early so we may comment on your projects potential impacts to the James C. Corman Federal Building and its tenants at 6230 Van Nuys Boulevard, Van Nuys, CA 91401-2713.

We appreciate LACTMA's effort to work with all stakeholders to determine the best alternative for the location of this project. If you have any questions, please contact Maureen Sheehan, NEPA Project Manager at Maureen.Sheehan@gsa.gov, 253-931-7548.

In the future, hard copies of notices and documents should be mailed to:

Ms. Moonyeen Alameida, Capital Investment Branch Chief
Portfolio Management Division
General Services Administration
450 Golden Gate Avenue, 3rd Flr. East (9P2PTC)
San Francisco, CA 94102

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Matthew Jear".

Matthew Jear
Portfolio Management Division Director
Public Buildings Service

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA



ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA
MAYOR

April 11, 2013

BUREAU OF SANITATION

ENRIQUE C. ZALDIVAR
DIRECTOR

TRACI J. MINAMIDE
CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER

VAROUJ S. ABKIAN
ADEL H. HAGEKHALIL
ALEXANDER E. HELOU
ASSISTANT DIRECTORS

NEIL M. GUGLIELMO
ACTING CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

WASTEWATER ENGINEERING SERVICES DIV.
2714 MEDIA CENTER DRIVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90065
FAX: (323) 342-6210
(323) 342-6211

File: SC.CE.

BOARD OF
PUBLIC WORKS

COMMISSIONERS

CAPRI W. MADDOX
PRESIDENT

VALERIE LYNNE SHAW
VICE PRESIDENT

STEVEN T. NUTTER
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

WARREN T. FURUTANI
COMMISSIONER

JERILYN LÓPEZ-MENDOZA
COMMISSIONER

Walt David, Project Manager
LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. David:

EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT – NOTICE OF PREPARATION EIR

This is in response to your letter requesting a review of your proposed transit project from Sherman Oaks to San Fernando that will introduce an improved north-south transit connection between key transit hubs/routes. The Bureau of Sanitation has conducted a preliminary evaluation of the potential impacts to the wastewater and stormwater systems for the proposed project.

WASTEWATER REQUIREMENT

The Bureau of Sanitation, Wastewater Engineering Services Division (WESD) has reviewed your request and found the project to be related to providing new rail service only.

Based on the project description, we have determined that the project is unrelated to sewer capacity availability and therefore do not have sufficient detail to offer an analysis at this time. However, as you develop your project alignment please keep us updated in order to ensure that you put in place mitigation measures whenever your project comes near, in contact or interfere with a sewer infrastructure to guarantee the continued safe operation of such structures. Should the project description change, please continue to send us information so that we may determine if a sewer assessment is required in the future.

If you have any questions, please call Kwasi Berko of my staff at (323) 342-1562.

STORMWATER REQUIREMENTS

The Bureau of Sanitation, Watershed Protection Division (WPD) is charged with the task of ensuring the implementation of the Municipal Stormwater Permit requirements within the City of Los Angeles. We anticipate the following requirements would apply for this project.



AN EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY - AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER

Recyclable and made from recycled waste



POST-CONSTRUCTION MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS

The project requires implementation of stormwater mitigation measures. These requirements are based on the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) and the recently adopted Low Impact Development (LID) requirements. The projects that are subject to SUSMP/LID are required to incorporate measures to mitigate the impact of stormwater runoff. The requirements are outlined in the guidance manual titled "*Development Best Management Practices Handbook – Part B: Planning Activities*". Current regulations prioritize infiltration, capture/use, and then biofiltration as the preferred stormwater control measures. The relevant documents can be found at: www.lastormwater.org. It is advised that input regarding SUSMP requirements be received in the early phases of the project from WPD's plan-checking staff.

GREEN STREETS

The City is developing a Green Street Initiative that will require projects to implement Green Street elements in the parkway areas between the roadway and sidewalk of the public right-of-way to capture and retain stormwater and urban runoff to mitigate the impact of stormwater runoff and other environmental concerns. The goals of the Green Street elements are to improve the water quality of stormwater runoff, recharge local ground water basins, improve air quality, reduce the heat island effect of street pavement, enhance pedestrian use of sidewalks, and encourage alternate means of transportation. The Green Street elements may include infiltration systems, biofiltration swales, and permeable pavements where stormwater can be easily directed from the streets into the parkways and can be implemented in conjunction with the SUSMP/LID requirements.

CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS


The project is required to implement stormwater control measures during its construction phase. All projects are subject to a set of minimum control measures to lessen the impact of stormwater pollution. In addition for projects that involve construction during the rainy season that is between October 1 and April 15, a Wet Weather Erosion Control Plan is required to be prepared. Also projects that disturb more than one-acre of land are subject to the California General Construction Stormwater Permit. As part of this requirement a Notice of Intent (NOI) needs to be filed with the State of California and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) needs to be prepared. The SWPPP must be maintained on-site during the duration of construction.

If there are questions regarding the stormwater requirements, please call Kosta Kaporis at (213) 485-0586, or WPD's plan-checking counter at (213) 482-7066. WPD's plan-checking counter can also be visited at 201 N. Figueroa, 3rd Fl, Station 18.

SOLID RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

The City has a standard requirement that applies to all proposed residential developments of four or more units or where the addition of floor areas is 25 percent or more, and all other development projects where the addition of floor area is 30 percent or more. Such developments must set aside a recycling area or room for onsite recycling activities. For more details of this requirement, please contact Daniel Hackney of the Special Project Division at (213)485-3684.

Sincerely,


Ali Poosti, Division Manager *for*
Wastewater Engineering Services Division
Bureau of Sanitation

KBVAP:tn

cc: Kosta Kaporis, BOS
Daniel Hackney, BOS
Zemamu Gebrewold, BOS



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

FIRE DEPARTMENT

1320 NORTH EASTERN AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90063-3294
(323) 881-2401

DARYL L. OSBY
FIRE CHIEF
FORESTER & FIRE WARDEN

March 29, 2013

Walt Davis, Project Manager
Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Davis:

NOTICE OF PREPARATION, NOTICE OF INTENT OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT, TO IMPROVE MOBILITY, ENHANCE TRANSIT ACCESSIBILITY, PROVIDE RELIABLE TRANSIT SERVICE, ENCOURAGE MODAL SHIFT TO TRANSIT IN THE EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY (FFER #201300034)

The Notice of Preparation has been reviewed by the Planning Division, Land Development Unit, Forestry Division and Health Hazardous Materials Division of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department. The following are their comments:

PLANNING DIVISION:

1. The subject property is entirely within the City of Los Angeles, which is not a part of the emergency response area of the Los Angeles County Fire Department (also known as the Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County). Therefore, this project does not appear to have any impact on the emergency responsibilities of this Department.

LAND DEVELOPMENT UNIT:

1. This project does not propose construction of structures or any other improvements at this time. Therefore, until actual construction is proposed the project will not have a significant impact to the Fire Department, Land Development Unit.
2. There are no additional comments regarding this project. The applicant's reply acknowledging our comments is acceptable at this time.

SERVING THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY AND THE CITIES OF:

AGOURA HILLS
ARTESIA
AZUSA
BALDWIN PARK
BELL
BELL GARDENS
BELLFLOWER
BRADBURY

CALABASAS
CARSON
CERRITOS
CLAREMONT
COMMERCE
COVINA
CUDAHY

DIAMOND BAR
DUARTE
EL MONTE
GARDENA
GLENORA
HAWAIIAN GARDENS
HAWTHORNE

HIDDEN HILLS
HUNTINGTON PARK
INDUSTRY
INGLEWOOD
IRWINDALE
LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE
LA HABRA

LA MIRADA
LA PUENTE
LAKEWOOD
LANCASTER
LAWDALE
LOMITA
LYNWOOD

MALIBU
MAYWOOD
NORWALK
PALMDALE
PALOS VERDES ESTATES
PARAMOUNT
PICO RIVERA

POMONA
RANCHO PALOS VERDES
ROLLING HILLS
ROLLING HILLS ESTATES
ROSEMEAD
SAN DIMAS
SANTA CLARITA

SIGNAL HILL
SOUTH EL MONTE
SOUTH GATE
TEMPLE CITY
WALNUT
WEST HOLLYWOOD
WESTLAKE VILLAGE
WHITTIER

3. The County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Land Development Unit appreciates the opportunity to comment on this project.
4. The statutory responsibilities of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Land Development Unit, are the review of, and comment on, all projects within the unincorporated areas of the County of Los Angeles. Our emphasis is on the availability of sufficient water supplies for firefighting operations and local/regional access issues. However, we review all projects for issues that may have a significant impact on the County of Los Angeles Fire Department. We are responsible for the review of all projects within Contract Cities (cities that contract with the County of Los Angeles Fire Department for fire protection services). We are responsible for all County facilities, located within non-contract cities.

The County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Land Development Unit may also comment on conditions that may be imposed on a project by the Fire Prevention Division, which may create a potentially significant impact to the environment.

5. Should any questions arise regarding subdivision, water systems, or access, please contact the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Land Development Unit Inspector, Claudia Soiza, at (323) 890-4243.

FORESTRY DIVISION – OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS:

1. The statutory responsibilities of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Forestry Division include erosion control, watershed management, rare and endangered species, vegetation, fuel modification for Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones or Fire Zone 4, archeological and cultural resources and the County Oak Tree Ordinance. Potential impacts in these areas should be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report.

HEALTH HAZARDOUS MATERIALS DIVISION:

1. The Health Hazardous Materials Division has no objection to the proposed project.

If you have any additional questions, please contact this office at (323) 890-4330.

Very truly yours,



FRANK VIDALES, ACTING CHIEF, FORESTRY DIVISION
PREVENTION SERVICES BUREAU

FV:ij

March 28, 2013

Walt Davis, Project Manager
One Gateway Plaza, M/S 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012


Dear Mr. Davis,

I was to deliver the enclosed material from the Studio City Neighborhood Council to yesterday's (3/27/13) Scoping Meeting in Van Nuys. Unfortunately, I was unable to get off work in time for the 4PM to 6PM meeting due to a Northridge kidnapping. So I'm mailing this instead. (But I have attended your other meetings over the last 2-3 years and our Neighborhood Council has been tracking this.) Thanks for accepting this by mail.

I would like to pose one question/comment:

This project actually lies in the **"Central Valley"** (Van Nuys for example) and some might also say the **"North Valley"** (San Fernando/Sylmar for example). Yet you are calling this the **"East San Fernando Valley"**. I beg to differ with you. The project proposal is *not* in the East San Fernando Valley and those of us who actually live in the East San Fernando Valley continually comment on the misleading location title of this project. We sure wish you would take the word "East" out of the title and let us know when there is a proposed project truly for the East San Fernando Valley.

Sincerely,



Barry Johnson
Studio City Neighborhood Council
1. Transportation Committee Member
2. Government Affairs Committee Vice-Chair

SCNC BOARD

Lisa Cahan Davis
Jane Drucker
Remy Kessler
John Lawler
Richard Niederberg
Scott Ouellette
Shoshana Raphael
Lisa Sarkin
Lana Shackelford
Gail Steinberg
Ron Taylor
Pasha Vafae
Rita C. Villa
John T. Walker
Denise Welvang



4024 Radford Ave.
Edit. Bldg. 2, Suite 6
Studio City, CA 91604
(818) 655-5400

PRESIDENT
John T. Walker

VICE PRESIDENT
Lisa Sarkin

TREASURER
Remy Kessler

SECRETARY
Rita C. Villa

**CORRESPONDING
SECRETARY**
Jane Drucker

www.studiocitync.org

October 25, 2011

Walt Davis
Project Manager Metro
One Gateway Plaza – MS 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

SENT VIA EMAIL

Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority
c/o Board of Directors
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Dear Mr. Davis:

At its regular meeting October 19, 2011, the board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council passed the following motion:

MOTION: 10.19.2011.13. The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council requests that the President of the SCNC write a letter in support of a combined study approach to relieve traffic on the I-405 Freeway by merging the Sepulveda Pass/Van Nuys Transit Project with the Van Nuys Corridor Rapid-way Project and that the letter include a request that the study consider a continuous subway alternative (similar to the Red Line) to relieve traffic congestion on the I405 Freeway.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

John T. Walker, President
Studio City Neighborhood Council

JTW/ls

SCNC BOARD

Jeffrey Carter
Ben Di Benedetto
Victor Helo
Wayne Kartin
Remy Kessler
Ben Neumann
Richard Niederberg
Todd Royal
Lisa Sarkin
Lana Shackelford
Gail Steinberg
Ron Taylor
Pasha Vafae
Rita C. Villa
John T. Walker
Denise Welvang



4024 Radford Ave.
Edit. Bldg. 2, Suite 6
Studio City, CA 91604
(818) 655-5400

PRESIDENT
John T. Walker

VICE PRESIDENT
Lisa Sarkin

TREASURER
Remy Kessler

SECRETARY
Rita C. Villa

**CORRESPONDING
SECRETARY**
Lana Shackelford

www.studiocitync.org

October 25, 2011

Walt Davis
Project Manager Metro
One Gateway Plaza – MS 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Via email

Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority
c/o Board of Directors
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, California 90012-2952

Re: Request for Community Input on the Van Nuys Corridor Rapidway

Dear Transit Authority:

The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council supports a combined study approach to relieve traffic on the I405 Freeway by merging the Sepulveda Pass/Van Nuys Transit Project with the Van Nuys Corridor Rapidway Project.

Additionally, the Board supports the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority to consider a continuous subway alternative (similar to the Red Line) to relieve traffic congestion on the I405 freeway.

Sincerely,

John Walker
President

JW/lis

Cc: Councilmember Krekorian, Councilmember Koretz, Councilmember LaBonge, City Council Transportation Committee Members, metro board secretary and Faramarz Nabavi

Help us plan more transit for the San Fernando Valley.

Ayúdenos a planear más tránsito para el Valle de San Fernando.

Scoping Meetings March 16, 19, 21 & 27

Reuniones comunitarias 16, 19, 21 y 27 de marzo



Metro



Community Meetings

Please visit information stations during the first half-hour to learn about the project and study process. Information shared at each meeting will be identical.

Saturday, March 16, 2013, 10am-12pm

Panorama High School
8015 Van Nuys Bl
Panorama City, CA 91402
Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 & Local Line 233 & DASH Route - Panorama City/Van Nuys

Tuesday, March 19, 2013, 6-8pm

The City of San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
208 Park Av
San Fernando, CA 91340
Served by Metro Rapid Line 794 & Local Lines 224 & 234

Thursday, March 21, 2013, 6-8pm

Arieta High School
14200 Van Nuys Bl
Arieta, CA 91331
Served by Metro Rapid Line 761 & Local Lines 158 & 233

Wednesday, March 27, 2013, 4-6pm

Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center
6262 Van Nuys Bl
Van Nuys, CA 91401
Served by Metro Orange Line, Rapid Line 761, & Local Lines 154, 156, 164, 233 & 237, & DASH Routes Panorama City/Van Nuys & Van Nuys/Studio City
Validated Parking Available at City Hall Parking Lot (Sylvan/Sylvan Av Entrance)

Can't make it in-person? Then, view and comment via a live-stream of the presentation beginning at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2013, on-demand at <http://stream.vtchicoms/bs23FV>.

Special accommodations and information in alternative formats are available to the public. All requests for reasonable accommodations must be made three working days (72 hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. Please call the Project Hotline at 818.276.3233 or the California Relay Service at 711.

Overview

The Study is evaluating the following alternatives:

- > **No Build:** Establishes a baseline for comparison with the other alternatives being evaluated. It represents conditions predicted for the year 2035 if no new project is constructed. It does incorporate other new projects that are already included in adopted plans.
- > **Transportation System Management (TSM):** Evaluates the benefits of lower cost operational improvements including enhanced bus frequencies for Van Nuys Rapid Bus 761 on other bus lines, traffic signal synchronization, off-board fare collection, bus stop amenities/improvements, bus schedule restructuring, intersection and road improvements, etc.
- > **Bus Rapid Transit (BRT):** Similar to the Metro Orange Line, BRT would generally operate in dedicated lanes with some portions operating in mixed-flow traffic. BRT typically provides higher frequency, speed and reliability when compared to standard Rapid or Local Bus service. The BRT route being evaluated for this project would travel from the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station southeast along San Fernando Rd and then south on Van Nuys Bl with three possible options for the project's southern terminus.
 - > **Light Rail Transit (LRT):** Similar to the Metro Gold, Blue, Green, and Expo Lines, LRT operates with standard gauge passenger railcars on exclusive right-of-way with overhead electric power. A two-car train set can carry approximately 300 passengers. Stations are typically spaced about one mile apart. Under this alternative, Metro would also need to build a new LRT maintenance facility. The LRT Alternative route would travel from the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station southeast along San Fernando Rd and then south on Van Nuys Bl to Ventura Bl.

> SUBWAY - WESTWOOD TO SYLMAR!

In collaboration with the Cities of Los Angeles and San Fernando, Metro is identifying north-south transit opportunities to improve local and regional connections, enhance access to jobs, education, cultural, recreational and other opportunities – without a car – in the East San Fernando Valley corridor.

Public input is also an important part of this process. The review process begins in the formal environmental review. Please attend upcoming Scoping Meetings to learn about alternatives to be studied and share your thoughts on the project.

At these meetings you will be able to:

- > Learn about the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study.
- > Learn about the environmental review process and project schedule.
- > Find out about the alternatives planned for analysis and
- > Provide formal comments regarding the scope of the analysis that should be considered in the environmental review.

Contact Us

818-276-3233
[eaststtransit@metro.net](http://eaststtransit.metro.net)
metro.net/eaststtransit
 @eaststtransit
 eaststtransit





March 27, 2013

Walter Davis, Project Manager
Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza, M/S 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

SUBJECT: East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

Dear Mr. Davis,

The Valley Industry and Commerce Association (VICA) looks forward to the development of the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor between the City of San Fernando and Sherman Oaks community.

We request that the Environment Impact Report address three major aspects:

1. *Route:* What is the expected ridership of the system, and which route provides the best access for these customers? What is the ridership of existing bus lines along each route? Is there a need to ease crowding? What regional landmarks, government offices or economic centers of activity are along each route? Which route provides the best connectivity to current systems (i.e. Metro Red and Orange Lines) as well as proposed future transit projects (i.e. the Sepulveda Pass corridor)? What are the environmental benefits of higher ridership, reduced crowding and reduced distances for customers to connect to these major centers of activity?
2. *Type of Vehicle:* What is the ridership capacity of each option, and what are the associated environmental benefits? What is the speed comparison between BRT (including traffic), LRT and HRT along the corridor? At what frequency can each option run?
3. *Cost:* What is the construction cost of each alternative, and which alternative provides the best cost recovery? Which alternative will be most attractive to riders? Is there potential for a public-private partnership? Which alternative will be most attractive to private investment?

We also request that the study compare if each alternative will prevent the issues associated with the San Fernando Valley's only other major transit system, the Metro Orange Line. VICA would like to prevent the East SFV Transit Corridor from the overcrowding, high traffic levels and slow speed that trouble Orange Line riders and discourage ridership.

We look forward to answers to these questions of importance to Valley residents and businesses.

Sincerely,

David Adelman
Chair

Stuart Waldman
President



Pacoima Beautiful

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION, LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT & ADVOCACY

March 21, 2013

Mr. Walt Davis
Project Manager
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-3
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Comments for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor

Dear Mr. Walt Davis,

We appreciate communication with Metro during the scoping and alternatives analysis process and offer these comments in regards to the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor.

Pacoima Beautiful and community members have been advocating for improved transit on this vital corridor for years and offer these comments with the hope that they will be seriously considered to create a better project:

- The San Fernando Valley is distant from, but functionally connected, to the Westside. Large numbers of people commute from the Valley to the Westside through the constrained Sepulveda Pass. **This project should be combined with the Sepulveda Pass Corridor Project as recommended by most community groups and community leaders.** The distances traveled by large numbers of people need to be addressed in a comprehensive way. This project has the potential to be greater than what was evaluated.
- In the Alternatives Analysis (A.A.), anything other than bus is disadvantaged as a potential mode option due to mode shifts in the analysis at potential connections at the Orange Line and for passengers traveling to the Westside. **Studies should evaluate how conversions of other corridors to LRT (such as the Orange Line) could represent transformative change for transportation in the Los Angeles Region. Other modes (LRT) and potential interlining with this project could create significantly faster one-seat rides.** For example, LRT on Van Nuys then continuing on a LRT-converted Orange Line with signal priority to connect with the Red Line in North Hollywood. This arrangement could provide reasonable transportation times to Downtown and the Westside near the Expo Line until the Sepulveda Pass Corridor is operational.
- **Currently, the Orange Line is frequently over-crowded and operating at near capacity and adding more passengers, which this project will do, will result in even poorer operations and passenger experiences.** Other options need to be evaluated.

11243 Glenoaks Blvd. Suite 1, Pacoima, CA 91331 • 818-899-2454 • Fax: 818-485-4306

www.pacoimabeautiful.org





Pacoima Beautiful

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION, LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT & ADVOCACY

- The two alignments recommended will connect to the Metrolink Station in Sylmar instead of continuing north on Van Nuys. Connecting to this station provides access for commuters from the Santa Clarita Valley but effectively cuts off the busy and heavily transit dependent Van Nuys corridor north of San Fernando Road to Glenoaks. **Feeder lines and physical corridor improvements on the Van Nuys corridor north of San Fernando Road to Glenoaks should be incorporated into the project. The improvements should address bus operations as well as first and last mile improvements that Metro has committed to improving for pedestrians and bicyclists.** This would be appropriate to Metro's desire to address the "first and last mile problem." The project should include features such as those in Metro's Eastside Access Project that build physical improvements such as complete streets and safety improvements.
- The project must **incorporate facilities and landscaping at a quality level similar to other corridors recently built in the region such as the Expo Line.** Landscaping and building materials should be attractive, functional, maintainable, and durable.
- **A completely protected or separated bikeway should be a part of this project to address the needs of existing and potential new bicyclists.** These types of bicycle facilities are becoming the norm world-wide and new transportation projects must incorporate them from the beginning. They provide a safe network to deal with the "first and last mile problem" on a busy road,

Please feel free to contact us at (818)899-2454 if you would like to discuss the community or project further.

Sincerely,

Ken Frederick
Project Manager

ESFV COMMENTS: Community Meeting #1 - Panorama High School (Written)					
Date	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Address	Comment
3/16/2013	Victor	Santillan	Resident	9318 Van Nuys Bl #26	Based on the information available, I now believe the LRT would serve the community at a greater rate. With any street improvements on Van Nuys Blvd, I hope that storm water flow improvements are made to reduce traffic flow issue. I also hope parking that is available in the affected areas in the residential community will be taken into consideration. Thank you!
3/16/2013	Jack	Waizenegger	Panorama City NC	P.O. Box 4652, Panorama City, CA, 91412	1. Take care to keep businesses open along alignment during construction. 2. Locate the maintenance yard in the Panorama City industrial zone. 3. Ensure that the station at the Panorama Metro Rail has easy access to transfer to the MetroRail and easy access to businesses north of the railroad tracks. 4. Build the Light Rail, not the Bus Rapid
3/16/2013	Michelle	Santillan	HOA President	9318 Van Nuys Bl #26	As a resident who chooses to take public transit when possible, I would like the counsel to consider that many residents would use the services more frequently if the number of trains are sufficient for the amount of riders at a given time. Many a time I have arrived at the Van Nuys station only to leave because the trains are so congested and are not able to accommodate new riders.
3/16/2013	Lorenzo	Mutia	CSUN Student	8400 Snowden Ave, Panorama City, CA 91402	Thank you for having a meeting in Panorama City. I noticed that the attendees may not generally represent the community in the vicinity (Latino, Asian, etc.) so I hope for future meetings, outreach is directed towards to the ethnic groups that have a lot to gain with improved transit.
3/16/2013	Cesar	De La Cruz	Agora Realty + Management Inc.	15206 Ventura Blvd. Sherman Oaks, CA, 91403	Concerns about specific Properties: 1. NW corner Van Nuys Blvd + San Fernando Rd. 2. Van Nuys Blvd. between Chase + Parthenia (both sides)

ESFV COMMENTS: Community Meeting #1 - Panorama High School (Verbal)		
First Name	Last Name	Comment
Dennis	Hindman	Hi. My name is Dennis Hindman. My first concern about the project is it should be done as a complete street, which means pedestrians, bicycles, motor vehicles and transit together, rather than separately. The other thing is that if you compare the current bus service which is curbside, what you get when you put -- whatever the technology, whether it be bus or train down the center, as you get more consistent service, if you compare the Orange Line to the curbside service, it's more consistent, it makes it more attractive, but also the stations you have a much more pleasant experience where the Orange Line stations are kept clean, they're separated from strangers walking by you, it's well lit. Also, the boarding experience, on a curbside bus, you are asked to board almost like cattle through the front door only. That is, it's not a pleasant experience for passengers, whereas on the Orange Line or train, you can board all doors at your leisure, whichever one you want to go to. So the -- that aspect, it's -- you get -- you're going to get more ridership if you put it down the middle of the street. Also, for a driver, they can see peripherally what is happening on the street much better than if they're curbside. They can see -- because it's a wide street, you can see if there's any cross traffic or pedestrians or anybody crossing their way. That, you can see from the Orange Line. They have much less trouble when they go down the middle of Chandler, as opposed to when they're going down the rest of it where their view is blocked by sound walls and buildings. So that's all I have.
Kenneth	Silk	Kenneth Silk. I'm with various groups, but I'm speaking for myself. Although I live in Encino, I frequently use the buses on Van Nuys for medical facilities, a senior park, the Van Nuys Center and occasionally the Amtrak station. First, I hope that any route will go all the way down to Ventura Boulevard, not end at the Orange Line, because of the need for service and the problem with traffic on Van Nuys from the Orange Line down to Ventura and because of the infrequent service, regular service, on Sepulveda from Ventura up to the Orange Line. As far as time as a factor, I'm more concerned about the time between the various plans, the time it will take to complete the service, complete construction, because I think it's important that -- particularly as a senior that it be completed as soon as possible and also the time -- rather, the total bus ride but the time of the frequency of service to avoid long -- to have the least possible waiting period for them. Also, I hope that whichever plan does follow, there will be, as there is with the other lines, both benches or places to sit as well as cover from the rain, sun or something while waiting for the bus of sorts. Thank you.
Jack	Lindblad	Okay. Great. So I'm going to be speaking to the group about it. I'm an architect, a health care architect, but that has peripheral connection with getting to a net-zero-energy economy. We have a mandate in California in seven short years that we're going to have one-third of our energy from renewable sources and having a dependency, any dependency, on oil or gas or fossil base and subsidizing these corporate welfare people to the hundreds of billions of dollars is not an answer. It's denying the Valley of the fair share of the transit dollar and generally the health and welfare of the survivability of our civilization in California, especially in the Mediterranean climate. So in revitalizing the watershed upstream in the L.A. River, the ecotourism, the potential and the business opportunities that will be totally focused on advantaging ourselves of our blessed resources here cannot be achieved by BRT. In fact, city planners across the country call the BRT system a BRT creep of a thousand cuts. In other words, there are so many opportunities with the level of boarding with -- as mentioned earlier by Dennis -- having a cattle guard for people boarding, having a station instead of a stop, having prepaid fares instead of having to pay at the point of boarding. So that's just to mention a few, but there's over a thousand. So if we're really going to be shepherding and spending our money wisely, it's going to be over the long term. If we're going to be spending a half a billion dollars or a billion dollars for a much greater economic opportunity that's sustainable, we have transit-oriented districts multiplied by transit-oriented development and -- as architects and planners, we can see a renaissance that will fit the revitalization of Panorama City as a transit-oriented district. Thanks a lot.

Panorama High (Spoken)

<p>Jack</p>	<p>Waizenegger</p>	<p>Okay. Jody and Walt, thank you very much for being here and bringing the meeting to Panorama City and we'd ask that you continue bringing these meetings to Panorama City. My name is Jack Waizenegger. I'm with the Panorama City Neighborhood Council, Board and Land Use Chair, and Panorama City supports the -- this project and the benefits it's going to bring to our neighborhood. There's -- I just have four items that I want to bring up: One is that during the construction, that we know there's tremendous long-term benefits, but during the construction you have to be very sensitive to all the businesses that are along the right-of-way and that they need to be kept open. A lot of drivers, you know, they can take other boulevards during the inconveniences, but the businesses here need to stay open. Next is the maintenance yard. Panorama City welcomes the maintenance yard in our industrial zone along the railroad tracks here. We've got plenty of space and this is the kind of jobs that we need, the high-paying, the highly skilled jobs that we need to bring back to our neighborhood that left with the plant. The next three stops that are planned or, you know, are possible stops for Panorama City at Nordhoff, Roscoe, and by the Metro rail are -- you know, are good for Panorama City and it's important that the stop near the Metro rail provides easy transfer between the two systems, but it's also critical that the Panorama City businesses just north of the railroad tracks have -- the riders have easy access to the businesses and the jobs and everything that are there. Last is for those of you who are not sure, Light Rail is better than the bus. It's more expensive, but over the long term it's much better. If you're not sure, you know, why, you know, ask some of the others or come and talk to me. Anyway, thanks a lot. And we're in good hands with Walt Davis. He's a very competent project manager.</p>
<p>Mike</p>	<p>Bernstein</p>	<p>Thank you. Good morning and thank you, Jody and Walt and everybody from Metro and LADOT for coming here. It's great to see this being done in a very convenient and transparent manner for public input. The primary thing I want to express is that while I'm glad to see the squiggly purple line on the map and some consideration for coordinating with the Sepulveda Pass project, I would submit that actually this project and Sepulveda Pass have to be explicitly linked and, in fact, combined into a single project. It seems -- it seems difficult for me to believe that these two would be in any way considered -- move at separate speeds or considered in a separate way. If you want to talk about regional connectivity, regional impact, the only -- the only option that's going to deliver that is looking at this in a single consolidated manner with, you know, connectivity from, you know, San Fernando and Sylmar down through the heart of the Valley and of course down through the Westside. If we are spending well over a billion dollars to add one HOV lane on the 405, it seems certainly transparent to me and very obvious to me that the only thing that's going to have the hope of, you know, meaningfully impacting transit times for the better along in the Valley and along the Westside of Los Angeles is some sort of mass-transit alternative under the hill and this has to be considered in a completely coordinated manner. I mean, when you consider this line that could be the backbone of the L.A. Transit system incorporating Chatsworth Metrolink, Orange Line bus, Expo, Purple Line, Green Line, Crenshaw Line, all the way through to LAX, it's -- I can't even comprehend why this would be considered in any way separate from that and, in fact, to the extent that they are separate because of the current condition with the Orange Line, it's likely that the recommendation will mitigate towards BRT versus LRT because it's a new mode of transit. So I would strongly encourage these projects to be combined into a single project so that a true regional alternative and a true regional -- a result that benefits the region as a whole is what ultimately comes out of the process.</p>

Panorama High (Spoken)


<p>Jan</p>	<p>Brown</p>	<p>Just looking at the BRT options, it seems like the only one that actually continues all the way to Ventura as a sub option of option one, so I don't know whether that's not a separate -- why that's not a separate option. I think -- and I agree with one of the previous speakers. I think it's very important that one of these alternatives continue all the way to Ventura Boulevard and not just channel everybody on the Orange Line over to Sepulveda. The other question generally about all of these options, are there any plans to add parking lots or parking access at any of these stations? There are many times when I would like to take the Orange Line, but frankly, the parking lots are full or there are no parking lots close to the places that I could get on board without driving a half an hour out of my way to get to a station that actually has parking accessible, and I don't see anything in any of these plans that talks about adding parking for either of these alternatives. Okay? And I really hope that one of these is completed in my lifetime. I'm not sure that's going to happen, but it would be nice.</p>
<p>Victor</p>	<p>Santillan</p>	<p>Hi. Good morning, Metro, State and City representatives. My name is Victor Santillan and I'm a resident here at Panorama City. My residence is pretty much right on Van Nuys at the intersection of Osborne and Tucker and one of my -- just a general comment and concern is that whatever option is decided that there's some infrastructure improvements such as storm water runoff issues to be addressed right on Van Nuys Boulevard. I believe that any issues with storm water runoff, for example, during the rainy days may actually have an impact on traffic flow on the right side of lanes. I'm assuming that the process may actually stretch out the lanes to as much as possible; and given that Panorama City has a lot of traffic-flow problems already during the actual rush-hour times, I believe that will actually have a major impact, for example, such as when it rains. And also, the situation with the parking in the communities, I'm assuming that the parking might actually be removed from existing parking, pockets right on Van Nuys Boulevard. So I guess some of the scoping process would also involve identifying some of the impacts in the community in regards to the parking in the community areas. That was my comments. Thank you.</p>
<p>Lorenzo</p>	<p>Mutia</p>	<p>Oh, thank you. Good morning, everyone. This is my first time going to one of these meetings, but I do have some comments about -- I do second that motion from a past speaker that this project should be combined with the Sepulveda Pass transit, maybe a tunnel or some sort of thing going on. I don't know what the plan is exactly, because it's -- and the route should include Ventura, because both Ventura and the Westside, I never -- I rarely travel to Ventura or the Westside because of the traffic and it would be nice if there was an easier way to get there. So, yes. And I also believe Light Rail should be the way to get there, because the Orange Line, I respect it, but the BRT has its shortcomings and I think a Light Rail Train would hopefully cover those shortcomings. I hope also safety for students at high schools along the route is also taken into account because of the pedestrians and all of that. I hope elevated and maybe underground routes are also considered as part of a way to mitigate any pedestrian concerns and traffic concerns. And I also hope that towns and cities like Panorama City and Van Nuys, the corridor, I hope that they'll become more than just passing places. They can also become destinations in and of themselves with possible investment in the area to improve, you know, shopping, health, educational facilities and all that along the route. Thank you.</p>

Panorama High (Spoken)

<p>Gregory</p>	<p>Wright</p>	<p>Okay. I have a thought that probably relates to the encouraging transit mode and shift -- or mode shift to transit and community input. Excuse me if it's already been raised because I came in late, but why not at kiosks at major stops along Van Nuys Boulevard along the future corridor present pictures of the various possible futures of the corridor as they will appear at that spot? Like, for example, show it with how the Rapid -- the busway will look at that point and the Light Rail at that point, and maybe even divide that pair into a pair. One is the background of the corridor and the city as it looks now and the other would be the background of a more green, in-the-future Los Angeles. The billboards are gone, the utilities are undergrounded and we've got green walls on buildings and stuff like that, and then invite people to share their thoughts about what they -- about the alternatives among those four that they prefer at a website. And so I hope that will be considered. It kind of brings the people in and involves future visioning. Since I've got some time left, I'll mention really quickly for the half decade between now and the implementation of the reconstituted corridor, please amalgamate the still-separated local and Rapid bus stops. For example, on northbound Van Nuys Boulevard at Riverside, my partner and I have been tortured forever by the divergence between those two buses, trying to figure out with our aging eyes which kind of bus is coming and then running toward the stop. We've missed buses, a lot of them, that way. It's very frustrating. And I would also encourage directions on such as today's announcement to indicate cross streets, not just addresses of destinations. That would really help people use transit where the directions on the buses are given in terms of cross streets. MTA should do it and encourage other -- any venue advertising its events and activities to always show us the cross street.</p>
<p>Noel</p>	<p>Barajas</p>	<p>Hello, everybody. As a person that lives in Pacoima and actually takes the transit line, I thought I should point out a couple things and hopefully get some answers for the future. The maintenance facility -- you guys mentioned a maintenance facility. Well, the people in Panorama mentioned how they lost a lot of industries and businesses and jobs out here. I'm just kind of wondering how many potential jobs a maintenance facility could bring to the people that are unemployed out in the San Fernando Valley. So hopefully we can find out how many job potentials a maintenance yard out here could do to improve job creation out here. The other thing, number one on your purpose is improve north-south mobility. Either BRT or LRT will take up a lane along Van Nuys Boulevard, at least, so you're forcing cars on less lanes on Van Nuys potentially so you're creating more traffic there so now we have to rely on public transit to move more people through and hopefully have less cars on the road. So if the buses of BRT 75 passengers and Light Rail handles 300 passengers, it seems like it's more efficient to have a 300-passenger mobility along the corridor. Also, we can look at the corridor right now. Those BRTs will use the same size buses as are on the Rapid line right now and those buses are already packed to capacity. So will a BRT really be able to handle any increased ridership? It doesn't seem likely. We pointed out the Sepulveda Pass project. If the Sepulveda Pass project goes into effect, there will be potentially a rail line or so that will be dumping 300-plus people at the Ventura Boulevard. Now, if we have BRT, how will we be able to address -- So how will we be able to address the over 300 people on Ventura Boulevard with 75-passenger capacity BRT?</p>

Panorama High (Spoken)

Cesar	de la Cruz	<p>Yes. I work with a developer that owns two properties that are right on the -- one is on Van Nuys Boulevard between Chase, between Chase and Parthenia. The other one is on the corner of San Fernando Road and Van Nuys Boulevard. According to the current statistics, the corner of Van Nuys Boulevard and San Fernando Road, there's a ridership of about 35,000 riders going through there. We are redeveloping that corner and we are conscious of the big ridership that is there and we are trying to accommodate them, but one of the things that is lacking in some of these bus stops that are very heavily -- is restroom facilities. You know, sometimes you have 40, 50 people there waiting for 10, 15 minutes and on San Fernando Road and Van Nuys Boulevard, we are going to put some public restrooms. In the shopping center that we own on Van Nuys Boulevard, we also have public restrooms, but I hope that when you get into the final planning of this that you will approach the property owners that are going to be affected or that can actually work in conjunction with Metro to create a better environment for the riders that are waiting for the bus. We see that on, again, Roscoe and Van Nuys Boulevard, Chase and Van Nuys Boulevard and you will find out that -- you will find property owners that are willing to work with you to create a better environment. The riders are like a two-edged sword for businesses. They are potential customers, but at the same time they create havoc sometimes. So please work with us, too.</p>
Dug	Gutierrez	<p>So basically what I told her was that I like where you guys are going as far as the projects. The only things I'm really concerned about are the environmental impacts over a long period of time for the future and the street density, like where you guys are going to keep the people as far as the street, yeah, 'cause I walk along the streets a lot and I'm sort of just concerned about if the people are just going to be poured out onto the street and then cause more traffic for the vehicles and for me. That's pretty much it on my part.</p>



East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <u>Victor Santillan</u>	
Organization/Organización: <u>Resident</u>	
Address/Dirección: <u>9318 Van Nuys Blvd #26</u>	
Tel: <u>818-298-5484</u>	Email/Correo electrónico: <u>Stargazer78@yahoo.com</u>

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

Based on the information available, I now believe the LRT would serve the community at a greater rate. With any street improvements on Van Nuys Blvd, I hope that storm water flow improvements are made to reduce traffic flow issue. I also hope parking that is available in the affected areas in the residential community will be taken into consideration. Thank you! - VS

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <i>Jack Waizenegger</i>	
Organization/Organización: <i>Panorama City Neighborhood Council, Land Use Chair</i>	
Address/Dirección: <i>POB 4652, Panorama City, CA 91412-4652</i>	
Tel: <i>818-262-8687</i>	Email/Correo electrónico: <i>jack.waizenegger@gmail.com</i>

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

- ① Take care to keep businesses open along alignment during construction
- ② Locate the maintenance yard in the Panorama City industrial zone
- ③ Ensure that the station at the ~~the~~ Panorama Metro Rail has easy access to transfer to the Metro Rail and easy access to businesses north of the railroad tracks
- ④ Build the Light Rail, not the Bus Rapid.

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <u>Michelle Santillan</u>	
Organization/Organización: <u>HOA President / Owner / Resident</u>	
Address/Dirección: <u>9318 Van Nuys Blvd #26, Panorama City</u>	
Tel: <u>818-205-6743</u>	Email/Correo electrónico: <u>m.davis2916@yahoo.com</u>

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:

- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

As a resident who chooses to take public transit when possible,
 I would like the counsel to consider that many residents would
 use the services more frequently if the ^{number of} trains ~~that~~ ~~have the~~
~~capacity~~ ~~are~~ are sufficient for the amount of riders at a given
 time. Many a time I have arrived at the Van Nuys Station
 only to leave because the trains are so congested and
 are not able to accomodate new riders

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





**East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study**

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <u>Lorenzo Mutia</u>	
Organization/Organización: <u>Resident/CSUN student</u>	
Address/Dirección: <u>8400 Snowden Avenue, Panorama City, CA 91402</u>	
Tel: <u>818-983-7080</u>	Email/Correo electrónico: <u>lmutia@yahoo.com</u>

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

Thank you for having a meeting in Panorama City. I noticed that the attendees may not generally represent the community in the vicinity (Latino, Asian, etc) so I hope for future meetings, outreach is directed towards to the ethnic groups that have a lot to gain with improved transit.

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <u>Cesar De La Cruz</u>	
Organization/Organización: <u>AGORA Realty + MANAGEMENT, LLC</u>	
Address/Dirección: <u>15206 Ventura Blvd. Sherman Oaks, CA 91403</u>	
Tel: <u>818-290-5206</u>	Email/Correo electrónico: <u>CESAR@AGORA2000.NET</u>

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:

- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

CONCERNS ABOUT SPECIFIC PROPERTIES

- ① NW CORNER VAN NUYS BLVD + SAN FERNANDO RD
 ② VAN NUYS BLVD. BETWEEN CHASE + PARTHENIA (BOTH SIDES)

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 3/16/13 (818) 504-0090

Name: Gabriela Márquez

Organization: Office of Congressman Tony Cardenas

Address: 9300 Laurel Cyn 2nd Fl. Arleta
gabriela.m Marquez @ mail.house.gov

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: -



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 3-15-13

Name: JENNIS HINDMAN

Organization: _____

Address: 4406 CAHUENGA BLVD TOLUCA LAKE

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 16 MARCH 2013

Name: KENNETH SILK

Organization: EVINOVA

Address: 5255 ZELZAH AV. #106 BURLINGAME 94010

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3-18-13

Name: JACK LINDBLAD

Organization: COALITION OF ESFV Transit Corridor

Address: 8211 Shadyglade Av

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

*NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 3-16-13

Name: Jack Waizenegger

Organization: Panorama City Neighborhood Council

Address: POB 4652, Panorama City, CA 91412-4652

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 3/16/13

Name: Mike Bernstein

Organization: —

Address: 4457 Balc Ave Studio City, CA

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3/16/13
Name: Jan Brown
Organization: PCNC
Address: 7822 Broadleaf Ave PC 91402

① Prefer sub-option ~~BRT~~ ^{option}
② any plans for parking lots?

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 3/16/13

Name: Victor Scahillan

Organization: _____

Address: 9318 Van Nuys Blvd, Panorama City, CA 91402

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 3/26/13

Name: Lorenzo Mutia

Organization: Resident

Address: 8400 Snowden Avenue, Panorama City, CA 91402

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3/15/2013

Name: GREGORY WRIGHT

Organization: WRIGHT THINKING

Address: 14161 RIVERSIDE DRIVE #3 S.O. 91423

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: March 16

Name: Noel Barajas

Organization: Pacoima Resident

Address: Pacoima, CA

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date:

3/16/2013

Name:

Cesar De La Cruz

Organization:

Agora Realty.

Address:

15206 Ventura Bl, S.O. 91403

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

*NOTE: Speakers cannot exceed their time to speak.

BEFORE THE METRO

EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT TEAM

Public Scoping Meeting in the)
Matter of:)
EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT)
CORRIDOR STUDY)
_____)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Panorama City, California

Saturday, March 16, 2013

Reported by:

MARCENA M. MUNGUIA,
CSR No. 10420

Job No.:
B9335NCO

1 BEFORE THE METRO
 2 EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT TEAM
 3
 4
 5
 6 Public Scoping Meeting in the)
 Matter of:)
 7)
 EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT)
 8 CORRIDOR STUDY)
 9 _____)
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken at
 16 Panorama High School, 8015 Van Nuys Boulevard,
 17 Panorama City, California, commencing at
 18 10:00 a.m. on Saturday, March 16, 2013,
 19 heard before the METRO EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY
 20 TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT TEAM, reported by
 21 MARCENA M. MUNGUIA, CSR No. 10420,
 22 a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for
 23 the State of California.
 24
 25

1 INDEX
 2 PUBLIC SPEAKERS: PAGE
 3 Dennis Hindman 25
 4 Kenneth Silk 26
 5 Jack Lindblad 27
 6 Jack Waizenegger 29
 7 Mike Bernstein 31
 8 Jan Brown 33
 9 Victor Santillan 34
 10 Lorenzo Mutia 36
 11 Gregory Wright 37
 12 Noel Barajas 39
 13 Cesar De La Cruz 40
 14 Ryan Gutierrez 42
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

1 APPEARANCES:
 2 Metro Presenters: WALTER DAVIS
 Project Manager
 3 Metro
 4 JODY LITVAK
 Community Relations Director
 Metro
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

1 Panorama City, California, Saturday, March 16, 2013
 2 10:00 a.m.
 3
 4
 5 MS. LITVAK: Good morning, everybody. Thank you so
 6 much for coming out on a Saturday morning. It's chilly
 7 by L.A. standards, but, hey, it's L.A. Imagine what
 8 everyone else in the country is dealing with.
 9 My name is Jody Litvak. I'm with Metro, MTA.
 10 My colleague, Walt Davis, is going to be joining me in
 11 the presentation.
 12 Before we get started, some housekeeping things:
 13 If there's anybody here who needs translation into
 14 Spanish, simultaneously, we will provide that for you.
 15 You just need to let us know and Lillian is going to
 16 repeat that message in that language.
 17 Also, I'd like to point out we very much
 18 appreciate it when our elected officials attend or attend
 19 and are represented here.
 20 I'd like to welcome Noel Barajas from Senator
 21 Padilla's office. Thank you so much for coming.
 22 And our team up front will let me know if anyone
 23 else shows up.
 24 Some information available today, I want to go
 25 through. Among other things, this is the most important

1 thing. If you want to give us verbal comments today, I
 2 need you to fill this out (indicating). If you do not
 3 have a form and you want one -- can we have some people
 4 with some blank forms in the back -- just raise your hand
 5 and we'll get you one. If you have a form and you
 6 haven't filled it out yet and you decide during the
 7 course of this morning you do want to speak during the
 8 formal comment time, just fill it out and wave it and
 9 we'll get it for you. And just anyway, so we'll keep
 10 doing that. I'll remind you of that.

11 Some other information, and this is the order,
 12 I'm going to use the order, it's on this table. We had
 13 had some questions about job opportunities. It was
 14 related to this project and I don't think we're there
 15 yet, but we do have a construction careers program. As a
 16 result of Measure R, Metro will be building many, many
 17 projects and it's on this table over here (indicating),
 18 these two pieces of paper. So if that's something you're
 19 interested in or you know organizations who are, feel
 20 free to pick that up and we'll put you in touch with
 21 those people.

22 We have a Fact Sheet on the project that I think
 23 you were all handed when you got here. It's -- this is
 24 the English one (indicating). It's also available in
 25 Spanish.

1 There's a lot of information about where we've
 2 been and where we're going on this project in our
 3 Frequently Asked Questions. Again, this is available in
 4 English and in Spanish. These documents -- we've been
 5 working on them, by the way, up until the very last
 6 minute. If things are not yet posted on the website,
 7 they will be really soon, early in the week. So we'll go
 8 from there.

9 And this (indicating) is sort of the overview of
 10 what's happening today.

11 Sorry. I'm of a certain age.

12 And where's Gabriela? In the back. We'd also
 13 like to welcome Gabriela Marquez from Congressman
 14 Tony Cardenas's office. Thank you so much for showing up
 15 today.

16 So the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor
 17 Study is a joint effort. Metro is -- we're at the
 18 beginning of the Environmental Analysis. We're just
 19 beginning the Draft EIS/EIR. The City of Los Angeles is
 20 co-lead with us on that. We have some representatives
 21 from the City of L.A. there.

22 Wave your hand in the back. Thank you for being
 23 part of the team.

24 And so you know, the Federal Transit
 25 Administration -- we are also doing this -- many of you

1 have heard the term "EIR." You may or may not have heard
 2 the term "EIS." The EIS is, in essence, the Federal
 3 equivalent or companion to an EIR. The Federal Transit
 4 Administration is also going along with us step by step.

5 So what we're going to do today is we're going
 6 to give you some overview and background on the study.
 7 We'll talk about the alternatives that we're going to be
 8 looking at and this is your opportunity to provide input.

9 I want to say this now and I'll say it at the
 10 end. If you have been to some of the earlier meetings on
 11 this project, when we get to the public comment and
 12 question time, we are in a period called scoping and it's
 13 a little more structured. It has to be. So if you ask
 14 us questions, we are not going to really in most cases be
 15 able to answer them today. The purpose of the study is
 16 to do the analysis and come up with the information that
 17 you're probably seeking, that you may be seeking answers
 18 to.

19 So get those questions on the record. Tell us
 20 what the issues are that are important for us to study.
 21 Certainly if you have opinions, express those. And I
 22 know it's frustrating for you to ask a question and not
 23 get an answer and you're going to have to wait about a
 24 year until the report comes out, but that's the way it is
 25 and I just want everybody to have appropriate

1 expectations for that today, and I'm going to say it
 2 again when we get to that part.

3 We did do some preliminary work prior to getting
 4 where we are today over the last two years. We did an
 5 Alternatives Analysis Study. We had a lot of community
 6 meetings. We looked at -- there's the red light -- okay.
 7 We looked at a whole bunch of alternatives and if you put
 8 them all on a map, they look like a big rectangular plate
 9 of spaghetti, and we narrowed those down to six.

10 In January, we went to the Metro Board of
 11 Directors, who is one of the key decision-making bodies
 12 on this, and based on that we're moving forward with four
 13 options, two of which are required and then our Bus Rapid
 14 Transit and Light Rail Transit; and if you were looking
 15 at the boards before, you saw that.

16 I want to say a word about something because I
 17 know there's a lot of interest. You will see these
 18 squiggly purple lines on this alignment map. That is not
 19 about the current carpool lane project that's being built
 20 on the 405. As many of you know or who have followed
 21 this, when Measure R passed four and a half years ago, it
 22 provided funding for a series of projects and the funding
 23 is through a series of negotiations among the political
 24 decision makers, it's doled out to projects around the
 25 County, and over a period of time.

1 This project, the one we're talking about today,
 2 is an early project. There are plans, hopes, dreams --
 3 "plans" is too much of a word; we haven't started the
 4 official planning yet -- for some kind of other transit
 5 connection between the Valley and the Westside of
 6 Los Angeles. That purple arrow is just meant to imply
 7 something. It may or may not follow the 405, so we don't
 8 know. I know there's a lot of interest in making a
 9 connection over, under, through, around the hills.
 10 That's not what the purpose of this study is. I want to
 11 assure you and you can see in our Frequently Asked
 12 Questions, we say that. We are thinking about that as a
 13 part of this study. Whatever we do, we don't want to
 14 preclude a future connection. We certainly think that's
 15 a good thing. Our colleagues who are at a very different
 16 stage of looking at that future project are aware of what
 17 we're doing and we work very closely.

18 Okay. So why are we doing this? That's
 19 important. I know many of you are going to go, "Well,
 20 duh," but it's one of the questions that are part of a
 21 series of questions that as a part of this process we
 22 have to answer. We want to make sure that we come up
 23 with a project that will improve north-south mobility in
 24 the area, that will improve reliability and connections,
 25 really enhance connectivity and accessibility by a

1 transit in the area and throughout the region, improve
 2 the options for transit for everyone, but especially
 3 because there is a lot of population that's
 4 transit-dependent in this area. And of course, you know,
 5 as compared to a generation ago or two generations ago
 6 when nobody could conceive of a really transit -- transit
 7 city in Los Angeles, everybody's talking about that now,
 8 which is a great thing, we think, and so the more people
 9 that we can encourage to travel without bringing their
 10 own personal hunk of metal with them and getting to
 11 transit is a great thing.

12 It's a long -- this looks like a long process,
 13 but this is actually a very short process, a very
 14 aggressive schedule. As I said, we completed the
 15 Alternatives Analysis in January. This is where we are
 16 right now (indicating), doing the Environmental Review.
 17 This will happen over the next two years, both the Draft
 18 and the Final Environmental. We'll move into Engineering
 19 and Construction, and the commitment in Measure R and the
 20 commitment in the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan,
 21 which is our agency's countywide road map, is to have a
 22 project up and operating in 2018. That's only five years
 23 away. This is a hugely aggressive schedule. It's going
 24 to take a lot of effort to get that done and we will keep
 25 the public involved at every stage.

1 A little more about the EIS/EIR process: I'm
 2 not going to spend a whole lot of time. We have
 3 information there and you can certainly read about it.

4 Again, we completed the Alternatives Analysis in
 5 2013. It's online.

6 Do we have copies of the Executive Summary? Did
 7 we bring printed copies?

8 So we have printed copies of the Executive
 9 Summary here. I knew that. I just forgot. This is our
 10 first of four meetings, so if we stumble a little bit, I
 11 appreciate your indulgence.

12 By next summer, we should have a draft of the
 13 EIS/EIR for you all to review. We'll have public
 14 hearings at that point in time. We will then recommend
 15 what's known as a Locally Preferred Alternative as staff,
 16 and then the decision makers, the elected decision
 17 makers, will choose that. We will do further analysis on
 18 that in the Final EIS/EIR over the subsequent year, get
 19 that certified, get a Record of Decision, which is the
 20 Federal equivalent of our local approval of that, and
 21 then we'll move into those preconstruction/construction
 22 phases that I just talked about.

23 The purpose of the Draft, what we're in right
 24 now, as I said, is to further refine and analyze our
 25 alternatives, look at the benefits of impacts and lead to

1 a selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative. When we
 2 get to the Final EIS/EIR in about a year, year plus,
 3 whatever that alternative is that is selected, that will
 4 go through more rigorous analysis. When the Draft
 5 Environmental is released, there will be an official
 6 comment period. We will prepare official written
 7 responses to all of those comments. Assuming there will
 8 be mitigations needed for whatever the project is, either
 9 in construction or in operations, we will be developing
 10 that mitigation program and recommend that, and we will
 11 recommend a project for construction.

12 So, again, scoping, this very early period, this
 13 is where we determine what the study is that we're going
 14 to do. We have some ideas. You're going to give us
 15 input, and we'll move forward. And so what we really
 16 want to hear from you -- again, you're welcome to comment
 17 on anything, and by the way, if you do the verbal
 18 comments, so you can think about it, you're going to get
 19 two minutes. So think about that. That's actually a
 20 fair amount of time.

21 What are your thoughts on the purpose and need
 22 for the project? Do you have thoughts on alternatives to
 23 be studied? Are there particular impacts you're
 24 especially interested in that you would like us to
 25 evaluate? Again, ask us those questions. I'm not going

1 to answer them today. And are there possible mitigations
2 that you'd like us to take a look at?

3 And I think with that, I'm going to hand it over
4 to Mr. Davis. He'll take you through the alternatives
5 and then I'll be back.

6 MR. DAVIS: Thank, you Jody.

7 Again, my name is Walt Davis and I feel lucky to
8 be the project manager for this project on the MTA side
9 because I think through this project, the San Fernando
10 Valley, the Eastern San Fernando Valley is going to
11 realize some real north-south transit improvements and
12 I'm excited to be a part of it and I thank you all for
13 being here on a Saturday morning. As beautiful as it is,
14 there's a lot of other things you could be doing. So
15 thank you for coming to let us know what you think about
16 the project. You all work, live, do business, go to
17 school in this area, so your comments are very valuable
18 to us and that's the reason for the scoping meeting.

19 I'm going to be fast because the big part of
20 this meeting is to get your comments, so I don't want to
21 do a whole lot of talking, but I want to tell you what
22 we're going to be doing over the next nine months to a
23 year.

24 Jody was talking about the EIR/EIS process and
25 the EIR/EIS process, in addition to better defining the

1 project, we also look at the project and define what the
2 benefits and impacts are going to be; and the EIR, the
3 Environmental Document, will be divided into
4 approximately 20 chapters and will look at each one of
5 these characteristics or elements or prospectives of the
6 document and, for example, if you are interested in, say,
7 noise and vibration, there will be a chapter in the
8 Environmental Document. You can look it up and you can
9 look and see if there are going to be impacts as it
10 relates to noise and vibration. If there are and it's
11 determined to be significant, we'll look to avoid,
12 minimize, or mitigate and you will look at how we're
13 going to do that and you may have comments and when we
14 have public comments, you'll have the opportunity to
15 comment on that.

16 So it's an open process. We'll try to be as
17 open as we possibly can and the Environmental Document is
18 designed to do so.

19 For those of you who have come to these meetings
20 before, this slide (indicating) we always put up. Jody
21 showed you what she affectionately called the spaghetti
22 map earlier. When we started this project about a year,
23 year and a half ago, we had about 30, 40 different
24 routes, alternatives, and modes that we were looking at.

25 Using the screening criteria and using the

1 purpose and need that Jody showed you earlier, we
2 narrowed this narrow number of build alternatives to six
3 that we presented back in October 2012 and now the two
4 build alternatives I'll be presenting to you in a couple
5 of slides. But this is the screening criteria, one of
6 which is community input, and that's what we are here
7 today to get is your community input.

8 Whenever you do a Federal or State document, you
9 have to do -- two alternatives have to be a part of that
10 document. The first alternative is the No Build
11 alternative and as the name would imply, the No Build
12 asks the question, What if we took the 170 million
13 dollars that's committed to this project and instead of
14 spending it in this area, we did nothing? What would the
15 conditions be like in 2035 if the only projects that are
16 done in this area are the existing highway and transit
17 service improvement projects that are currently
18 identified and committed to this area? What will the
19 study area be like in the year 2035? It asks that
20 question and that serves as our baseline, and that will
21 be a chapter of the document.

22 The second alternative that has to be looked at
23 is called the Transportation System Management
24 alternative and that basically asks the question, What if
25 you just did low-cost improvements instead of a major

1 capital investment project? Could you serve the purpose
2 and needs of this project by doing the spot intersection
3 improvements, spot widening, adding bus service? Could
4 you achieve the purpose and need for a lot lower cost?
5 And that will be a chapter of the EIR/EIS.

6 And then we move into the build alternatives.
7 As Jody mentioned, we're going to have a BRT alternative
8 and we're going to have an LRT alternative. "BRT" is Bus
9 Rapid Transit. "LRT" is Light Rail Transit.

10 For our BRT alternative, I want to emphasize
11 that I'm not talking about the Rapid buses that are
12 currently in service on Van Nuys or Ventura or all over
13 the Valley. We're talking about something that's more
14 akin to the Metro Orange Line, a dedicated right-of-way
15 for the buses.

16 Some of the characteristics for the buses, they
17 could accommodate approximately 75 passengers, stations
18 approximately one mile apart. We don't operate diesel
19 buses anymore, so those of you who lived in the '70s and
20 saw that black smoke spewing from the backs of the buses,
21 you don't see that from our -- I think we have 2700 buses
22 right now. We have a fleet of clean natural gas buses.
23 Maintenance facilities, we do have two maintenance
24 facilities in the San Fernando Valley. If the BRT
25 alternative turns out to be the preferred alternative, we

1 could accommodate the buses at existing maintenance
2 facilities.

3 The route for the BRT alternative would start at
4 the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station where we have
5 some transit-oriented development opportunities and it
6 would proceed southeast along Truman Boulevard and
7 San Fernando Road in mixed-flow traffic. At Van Nuys
8 Boulevard, it would transition into a median-lane -- by
9 "median," the middle of the street -- exclusive bus lane
10 and travel along Van Nuys Boulevard south as far as the
11 Metro Orange Line.

12 At the Metro Orange Line, there are three
13 different options that we could take. One is we conclude
14 it here or we continue south on Van Nuys Boulevard in
15 mixed-flow lane. The second option is we could turn west
16 and travel as far as the Sepulveda Station; or the third
17 option is from the Sepulveda Station, transition back
18 onto Sepulveda Boulevard and travel south to
19 Ventura Boulevard.

20 For this alternative, some of the
21 characteristics: Approximately 12 miles in length, 14
22 stations, travel time is approximately 41 minutes. We
23 did do a modeling effort, and notice that I always say
24 "approximately." The reason I say "approximately" is we
25 have only done a 5 percent level of engineering on this

1 project, so these numbers, as the project is better
2 defined and moves forward and as we do more engineering,
3 they will be refined, but they give you a good estimate
4 of what the travel times would be and what the ridership
5 would be.

6 Our modeling forecast of ridership indicated
7 that by the year 2035, approximately 33,600 weekday
8 boardings would be attracted to this lineup, which is
9 significant. The cost: The cost is estimated between
10 250 and 520 million dollars to build a project in its
11 entirety from Ventura to San Fernando Road. So for the
12 low end, there is a gap that would have to be identified
13 and discussed in the Environmental Document.

14 The second alternative is the Light Rail Transit
15 or LRT alternative. Some of the characteristics:
16 Obviously LRT can't ride in mixed-flow lanes, so it would
17 have to be exclusive right-of-way on tracks;
18 approximately 300 passengers per train car set; stations
19 about a mile apart.

20 Maintenance facilities, if I could spend a
21 moment on maintenance facilities: We do not operate
22 Light Rail Transit in the San Fernando Valley and we
23 cannot maintain trains at a bus division, so we would
24 have to identify a location for a Light Rail maintenance
25 facility. It would have to be approximately 10 to 15

1 acres in size. It would preferably be within about an
2 eighth of a mile alignment. We'd go out about as far as
3 a quarter of a mile, and it would have to be in an
4 industrialized area. We don't want to be around
5 residential neighborhoods.

6 On the other side of this wall, we do have a map
7 where we've preliminarily identified possible vicinities
8 where a station could be and we are very interested in
9 your comments. Do you have any other ideas of alternate
10 locations or do you think we nailed it? Please let us
11 know. Again, you guys work, live, reside out here so you
12 know more about it than we do and we'd be very interested
13 in hearing what you have to say.

14 Okay. The route is very similar to BRT: Start
15 at the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station, travel down
16 Truman Boulevard and San Fernando Road as far as Van Nuys
17 and then travel south to Ventura Boulevard. Light Rail
18 doesn't turn as easily as BRT, so right now we don't have
19 the alternative to turn down Sepulveda, but if you think
20 that's a good idea, we'd be very interested in hearing
21 your comments.

22 Some of the characteristics: Approximately
23 11.2 miles in length, approximately 13 stations. Our
24 forecasting estimated about 37,500 weekday boardings
25 would be realized by the year 2035. Cost: LRT is more

1 expensive, 1.8 to 2.3 billion dollars to construct. So
2 there is a funding gap between what we have and the cost
3 of LRT.

4 Now, with that, for some closing comments, I'll
5 turn it back to Jody. I very much thank you for your
6 time and I look forward to your comments.

7 MS. LITVAK: Okay. Just so you know what I was
8 checking on, we've got -- Ashley's live tweeting the
9 meeting, so I was just watching how that was going on.

10 So, again, this is your opportunity to help
11 shape the study. We want to know what are the issues
12 that are most important to you. Do you have thoughts or
13 questions about BRT, LRT? Are there other modes? Are
14 you most concerned about the speed of travel for transit,
15 for cars, for -- I don't know -- skateboarders, whatever,
16 or is it reliability or all of those things? Are the
17 locations of the stations what really matters to you? If
18 it is LRT, do you have thoughts, comments, questions,
19 issues you'd like us to look at relative to the location
20 of the maintenance yard? Are connections what matters to
21 you? Parking, bicycles, construction impacts, anything
22 else? This is your chance to get these issues into the
23 study for us to look at.

24 So we do want to hear from you. We're going to
25 open it up in a few minutes to -- for you to speak for

1 two minutes. Can everybody see this countdown? I'm
2 going to move it out. Okay.

3 MR. LINDBLAD: No, we can't see it.

4 MS. LITVAK: Yes, you can. You can. All right.

5 So you can comment today. You can send e-mail.
6 You can send snail mail to Walt at that address. You can
7 call the number and leave a message. You can e-mail us
8 at eastsvtransit@metro.net, which is also the same
9 address for the website and there's a "how to contact us"
10 there.

11 We are for the first time -- we think probably
12 in the country for a CEQA/NEPA project -- also accepting
13 official comments via social media, but there is a way
14 you have to do it. If you go to our Facebook page and
15 you just post it on the wall, we can't guarantee we'll
16 capture that; but if you go to our Facebook page, you'll
17 see something that says "Submit Official Scoping
18 Comments" and it will take you to an app that you can
19 fill it out there and they're coming into the project
20 mailbox. I see them every day, so it's working. I'm
21 really excited. We've gotten a ton of them. And if you
22 can get your comment into 140 characters minus the number
23 of characters in that hash tag, we'll take it via Twitter
24 as well, so make sure to tweet it and use the hash tag
25 "eastsvscoping," and then of course you can text us.

1 All of your comments during the scoping period
2 have to get to us by May 6th, so there's lots of time to
3 do that.

4 As I said, this is our first meeting. We'll be
5 Tuesday night at the San Fernando Aquatic Center.
6 Thursday we'll be in Arleta. We're going to live stream
7 that meeting, and then that live stream will also be
8 posted online. And then the following Wednesday we'll be
9 at the Van Nuys Civic Center. And then we'll all
10 collapse, I think.

11 So we're going to do two minutes per speaker.
12 Again, if anybody has a card filled out or wants to fill
13 out a card, raise your hand or raise your filled-out
14 card, and there we go. We'll take them in the order
15 we've got them. Pretty much what I'll ask you to do is
16 come up here to the microphone.

17 These are written comments. Did you want to
18 speak or you're just handing these in? Did you also want
19 to speak?

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, not necessarily.

21 MS. LITVAK: All right. Confuse me.

22 This is to speak. That's right. We have
23 written comment forms also.

24 By the way, Walt is going to be taking general
25 notes on what you're saying here and we have a court

1 reporter who's going to be transcribing them. After the
2 meeting -- after this part of the meeting, we break up.
3 There's a comment table over there. You can fill out the
4 forms. There's comment written forms you can fill out
5 there. If you want to speak to the court reporter and
6 have her transcribe your comments once she gets all of
7 her notes caught up because she's going to have to get
8 all your names down, she'll be here until noon and we'll
9 pull up a chair and you can sit with her as well.

10 So I'm going to call the name of the speaker and
11 the person behind the next person, so come up to the
12 microphone.

13 Dennis, you're first.

14 And just for those who aren't familiar, a little
15 bit of Microphone 101. Okay? Here we go. Hold it
16 really close to your mouth like an ice cream cone. Don't
17 hold it down here. Don't hold it over here. Don't be
18 here and start talking and go like this because we won't
19 hear you. We want to get your comments. You want us to
20 get your comments.

21 We've got -- Ashley, you're operating the -- so
22 what I'll ask -- first of all, I'm going to apologize in
23 advance for any of you where I butcher your name. My
24 intent is to get it as close to correct as I can. I
25 apologize if I blow it, but I will ask you to start by

1 stating your name. Then we'll do the two minutes.

2 Dennis Hindman, followed by Kenneth Silk.

3 Mr. Silk, if you just want to go stand over by
4 the wall over there behind Dennis so we can keep going.

5 And let me just say if any of you have issues --
6 mobility issues that it's a challenge for you to get to
7 the microphone, let us know and we'll bring it to you.

8 Take it away.

9 MR. HINDMAN: Hi. My name is Dennis Hindman.

10 My first concern about the project is it should
11 be done as a complete street, which means pedestrians,
12 bicycles, motor vehicles and transit together, rather
13 than separately.

14 The other thing is that if you compare the
15 current bus service which is curbside, what you get when
16 you put -- whatever the technology, whether it be bus or
17 train down the center, as you get more consistent
18 service, if you compare the Orange Line to the curbside
19 service, it's more consistent, it makes it more
20 attractive, but also the stations you have a much more
21 pleasant experience where the Orange Line stations are
22 kept clean, they're separated from strangers walking by
23 you, it's well lit.

24 Also, the boarding experience, on a curbside
25 bus, you are asked to board almost like cattle through

1 the front door only. That is, it's not a pleasant
2 experience for passengers, whereas on the Orange Line or
3 train, you can board all doors at your leisure, whichever
4 one you want to go to. So the -- that aspect, it's --
5 you get -- you're going to get more ridership if you put
6 it down the middle of the street.

7 Also, for a driver, they can see peripherally
8 what is happening on the street much better than if
9 they're curbside. They can see -- because it's a wide
10 street, you can see if there's any cross traffic or
11 pedestrians or anybody crossing their way. That, you can
12 see from the Orange Line. They have much less trouble
13 when they go down the middle of Chandler, as opposed to
14 when they're going down the rest of it where their view
15 is blocked by sound walls and buildings.

16 So that's all I have.

17 MS. LITVAK: Great. Thank you so much.

18 Mr. Silk, come on up to the microphone, followed
19 by Jack Lindblad.

20 Mr. Lindblad, if you could come on over here.

21 MR. SILK: Kenneth Silk. I'm with various groups,
22 but I'm speaking for myself.

23 Although I live in Encino, I frequently use the
24 buses on Van Nuys for medical facilities, a senior park,
25 the Van Nuys Center and occasionally the Amtrak station.

1 First, I hope that any route will go all the way
2 down to Ventura Boulevard, not end at the Orange Line,
3 because of the need for service and the problem with
4 traffic on Van Nuys from the Orange Line down to Ventura
5 and because of the infrequent service, regular service,
6 on Sepulveda from Ventura up to the Orange Line.

7 As far as time as a factor, I'm more concerned
8 about the time between the various plans, the time it
9 will take to complete the service, complete construction,
10 because I think it's important that -- particularly as a
11 senior that it be completed as soon as possible and also
12 the time -- rather, the total bus ride but the time of
13 the frequency of service to avoid long -- to have the
14 least possible waiting period for them.

15 Also, I hope that whichever plan does follow,
16 there will be, as there is with the other lines, both
17 benches or places to sit as well as cover from the rain,
18 sun or something while waiting for the bus of sorts.

19 Thank you.

20 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much.

21 Okay. Jack Lindblad, followed by another Jack,
22 Jack Waizenegger.

23 MR. LINDBLAD: Well, I don't want to have everybody's
24 neck turn, so unless --

25 MS. LITVAK: However you like. State your name.

1 MR. LINDBLAD: Okay. Great. So I'm going to be
2 speaking to the group about it. I'm an architect, a
3 health care architect, but that has peripheral connection
4 with getting to a net-zero-energy economy.

5 We have a mandate in California in seven short
6 years that we're going to have one-third of our energy
7 from renewable sources and having a dependency, any
8 dependency, on oil or gas or fossil base and subsidizing
9 these corporate welfare people to the hundreds of
10 billions of dollars is not an answer. It's denying the
11 Valley of the fair share of the transit dollar and
12 generally the health and welfare of the survivability of
13 our civilization in California, especially in the
14 Mediterranean climate.

15 So in revitalizing the watershed upstream in the
16 L.A. River, the ecotourism, the potential and the
17 business opportunities that will be totally focused on
18 advantaging ourselves of our blessed resources here
19 cannot be achieved by BRT. In fact, city planners across
20 the country call the BRT system a BRT creep of a thousand
21 cuts. In other words, there are so many opportunities
22 with the level of boarding with -- as mentioned earlier
23 by Dennis -- having a cattle guard for people boarding,
24 having a station instead of a stop, having prepaid fares
25 instead of having to pay at the point of boarding. So

1 that's just to mention a few, but there's over a
2 thousand.

3 So if we're really going to be shepherding and
4 spending our money wisely, it's going to be over the long
5 term. If we're going to be spending a half a billion
6 dollars or a billion dollars for a much greater economic
7 opportunity that's sustainable, we have transit-oriented
8 districts multiplied by transit-oriented development
9 and --

10 MS. LITVAK: All right. You've got to wrap it up.

11 MR. LINDBLAD: -- as architects and planners, we can
12 see a renaissance that will fit the revitalization of
13 Panorama City as a transit-oriented district. Thanks a
14 lot.

15 MS. LITVAK: All right. Mr. Waizenegger, come on up
16 and following Jack Waizenegger is Mike Bernstein here,
17 Mike, if you could get ready.

18 Step on up to the microphone. State your name
19 and we'll get started. Thank you.

20 MR. WAIZENEGGER: Okay. Jody and Walt, thank you
21 very much for being here and bringing the meeting to
22 Panorama City and we'd ask that you continue bringing
23 these meetings to Panorama City.

24 My name is Jack Waizenegger. I'm with the
25 Panorama City Neighborhood Council, Board and Land Use

1 Chair, and Panorama City supports the -- this project and
2 the benefits it's going to bring to our neighborhood.

3 There's -- I just have four items that I want to
4 bring up: One is that during the construction, that we
5 know there's tremendous long-term benefits, but during
6 the construction you have to be very sensitive to all the
7 businesses that are along the right-of-way and that they
8 need to be kept open. A lot of drivers, you know, they
9 can take other boulevards during the inconveniences, but
10 the businesses here need to stay open.

11 Next is the maintenance yard. Panorama City
12 welcomes the maintenance yard in our industrial zone
13 along the railroad tracks here. We've got plenty of
14 space and this is the kind of jobs that we need, the
15 high-paying, the highly skilled jobs that we need to
16 bring back to our neighborhood that left with the plant.

17 The next three stops that are planned or, you
18 know, are possible stops for Panorama City at Nordhoff,
19 Roscoe, and by the Metro rail are -- you know, are good
20 for Panorama City and it's important that the stop near
21 the Metro rail provides easy transfer between the two
22 systems, but it's also critical that the Panorama City
23 businesses just north of the railroad tracks have -- the
24 riders have easy access to the businesses and the jobs
25 and everything that are there.

1 Last is for those of you who are not sure, Light
2 Rail is better than the bus. It's more expensive, but
3 over the long term it's much better. If you're not sure,
4 you know, why, you know, ask some of the others or come
5 and talk to me.

6 Anyway, thanks a lot. And we're in good hands
7 with Walt Davis. He's a very competent project manager.

8 MS. LITVAK: Walt will be sending you the check at
9 the end of this.

10 Mike Bernstein, followed by Jan Brown.

11 Ms. Brown, if you want to get ready,
12 Mr. Bernstein, take it away.

13 MR. BERNSTEIN: Thank you. Good morning and thank
14 you, Jody and Walt and everybody from Metro and LADOT for
15 coming here. It's great to see this being done in a very
16 convenient and transparent manner for public input.

17 The primary thing I want to express is that
18 while I'm glad to see the squiggly purple line on the map
19 and some consideration for coordinating with the
20 Sepulveda Pass project, I would submit that actually this
21 project and Sepulveda Pass have to be explicitly linked
22 and, in fact, combined into a single project. It
23 seems -- it seems difficult for me to believe that these
24 two would be in any way considered -- move at separate
25 speeds or considered in a separate way.

1 If you want to talk about regional connectivity,
2 regional impact, the only -- the only option that's going
3 to deliver that is looking at this in a single
4 consolidated manner with, you know, connectivity from,
5 you know, San Fernando and Sylmar down through the heart
6 of the Valley and of course down through the Westside.
7 If we are spending well over a billion dollars to add one
8 HOV lane on the 405, it seems certainly transparent to me
9 and very obvious to me that the only thing that's going
10 to have the hope of, you know, meaningfully impacting
11 transit times for the better along in the Valley and
12 along the Westside of Los Angeles is some sort of
13 mass-transit alternative under the hill and this has to
14 be considered in a completely coordinated manner.

15 I mean, when you consider this line that could
16 be the backbone of the L.A. Transit system incorporating
17 Chatsworth Metrolink, Orange Line bus, Expo, Purple Line,
18 Green Line, Crenshaw Line, all the way through to LAX,
19 it's -- I can't even comprehend why this would be
20 considered in any way separate from that and, in fact, to
21 the extent that they are separate because of the current
22 condition with the Orange Line, it's likely that the
23 recommendation will mitigate towards BRT versus LRT
24 because it's a new mode of transit.

25 So I would strongly encourage these projects to

1 be combined into a single project so that a true regional
2 alternative and a true regional -- a result that benefits
3 the region as a whole is what ultimately comes out of the
4 process.

5 MS. LITVAK: Great. Thank you so much.

6 While Ms. Brown comes up, I just -- if you saw
7 Lillian hand me another speaker card, that reminds me if
8 anyone still wants to speak, go ahead and fill out a
9 speaker card and we'll take care of you.

10 This is Jan Brown, and following Ms. Brown I've
11 got Victor Santillan, if Mr. Santillan wants to get ready
12 after Ms. Brown.

13 MS. BROWN: Just looking at the BRT options, it seems
14 like the only one that actually continues all the way to
15 Ventura as a sub option of option one, so I don't know
16 whether that's not a separate -- why that's not a
17 separate option. I think -- and I agree with one of the
18 previous speakers. I think it's very important that one
19 of these alternatives continue all the way to
20 Ventura Boulevard and not just channel everybody on the
21 Orange Line over to Sepulveda.

22 The other question generally about all of these
23 options, are there any plans to add parking lots or
24 parking access at any of these stations? There are many
25 times when I would like to take the Orange Line, but

1 frankly, the parking lots are full or there are no
 2 parking lots close to the places that I could get on
 3 board without driving a half an hour out of my way to get
 4 to a station that actually has parking accessible, and I
 5 don't see anything in any of these plans that talks about
 6 adding parking for either of these alternatives. Okay?

7 And I really hope that one of these is completed
 8 in my lifetime. I'm not sure that's going to happen, but
 9 it would be nice.

10 MS. LITVAK: All right. Eat well and be careful
 11 crossing streets and we'll see what we can do.

12 Mr. Santillan and after Victor Santillan, we
 13 have Lorenzo Mutia. God, I hope I said that correctly.
 14 Come on up. Go ahead, sir.

15 MR. SANTILLAN: Hi. Good morning, Metro, State and
 16 City representatives. My name is Victor Santillan and
 17 I'm a resident here at Panorama City. My residence is
 18 pretty much right on Van Nuys at the intersection of
 19 Osborne and Tucker and one of my -- just a general
 20 comment and concern is that whatever option is decided
 21 that there's some infrastructure improvements such as
 22 stormwater runoff issues to be addressed right on
 23 Van Nuys Boulevard. I believe that any issues with
 24 stormwater runoff, for example, during the rainy days may
 25 actually have an impact on traffic flow on the right side

1 of lanes. I'm assuming that the process may actually
 2 stretch out the lanes to as much as possible; and given
 3 that Panorama City has a lot of traffic-flow problems
 4 already during the actual rush-hour times, I believe that
 5 will actually have a major impact, for example, such as
 6 when it rains.

7 And also, the situation with the parking in the
 8 communities, I'm assuming that the parking might actually
 9 be removed from existing parking, pockets right on
 10 Van Nuys Boulevard. So I guess some of the scoping
 11 process would also involve identifying some of the
 12 impacts in the community in regards to the parking in the
 13 community areas.

14 That was my comments. Thank you.

15 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

16 And it gives me an opportunity to remind
 17 everybody and people who came in late that these are the
 18 issues that we're going to take back in and evaluate as a
 19 part of the study and when the Draft EIS/EIR comes out,
 20 we will tell you what the analysis found.

21 You must be Lorenzo Mutia. Did I get it close?

22 MR. MUTIA: Yes, exactly. Very good. Yes.

23 MS. LITVAK: Following that is Gregory Wright.

24 Go ahead.

25 MR. MUTIA: Thank you.

1 MS. LITVAK: Go ahead. Get up close to the
 2 microphone.

3 MR. MUTIA: Oh, thank you. Good morning, everyone.

4 This is my first time going to one of these
 5 meetings, but I do have some comments about -- I do
 6 second that motion from a past speaker that this project
 7 should be combined with the Sepulveda Pass transit, maybe
 8 a tunnel or some sort of thing going on. I don't know
 9 what the plan is exactly, because it's -- and the route
 10 should include Ventura, because both Ventura and the
 11 Westside, I never -- I rarely travel to Ventura or the
 12 Westside because of the traffic and it would be nice if
 13 there was an easier way to get there. So, yes.

14 And I also believe Light Rail should be the way
 15 to get there, because the Orange Line, I respect it, but
 16 the BRT has its shortcomings and I think a Light Rail
 17 Train would hopefully cover those shortcomings.

18 I hope also safety for students at high schools
 19 along the route is also taken into account because of the
 20 pedestrians and all of that. I hope elevated and maybe
 21 underground routes are also considered as part of a way
 22 to mitigate any pedestrian concerns and traffic concerns.
 23 And I also hope that towns and cities like Panorama City
 24 and Van Nuys, the corridor, I hope that they'll become
 25 more than just passing places. They can also become

1 destinations in and of themselves with possible
 2 investment in the area to improve, you know, shopping,
 3 health, educational facilities and all that along the
 4 route.

5 Thank you.

6 MS. LITVAK: Thank you so much.

7 Gregory Wright. That's you.

8 MR. WRIGHT: That's me.

9 MS. LITVAK: And after that, I've got Noel Barajas.

10 That's the last speaker card I have so far, but it
 11 doesn't have to be, so let us know.

12 Go right ahead, sir.

13 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. I have a thought that probably
 14 relates to the encouraging transit mode and shift -- or
 15 mode shift to transit and community input.

16 Excuse me if it's already been raised because I
 17 came in late, but why not at kiosks at major stops along
 18 Van Nuys Boulevard along the future corridor present
 19 pictures of the various possible futures of the corridor
 20 as they will appear at that spot?

21 Like, for example, show it with how the Rapid --
 22 the busway will look at that point and the Light Rail at
 23 that point, and maybe even divide that pair into a pair.
 24 One is the background of the corridor and the city as it
 25 looks now and the other would be the background of a more

1 green, in-the-future Los Angeles. The billboards are
2 gone, the utilities are undergrounded and we've got green
3 walls on buildings and stuff like that, and then invite
4 people to share their thoughts about what they -- about
5 the alternatives among those four that they prefer at a
6 website. And so I hope that will be considered. It kind
7 of brings the people in and involves future visioning.

8 Since I've got some time left, I'll mention
9 really quickly for the half decade between now and the
10 implementation of the reconstituted corridor, please
11 amalgamate the still-separated local and Rapid bus stops.
12 For example, on northbound Van Nuys Boulevard at
13 Riverside, my partner and I have been tortured forever by
14 the divergence between those two buses, trying to figure
15 out with our aging eyes which kind of bus is coming and
16 then running toward the stop. We've missed buses, a lot
17 of them, that way. It's very frustrating.

18 And I would also encourage directions on such as
19 today's announcement to indicate cross streets, not just
20 addresses of destinations. That would really help people
21 use transit where the directions on the buses are given
22 in terms of cross streets. MTA should do it and
23 encourage other -- any venue advertising its events and
24 activities to always show us the cross street.

25 MS. LITVAK: Again, thank you so much.

1 passengers, it seems like it's more efficient to have a
2 300-passenger mobility along the corridor.

3 Also, we can look at the corridor right now.
4 Those BRTs will use the same size buses as are on the
5 Rapid line right now and those buses are already packed
6 to capacity. So will a BRT really be able to handle any
7 increased ridership? It doesn't seem likely.

8 We pointed out the Sepulveda Pass project. If
9 the Sepulveda Pass project goes into effect, there will
10 be potentially a rail line or so that will be dumping
11 300-plus people at the Ventura Boulevard. Now, if we
12 have BRT, how will we be able to address --

13 MS. LITVAK: Noel, I need you to wrap it up. Same
14 two minutes as everybody.

15 MR. BARAJAS: So how will we be able to address the
16 over 300 people on Ventura Boulevard with 75-passenger
17 capacity BRT?

18 MS. LITVAK: Okay. Cesar de la Cruz.

19 This is the last speaker card I have, but it
20 doesn't have to be.

21 Go ahead.

22 MR. DE LA CRUZ: Yes. I work with a developer that
23 owns two properties that are right on the -- one is on
24 Van Nuys Boulevard between Chase, between Chase and
25 Parthenia. The other one is on the corner of

1 Noel Barajas.

2 And Cesar de la Cruz will be after that. And,
3 again, we'll take more. Step on up. Go ahead.

4 MR. BARAJAS: Hello, everybody.

5 As a person that lives in Pacoima and actually
6 takes the transit line, I thought I should point out a
7 couple things and hopefully get some answers for the
8 future.

9 The maintenance facility -- you guys mentioned a
10 maintenance facility. Well, the people in Panorama
11 mentioned how they lost a lot of industries and
12 businesses and jobs out here. I'm just kind of wondering
13 how many potential jobs a maintenance facility could
14 bring to the people that are unemployed out in the
15 San Fernando Valley. So hopefully we can find out how
16 many job potentials a maintenance yard out here could do
17 to improve job creation out here.

18 The other thing, number one on your purpose is
19 improve north-south mobility. Either BRT or LRT will
20 take up a lane along Van Nuys Boulevard, at least, so
21 you're forcing cars on less lanes on Van Nuys potentially
22 so you're creating more traffic there so now we have to
23 rely on public transit to move more people through and
24 hopefully have less cars on the road. So if the buses of
25 BRT handle 75 passengers and Light Rail handles 300

1 San Fernando Road and Van Nuys Boulevard.

2 According to the current statistics, the corner
3 of Van Nuys Boulevard and San Fernando Road, there's a
4 ridership of about 35,000 riders going through there. We
5 are redeveloping that corner and we are conscious of the
6 big ridership that is there and we are trying to
7 accommodate them, but one of the things that is lacking
8 in some of these bus stops that are very heavily -- is
9 restroom facilities. You know, sometimes you have 40, 50
10 people there waiting for 10, 15 minutes and on
11 San Fernando Road and Van Nuys Boulevard, we are going to
12 put some public restrooms.

13 In the shopping center that we own on Van Nuys
14 Boulevard, we also have public restrooms, but I hope that
15 when you get into the final planning of this that you
16 will approach the property owners that are going to be
17 affected or that can actually work in conjunction with
18 Metro to create a better environment for the riders that
19 are waiting for the bus. We see that on, again, Roscoe
20 and Van Nuys Boulevard, Chase and Van Nuys Boulevard and
21 you will find out that -- you will find property owners
22 that are willing to work with you to create a better
23 environment.

24 The riders are like a two-edged sword for
25 businesses. They are potential customers, but at the

1 same time they create havoc sometimes. So please work
2 with us, too.

3 MS. LITVAK: We will. We need all the partners we
4 can get. Thank you.

5 All right. That's the last speaker card I have,
6 so I think we're going to wrap up this part of the
7 morning. We are going to be here until noon.

8 I invite you to fill out these forms and turn in
9 written comments at the table over there. If you want to
10 take them with you when you go home, you may walk out of
11 here and three minutes after that or this evening or on
12 Wednesday, you may have a brilliant thought, so you can
13 get this in to us.

14 These are all the other ways (indicating) you
15 can communicate with us. Please let us know about
16 scoping from now through May 6th.

17 Once our court reporter goes through all of the
18 speaker cards I gave her so she makes sure she's got your
19 names accurately, she'll be available if any of you want
20 to spend a couple moments with her getting your thoughts
21 on the record.

22 And we've got coffee and snack bars, and have a
23 great Saturday, everybody. Thank you so much.

24 MR. GUTIERREZ: So basically what I told her was that
25 I like where you guys are going as far as the projects.

1 The only things I'm really concerned about are the
2 environmental impacts over a long period of time for the
3 future and the street density, like where you guys are
4 going to keep the people as far as the street, yeah,
5 'cause I walk along the streets a lot and I'm sort of
6 just concerned about if the people are just going to be
7 poured out onto the street and then cause more traffic
8 for the vehicles and for me. That's pretty much it on my
9 part.

10 (Proceedings concluded at 12:00 p.m.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ESFV COMMENTS: Community Meeting #2 - San Fernando Aquatics Center (Written)					
Date	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Address	Comment
3/19/2013	S. Michelle	Klein-Hass	Center - East Renter Rep	8820 Van Nuys Blvd. #2, Panorama City, CA, 91402	Light Rail or Bust!! Fully support the Light Rail Option, and I welcome the maintenance yard in Panorama City. Panorama City needs Jobs and this would represent more jobs in town.
3/19/2013	Christine	Estrada	Resident		I am favoring the light rail project. I would use that mode of transportation more so than a bus line. I would like to know the potential of the light rail to be connected to other parts of the valley or further out to Santa Clarita in the future.
3/19/2013	Marcos	Tapia		13242 Drowfield Avenue	This should be a no build.
3/19/2013	Mais	Sagradyon		17221 Chatsworth Street #110, Granada Hills, CA, 91344	BRT seems logical because time differences for end to end travel differs only by 10 minutes and the weekly use is similar but it costs a fraction of the LRT and if it is all on it's dedicated route, it seems easier to maintain.
3/19/2013	Imelda	Padilla	Sun Valley Area NC	8700 Norris Avenue, Sun Valley, CA, 91352	1. Is there any way we can make Van Nuys a Light Rail train and link it to the Sepulveda Project? 2. Can we have the Van Nuys corridor LRT also continue on the orange line down to North Hollywood station? I ask because if one uses Van Nuys to transfer on the orange line, to reach noho, for the future of this project I think it would be best to continue the light to noho because the orange line is already operating at full capacity, thus it can't just soak up the new passengers that this new project will pick up. That's overkill for the orange line. Thus, I want to know if it would be a better idea to extend this project to? #1 be linked tot he Sepulveda Project #2 continue to the orange line route down to noho? What would these two additions mean? In other words travel both north and south closer to the west valley side.
3/19/2013	Liza	Wright	CSUN Student	17720 Superior Street #313, Northridge, CA, 91325	Pro-light rail transit, I would like to see it over BRT, we need to get away from buses and go towards rail in our future.
3/19/2013	Angel Joy	Estrada	Small Business Owner		I prefer the light rail option through Sepulveda Blvd, and potentially build another phase through the Sepulveda pass mountains to UCLA and LAX
3/19/2013	Julia	Hernandez			I would prefer the light rail over bus option. I like the exclusive lane for the rail and in the long run its greener compared to the bus. Maybe consider running along Sepulveda and instead of Van Nuys. Van Nuys is a bit more narrow and feel Sepulveda would be a better choice.

ESFV COMMENTS: Com	
First Name	Last Name
Jack	Lindblad
Marcos	Tapia
John	Ulloth

Kevin	Davis
Lydia	Drew Mather
Stacey	Siegel

munity Meeting #2 - San Fernando Aquatics Center (Verbal)

Comment

I'm Jack Lindblad. I'm pretty much representing the movement through the community activists throughout the East San Fernando Valley and, well, primarily through the Facebook like page that advocates Light Rail over the BRT. We were very successful in assisting the decision to be made to be put on Van Nuys Boulevard. A lot of the same comments and the arguments that led us to seeing Van Nuys as a superior grid over the Sepulveda because of the same reason or the same reasons to see the LRT is over Bus Rapid Transit creep that we've seen already, even in the alternative stage here where's there's mixed-flow traffic in San Fernando. It's really a clog. Just getting out here tonight up San Fernando road, it's impossible. You can imagine the lowered service and lowered expectations. The half a billion dollar expenditure would be wasting money. It's a criticism. To be wisely spending the public money in an alternative that's going to last through 2035/2050. And, again, the project director here has mentioned the daily news yesterday, as we all know, that it's part of a larger network the high speed rapid rail through California and also the regional area. So it serves as a significant tie to the airport and Santa Clarita and points north of Fresno. And I'm going to use my few seconds left as an architect and I'm saying that the scoping has to include, or must include, if we're going to come out of this all right, the fact that the budget cannot be driven -- we can't use the budget as a vehicle to drive the solution saying we only have 170 million or 300. Any programming effort that the scoping involves, you've got time, which is pretty short, budget -- Okay. Ten seconds. We've got to have the Map 21 and America Fast Forward put to use here as part of the scoping; so that we have a financial vehicle to entertain the correct choice.

Marcos Tapia; M-a-r-c-o-s. last name's Tapia; T-a-p-i-a. When we build this project, we got to make sure that the council members and our elected officials get the same positive financial stuff like they did in Agoura Hills, on Agoura Road in Lindero Canyon, when they used the Measure R funds to -- they repaved, they restriped, they redid the lighting. So if you guys go to build this thing here, make sure you upgrade all the lighting, all the paving, all the striping, all the signs. Make sure we get our fair share here in the Valley, just like they did over there in Westlake. So those elected officials in San Fernando, your Assembly, call all your representatives, make sure we get our fair share. Don't try to shortchange us. Because like did on San Fernando Road, that bike path is maintained by Parks and Rec. The job that you guys did over there in Chatsworth is contracted out by maintenance people. So that's why it looks real nice over there. So when you build the project here, do the same thing. Make it look nice. That's what we're asking you to do. Thank you.


Okay. John Ulloth rising to speak on behalf of rail, surprised that the streetcar was thrown out because of the low-flow boarding capabilities of the vehicle, I think, using the existing curve. But in any case, Light Rail is just fine and Bus is insufficient. I'm curious about the change in the route map, which is available on the Internet, versus the one we're seeing today. I prefer the one that goes over to Sepulveda Boulevard then Parthenon then down to Sherman Oaks. However, this must be followed up by a connection to UCLA. Without this, as this project stands alone, doesn't make any sense connecting to UCLA and the Aqua Line, Expo Line makes abundant sense, and it should be done. So forward on Rail and whatever the route may happen to take. But let's, please, make sure that this is part of a bigger system with all the connections that's we need. Thank you.

SF Aquatics (Spoken)

My name is Kevin Davis. I'm actually president of the Foothill Trails Council, which includes Lake View Terrace and Shadow Hills area. I'm looking at your map. I'm a little disappointed that we didn't go back to the Sepulveda route. Knowing the Valley, having lived here all my life, Van Nuys is probably one of the narrowest streets to build this kind of transit route on. And I'm concerned about the disruption in the area. But if you're going to go with this route, I would ask you to consider future generations. Right outside the area in question here is the Mission college. I'd like to see if you guys might consider extending the route up a little farther. I notice you run several miles along the San Fernando Corridor, which is already served by the Metrolink route. So if we're going to advocate for future generations to use mass transit, it would be good to get in the habit in college. I would like to advocate you consider extending it6 an extra mile or so up to Mission College and include it as part of your route.

All three maps I see here are making a grave mistake. I've voiced this for the last year and a half in this process. The line needs to get off of Van Nuys Boulevard near the railroad tracks to either Saticoy or Sherman Way and go down Sepulveda. There are too many schools, too much business that will be permanently damaged by having dedicated lines through the city of Van Nuys up through Sherman Oaks. Not to mention there's a hospital in Sherman Oaks, freeway access. I don't know how they expect to get past that. But they can access the Orange Line parking on Sepulveda which is underutilized. As it stands now, if they need to get over to Van Nuys Boulevard, they can take the line from there. But it is wrongheaded and stubborn on the part of MTA to continue to go from Van Nuys Boulevard to south of Sherman Way. You will destroy schools, neighborhoods, and businesses all the way down Van Nuys Boulevard. And as a resident of Van Nuys, founder of the Historic Zone and currently serving on the South L.A. Area Planning Commission, I urge them to seriously take a look at the other alternatives..

I'm Stacey Siegel; S-I-e-g-e-l. Keys Automotive Group, K-e-y-e-s. I'm representing the Auto Row. We urge the Metro to place this line on Sepulveda Boulevard, which is the natural place for it to be. It's adjacent to the 405 Freeway, and it makes sense for the eventual construction through the pass, for the line to be on Sepulveda Boulevard, which is an artery for the Valley. We feel that at Sherman Way or Oxnard would be alternatives that would be acceptable. And we urge them to consider this location. And that's it. I just want to go on record that, as we said before, it would kill business, and it would be a bad choice.



East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: S. Michelle Klein - Hass	
Organization/Organización: Center - East Renton Rep, PANORAMA City NC	
Address/Dirección: 8820 Van Nuys Blvd. #2 PC, CA 91402	
Tel:	Email/Correo electrónico: msgeek703@gmail.com

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

LIGHT RAIL OR BUST!! Fully support
 the Light Rail Option, AND I welcome the
 MAINTENANCE YARD in PANORAMA City. PANORAMA
 City needs JOBS AND this would represent more
 jobs in TOWN.

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <i>Christine Estrada</i>	
Organization/Organización: <i>Resident of Sylmar & Small business owner</i>	
Address/Dirección:	
Tel:	Email/Correo electrónico:

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

I am favoring the light rail project. I would use that mode of transportation more so than a bus line. I would like to know the potential of the light rail to be connected to other parts of the valley or further out to Santa Clarita in the future.

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: MARCOS TAPPA	
Organization/Organización:	
Address/Dirección: 13242 DROWFIELD AVE	
Tel: 818-833-0460	Email/Correo electrónico: TAPPA@TRANSPORTATION.MSU.COM

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

(THIS SHOULD BE A NO BUILD)

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





**East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study**

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <i>Mais Sagradyn</i>	
Organization/Organización:	
Address/Dirección: <i>17221 Chatsworth St #110, Granada Hills CA 91344</i>	
Tel: <i>(818) 284-2000</i>	Email/Correo electrónico: <i>maisagradyn@yahoo.com</i>

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

BRT seems logical because time differences for end to end travel differs only by 10 mins and the weekly use is similar but it costs a fraction of the LRT. And if it is all on its' dedicated route, it seems easier to maintain.

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





**East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study**

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <i>Imelda Padilla</i>	
Organization/Organización: <i>San Valley Area Neighborhood Council</i>	
Address/Dirección: <i>8700 Norris Ave SV CA 91352</i>	
Tel:	Email/Correo electrónico: <i>ipadilla@pacomabeautiful.org</i>

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:

Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 pacomabeautiful.org
 Arleta High School

① Is there any way we can make Van Nuys a Light Rail train and link it to the Sepulveda project?

② Can we have the Van Nuys corridor LRT also continue on the orange line down to North Hollywood Station? I ask because if one uses Van Nuys to transfer on the orange line, to reach

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.


Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.

noho, for the future of this project I think it would be best to continue the light to noho because the orangeline is already operating at full capacity, thus it



Metro





East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <u>Liza Wright</u>	
Organization/Organización: <u>CSUN student</u>	
Address/Dirección: <u>17720 Superior street #313, Northridge CA 91325</u>	
Tel: <u>760 855 388</u>	Email/Correo electrónico: <u>LizaWright42@yahoo.com</u>

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

Pro - light rail transit, I would like to see
 it ~~have~~ over BRT, we need to get away from
 buses and go towards rail in our future.

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <i>Angel Joy Estrada</i>	
Organization/Organización:	
Address/Dirección: <i>Small Business Owner</i>	
Tel:	Email/Correo electrónico:

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

I prefer the Light Rail Option through Sepulveda Blvd, and potentially build another phase through the Sepulveda Pass Mountains to UCLA and LAX

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





**East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study**

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <u>Julio Hernandez</u>	
Organization/Organización:	
Address/Dirección:	
Tel: <u>818-545-9485</u>	Email/Correo electrónico: <u>cutracho@outlook.com</u>

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:

- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

I would prefer the light rail over bus
option. I like the exclusive lane for the rail
and in the long run its greener compared to
the bus. maybe consider running along ~~San~~ Sepulveda
instead of Van ~~nuys~~. Van nuys is a bit more narrow
and feel Sepulveda would be a better choice.

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 3/19/2015

Name: JERRY ULLICH

Organization: _____

Address: PO BOX 7232 VAN NUYS, CA 91411

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 3-19-13
Name: JACK LINDBLAD
Organization: ESFV Transit (Coalition)
Address: 8211 Shadyglade Av

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



**EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS**

Please print.

Date: 13-3-19

Name: MARCUS TAPIA

Organization: _____

Address: 13242 DROWFIELD AVE

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 03/20/17

Name: Kevin Davis

Organization: Toothill Trails District NC

Address: 12145 Claretta Street, Lake View Terrace

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.

BEFORE THE METRO

EAST SAN FERNANDO Valley TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT TEAM

Public Scoping Meeting in the)
Matter of:)
)
EAST SAN FERNANDO Valley TRANSIT)
CORRIDOR STUDY)
_____)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

San Fernando Valley, California

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Reported by:

ALETHA LOFTFIELD,
CSR No. 13767

Job No.:
B9339NCO

1 BEFORE THE METRO
 2 EAST SAN FERNANDO Valley TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT TEAM
 3
 4
 5
 6 Public Scoping Meeting in the)
 Matter of:)
 7)
 EAST SAN FERNANDO Valley TRANSIT)
 8 CORRIDOR STUDY)
 _____)

9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken at
 16 San Fernando Aquatics Center, 208 Park Avenue,
 17 San Fernando, California, commencing at
 18 6:03 p.m. on Saturday, March 19, 2013, heard
 19 before the METRO EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT
 20 CORRIDOR PROJECT TEAM, reported by ALETHA LOFTFIELD,
 21 CSR No. 13767, a Certified Shorthand Reporter
 22 in and for the State of California.
 23
 24
 25

1 APPEARANCES:
 2 Metro Presenters: WALTER DAVIS
 Project Manager
 3 Metro
 4 JODY LITVAK
 Community Relations Director
 5 Metro
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

1 I N D E X
 2 PUBLIC SPEAKERS: PAGE
 3 MARCOS TAPIA 5
 4 28
 5 JACK LINDBLAD 26
 6 JOHN ULLOTH 29
 7 KEVIN DAVIS 30
 8 LYDIA DREW MATHER 32
 9 STACEY SIEGEL 33
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

1 San Fernando Valley, California, Tuesday, March 19, 2013
 2 6:03 p.m.
 3
 4
 5 MR. TAPIA: Marcos; M-a-r-c-o-s. Tapia; T-a-p-i-a.
 6 Well, the statement that I wanted to make was: Is
 7 the Northeast Valley going to get the same financial
 8 treatment as Agoura Hills job site? It's located on Agoura,
 9 and, I want to say, Lake View Cannon Road or Lindero Canyon.
 10 We need striping, trees, landscaping, new sidewalks
 11 like they got. And just, hopefully, we get the same
 12 financial benefits as they did in Agoura Hills. That's it.
 13 Mainly, it's a big financial discrepancy.
 14 MS. LITVAK: Good evening, everybody. My name is Jody
 15 Litvak and I'm with Metro. And before we get into the meat
 16 of the program, I want to make sure if anybody needs
 17 simultaneous Spanish translation, tonight we have that
 18 available for you.
 19 And we're going to repeat that message to you right
 20 now.
 21 (Spanish translation)
 22 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.
 23 So we're going to get started. My name is Jody
 24 Litvak. I'm with -- I am with Metro, or MTA. We're here
 25 tonight to talk about the -- hold on.

1 We're here tonight to talk about the East
2 San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor. This is a project we
3 are doing in conjunction with the City of Los Angeles and
4 the City of San Fernando. And we're pleased tonight to
5 welcome our partners from the City of San Fernando,
6 including Councilman Jesse Avila.

7 Thank you for coming.

8 In addition, from State Senator Padilla's office
9 Noel Barajas and Gibson Niambra (phonetic spelling). How
10 did I do?

11 (Applause)

12 You were all given a bunch of information when you
13 arrived tonight, this evening. We've got our frequently
14 asked questions. You don't need to read it now, but you
15 might want to take it with you. There's a lot of new
16 information in there. We have information on our remaining
17 meetings, our ever-lovely fact sheet.

18 And most importantly for tonight, we are here to
19 get your input. And there are lots of ways to give input.
20 And we'll letting you know what those are.

21 But for tonight, two things: One is you should
22 have all been given a speaker card. Once we get through
23 with our presentations, we'll have an opportunity to hear
24 from you. You'll have two minutes to speak. But I need you
25 to fill out this card. So if you don't have a card and you

1 to be tweeting tonight's meeting. So -- I mean, maybe
2 she'll be texting with friends and stuff, but really she'll
3 be tweeting tonight's meeting. I promise. I promise.
4 So the purpose of tonight's meeting is to give you
5 some overview and background on this project, describe
6 alternatives to be studied, and most importantly, get your
7 input.

8 For any of you who have been to some of the
9 meetings before we've had on this project, I want to let you
10 know a little bit about this phase that we're in. We're in
11 a period called "scoping." It's the very beginning of the
12 be environmental analysis. And it's your opportunity to
13 help us shape the project, shape the study.

14 So you can ask questions tonight. And it might be
15 a little frustrating for you, but we really probably can't
16 give you answers. The purpose of the study is to do the
17 analysis and develop the answers to those questions.

18 So ask your questions, get them on the record,
19 share your opinions with us, and just understand we're going
20 to be doing a lot of analysis over the course of the next
21 year or so. And please be patient with us. That's how the
22 process goes.

23 We're not starting off brand new. How we got here
24 was over the last year and a half, two years, we did a lot
25 of analysis in an alternative analysis study. We were we

1 want one, raise your hand and Lillian will get it to you.
2 If you have a card and want to speak and haven't turned it
3 in yet, raise the card, wave it around, and she'll come get
4 it from you.

5 And if you -- and you can do that at any point
6 during this evening. So if you hear something that I say or
7 Walt says and at that point decide you have to speak, go
8 ahead and do that.

9 AUDIENCE: Just raise your hand, and I'll come get it
10 from you.

11 MS. LITVAK: Yeah, at any point.

12 In addition, we have this form for written
13 comments. You can fill it out -- and where did the box go?

14 AUDIENCE: Over at the table over there.

15 MS. LITVAK: There in the corner. That's where you can
16 take it.

17 In addition, I would encourage any of you who have
18 this (indicating), you might want to take it with you,
19 although other information talks about how to contact us.
20 If you leave tonight and suddenly a light bulb goes on over
21 your head and you have a brilliant idea you forgot to submit
22 tonight, don't worry about it. This will tell you how to
23 get it to us.

24 With that -- where did Ashley go? There's Ashley.
25 If you see Ashley clicking away with her thumbs, she's going

1 were out in the community a lot. We hosted ten meetings.
2 We probably came to a number of meetings in your
3 communities.

4 We looked at a bunch of different alternatives.
5 The map on the left there is if you put all the alternatives
6 on one map, that's what it looked like. We looked at a
7 whole bunch of different routes.

8 We did more in-depth analysis on six of them. And
9 then in January of this year, that all got rolled into an
10 alternatives analysis study, which is online if any of you
11 want to read it. I think we have a copy of the executive
12 summary over where Lillian is pointing, back there
13 somewhere.

14 Okay. And we're moving forward with four
15 alternatives. Walt is going to talk about them a little bit
16 more, two that are required and two of the other
17 alternatives. I'll let Walt fill you in on that.

18 Why are we doing this? Let's start off from the
19 beginning. Why are we even taking a look at this?
20 Certainly there's a directive. When voters of Los Angeles
21 adopted Measure R a little over four years ago and when the
22 long-range transportation plan for Los Angeles County was
23 adopted, a project for north-south mobility in the eastern
24 part of the San Fernando Valley was included.

25 There's a lot of people who travel this area. We

1 have some of our busiest bus routes here; some of our
 2 highest ridership and congestion.
 3 So really, what are the options that we can look
 4 at? How can we move more people more efficiently where we
 5 are? I think everyone in Los Angeles realizes we've paved
 6 all we can. And we have to figure out how to use what we
 7 have more efficiently.
 8 So we're looking at something, as I said, to
 9 improve north-south mobility, improve the operations and the
 10 connections between key transit locations, make transit more
 11 accessible and improved connectivity both to local
 12 destinations and destinations further in the region, have
 13 more transit options, especially, much of the area we're
 14 looking at has a large transit-dependent population.
 15 So if we can help them, we'll be able to help
 16 everybody, which is a good thing. And, of course, in the
 17 opening of this vein, we're trying to move more people more
 18 efficiently in the space we have. If we can encourage
 19 people to get out of their cars and move to transit, that
 20 would be great.
 21 I know these studies and these projects seem like
 22 they take forever. This is actually a pretty aggressive
 23 timeframe. Over the next two years, we'll be doing the
 24 environmental analysis and some of the early engineering.
 25 We plan to wrap that up and move into engineering

1 many of you are familiar with the term "CEQA" or "EIR."
 2 We're doing that, but in addition we're following the
 3 federal procedures, which mirror that. So you'll hear the
 4 term "EIS" as well.
 5 By the way, I see one person in the front taking
 6 notes. This presentation should be posted to our website in
 7 the next day or so.
 8 Okay. The purpose of the Draft EIS/EIR is to
 9 really define and refine the alternatives that we're looking
 10 at, look at the benefits and impacts of those
 11 alternatives -- both what the benefit and impacts would be
 12 while the project is being built and then once it's up and
 13 running. And, again, select that LPA when we move into the
 14 final.
 15 As I said, that LPA will go through further
 16 analysis. When we release the Draft EIS/EIR, there will be
 17 another formal comment period, and there will be hearings,
 18 and all of those questions at that point will be recorded
 19 and in the final EIS/EIR, we will actually develop the
 20 formal responses to those comments.
 21 We'll recommend mitigations for any impacts that
 22 need them. And ultimately recommend a project for
 23 construction. And, again, those decisions will be made by
 24 the Metro Board of Directors in concert with the cities of
 25 Los Angeles and San Fernando.

1 in 2015 and construction in 2016 for a project that has been
 2 promised to be open by 2018. That is an extremely,
 3 extremely aggressive schedule.
 4 But that's our commitment. And we're going to be
 5 working hard to try and fulfill it. And the public will be
 6 involved throughout. There will be lots of opportunities.
 7 I do want to make a note before -- it popped into
 8 my head. After we conclude this round of meetings, there --
 9 while we'll be involved with public throughout, there will
 10 be periods of a lot of activity with you and periods where
 11 you may not hear from us.
 12 We'll be going into more quiet periods as we do
 13 some analysis in the coming months. But we'll be back, I
 14 promise.
 15 More on the environmental-study side that will get
 16 us through the next two years. As I mentioned, we completed
 17 the alternatives analysis this past January. It will take
 18 us a little more than a year to review the draft
 19 environmental analysis and get it out to you.
 20 Later next year, there will be an adoption of
 21 what's called a "locally preferred alternative" or "LPA."
 22 That's the option that will go through further environmental
 23 review in the final EIS/EIR during 2015.
 24 We'll get that certified and hopefully get what's
 25 know as a "record of decision." This process is called --

1 Unlike some other projects, this is a project that
 2 is envisioned to run on the city streets. Which is why
 3 we're working so closely with cities.
 4 So scoping, as I said, is the process of
 5 determining what the scope and focus of the content is of
 6 the study we're doing. So you are invited -- you can give
 7 us comments on whatever you want, but we especially really
 8 need right now is for you to tell us what you think about
 9 the purpose and need for the project, the alternatives to be
 10 studied, the impacts to be evaluated, and possible
 11 mitigations. And I'll be back to talk about that more in a
 12 little bit.
 13 And I think -- Mr. Davis.
 14 MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Jody.
 15 My name is Walt Davis. I am the Metro project
 16 manager for this project, and I am very pleased to be here.
 17 And I want to thank everybody for coming out. It's
 18 a beautiful Tuesday evening, and I know there are a lot of
 19 other things you could be doing tonight. So thank you for
 20 coming out. And in a moment you'll have opportunity to
 21 share your ideas and thoughts, wants, desires about this
 22 project, how we might make it of greater benefit to you.
 23 And I'm excited to be the project manager because
 24 this I think this project -- one day we are going to realize
 25 some real north-south improvement in mass transit in the

1 San Fernando Valley. So, again, thank you for coming out.
2 You may be asking yourself what we are going to be
3 doing over the next nine months to a year, and I'm
4 going to go over that and a few more slides. I'll show you
5 two build alternatives are. Jody touched on the DEIR/DEIS.
6 And what we're going to be doing, in addition to better
7 defining the project, is environmental clearing the project.

8 When you do that, the environmental document will
9 be divided into 20 chapters. Each one of these elements, or
10 each one of these perspectives, will be addressed in the
11 environmental document. And not only will we identify the
12 benefits, but we'll identify the impact of the project.

13 Obviously, we can't do a
14 multi-hundred-million-dollar project and get the corridor
15 without impacting some people. In the interest of full
16 disclosure, we're going to disclose which impact in each one
17 element.

18 So for example, if you're interested in noise and
19 vibration, you can go to that chapter and see if there's an
20 impact. And if there's an impact, how we're going to avoid
21 the impact -- avoid, minimize or mitigate that impact.

22 And you'll have opportunity in a year or two to
23 talk to us again and let us know if you have any ideas on
24 how we might better address any effect it might have on you.

25 This is the exercise we're going to be doing for

1 And those alternatives, as the name would imply,
2 no-build asks question: What if -- with the money that's
3 going to be attached to this project -- what if you did
4 nothing? What if the the only thing you did were the
5 existing highway projects and existing transit projects that
6 are already committed to the area, that the money identified
7 for this project were committed to another project? What
8 would the conditions be like in 2035 if you did nothing?

9 And that's, basically, the baseline and that has to
10 be looked at as an alternative. Would there be gridlock, or
11 would people get around fine? That's the question that the
12 no-build answers.

13 The Transportation System Management alternative
14 asks: What if, rather than doing a major capital investment
15 project, what would happen if you did low-cost improvements
16 like spot intersection widening, better sitting at the
17 lights, put a lot more buses out there.

18 Could you meet the goals and objectives of the
19 purpose and need by doing lower-cost improvements and save
20 yourself a lot of money? And that's the question I'll be
21 asking with the TSM alternatives. So these two alternatives
22 will be considered in the environmental document in addition
23 to the build alternatives. I'm going with two build
24 alternatives that I'm moving for: One BRT and one LR
25 alternative. But the BRT alternative -- and I want to

1 the next nine months to a year. And we'll be coming back to
2 you when it's better defined. For those of you who have
3 come to past meetings -- we've gone up and down Van Nuys,
4 Sepulveda, every meeting I've had, I've shown this slide.
5 What this slide shows is: How we screen the number of
6 criterias down to where we're at today and how we're further
7 screening it down to the preferred alternative.

8 Jody showed you a map that had about 30, 40
9 alternatives on it. We took all those alternatives, and we
10 applied it to this screening criteria. And you might notice
11 that one screen criteria is community input, and that's what
12 we're here today to get is your community input.

13 We took those 30, 40 alternatives, we narrowed it
14 down to six build alternatives that were presented about six
15 months ago at a meeting just like this, took community
16 input, weighed that community input with additional
17 technical modalities -- light travel and mobility to assist
18 regional connectivity -- and have now narrowed it down to
19 two build alternatives, as well as for state bill requiring
20 no-build and TSM alternatives. So the screen criteria
21 you'll see again at our next meeting, too.

22 For the environmental document and for all federal
23 and state documents, in addition to the build alternatives,
24 two alternatives that had to be considered are the no-build
25 and Transportation System Management alternatives.

1 emphasize for BRT, I'm not talking about Metro Rapid Bus
2 that's on Van Nuys and San Fernando Road, I'm talking about
3 something more (unintelligible phrase) where you have a
4 dedicated right-of-way.

5 So for the BRT alternative, we're looking at buses
6 that can carry approximately 75 people per fully loaded
7 stations, approximately one mile apart. Maintenance
8 facilities, we do have two maintenance facilities in the
9 San Fernando Valley to maintain the service buses. So if it
10 turns out to be the preferred alternative, we would not have
11 to build new maintenance facility in the San Fernando
12 Valley.

13 The route for the BRT alternative would start the
14 Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink station, not far from where
15 we're at right now where we have some transit oriented
16 development opportunities. From there, it would travel down
17 to Truman and San Fernando Road in mixed-flow traffic until
18 it gets to Van Nuys Boulevard.

19 Van Nuys Boulevard, it would transition into a
20 median running -- and that median in the middle of the
21 street -- dedicated bus lane, and travel down Van Nuys
22 Boulevard as far as the Metro Orange Line. At that point,
23 for the BRT alternative, we have three options:

24 The first option is: It can stop at the Metro
25 Orange Line or it can continue south in mixed-load traffic.

1 Option number two, it can join the Metro Orange Line and
2 travel west to the Sepulveda station. Or option number
3 three, from the Sepulveda Station transition back to
4 Sepulveda Boulevard south to Ventura Boulevard.

5 For this alternative, some of the characteristics:
6 It would be approximately 12 hours long and include,
7 approximately, 14 stations. And I want to emphasize -- I
8 keep on saying "approximately" -- the reason for that is to
9 this level, we've only done a 5 percent level of
10 engineering. So if the project was better defined and the
11 City of San Fernando Valley and City of L.A., who are both
12 represented at this meeting, as well as the FDA, the project
13 will be better defined and (unintelligible phrase) we think
14 that we're in the ballpark.

15 We've done initial modeling effort. And the
16 modeling effort is the means by which you forecast what
17 ridership would be. And what that effort communicated would
18 be approximately 33,600 boardings on an average weekday by
19 the year 2035, which is excellent.

20 The cost to build this thing from end to end would
21 be somewhere in the neighborhood of 250 to \$520 million. So
22 there's a funding gap between the amount of money identified
23 and the amount this would cost.

24 The next alternative Light Rail Transit or the LRT
25 alternative, some of the characteristics: Exclusive

1 So with the LRT alternative, we would have to find
2 a location and build a Light Rail transit facility.

3 Now for the alternative, very similar to BRT. it
4 starts at Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink station and travels
5 southeast as far as Van Nuys, takes (unintelligible) the
6 entire distance, then south on Van Nuys as far as Ventura
7 Boulevard.

8 Some of the characteristics of the LRT alternative:
9 11.2 miles for the total distance, and we may look at this
10 project in phases. Potentially 13 stations, our official
11 modeling effort indicated that approximately 37,500
12 boardings would be attracted to this line by year 2035.

13 The cost: LRT does come with a big price tag,
14 somewhere in the neighborhood of 1.8 to 2.3 billion dollars.
15 So there's a sizable difference between what's been
16 specifically identified in the cost of this alternative.

17 So the reason why we're here is to hear your
18 comments. So I'm going to conclude. I thank you for your
19 time. I'll turn it back over to Jody for some housekeeping
20 issues.

21 MS. LITVAK: I need that, sir (indicating).

22 Thank you.

23 Two important things: One is: I'd like to welcome
24 also from the City of San Fernando, Mayor Antonio Lopez who
25 came in.

1 right-of-way, light rail trains have steel wheels instead of
2 rubber wheels, they have to be on train tracks; so it has to
3 be exclusive right-of-way for the entire system. Two-car
4 train set can take over 300 passengers. Stations are
5 typically one mile apart. And for the maintenance facility,
6 we do not have Light Rail Transit in the San Fernando
7 Valley, so if LRT turns out to be the preferred alternative,
8 we would have to identify a site for a Light Rail
9 maintenance facility.

10 And I might point out the board right over here by
11 the councilman (indicating), "Potential LRT Maintenance
12 Facilities." We've targeted just a couple of the areas that
13 might be a good location for a Light Rail maintenance
14 facility.

15 Some of the characteristics we're looking for: It
16 must be an industrialized area. It can't be near
17 residential properties. They have to be within -- we'd like
18 it to be within one-eighth of a mile, but within a quarter
19 of a mile, you don't want Light Rail going through areas
20 with having people on it, so it's too close to the alignment
21 itself, and we need between 10 and 15 acres.

22 I would encourage you to look at that illustration.
23 If you think we nailed it, let us know, write your comments.
24 Or if you have any ideas for an alternate location, we'd be
25 interested in hearing those comments, as well.

1 Thank you for coming.

2 (Applause)

3 And Council Member Robert Gonzalez, as well, who
4 has joined us.

5 Thank you both for being here.

6 Before I go on with the presentation, something I
7 was supposed to say earlier, and I'm going to get in trouble
8 if I don't: You see this purple squiggly line right here
9 that you saw on all the other maps? That is not the current
10 carpool lane project on the 405 Freeway. We've talked about
11 that this is a Measure R project.

12 The very last of the Measure R projects is
13 something to connect the San Fernando Valley and the
14 Westside that might be along the 405, but it might also be
15 under the hills. We don't know. We haven't even begun the
16 the environmental studies for that.

17 There's an effort underway to see if we can
18 accelerate that project, get it done faster. We're looking
19 at creative financing for it. And I know somewhere, you
20 know, around, we hear from some people that whatever happens
21 needs to deal with that area of those mountains.

22 And all I can tell you for right now is that it is
23 a separate effort, but the out -- we and the PM's for that
24 project are coordinating with each other and talking to each
25 other. And every intention to design the project so that

1 whenever they happen, they, you know, one will not preclude
2 the other.

3 Okay, back to this. So, again, as I said, this is
4 your opportunity to help us shape the study. I'm going to
5 ask you, again, if you intend to speak tonight, please get
6 one of these from -- they're being held up right now. If
7 you need one, raise your hand. We'll get it to you. Or you
8 can fill one out we'll take it.

9 And just so you can begin thinking about it, we'll
10 give you two minutes to speak. If you're not going to be
11 using English and you're going to be speaking another
12 language that we're going to translate, I'll double that for
13 you.

14 We'll ask you to come over here to this microphone.
15 And if any of you have issues getting to the microphone, let
16 us know; we'll bring the microphone to you.

17 But, again, for shaping the study, the most
18 important thing -- some issues you may wish to comment on or
19 ask us to look at or have specific questions about is: What
20 do you think about BRT or LRT? Are there specific questions
21 you have about those? What about travel speed? Is that
22 important to you? Is it travel speed for transit? Travel
23 speed for cars? Both? Something else? Is reliability
24 really what's critical for you? Do you have opinions or
25 thoughts or questions about the locations of stations? What

1 us. And and I invite you to do that. And you can post on
2 our wall anyway.

3 And if you think you have something you can say in
4 140 characters or less and you want to tweet about it, you
5 can use the hashtag "eastsvscoping," and we'll capture all
6 of those. Or you can just follow us on twitter at
7 "twitter@eastsvscoping" or text us.

8 For this scoping period, your chance to shape this
9 study runs through May 6. That's when we'd like to hear
10 from you about this. And if on our e-mail distribution list
11 or on Facebook, we'll be bugging you about that as that date
12 approaches.

13 Saturday at Panorama High School, obviously, we're
14 here at the Aquatic Center today. Thursday we'll be at
15 Arleta High School. We'll also be live-streaming that
16 meeting. And we'll post that live stream, as well.

17 And then, we all catch our breath, and then next
18 Wednesday afternoon we're at the Van Nuys Civic Center.
19 Same presentation at all the meetings. But if you like it,
20 feel free.

21 On that note, we're going to open it up. I only
22 have two speaker cards so far. But, please, we'll take some
23 more from you. Hang on.

24 If I -- I'll invite you to come up to this
25 microphone over here. If I can have someone help people

1 are your thoughts on the maintenance yard? As Walt said,
2 are we looking at the right areas? Are there some great
3 opportunities we haven't looked at? Are there issues with
4 some of the areas we are looking at that we may not know
5 about? Please, please tell us. Are you interested in
6 making connections? Was what about the parking? Bicycles?
7 Do you have particular questions or concerns about
8 construction impacts or anything else? This is your
9 opportunity to get that on the record.

10 There are a lot of ways to get your comments to us.
11 Again, you can speak tonight; you can fill out the written
12 form. We have our court reporter sitting right over here.
13 When we wrap up the forum part of the meeting, if any of you
14 want to sit with her and have her transcribe your comments,
15 she's available to do that. You can send Walt a love
16 letter. There's his address. You can phone us. You can
17 e-mail us at eastsvtransit@metro.net. You can also go to
18 website, and there will be a "how to contact us" form.

19 You can find us on Facebook at "East SFV Transit."
20 We are, for the first time, also during this formal scoping
21 period, taking comments via Facebook. I need to note for
22 you, you can post on our wall, but we won't count those as
23 part of the formal comments because I can't be sure we get
24 all of those. If you go to the top of the page, there's a
25 place you can click on for submitting comments on a form for

1 adjust the microphone.

2 Our first speaker, Jack Lindblad.

3 While he's coming up, I just want to talk to those
4 of you who are planning to speak. First of all, we have the
5 countdown clock over here. Ashley is working the countdown
6 clock. Everybody gets two minutes; plenty of time to say
7 what have to say. I will ask you, also, to please get
8 really close to the microphone. Get really close to the
9 microphone, okay? Don't want back here. Don't want you
10 talking and going like this (indicating).

11 She needs to hear what you're saying so she can get
12 the information down. So get really close to the microphone
13 and speak clearly. Following Mr. Lindblad, I have Marcos
14 Tapia. But start by stating your name, and then we'll count
15 down your two minutes.

16 Go ahead.

17 MR. LINDBLAD: I'm Jack Lindblad. I'm pretty much
18 representing the movement through the community activists
19 throughout the East San Fernando Valley and, well, primarily
20 through the Facebook like page that advocates Light Rail
21 over the BRT.

22 We were very successful in assisting the decision
23 to be made to be put on Van Nuys Boulevard. A lot of the
24 same comments and the arguments that led us to seeing Van
25 Nuys as a superior grid over the Sepulveda because of the

1 same reason or the same reasons to see the LRT is over Bus
2 Rapid Transit creep that we've seen already, even in the
3 alternative stage here where's there's mixed-flow traffic in
4 San Fernando. It's really a clog. Just getting out here
5 tonight up San Fernando road, it's impossible. You can
6 imagine the lowered service and lowered expectations. The
7 half a billion dollar expenditure would be wasting money.

8 It's a criticism. To be wisely spending the public
9 money in an alternative that's going to last through
10 2035/2050. And, again, the project director here has
11 mentioned the daily news yesterday, as we all know, that
12 it's part of a larger network the high speed rapid rail
13 through California and also the regional area. So it serves
14 as a significant tie to the airport and Santa Clarita and
15 points north of Fresno.

16 And I'm going to use my few seconds left as an
17 architect and I'm saying that the scoping has to include, or
18 must include, if we're going to come out of this all right,
19 the fact that the budget cannot be driven -- we can't use
20 the budget as a vehicle to drive the solution saying we only
21 have 170 million or 300. Any programming effort that the
22 scoping involves, you've got time, which is pretty short,
23 budget --

24 MS. LITVAK: And your time is up. I need you to wrap it
25 up.

1 MR. LINDBLAD: Okay. Ten seconds. We've got to have
2 the Map 21 and America Fast Forward put to use here as part
3 of the scoping; so that we have a financial vehicle to
4 entertain the correct choice.

5 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

6 All right. Marcos Tapia. Come on up to the
7 microphone.

8 After Mr. Tapia -- okay, hold on. John Ulloth. Am
9 I even close to that?

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Unintelligible)

11 MS. LITVAK: Wow. Okay. And then do I have any more?
12 Do I have anymore? Okay.

13 Mr. Tapia, step on up to the microphone, say your
14 name, and we'll get --

15 MR. TAPIA: Marcos Tapia; M-a-r-c-o-s. last name's
16 Tapia; T-a-p-i-a.

17 When we build this project, we got to make sure
18 that the council members and our elected officials get the
19 same positive financial stuff like they did in Agoura Hills,
20 on Agoura Road in Lindero Canyon, when they used the
21 Measure R funds to -- they repaved, they restriped, they
22 redid the lighting.

23 So if you guys go to build this thing here, make
24 sure you upgrade all the lighting, all the paving, all the
25 striping, all the signs. Make sure we get our fair share

1 here in the Valley, just like they did over there in
2 Westlake.

3 So those elected officials in San Fernando, your
4 Assembly, call all your representatives, make sure we get
5 our fair share. Don't try to shortchange us. Because like
6 did on San Fernando Road, that bike path is maintained by
7 Parks and Rec. The job that you guys did over there in
8 Chatsworth is contracted out by maintenance people. So
9 that's why it looks real nice over there.

10 So when you build the project here, do the same
11 thing. Make it look nice. That's what we're asking you to
12 do. Thank you.

13 MS. LITVAK: Thank you so much. Okay.

14 John, say your last name for me again.

15 MR. ULLOTH: John Ulloth.

16 MS. LITVAK: Ulloth, just like it's spelled. All right.

17 At the moment, Mr. Ulloth's card is the last one I
18 have, but it doesn't have to be. So let us know.

19 All right. Go ahead.

20 MR. ULLOTH: Okay. John Ulloth rising to speak on
21 behalf of rail, surprised that the streetcar was thrown out
22 because of the low-flow boarding capabilities of the
23 vehicle, I think, using the existing curve.

24 But in any case, Light Rail is just fine and Bus is
25 insufficient. I'm curious about the change in the route

1 map, which is available on the Internet, versus the one
2 we're seeing today. I prefer the one that goes over to
3 Sepulveda Boulevard then Parthenon then down to Sherman
4 Oaks. However, this must be followed up by a connection to
5 UCLA. Without this, as this project stands alone, doesn't
6 make any sense connecting to UCLA and the Aqua Line, Expo
7 Line makes abundant sense, and it should be done.

8 So forward on Rail and whatever the route may
9 happen to take. But let's, please, make sure that this is
10 part of a bigger system with all the connections that's we
11 need. Thank you.

12 MS. LITVAK: Thank you so much.

13 Is there anyone else who wishes to speak for the
14 record tonight? If not, you can come over to our comment
15 table and fill out a written comment and turn in your forms.
16 You can get your comments to us any of these ways. I'll
17 leave this up when we break in a moment. You can give your
18 comments to our -- hang on.

19 AUDIENCE: She wants to speak.

20 MS. LITVAK: Okay. Sir, step up to the microphone and
21 fill that out afterwards, okay. Great. Thank you so much.

22 And tell us your name, sir.

23 MR. DAVIS: My name is Kevin Davis. I'm actually
24 president of the Foothill Trails Council, which includes
25 Lake View Terrace and Shadow Hills area.

1 I'm looking at your map. I'm a little disappointed
2 that we didn't go back to the Sepulveda route. Knowing the
3 Valley, having lived here all my life, Van Nuys is probably
4 one of the narrowest streets to build this kind of transit
5 route on. And I'm concerned about the disruption in the
6 area. But if you're going to go with this route, I would
7 ask you to consider future generations.

8 Right outside the area in question here is the
9 Mission college. I'd like to see if you guys might consider
10 extending the route up a little farther. I notice you run
11 several miles along the San Fernando Corridor, which is
12 already served by the Metrolink route. So if we're going to
13 advocate for future generations to use mass transit, it
14 would be good to get in the habit in college.

15 I would like to advocate you consider extending it
16 an extra mile or so up to Mission College and include it as
17 part of your route.

18 MS. LITVAK: Thank you so much.

19 If you'll finish one of those forms for us, we'll
20 take care of it from there.

21 Is there anybody else who wishes to step up to the
22 microphone and speak this evening?

23 Okay. Now, with that, again, these are all the
24 ways to contact us (indicating). And we will be Thursday
25 evening at Arleta High School and next Wednesday out at the

1 line from there.

2 But it is wrongheaded and stubborn on the part of
3 MTA to continue to go from Van Nuys Boulevard to south of
4 Sherman Way. You will destroy schools, neighborhoods, and
5 businesses all the way down Van Nuys Boulevard.

6 And as a resident of Van Nuys, founder of the
7 Historic Zone and currently serving on the South L.A. Area
8 Planning Commission, I urge them to seriously take a look at
9 at the other alternatives..

10 MS. SIEGEL: I'm Stacey Siegel; S-i-e-g-e-l. Keys
11 Automotive Group, K-e-y-e-s. I'm representing the Auto Row.

12 We urge the Metro to place this line on Sepulveda
13 Boulevard, which is the natural place for it to be. It's
14 adjacent to the 405 Freeway, and it makes sense for the
15 eventual construction through the pass, for the line to be
16 on Sepulveda Boulevard, which is an artery for the Valley.

17 We feel that at Sherman Way or Oxnard would be
18 alternatives that would be acceptable. And we urge them to
19 consider this location. And that's it.

20 I just want to go on record that, as we said
21 before, it would kill business, and it would be a bad
22 choice.

23 (Meeting concluded at 7:34 p.m.)

1 Van Nuys Civic Center.

2 I'd like to thank everybody for coming this
3 evening. We will be hanging out till 8:00 and are happy to
4 chat with you. Again, we can't really provide too many
5 answers now. That's the purpose of the study. But ask us
6 the questions and get them on the record.

7 And thank you all for coming this evening.

8 MS. MATHER: Lydia, L-y-d-i-a; Drew, D-r-e-w; Mather,
9 M-a-t-h-e-r.

10 Anything else I need to answer for you before you
11 start?

12 THE REPORTER: No.

13 MS. MATHER: All three maps I see here are making a
14 grave mistake. I've voiced this for the last year and a
15 half in this process. The line needs to get off of Van Nuys
16 Boulevard near the railroad tracks to either Saticoy or
17 Sherman Way and go down Sepulveda. There are too many
18 schools, too much business that will be permanently damaged
19 by having dedicated lines through the city of Van Nuys up
20 through Sherman Oaks.

21 Not to mention there's a hospital in Sherman Oaks,
22 freeway access. I don't know how they expect to get past
23 that. But they can access the Orange Line parking on
24 Sepulveda which is underutilized. As it stands now, if they
25 need to get over to Van Nuys Boulevard, they can take the

ESFV COMMENTS: Community Meeting #3 - Arleta High School (Written)					
Date	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Address	Comment
3/21/2013	Donna	Gooley	BRU		Build BRT no articulated buses. Put stops at Chase, Riverside, Plummer. Extend to Foothill. Route - Van Nuys to Ventura - where more people go and more destinations.
3/21/2013	Jason	Ackerman	Encino Neighborhood Council	16718 Addkony Street Encino, 91436	1. Build it rail! 2. Connect it to the Sepulveda Pass Corridor 3. Expand the study area farther north and add stations at Mission College and Olive View Medical Center. 4. If we need to wait for the tunnel under the Sepulveda Pass to get LRT to Ventura blvd, that's fine. 5. keep it grade separated as much as possible.
3/21/2013	Donna	Pearman			It's more important to get transit from the valley (Sepulveda Pass) to Westwood we have been waiting forever -- who needs a busline/subway to Sylmar -- maybe a orange line -- but Van Nuys Blvd is bad -- it can't even take cars we have on it now -- Donna
3/21/2013	Mr. F.G.	Cortes B. A.	Bus Riders Union	17331 Sherman Way Lake Balboa, Ca, 91406	Merge Metro and LADOT (DASH) and save the taxpayers some money that is hardly needed in this economy!!
3/21/2013	Magnolo	Bugarin		14077 Hoyt Street Arleta, CA, 91331	Please implement the light rail option to serve Van Nuys Blvd. The affected communities would be transformed economically as it would allow greater amounts of residents to access employment in the valley and downtown area. The bus option would be a failure as it would not improve mobility and often no improvement.
3/21/2013	Yvette	Lopez	Pacoima Beautiful	11243 Glenoaks Blvd Suite 1	We prefer light rail option for our community. We would like to make sure that safty and connectivity are a priority. I would hope that this project will connect to the Sepulveda Project.
3/21/2013	Jose	Plama	The Transit Coalition	6706 Bakman Avenue, Apartment 1, North Hollywood, CA, 91606	Connectivity is key! Make sure that LRT is connected with the Sepulveda Pass so people are encouraged to west and not the 405. Storage facilities in whiteman airport would stimulate the economy and create new jobs. Grade separation, above or below depeneding on the situation.
3/21/2013	Veronica	Hernandez	La Mexicana Enterprise	Van Nuys @ El Dorado	Yo he visto varios accidentes por la calle Van Nuys les pido que antes de epezar el proyecto aszguren las calles para que ya no haiga tantos accidentes. Preferio Tren Ligero. [TRANSLATION: I have seen various accidents on Van Nuys. I ask that before you start the project you make the streets safer so there aren't as many accidents. I prefer light rail]
3/21/2013	Sofia	Ramirez	Pacoima Beautiful	1694 El Dorado Avenue #5 Pacoima, CA, 91331	Por favor aszgurense de que las calles esten seguras para todos los que las vsamos. [TRANSLATION: Please make sure that the streets are safe for everyone that uses them]

ESFV COMMENTS: Community Meeting #2 - Arleta High School (Verbal)		
First Name	Last Name	Comment
Jason	Ackerman	All right. So my name is Jason Ackerman. I'm on the Encino Neighborhood Council, and I just want to quickly point out that there are more elected officials in the audience and aides from the legislature -- that there are other neighborhood council people, and we are elected officials, too. So a shout out to the NCs. So I have five points that I want to get out in two minutes if I can pull it. All right. So the first point: Build the rail. It's worth every penny. It will last. BRT is a joke, and we need to embrace the future. Two: Connect it to the Sepulveda Pass Corridor because we desperately need a better connection between the west side and the valley. And I think it would be really well suited if we had it going to UCLA. Six minutes on the Sepulveda Pass versus 20, 30 minutes in gridlock 405 traffic. If you consider the cost of building the light rail, it's nothing compared to adding another lane. Also, three: Expand the study area farther north and consider adding stations at Mission College and Olive View Medical Center. That way when you run it to UCLA, you can actually have medical students from UCLA taking the train to Olive View Medical Center doing their -- doing their internship and, you know, taking the transit while they're doing it. Four: If we need to wait for the tunnel and Sepulveda Pass to get LRT to Ventura Boulevard, that's fine. We can deal with that. And five: Keep it grade separated as much as possible. Trains and cars do not mix. Keep them at different levels. I don't care how much it costs. My generation is going to be strapped with all sorts of debt from these wars and all sorts of nonsense. What's a good train on top of all that? I think it's a worthwhile investment, and I think that we should absolutely pursue maximization of the system. Thank you.
Brian	Patton	Hi, Brian Patton. How is everybody doing today? All right. I like the LRT compared to the BRT. That's kind of like, I would say, yesteryear -- the BRT. We're heading towards the rail system here in the San Fernando Valley. Okay. I would say that we're headed for the rail system in the San Fernando Valley. You know, we started on the rail system, so let's continue on the rail system. You know, this is, like, over 100 years ago. And you know, we have maintenance facility areas perhaps, you know, to continue on with these things. Perhaps -- I would say a good one would be the Orange Line system since we already have a rail system right there --well, perhaps a future rail system. And this would keep Van Nuys Boulevard very, very clean. It would be a center -- it would be a center point to the boulevard, which would actually help out to keep the boulevard clean. It would stop separate communities from having to argue over, "We're going to do this to the boulevard. We're going to clean the boulevard that way." We'd just have one nice Metro LTR (sic) running right up and down Van Nuys Boulevard making it one beautiful thing and much less to argue about. And fuel efficiency -- obviously anything gas is going to be fuel efficient if we're using electricity because that puts us on the highway of a computer system which can change any day which is electricity. How we get it -- that can change tomorrow --how we do electricity -- via solar or burning a very small amount of gas. So just going by the -- I'm sorry. The LRT -- that would just bring something to the San Fernando Valley which we don't have which is going to make our future very good.
Farmarz	Nabavi	Hi, my name is Faramarz Nabavi, and I'm a resident of Encino. So as a San Fernando Valley stakeholder, I'd like to speak on several aspects of this corridor. Number one: I also, like the previous speakers, prefer the light rail transit alternative to bus. I do think that both an upgrade as well as non grade options should be evaluated. So if there's a cost impact there, transit planners should be able to evaluate the alternatives. Number one: In terms of the measurement of ridership, I'd like to see not just the total ridership but the difference, the increase in ridership relative to the current total ridership in the corridor. That includes the Woodley bus that goes partially on Van Nuys Boulevard as well as 761, 233, and also some other buses that have portions of their ridership on Van Nuys Boulevard. Second: In terms of trying to decide between the type of project and the length of the project within budgetary constraints -- it's better to have the right type of project and shorten the length for this phase rather than having a longer length and having a type that's less preferable. Third: To the purpose and need, it's important to have maximized regional connectivity not just in the valley but also to the west side. Fourth: The share of the maintenance facility that could be attributable to the Sepulveda Pass project should be considered. Fifth: The speed of the mode and the long-term capacity of the mode should be considered. And finally, the economic and environmental benefits of operating light rail using clean energy and with lower operating costs for passengers should be considered. Thank you.
Darrell	Clark	Okay. I'm Darrell Clarke, co-chair of the Sierra Club Angeles Chapter Transportation Committee. And this is a project we are quite interested in this year. And I'll say personally I grew up less than a mile west of Van Nuys Boulevard. I graduated Van Nuys High School. My father, who's here in the audience with me, has actually ridden the old red cars circa 1950 from Van Nuys to downtown. My first main point is -- and I'll hold up the Transit Coalition's map. Think of this as the entire corridor from the north valley to Sherman Oaks to the west side to LAX. And whatever is done should be compatible with that greater vision. I currently live in the Santa Clarita area. And every time I drive down the 405, I keep thinking this is awful. We have to have a high capacity rail transit link from across the valley, across the -- or through the Santa Monica Mountains down the west side. Desperately needed that years ago. And whatever we do here must be compatible with that. I'm a bit startled by the proposed costs of LRT. Granted, they're very early in the process. I thought that could come in significantly less expensive than the quoted price which makes it look much more expensive than BRT -- than it necessarily would be. And finally -- and I know this is a challenge for both BRT and LRT -- that boulevard right-of-way is not all that wide, and it would be interesting to start seeing sectioned diagrams about how do we fit that in. So that's it. Go team. Great project. And let's think about the project we need and then think about "How are we going to get the money to build it" rather than thinking "We only have a little bit of money, and this is all we can afford."

Jose	Palma	<p>Hi. I grew up in the San Fernando Valley, and I think that a light rail is very needed here. BRT seems to be a big amount of waste. I feel that LRT -- I've been in Spain, Barcelona. I lived there for a year, and I saw the benefits of LRT and the connection that is potential for San Fernando Valley connection to downtown LA and connection to the west side. I believe this is very beneficial and needed including the cleaning up of the air is very important in the San Fernando Valley. And I think -- I think LRT pushes that forward even more. With consideration of TOD, transportation-oriented development, there is a lot of potential in each of the connections. And I think that education is key to ensuring that people from all parts of the east valley understand what connection is, educating them potentially in different languages -- especially in Spanish -- and ensuring that they know what a TAP card is, they know what the benefits are of taking it. And they're not scared of taking it because they don't understand how to use public transportation. I know a lot of people who don't know how to use it. And once they face the problem, they just decide "Well, you know what? I'm just going to use a car." So this is the potential for everybody to understand and to educate -- you know, it can -- even people in the audience and even yourselves can educate people in telling them, "Try the -- try the Metro. Give it a chance," because we need to really give up on the car. The 405 is a mess. We really just can't be adding more lanes. That money could be oriented to the LRT, especially and potentially for more connections including to Olive View Hospital like was suggested before but also connections to Santa Clarita and connecting Santa Clarita buses. Instead of it coming all the way from Santa Clarita down to Red Line, it could come down to San Fernando City. So really consider that. And maybe even consider bicycle racks, especially within the Metro, so people can bike more and there's a better bike connection. And you know, all the stakeholders here and all the constituents just need to understand the importance of this for the valley. Let's promote, you know, this mobility. And also, when it comes to storage, I would prefer it by the airport, the Whiteman Airport. And I think that's enough space for connection and storage. And it will stimulate the economy by building more factories and helping the much needed east side of the valley. Thank you.</p>
Mishael	Romero	<p>Yeah. And again -- I'm sorry. Again, I take the transportation. It took me almost 50 minutes just to get from the Orange Line to here, so we obviously need something. But I've been also really lucky. I've lived and/or worked in different places such as Bangkok. I lived in Seoul for over a year, Mexico City, Chicago, New York -- I can go on. But I have a passion for transportation. And unfortunately, every time I come home, I see projects like these. I feel like we're going backwards. We're supposed to be LA. We're supposed to be a great city. You know, I understand that we do have a budget question in mind. But at the same time, we've got to think for the future, you know? For example -- I know this is not New York or Chicago, but a lot of those routes -- a lot of them have been there for what? Almost a hundred years, if not more. So I really would like to recommend a subway. But if we can't, at least a light rail. And the light rail -- that is segregated because when you have -- for example, near my job in downtown Little Tokyo, you have the line going northwards towards Union Station. And then you stop to let people on and off. And then you go for, like, ten more feet. And then you stop and start again because there's a light. No. You know, that's not going to bring new consumers into it. I have a car. I have the option of taking a car to work. But no, I want transportation in LA. I want to be able to just say, "I want to drive in today," or, "I want to take the subway today." And if you want more ridership, you've got to market to people like me. Another question about marketing is I just found out about this yesterday. You know, unless I'm accidentally going to the Website, which -- you know, I can say the same thing. Have you visited government of Coachella valley city? Or have you visited the Engineer of City of LA Website? You know, we might have interest in things, but there's better ways to market. For example, when the TAP card came to be, I know in the subway there were attendants at almost every station I was at handing out pamphlets and information and helping them to do the machine. If you want more people to come to these meetings -- and I know people want to come to these meetings. Because just like me, they just found out -- please market this in a more efficient way. Lastly, I have sent E-mails, and I haven't gotten a single reply. So if you could please address that as well. Thanks.</p>
Donna	Pearman	<p>Okay. Number one: I'm totally against having anything on Van Nuys Boulevard because that's an area where the cars go on, and most of those people are not going to get out of those cars, so I prefer something going down Sepulveda. And it seems like it's low on the totem pole to do the one going to Westwood -- that that's going to be way down the line. And we're going this one, and I don't see any real need to go down to Sylmar. Most of it's just going down ways that the 233 or 761 appear to be going in the first place. So maybe it veers off. So I don't see -- you certainly don't need a rail for that. Maybe -- I mean, a subway for that. Maybe if you have to, you have to -- you use a rail -- I mean, the Orange Line for something like that. Two: I want to tell you that the TAP system is a great big joke for a lot of people. If you don't simply have a regular -- these people who don't have a regular -- people who have the disabled TAP or senior TAP -- people who don't happen to have that -- for a lot of seniors and a lot of disabled people, they -- they have to pay a larger amount fare on the Orange Line or this rail because there's -- if you don't happen to have it, there's no way to prove it. And so these people are paying full fare. My boyfriend goes on it, and he has to pay full fare even though he's a senior, so I don't think that's right. And two: You can't find any -- it's very difficult when I have my -- to get my TAP filled up for an EZ pass. Either they don't take my federal subsidy, or they don't -- the places don't have the EZ TAP. So that's like a great big joke. We really need to have the subway down to Westwood. That's something that people have been wanting for a long, long time. I think we need it a lot longer than Sylmar.</p>

Miriam	Fogler	<p>I want to let you know that they shut off the videoconferencing here in the valley so we can't speak on transportation issues in the city. In the Van Nuys City Hall, they shut it down. And that should be turned back on, folks. And you need to put pressure on the City Council Mayor to put it back on for the disabled because there is no access on these buses, you know, where you have back problems and arthritis issues and you can't walk too well, and you can't stand a long period of time. The accessibility for public transit is very archaic. And let me tell you, folks, this is a joke because Antonio Villarosa is a conflict of interest. To shut off videoconferencing when we had him on the transportation committee -- he should be -- he should have not never been on it and been mayor at the same time. Absolute monopoly from the first, from the goal. She has -- can only get a bus pass once a month on the 25th. This is an outrage. I think you people should have -- should look behind you and look and see what you're doing because this is an outrage to charge one-and-a-half percent tax on us, and she can't even get a bus pass a different day. She has to go all the way downtown wherever to get a bus pass if she doesn't get it on the 25th that she can get one. And it's so hard getting around because you people make it very difficult. You want us to put you in so that you can have eminent domain so you can take out any projects, which is why -- you want to set yourselves up all over here along the main corridor where all the businesses are so you can put your own people in. They've got those businesses. Put them in -- whatever you want. Anybody who's in the way of a project will be taken out by eminent domain, by the MTA, and the LAUSD just like the CRA. I'm just telling you folks you're getting ripped off left and right paying all this tax. And what are you getting for it? You're not getting anything. The fact is that the buses -- are very -- cannot be accessible for disabled people. It's an outrage.</p>
Jack	Lindblad	<p>Well, I won't do my Elvis, but I'm Jack Lindblad. And I hear your comments about the disabled access and the eminent domain. The problem that we have in California, in the world -- we're making the most progress in Los Angeles thanks to a very proactive transit mayor. He's bringing our global greenhouse gases into line and reducing them and reducing them and so forth. We have to meet a deadline by 2020 because at that point funding is going to be cut off. We're going to be in a very difficult situation if we don't meet our global greenhouse gas reduction in 2020 AB32. LRT does it. Van Nuys Boulevard did it. So for the same reasons that Metro has chosen the Van Nuys Boulevard with some small part that we've added throughout the neighborhood councils and the entire East San Fernando District north and south of 16 neighborhood councils that we've coalesced into a Facebook page. And we have about an eighth of the likes on the Metro official study page, so we're very proud of that. One of the things is that Metro I think really has a very good responsibility here of showing the financial capability as a screening criteria because we've all demonstrated political will here tonight. And even though we're kind of top-heavy with electives, volunteers, and paid electives, but basically elected officials and staff from Metro is that, you know, we put up all of the screening criteria, community input, economic land use development, economic environmental benefits. But the financial capability has to be explored in as great or greater depth because this is a project that costs about ten times as much as one of the projects. So it isn't -- it's almost like putting up a false flag. So you have Project A and Project B. But Project B only costs ten percent, but it's got built in BRT creep. In other words, a bus rapid transit that has been acknowledged across the Americas -- LRT is the best choice.</p>
Jose	Juarez	<p>All right. Well, I mean, I have no prestigious titles to my name. And I've been to several of these meetings before, and I cannot stress the importance of building a light rail transit out here because the citizens of the San Fernando Valley -- whenever they see a bus rail transit, they don't see a cheap innovative way to travel. They see a community that -- or, like, a city council or a city that didn't want to invest enough in their citizens to build a more efficient way to get around. I think the bus rail transit is a joke because it's just -- it's not appealing to somebody who wants to try using public transportation. So I feel like it's a bit upsetting to see as few people here as there is because I know way too many people that -- around my community that constantly complain about how difficult it is to get from one side of the valley to the other, so it's very disappointing. And it just goes to show me that people don't care enough about the subject because it's not present. You know, one is -- it's not around. It's not in eyesight. So if a light rail transit were to be built, it would definitely promote a lot more prosperity in each community, and it would be a lot easier for everybody to want to just take -- use public transportation as the alternative instead of cars. So I feel like it's very important that we build a light rail transit. And I mean, it's -- I cannot stress that enough. It's just -- it's a joke that one of the largest metropolitan cities in the world has as bad of a transportation system as Los Angeles does, so I think something desperately needs to be done. And I mean, I wish there was a more -- a better way to connect the -- the -- the line to -- like the Red Line, say, or, like, provide some sort of easier connection to the greater Los Angeles area or -- or downtown. So I mean, that's my two cents.</p>
Sergio	Ibarra	<p>Good evening. My name is Sergio Ibarra, and I'm the president of the Arleta Neighborhood Council. I've been a long-time resident of Arleta, and I want to say welcome to Arleta. Thank you for coming. We're here today. I'm here today speaking -- a supporter of LTR (sic), the light rail project. It's time for the City of Los Angeles and Metro to really explore in investing in the San Fernando Valley. We send our tax dollars to Measure R to transit projects. It's time for Metro to really commit to giving us a top quality transportation system in the San Fernando Valley. That's why I did not support Measure J because this project was not on -- on the list of projects that would receive additional funding. I ask Metro really truly explore the possibilities of really funding this project. I keep hearing from Metro that it's going to cost extra money to place a rail yard and a maintenance yard in the San Fernando Valley. Well, guess what, folks? We want investment in the San Fernando Valley -- in the northeast San Fernando Valley because that means jobs. We want jobs. We want development. We want services that we need here in the San Fernando Valley. I want a Starbucks at the corner and places where our youth here from Arleta High School can go there and do their homework and create communities. The other thing I'm asking for is on the map, you state that there's going to be a station in front of Arleta High School. I would be opposed to a station at Arleta High School. I would recommend that the station be located on Van Nuys Boulevard and Woodman, our commercial heart of Arleta. And again, thank you for coming out and supporting the top quality -- thank you for coming out and supporting the top quality transportation system that we need. And we want to connect it from Mission College to UCLA. We want our students to go to UCLA in 37 minutes.</p>

Arleta High (Spoken)

John	Hernandez	<p>Great. Thank you. Good evening. My name is John Hernandez. I'm with the Pacoima Neighborhood Council as well as Arleta Neighborhood Council. I'm also a small business owner on the Van Nuys Corridor in Pacoima. I'm a proponent personally for the LRT program. I think it will bring that visibility, that presence, the beautification that we need in the northeast San Fernando Valley. In addition to that, we also -- like Sergio Ibarra stated earlier, we need the opportunity to move the kids from this community into more affluent areas: UCLA, Loyola, USC. In the evenings, unfortunately there is no Metro going to Mission College at night, so we definitely -- there is an opportunity there as well. Hopefully -- the Metro has also done studies with other communities that have the same demographics as ours like Pasadena, Highland Park, Lincoln Park just to name a few. So thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening and have a good night.</p>
Robert	Gardner	<p>I just wanted to say that I do believe that the train should go -- extend to Mission College and the medical center. And also wanted to point out what they were saying about how they have to go all the way downtown just to get, like, a senior or disabled bus pass. And I understand where they're coming from because I have to go all the way downtown just to get a student pass. And there's only two Metro places that I know. It's the one downtown and one in Crenshaw Baldwin Hills Plaza that people can physically go. So I think that you guys should look into the possibility of having another Metro center maybe somewhere near the Van Nuys Courthouse so people can have easier access to get their disabled pass, senior pass, school pass. I think it will be much easier because there's nowhere that you can go in the valley. And I believe -- you know, if you're going to create this massive project, going to have all these commuters, you should have at least one more location where people can go so they can have it easier to access these discounted passes. That's it.</p>
Bart	Reed	<p>Hi, I'm Bart Reed, executive director of the Transit Coalition, and I run the California State University Northridge Transportation Tiger Team. This East San Fernando Valley Transit project light rail option is probably the most important element that will ever be presented into the San Fernando Valley. Bear in mind that until 1952, we actually had rail transit on Van Nuys Boulevard from Chandler to Parthenia at one point, but then it was shortened to Sherman Way. But we always had rail transit on Van Nuys Boulevard from 1912 to 1952. This isn't new. This is why Van Nuys Boulevard is so wide. It has been there -- accommodated transit for whatever the years were -- between 1912 and 1952, and it's important. Side comment: We are also working on night and weekend bus service to get to Cal State Northridge. We're looking for supporters on that. That's one element. We're also working with Jason Ackerman to improve the service on Balboa Boulevard. Back to the transit on Van Nuys Boulevard, light rail is the most cost effective option. Bear in mind that each light rail train car can carry about 150 people -- in a three-car train, about 500 people. Compare that to the capacity of the roads, which is only about 500 an hour per lane. So you don't really have that much road capacity. So if you can be carrying several thousand people+D28 an hour on light rail, you're increasing the capacity of the road. Even though the road might have to get narrowed a little bit, it actually makes the road more cost effective for the citizens. There's no eminent domain involved despite misstatements from some people. I don't know how you eminent domain city streets that used to have rail line in it anyway, but there's bizarre ideas here. Thank you very much.</p>
Tony	Warte	<p>Hi, I'm Tony Warte. I'm a resident of Arleta. And I'm happy that you are looking at the Van Nuys Boulevard Corridor and San Fernando Road Corridor for this project. I'm in favor of light rail transit because I am a daily rider of Metro. I work in East Hollywood, so I take the Red Line, the Orange Line, and either the 233 or 761. So I am very familiar with other modes of transit here including the Gold Lines I ride occasionally. I've been reading about past histories on other projects, and I'm kind of disappointed as to how the Orange Line came out and the outcome of it. And I wish it was light rail. I don't want to see the same thing happen to Van Nuys Boulevard, San Fernando Road. And I want to see that as a combined project with the -- with the Sepulveda Pass subway corridor down to the west side. And just this evening on my way here -- I usually don't get home until, like, late evening. But apparently -- I checked the next trip, and I noticed that there was a 40, 50-minute gap in 761 service. So I was forced to take the 233 bus. And it's a five-and-a-half -- five-and-a-half mile trip from the Orange Line at Oxnard all the way up here. It took 50 minutes. And it was horrendous because that bus itself -- the driver -- he was probably frustrated himself. He had to handle not only the 233 stops and the riders but also the 761 riders. And there's definitely a lot of -- a lot of transit dependent people on that corridor that are depending on the service, and light rail definitely is a lot more dependable. It's a lot more reliable. You can be serving the existing 25,000 riders that currently use the 233 and 761. At the same time, you're also going to get the discretionary riders. And that's a bonus because this light rail line -- if it is light rail -- will be very successful from day one. Thank you.</p>



East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: DONNA GOOLEY	
Organization/Organización: BRU	
Address/Dirección:	
Tel:	Email/Correo electrónico: DONNA.GOOLEY@HOTMAIL.COM

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:

- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

BUILD BRT NO ARTICULATED BUSES

PUT STOPS @ CHASE, RIVERSIDE, PLUMMER

EXTEND TO FOOTHILL


MUST TERMINATE SEPULVEDA/VENTURA

ROUTE = VAN NUYS TO VENTURA - WHERE MORE PEOPLE GO & MORE DESTINATIONS

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





**East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study**

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: Jason Ackerman	
Organization/Organización: Encino Neighborhood Council	
Address/Dirección: 16718 Addison St, Encino, 91436	
Tel: (818) 516-4077	Email/Correo electrónico: ENC Jason Ackerman@gmail.com

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

① Build it Rail! ② connect it to the servived a pass
 Corridor. ③ Expand the study area farther north
 and add stations at Mission College and Olive
 View Medical Center. ④ If we need to wait for the
 tunnel under the servived a pass to get LRT to Ventura
 Blvd, that is fine. ⑤ Keep it grade separated as much
 as possible

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <u>Donna Parmetta</u>	
Organization/Organización:	
Address/Dirección:	
Tel:	Email/Correo electrónico:

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

~~It~~ Its more important to get transit
 from the valley (Sepulveda Pass) to Westwood
 we have been waiting Brewer - who needs
 a bus line/ subway to Sylmar - maybe a
 orange line - but Van Nuys Blvd is bad - it
 cant even take cars we have on it now - Donna

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <u>MR. F. G. CORTES B. A.</u>	
Organization/Organización: <u>Bus Riders Union</u>	
Address/Dirección: <u>17331 Sherman way Lake Balboa CA 91406</u>	
Tel: <u>323-3449097</u>	Email/Correo electrónico: <u>cortesfeddy@yahoo.com</u>

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:

- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

MERGE METRO AND
LADOT (DASH) AND
SAVE THE TAXPAYERS
SOME MONEY THAT IS
HARDLY NEEDED IN THIS
ECONOMY !!

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.



Metro





East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: MAGNULO BOGARIN BOGARIN	
Organization/Organización:	
Address/Dirección: 14077 HOYT ST. ARLETA CA 91331	
Tel: 818 517 2053	Email/Correo electrónico: Magnulo.b@me.com

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

Please implement the light rail option to serve van nuys blvd. The affected communities would be transformed economically as it would allow greater amounts of residents to access employment in the valley and downtown area. The bus option would be a failure as it would not improve mobility and offer no improvement

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





**East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study**

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <i>Yvette Lopez</i>	
Organization/Organización: <i>Pacoima Beautiful</i>	
Address/Dirección: <i>11243 Glenoaks Blvd. Suite #1</i>	
Tel: <i>(818) 8592845</i>	Email/Correo electrónico: <i>ylopez@pacoimabeautiful.org</i>

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

We prefer a light rail option for our community. We would like to make sure that safety and connectivity are a priority. I would hope that this project will connect to the Sepulveda Project.

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





**East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study**

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <u>José eduardo Palma</u>	
Organization/Organización: <u>The transit Coalition</u>	
Address/Dirección: <u>6706 Balsman Ave. Apt #1 North Hollywood CA 91606</u>	
Tel: <u>818-314-3860</u>	Email/Correo electrónico: <u>palma818@gmail.com</u>

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

Connectivity is key! Make sure that LRT is connected with the
spuneda pass so people are encouraged to west and not use the 405.
Storage facilities in white man airport would stimulate the economy
and create new jobs. Grade separation, above or below
depending on the situation.

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <u>Veronica Hernandez</u>	
Organization/Organización: <u>La Mexicana Enterprise</u>	
Address/Dirección: <u>Van Nys @ El Dorado</u>	
Tel: <u>(818) 899 1711</u>	Email/Correo electrónico:

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

Yo he visto varios accidentes por la calle Van Nys
Les pido que antes de empezar el proyecto
aseguren las calles para que ya no haya
tantos accidentes. Prefiero Tren Ligero.

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <i>Sofia Ramirez</i>	
Organization/Organización: <i>Pacoima Beautiful</i>	
Address/Dirección: <i>1694 El Dorado Ave #5 Pacoima CA 91331</i>	
Tel: <i>(818) 257 4832</i>	Email/Correo electrónico:

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:

- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

*Por favor aseguranza de que las calles
estén seguras para todos los que las usamos.*

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





COMENTARIO FORMAL



REUNIONES COMUNITARIAS DE ÁMBITO PROYECTO DEL CORREDOR DE TRANSPORTE DEL ESTE DEL VALLE DE SAN FERNANDO

Por favor escriba de una forma legible.

Fecha: 3-21-13

Nombre: Magnolo Bugarin

Organización: _____

Domicilio: 14077 HOYT ST. Arleta CA 91331

**POR FAVOR ENTREGUE ESTA FORMA A UN MIEMBRO DEL EQUIPO DE METRO ANTES DE QUE
COMIENZE LA SESIÓN DE COMENTARIO/TESIMONIO FORMAL.**

Por favor someta su comentario o pregunta acerca el Proyecto del Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando para que pueda recibir una respuesta en la/el Declaración/Reporte de Impacto Ambiental Borrador. Cada persona tendrá dos minutos para hacer sus comentarios.

**Nota: Personas con permiso para hablar no pueden ceder su tiempo a otras personas para que hablen de su parte.*



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 21 MARCH 2013
Name: TOMY WARRE
Organization: RESIDENT
Address: 14431 MERCER STREET

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: March 21, 2013

Name: Bart Reed

Organization: _____

Address: _____

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 03/21/13

Name: Robert Croodner

Organization: _____

Address: 12201 Chandler Blvd 91607

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 3/21/13

Name: JOHN HERNANDEZ

Organization: SMALL BIZ OWNER

Address: 13631 VAN NUYS BLVD PACOIMA 91331

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date:

3/2/13

Name:

Sergio Barra

Organization:

Arleta NC

Address:

13883 Garber Ave, Arleta, CA 91331

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3-21-13

Name: Jose Juarez

Organization: _____

Address: 14700 ~~West~~ hubbard st Apt#

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 21 March 2013
Name: JACK LINDBLAD
Organization: ESFV Transit Coalition
Address: 8211 Shadydale Av 91605

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 3/26/13

Name: Miriam Fogler

Organization: _____

Address: PO Box 4246 P.O. CA 91412

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: March 21, 2013
Name: Donna Pearman
Organization: Derek Waleko Jan Club
Address: NOT NECESSARY FOR YOU TO KNOW

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3/21/13
Name: Michael Romero
Organization: _____
Address: michael.romero@gmail.com

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 3/ / 2013
Name: Jose Palma
Organization: Transit Coalition
Address: 6700 Bakman Ave. Apt #1 N Hollywood CA 91606

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3/21/13

Name: Darrell Clarke

Organization: Sierra Club

Address: _____

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: Fatemeh Nabavi - 3/21/13

Name: _____

Organization: _____

Address: _____

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3-21-18
Name: BRIAN- PATTON
Organization: COMM, STATEHOLDER - LAVC student
Address: 9225 PETIT AVE NORTH HILLS CA 91343

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3-21-13

Name: Jason Ackerman

Organization: Encino Neighborhood Council

Address: 16713 Addison St, Encino, CA, 91436

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.

BEFORE THE METRO

EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT TEAM

Public Scoping Meeting in the)
Matter of:)
)
EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT)
CORRIDOR STUDY)
_____)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Arleta, California

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Reported by:

ERIN WINN
CSR No. 13579

Job No.:
B9349NCO

1 BEFORE THE METRO
 2 EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT TEAM
 3
 4
 5
 6 Public Scoping Meeting in the)
 Matter of:)
 7)
 EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT)
 8 CORRIDOR STUDY)
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken at
 16 Arleta High School, 14200 Van Nuys Boulevard,
 17 Arleta, California, commencing at
 18 6:31 p.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2013,
 19 heard before the METRO EAST SAN FERNANDO
 20 VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT TEAM,
 21 reported by ERIN WINN, CSR No. 13579,
 22 a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for
 23 the State of California.
 24
 25

1 INDEX
 2 PUBLIC SPEAKERS: PAGE
 3 JASON ACKERMAN 24
 4 BRIAN PATTON 26
 5 FARAMARZ NABAVI 28
 6 DARRELL CLARKE 29
 7 JOSE PALMA 31
 8 MISHAEL ROMERO 33
 9 DONNA PEARMAN 36
 10 MIRIAM FOGLER 37
 11 JACK LINDBLAD 40
 12 JOSE JUAREZ 42
 13 SERGIO IBARRA 43
 JOHN HERNANDEZ 45
 14 ROBERT GARDNER 46
 BART REED 48
 15 TONY WARTE 49
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

1 APPEARANCES:
 2 Metro Presenters: WALTER DAVIS
 Project Manager
 3 Metro
 4 JODY LITVAK
 Community Relations Director
 5 Metro
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

1 Arleta, California, Thursday, March 21, 2013
 2 6:31 p.m.
 3
 4
 5 MS. LITVAK: Good evening, everybody. We're going to
 6 get our meeting started. It's coming up on 6:30. I'm
 7 going to use the clock on the wall as our official
 8 timekeeper for the evening.
 9 So I'd like to invite everybody to take a seat.
 10 Thank you. And we're going to get our meeting started.
 11 So that includes staff and consultants and even Mr. Reed.
 12 All right.
 13 Everybody, thank you so much for coming this
 14 evening. Can you hear me okay? Louder? I'll hold it
 15 really close, or he'll -- or that.
 16 I'm Jody Litvak with Metro, and this is our third
 17 public scoping meeting for the San Fernando Valley -- the
 18 East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor study. We have
 19 the capability tonight for simultaneous Spanish
 20 translation available to you. And if you need that, I
 21 need you to raise your hand, and we will take care of you.
 22 And if you could come up here and repeat that
 23 message for everybody, I'd appreciate that.
 24 (Spanish translation)
 25 MS. LITVAK: Great. Thank you so much. Hang on. So

1 a few housekeeping things this evening before we get into
2 it. Ma'am, can you please -- while we get through this.

3 First of all, we've got a live Web stream of this
4 meeting going. It's identical to our other meetings, and
5 it will be posted. So I'd like to welcome anybody who's
6 joining us online tonight. It will be posted subsequently
7 on the Web for people to tune in and watch afterwards.

8 You were all given several pieces of paper when
9 you arrived. I just want to walk you through some of
10 those. We have our frequently asked questions. It's
11 rather long. You don't need to read it here unless you
12 really want to.

13 We have information on the upcoming meetings. We
14 have our fact sheet discussing where we are now. We have
15 our roadmap for tonight's meeting. And then the two most
16 important things that we handed you as far as tonight goes
17 is there's several ways to submit comments tonight.

18 You can also submit them after this. If you want
19 to submit written comments, we have these forms for you.
20 You can fill them out, and there's a box over there in the
21 corner to my left, your right, and you can turn it in.
22 You might also want to take this with you because -- most
23 of these documents tell how to get in contact with us, but
24 you might want to take this with you as well. If you have
25 a thought that comes to you after you leave, you can put

1 that down.

2 Once we get through the presentation --
3 Walt Davis, my colleague over here, and I are going to do
4 the presentation. Hopefully we won't take too long. Once
5 we get through that, we're going to open it up to public
6 comments from you. I'll call people up in the order I
7 have their names to this microphone over here. You'll
8 have two minutes to speak.

9 We have a countdown clock for you. If you want
10 to speak tonight and you have a comment card filled out
11 and you haven't turned it in, just fill it out and hold it
12 up, and we'll get it from you. If you don't have a
13 comment card and you want one, raise your hand and someone
14 will bring you a comment card. And I will repeat that
15 over and over again.

16 In addition -- hold on. I am of a certain age.
17 Okay. We appreciate it so much when -- hey, you know,
18 I've got to make jokes about it.

19 We appreciate it so much when our elected
20 officials attend or send their representatives. We'd like
21 to welcome and acknowledge Wesly Hernandez from
22 LA Councilman -- oh, he's really here. I'll come back in
23 a moment. Okay.

24 Lorena Bernal -- Lorena Bernal -- Lorena --
25 Lorena -- Lorena from Council District 6 is here.

1 Thank you for coming. Don -- I'm sorry. Dan Rosales is
2 in the back there from Councilman Richard Alarcon's office
3 and Noel Barajas from State Senator Alex Padilla's office.

4 Where did he go? There is he in the back, also.
5 I knew I saw you. So thank you all so much for coming.

6 So with that, let's talk about what the purpose
7 of our meeting is tonight. We want to give you some
8 overview and background on the project and the study and
9 what we're doing. We want to describe the alternatives
10 that we're studying, and we want to get your input on the
11 study.

12 Now, I want to be very clear about something.
13 We're in a period of the study that's called "scoping."
14 It's the very beginning of the environmental process, and
15 this is your chance to help us shape the project -- shape
16 what we're going to study.

17 Therefore, if there are things you want us to
18 study, if there are things you want us to analyze, if
19 there are questions you would like the study to evaluate
20 and develop answers for, ask those tonight. But we are
21 not going to answer you tonight. We can't. We haven't
22 done the analysis. So it may be a little frustrating for
23 you, and I understand that, but that's how it goes.

24 So I just want you to be warned. Ask your
25 questions. Get them on the record. We'll do the

1 analysis, but we're not going to answer them tonight.

2 And now there's Wesly Hernandez from
3 Councilman Koretz's office in the back of the room who
4 just came back in. Thank you. You missed your earlier
5 introduction. Okay.

6 So how we got to this point -- some of you have
7 been to our previous meetings that was in an earlier phase
8 of this study. In 2011 and '12, we did an alternatives
9 analysis study. We held several community meetings.

10 We looked at a bunch of different alternative
11 routes and designs and modes of traffic. If you put them
12 all on top of each other, it's this map on the right --
13 focus. And we decided really to focus primarily on
14 Van Nuys Boulevard.

15 Why Van Nuys Boulevard? Why are we really here?
16 Van Nuys is -- it's the heaviest traveled north, south
17 route in the San Fernando Valley. It's the second
18 heaviest transit route in the valley; second only to the
19 Orange Line. And it's the seventh busiest transit route
20 in the Metro system for the whole county, so it's pretty
21 busy. And that's where the major centers and connections
22 are.

23 And we decided that we would -- and we narrowed
24 it down to four different alternatives. The top two are
25 required, and then the other two are the build

1 alternatives. And Walt is going to talk about that.
 2 I want to say something about this purple
 3 squiggly line right here. This study, this effort that
 4 we're here tonight to talk about goes from
 5 Ventura Boulevard on the south up over to the
 6 Sylmar/Metrolink Station; okay? There is a separate study
 7 for a project that is more years away for something to
 8 connect the San Fernando Valley to the west side of
 9 Los Angeles.

10 We don't know yet what that's going to be. The
 11 studies haven't been done. Whether that's going to be
 12 something that goes over the Sepulveda Pass and follows
 13 the route of the 405 or a tunnel that goes through and
 14 perhaps follows another route and whether it will be bus
 15 or rail -- we don't know that yet. But everybody is
 16 trying -- both the team working on that and our team are
 17 talking to each other and working hard to coordinate.

18 We understand that those barriers -- whether
 19 you're on the north side -- those mountains -- whether
 20 you're on the north side or the south side -- create quite
 21 a barrier, and ultimately things have to connect. But the
 22 purposes of this study are from Ventura north.

23 I'd also like to welcome recently arrived
 24 Caesar Huerta from Assemblyman Bocanegra's office in the
 25 back. Thank you so much for coming.

1 Let's keep going. So I talked a little bit about
 2 why we're focusing on Van Nuys Boulevard. That's where
 3 the need is the greatest.

4 So what we're trying to do is come up with
 5 options that will improve north, south mobility; that will
 6 improve the reliability and the connectivity between key
 7 transit routes and hubs. We want to make transit more
 8 accessible and improve connectivity within the study area
 9 and to the region beyond. We want to have more and better
 10 transit options for people in this area especially because
 11 there's a large proportion of the population that is
 12 transit dependent, and we want to encourage a mode shift
 13 to transit.

14 This is the schedule that we're on for the whole
 15 project. As I said, this is a very -- this is a near-term
 16 project. This project is due to be up and operating in
 17 2018. That's a really, really, really aggressive
 18 schedule.

19 As I said, in January this year, we completed the
 20 alternatives analysis. We're doing the environmental
 21 study -- the draft and the final. That will take two
 22 years. And then we'll move into engineering,
 23 construction, and we will keep the public involved all
 24 along the way.

25 Just to break down the environmental process,

1 over the two years, it's going to take us about another
 2 year to finish the draft environmental. By the way, where
 3 you see EIS, EIR -- many of you are familiar with the term
 4 "EIR." It is the state requirement. EIS is the federal
 5 companion to that. So we're following them -- we're
 6 following both processes together.

7 The draft document will be circulated. We'll
 8 have public hearings. There will be a recommendation for
 9 what's known as a locally preferred alternative.

10 We will ask the Board to approve -- the Metro
 11 Board of Directors to approve that. That will be the
 12 option that will go through the final environmental
 13 analysis where we'll do some more work. There will be
 14 certification and off we'll go.

15 I want to say a note, by the way. I should have
 16 said this earlier. You see the City of Los Angeles seal
 17 up here. This project is envisioned to operate on the
 18 streets of the city of Los Angeles as well as the city of
 19 San Fernando. We're cooperating very closely with both
 20 Cities, and the City of Los Angeles is the co-lead with us
 21 for the environmental analysis.

22 So the purpose of the draft EIS, EIR is to
 23 further study and refine the alternatives that we're
 24 looking at, get a better definition, look at the benefits
 25 and the impacts -- positive and negative -- of the options

1 being evaluated, and select that locally preferred
 2 alternative for further study. That's what we'll do in
 3 the final environmental. In addition, when we release the
 4 draft EIS, EIR, we will take comments again, and we will
 5 develop official formal responses to those comments. If
 6 anything is identified that needs mitigation, we will
 7 develop a mitigation program and recommend that, and we'll
 8 recommend the project for construction.

9 And I believe with that -- oh, no. Almost. One
 10 more slide before I hand it off.

11 So again, I want to remind you scoping is at the
 12 very beginning stage of the environmental analysis. This
 13 is where we determine what we're going to study, what the
 14 focus is, what it is we're going to analyze. And this is
 15 your chance to help us shape the study. So please give us
 16 comments on the purpose of the project, the need for the
 17 project, thoughts on the alternatives, questions you have
 18 about the alternatives, the impacts, possible
 19 mitigations -- anything else. I'm going to talk about
 20 those more later on.

21 And now I do hand it off to Walt Davis, and I'll
 22 be back in a little bit.

23 MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Jody. As Jody said, my name is
 24 Walt Davis. I'm the Metro project manager of this
 25 project, a title that I'm proud of because I think this

1 project through which is going to -- we're going to
2 realize real improvements of north, south transit for the
3 Eastern San Fernando Valley.

4 So I thank you all for coming out this Thursday
5 evening. It's important for us to get comments from the
6 people who live, do business, reside, go to school in the
7 San Fernando Valley, so thank you. I know there's a lot
8 of other things you could be doing on a Thursday night.
9 I'm going to be brief because the purpose of this meeting
10 is to get comments from you, but I do want you to know
11 what we're going to be doing for the next nine to
12 12 months.

13 As Jody said, we're doing an environmental
14 document. And basically what an environmental document is
15 in addition to better defining the project, doing a little
16 bit more engineering, determining what we'll be doing
17 exactly -- that's what it says. It's an environmental
18 document. It looks at what are the benefits and what are
19 the impacts of the project from a number of different
20 elements and perspectives.

21 When you get the environmental document -- and it
22 will be published at libraries and a number of other
23 places -- the environmental section will be divided into
24 approximately 20 different sections, and these are the
25 different sections or elements they'll be divided in to.

1 And for each one of these elements, we'll look at it and
2 try to better understand what impacts the project will
3 have. Obviously we can't do a multi, multi hundred
4 million dollar project in a quarter without having impacts
5 to the congested quarter as it is today.

6 So for example, if you're interested in
7 air quality, you can go to the air quality section and
8 read about what the air quality impacts will be. Will
9 impacts be significant? If they'll be significant, how
10 we're going to avoid, minimize, or mitigate those impacts
11 and thereby be able to make a more focused comment to us
12 or question to us as to how we can make this project as
13 complementary to you and avoid having negative impacts to
14 you.

15 So that's the environmental document. We'll be
16 working on that for the next nine months to a year. Look
17 forward to it coming out probably in January of 2014.

18 For those of you who have to a lot of these
19 meetings, this is about the twelfth we've had up and down
20 Van Nuys and Sepulveda over the last year-and-a-half.
21 Every presentation we've given has had this slide, and the
22 reason being is -- when we started this project, that map
23 Jody showed you that showed alignments all over the
24 place -- we went from that alignment. And that alignment
25 was only alignment -- it was modes and configuration.

1 And with this screening criteria and the purpose
2 and need, we narrowed down the number of alternatives down
3 to six build alternatives that was presented back in
4 October of 2012. We got your community input. And please
5 do notice that community input is one of the weighting
6 criteria we use in determining what modes move forward.

7 So with the community input and these other
8 criteria, we have now narrowed down the number of
9 alternatives down to two that I'll be presenting to you in
10 a few more slides. But this is the screening criteria.

11 Whenever you do an environmental document, by
12 federal and state law in addition to the build
13 alternatives, you have to consider the no-build
14 alternative and the transportation system management
15 alternatives. Those have to be a section of the
16 environmental document. And as the name would imply,
17 no-build basically asks the question: What if we take the
18 money that's committed to this project, and we do nothing?

19 What would the conditions be? Would there be
20 gridlock, or would traffic still get through and people
21 find another way to move up and down the Van Nuys Corridor
22 throughout the Eastern San Fernando Valley? What would
23 the impact be?

24 The second alternative is called the
25 transportation system management alternative. And

1 basically what it does is says: What if, instead of doing
2 a major capital investment project -- what if you just did
3 spot widening at signalized intersections? You increased
4 efficiency of signals? You added left and right-hand turn
5 pockets, and you added whole bunch of buses?

6 Could you meet the purpose of this project -- the
7 goals and objectives of this project with low cost
8 alternatives? And the TSM alternative will answer that
9 question.

10 Now, for the build alternatives -- and we have
11 two. One is the bus rapid transit and the LRT
12 alternative, so those are the modes. We had street car,
13 but we reported back in October 2012 that's been removed
14 from consideration based on the screening criteria and the
15 purpose and need. It really didn't offer any operations
16 improvements, so it has been eliminated from
17 consideration.

18 For the bus rapid transit alternative, I want to
19 emphasize that I'm not talking about rapid bus like the
20 Metro rapid bus on Ventura and Van Nuys and other places.
21 We're talking about something more akin to the Metro
22 Orange Line where we have a dedicated
23 right-of-way specifically for the operation of buses
24 through which you get better operation efficiency. The
25 buses are similar to Metro Orange Line.

1 Articulated buses carry up to 75 passengers.
 2 Stations would be approximately one mile apart. Clean
 3 natural gas buses. Maintenance facilities -- we do have
 4 two maintenance facilities in San Fernando Valley: One in
 5 Sun Valley and one off Canoga. So if BRT is the preferred
 6 alternative, we could service the buses with the current
 7 infrastructure that we have in place.

8 Now, for the alignment itself -- starting from
 9 the north, the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station would
 10 be the origin/destination point, and it would travel
 11 southeast along San Fernando Road in mixed-flow traffic.
 12 At Van Nuys Boulevard, it would transition into a median
 13 running -- and by "median," I mean middle of the street --
 14 dedicated bus lane and travel south on Van Nuys Boulevard
 15 as far as the Metro Orange Line.

16 At the Metro Orange Line, we have three different
 17 options. The first option is it could either terminate
 18 here or continue south in mixed-flow lanes to
 19 Ventura Boulevard. The second option is it could join the
 20 Metro Orange Line and travel west to the
 21 Sepulveda Station. Or the third option is from the
 22 Sepulveda Station, it could transfer back onto
 23 Sepulveda Boulevard and travel south to Ventura Boulevard.

24 Some of the characteristics of the
 25 BRT alternative. From end to end, approximately 12 miles.

1 We did do a modeling effort for this. The modeling is the
 2 effort that we utilize to estimate how many riders will be
 3 attracted to the system. And our modeling effort
 4 indicated that by the year 2035, we'd attract 33,600
 5 average weekday boardings, which is significant.

6 The cost of the BRT alternative is projected to
 7 be between \$250 and \$520 million to build end from end,
 8 and you notice that's a pretty big span. And the reason
 9 for that is everything we've done thus far has been based
 10 on a five percent level of engineering. There's an awful
 11 lot more engineering to do.

12 We have to negotiate with the City of LA because
 13 it's on their streets, determine what type of signal
 14 prioritization we're going to get. And when the project
 15 is better defined and we do more engineering, these
 16 numbers will be redefined. But they're based on five
 17 percent engineering, so they are our best estimate at this
 18 time.

19 Now, the light rail transit alternative is the
 20 second mode that we are considering. Again, exclusive
 21 right-of-way. Cars -- over 300 passengers per two-car
 22 train set. Stations typically one mile apart.

23 Maintenance facilities -- we do not operate
 24 light rail transit in the San Fernando Valley. So if LRT
 25 turns out to be the preferred alternative, we would have

1 to locate a maintenance facility in the San Fernando
 2 Valley.

3 So I'll point out this board right over here. On
 4 this board, we've circled three different general areas
 5 which we think might be ideal for a maintenance facility,
 6 and we welcome comments on this board. If you think we
 7 nailed it, you think one of those locations would be ideal
 8 for a maintenance facility, please let us know. Or if you
 9 know an alternate location -- again, you guys work, live,
 10 and reside in this area. We would welcome those comments
 11 because whatever we can get to make this project better
 12 for you is welcome.

13 The LRT alternative -- very similar to the
 14 BRT alternative. Again, it starts at the
 15 Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station creating
 16 transit-oriented life development opportunities.
 17 Light rail does not operate on streets, so it would be a
 18 dedicated right-of-way from Sylmar/San Fernando. Again,
 19 southeast along San Fernando Road and then along Van Nuys
 20 Boulevard south all the way to Ventura Boulevard.

21 The alternative from end to end would be
 22 11.2 miles in length. Travel time: About 36 minutes.
 23 Our initial modeling effort indicated that approximately
 24 37,500 weekday boardings would be attracted to the
 25 alignment by the year 2035.

1 The cost -- LRT is quite a bit more expensive
 2 than BRT -- somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1.8 to
 3 \$2.3 billion. And again, in our LRTP, we have identified
 4 for the project \$170 million. So there's a funding gap
 5 that would have to be addressed.

6 With that -- again, we're here for your comments.
 7 So I'm going to turn it back over to Jody for some closing
 8 remarks, and then we'll turn the microphone over to you.
 9 Thank you very much.

10 MS. LITVAK: Let's wrap this up. Okay. So again, I
 11 said I'd remind you, and so I am.

12 This is your chance to help shape this study. We
 13 wanted to know really what are the issues that are most
 14 important to you? What are the questions you want this
 15 study to answer?

16 What do you want us to evaluate? Do they have to
 17 do with whether it's BRT or LRT or something else? Are
 18 you focusing on travel speed for transit or for cars?

19 Reliability of schedules? Where the stations
 20 are? If it's LRT, do you have thoughts or questions about
 21 that maintenance yard?

22 Making connections? Parking bikes? Impacts?
 23 Real estate? Anything else? So this is your chance to
 24 let us know.

25 Lots of ways you can tell us what -- get that to

1 us. Obviously we'll be taking your comments verbally in
2 just a few moments in those written forms. These written
3 forms -- you can fill them out and send them in and turn
4 them in tonight. I apologize.

5 You can send them in by mail to Walt. That's his
6 address. All of this information is in the stuff that was
7 handed to you. You can phone us and leave a message. You
8 can send an E-mail.

9 You can go to our Website. Find out how to
10 contact us there. We are taking -- for the first time, we
11 are taking official comments via Twitter. I mean -- well,
12 yes, via Twitter. We ask you to use the hashtag
13 "ESFV Scoping."

14 We're also taking them via Facebook. Please like
15 us on our Facebook page. If you go there and post on the
16 wall, that's lovely and wonderful. But for the comments
17 to be counted as a part of the official record, we have an
18 app that you'll find at the top of the Facebook page that
19 says "submit official scoping comments" or something like
20 that. And click on that and send them in, or you can text
21 us.

22 The scoping period closes on May 6th, so please
23 get the comments in to us by then. That's our UStream
24 channel. We'll also post it on the project Web page
25 tomorrow. She's watching us here. And if you want to see

1 this presentation live one more time, next Wednesday
2 afternoon we'll be at the Van Nuys Civic Center -- the
3 same information.

4 So we're going to open it up to all of you. It's
5 two minutes per speaker. I'm going to invite you to come
6 over here. Great.

7 Sam is going to be our microphone assistant, I
8 guess. He stepped up to that. I'm going to call the
9 person to speak. And then the person immediately
10 following them -- if you're the second person, if you want
11 to head over here and wait and then step on up.

12 Our first speaker is Jason Ackerman followed by
13 Brian Patton. While Mr. Ackerman and Patton are coming
14 up, I just want to say a couple more things. You have two
15 minutes to speak. We have the countdown clock over here.

16 Who's operating the countdown clock? Oh,
17 there's -- Ashley is operating the countdown clock.
18 Thank you.

19 So state your name clearly, and then we'll start
20 that. Everybody gets two minutes. Keeps it fair for
21 everybody else.

22 If you're not familiar or comfortable talking
23 into microphones, let me give you a little microphone
24 tutorial; okay? Watch this. You want to get really close
25 to the microphone; okay? Really close to the microphone.

1 Don't be holding it out here; okay? Don't start
2 talking with the microphone in a stationary place and
3 start doing one of these things because we'll miss what
4 you're saying, and the whole point of your being here and
5 speaking tonight is so that we can get it on the record.
6 So get close to it, speak clearly, and we'll be doing
7 great.

8 So we've got Mr. Ackerman up at the microphone;
9 yes? Step on up. State your name. We'll start your two
10 minutes. And then he'll be followed by Brian Patton who
11 is -- come on over and get ready.

12 Go right ahead, sir.

13 MR. ACKERMAN: All right. So my name is
14 Jason Ackerman. I'm on the Encino Neighborhood Council,
15 and I just want to quickly point out that there are more
16 elected officials in the audience and aides from the
17 legislature -- that there are other neighborhood council
18 people, and we are elected officials, too. So a shout out
19 to the NCs.

20 So I have five points that I want to get out in
21 two minutes if I can pull it. All right. So the first
22 point: Build the rail. It's worth every penny. It will
23 last. BRT is a joke, and we need to embrace the future.

24 Two: Connect it to the Sepulveda Pass Corridor
25 because we desperately need a better connection between

1 the west side and the valley. And I think it would be
2 really well suited if we had it going to UCLA.
3 Six minutes on the Sepulveda Pass versus 20, 30 minutes in
4 gridlock 405 traffic. If you consider the cost of
5 building the light rail, it's nothing compared to adding
6 another lane.

7 Also, three: Expand the study area farther north
8 and consider adding stations at Mission College and Olive
9 View Medical Center. That way when you run it to UCLA,
10 you can actually have medical students from UCLA taking
11 the train to Olive View Medical Center doing their --
12 doing their internship and, you know, taking the transit
13 while they're doing it.

14 Four: If we need to wait for the tunnel and
15 Sepulveda Pass to get LRT to Ventura Boulevard, that's
16 fine. We can deal with that. And five: Keep it grade
17 separated as much as possible. Trains and cars do not
18 mix. Keep them at different levels.

19 I don't care how much it costs. My generation is
20 going to be strapped with all sorts of debt from these
21 wars and all sorts of nonsense. What's a good train on
22 top of all that? I think it's a worthwhile investment,
23 and I think that we should absolutely pursue maximization
24 of the system. Thank you.

25 MS. LITVAK: Thank you so much. While Mr. Patton is

1 coming up, following Brian Patton will be Faramarz Nabavi.
2 Faramarz, if you can come on up here. I do want
3 to acknowledge our neighborhood council folks. And I also
4 notice in the back we have somebody from our City of
5 San Fernando who is here, and then we have someone from
6 LA DOT. I see you in the back, sir. Thank you for
7 coming.

8 State your name and go ahead.

9 MR. PATTON: Hi, Brian Patton here. How is everybody
10 today?

11 MS. LITVAK: Hang on. Hang on. Don't -- get up
12 close.

13 MR. PATTON: Hi, Brian Patton. How is everybody doing
14 today? All right.

15 I like the LRT compared to the BRT. That's kind
16 of like, I would say, yesteryear -- the BRT. We're
17 heading towards the rail system here in the San Fernando
18 Valley.

19 MS. LITVAK: Hang on. Hang on. You really need to
20 get really close to it.

21 MR. PATTON: Okay. I would say that we're headed for
22 the rail system in the San Fernando Valley. You know, we
23 started on the rail system, so let's continue on the rail
24 system. You know, this is, like, over 100 years ago.

25 And you know, we have maintenance facility areas

1 perhaps, you know, to continue on with these things.
2 Perhaps -- I would say a good one would be the Orange Line
3 system since we already have a rail system right there --
4 well, perhaps a future rail system. And this would keep
5 Van Nuys Boulevard very, very clean.

6 It would be a center -- it would be a center
7 point to the boulevard, which would actually help out to
8 keep the boulevard clean. It would stop separate
9 communities from having to argue over, "We're going to do
10 this to the boulevard. We're going to clean the boulevard
11 that way." We'd just have one nice Metro LTR (sic)
12 running right up and down Van Nuys Boulevard making it one
13 beautiful thing and much less to argue about.

14 And fuel efficiency -- obviously anything burning
15 gas is going to be fuel efficient if we're using
16 electricity because that puts us on the highway of a
17 computer system which can change any day which is
18 electricity. How we get it -- that can change tomorrow --
19 how we do electricity -- via solar or burning a very small
20 amount of gas. So just going by the -- I'm sorry.

21 The LRT -- that would just bring something to the
22 San Fernando Valley which we don't have which is going to
23 make our future very good.

24 MS. LITVAK: Thank you so much. Okay.
25 Faramarz Nabavi. And then after Mr. Nabavi will be

1 Darrell Clarke.

2 MR. NABAVI: Hi, my name is Faramarz Nabavi, and I'm a
3 resident of Encino. So as a San Fernando Valley
4 stakeholder, I'd like to speak on several aspects of this
5 corridor.

6 Number one: I also, like the previous speakers,
7 prefer the light rail transit alternative to bus. I do
8 think that both an upgrade as well as non grade options
9 should be evaluated. So if there's a cost impact there,
10 transit planners should be able to evaluate the
11 alternatives.

12 Number one: In terms of the measurement of
13 ridership, I'd like to see not just the total ridership
14 but the difference, the increase in ridership relative to
15 the current total ridership in the corridor. That
16 includes the Woodley bus that goes partially on Van Nuys
17 Boulevard as well as 761, 233, and also some other buses
18 that have portions of their ridership on Van Nuys
19 Boulevard. Second: In terms of trying to decide between
20 the type of project and the length of the project within
21 budgetary constraints -- it's better to have the right
22 type of project and shorten the length for this phase
23 rather than having a longer length and having a type
24 that's less preferable.

25 Third: To the purpose and need, it's important

1 to have maximized regional connectivity not just in the
2 valley but also to the west side. Fourth: The share of
3 the maintenance facility that could be attributable to the
4 Sepulveda Pass project should be considered. Fifth: The
5 speed of the mode and the long-term capacity of the mode
6 should be considered.

7 And finally, the economic and environmental
8 benefits of operating light rail using clean energy and
9 with lower operating costs for passengers should be
10 considered. Thank you.

11 MS. LITVAK: Wow. Right on time. While
12 Darrell Clarke is coming up -- first of all, following
13 Darrell -- hang on -- will be Jose Palma. I do want to --
14 I'm reminded of two things that I want to point out to
15 you.

16 If anyone in the room wishes to make comments
17 verbally in Spanish, we'll double the amount of time to
18 allow for the translation. So I wanted to let you know
19 that. And if you have difficulty coming up to the
20 microphone -- they're wireless -- we'll bring it to you.
21 But you still get your two minutes.

22 Darrell Clarke, go right ahead.

23 MR. CLARKE: Okay. I'm Darrell Clarke, co-chair of
24 the Sierra Club Angeles Chapter Transportation Committee.
25 And this is a project we are quite interested in this

1 year.
2 And I'll say personally I grew up less than a
3 mile west of Van Nuys Boulevard. I graduated Van Nuys
4 High School. My father, who's here in the audience with
5 me, has actually ridden the old red cars circa 1950 from
6 Van Nuys to downtown.

7 My first main point is -- and I'll hold up the
8 Transit Coalition's map. Think of this as the entire
9 corridor from the north valley to Sherman Oaks to the
10 west side to LAX. And whatever is done should be
11 compatible with that greater vision.

12 I currently live in the Santa Clarita area. And
13 every time I drive down the 405, I keep thinking this is
14 awful. We have to have a high capacity rail transit link
15 from across the valley, across the -- or through the
16 Santa Monica Mountains down the west side. Desperately
17 needed that years ago. And whatever we do here must be
18 compatible with that.

19 I'm a bit startled by the proposed costs of LRT.
20 Granted, they're very early in the process. I thought
21 that could come in significantly less expensive than the
22 quoted price which makes it look much more expensive than
23 BRT -- than it necessarily would be.

24 And finally -- and I know this is a challenge for
25 both BRT and LRT -- that boulevard right-of-way is not all

1 With consideration of TOD,
2 transportation-oriented development, there is a lot of
3 potential in each of the connections. And I think that
4 education is key to ensuring that people from all parts of
5 the east valley understand what connection is, educating
6 them potentially in different languages -- especially in
7 Spanish -- and ensuring that they know what a TAP card is,
8 they know what the benefits are of taking it. And they're
9 not scared of taking it because they don't understand how
10 to use public transportation.

11 I know a lot of people who don't know how to use
12 it. And once they face the problem, they just decide
13 "Well, you know what? I'm just going to use a car."

14 So this is the potential for everybody to
15 understand and to educate -- you know, it can -- even
16 people in the audience and even yourselves can educate
17 people in telling them, "Try the -- try the Metro. Give
18 it a chance," because we need to really give up on the
19 car. The 405 is a mess. We really just can't be adding
20 more lanes.

21 That money could be oriented to the LRT,
22 especially and potentially for more connections including
23 to Olive View Hospital like was suggested before but also
24 connections to Santa Clarita and connecting
25 Santa Clarita buses. Instead of it coming all the way

1 that wide, and it would be interesting to start seeing
2 sectioned diagrams about how do we fit that in. So that's
3 it. Go team. Great project. And let's think about the
4 project we need and then think about "How are we going to
5 get the money to build it" rather than thinking "We only
6 have a little bit of money, and this is all we can
7 afford."

8 And I feel like gymnasts. Dismount is right on
9 the dot.

10 MS. LITVAK: Okay. Mr. Palma; right?

11 MR. PALMA: Yeah.

12 MS. LITVAK: And then following Mr. Palma is
13 Mishael Romero. Did I -- I hope I said that right. Okay.
14 Good. Go right ahead, sir.

15 MR. PALMA: Hi. I grew up in the San Fernando Valley,
16 and I think that a light rail is very needed here. BRT
17 seems to be a big amount of waste. I feel that LRT --
18 I've been in Spain, Barcelona. I lived there for a year,
19 and I saw the benefits of LRT and the connection that is
20 potential for San Fernando Valley connection to
21 downtown LA and connection to the west side.

22 I believe this is very beneficial and needed
23 including the cleaning up of the air is very important in
24 the San Fernando Valley. And I think -- I think LRT
25 pushes that forward even more.

1 from Santa Clarita down to Red Line, it could come down to
2 San Fernando City. So really consider that. And maybe
3 even consider bicycle racks, especially within the Metro,
4 so people can bike more and there's a better bike
5 connection.

6 And you know, all the stakeholders here and all
7 the constituents just need to understand the importance of
8 this for the valley. Let's promote, you know, this
9 mobility.

10 And also, when it comes to storage, I would
11 prefer it be by the airport, the Whiteman Airport. And I
12 think that's enough space for connection and storage. And
13 it will stimulate the economy by building more factories
14 and helping the much needed east side of the valley.
15 Thank you.

16 MS. LITVAK: Thank you so much. Okay. Mishael Romero
17 followed by -- I believe it's Donna Pearman would be next
18 after Mr. Romero.

19 Step on up, sir. State your name. I hope I
20 didn't bungle it too badly.

21 MR. ROMERO: Hello. My name is Mishael Romero. I'm a
22 federal employee. I take -- I live not too far from here,
23 and I take the transportation every day to downtown and
24 from.

25 And yeah, it's sad. It took me almost

1 50 minutes --

2 MS. LITVAK: We'll give you a little more time if you

3 run over.

4 MR. ROMERO: Yeah. And again -- I'm sorry. Again, I

5 take the transportation. It took me almost 50 minutes

6 just to get from the Orange Line to here, so we obviously

7 need something.

8 But I've been also really lucky. I've lived

9 and/or worked in different places such as Bangkok. I

10 lived in Seoul for over a year, Mexico City, Chicago,

11 New York -- I can go on. But I have a passion for

12 transportation.

13 And unfortunately, every time I come home, I see

14 projects like these. I feel like we're going backwards.

15 We're supposed to be LA. We're supposed to be a great

16 city.

17 You know, I understand that we do have a

18 budget question in mind. But at the same time, we've got

19 to think for the future, you know? For example -- I know

20 this is not New York or Chicago, but a lot of those

21 routes -- a lot of them have been there for what? Almost

22 a hundred years, if not more.

23 So I really would like to recommend a subway.

24 But if we can't, at least a light rail. And the

25 light rail -- that is segregated because when you have --

1 for example, near my job in downtown Little Tokyo, you

2 have the line going northwards towards Union Station. And

3 then you stop to let people on and off.

4 And then you go for, like, ten more feet. And

5 then you stop and start again because there's a light.

6 No. You know, that's not going to bring new consumers

7 into it.

8 I have a car. I have the option of taking a car

9 to work. But no, I want transportation in LA. I want to

10 be able to just say, "I want to drive in today," or, "I

11 want to take the subway today." And if you want more

12 ridership, you've got to market to people like me.

13 Another question about marketing is I just found

14 out about this yesterday. You know, unless I'm

15 accidentally going to the Website, which -- you know, I

16 can say the same thing. Have you visited government of

17 Coachella valley city? Or have you visited the Engineer

18 of City of LA Website? You know, we might have interest

19 in things, but there's better ways to market.

20 For example, when the TAP card came to be, I know

21 in the subway there were attendants at almost every

22 station I was at handing out pamphlets and information and

23 helping them to do the machine. If you want more people

24 to come to these meetings -- and I know people want to

25 come to these meetings. Because just like me, they just

1 found out -- please market this in a more efficient way.

2 MS. LITVAK: Thank you so much.

3 MR. ROMERO: Just really quick because I --

4 MS. LITVAK: Okay.

5 MR. ROMERO: Lastly, I have sent E-mails, and I

6 haven't gotten a single reply. So if you could please

7 address that as well. Thanks.

8 MS. LITVAK: Donna Pearman or Pearman? And after

9 Ms. Pearman is Miriam Fogler. Oh, okay. I'll bring it

10 over to her.

11 But why don't you step up close?

12 MS. PEARMAN: Okay. Number one: I'm totally against

13 having anything on Van Nuys Boulevard because that's an

14 area where the cars go on, and most of those people are

15 not going to get out of those cars, so I prefer something

16 going down Sepulveda. And it seems like it's low on the

17 totem pole to do the one going to Westwood -- that that's

18 going to be way down the line. And we're going this one,

19 and I don't see any real need to go down to Sylmar. Most

20 of it's just going down ways that the 233 or 761 appear to

21 be going in the first place. So maybe it veers off.

22 So I don't see -- you certainly don't need a rail

23 for that. Maybe -- I mean, a subway for that. Maybe if

24 you have to, you have to -- you use a rail -- I mean, the

25 Orange Line for something like that.

1 Two: I want to tell you that the TAP system is a

2 great big joke for a lot of people. If you don't simply

3 have a regular -- these people who don't have a regular --

4 people who have the disabled TAP or senior TAP -- people

5 who don't happen to have that -- for a lot of seniors and

6 a lot of disabled people, they -- they have to pay a

7 larger amount fare on the Orange Line or this rail because

8 there's -- if you don't happen to have it, there's no way

9 to prove it. And so these people are paying full fare.

10 My boyfriend goes on it, and he has to pay full fare even

11 though he's a senior, so I don't think that's right.

12 And two: You can't find any -- it's very

13 difficult when I have my -- to get my TAP filled up for an

14 EZ pass. Either they don't take my federal subsidy, or

15 they don't -- the places don't have the EZ TAP. So that's

16 like a great big joke.

17 We really need to have the subway down to

18 Westwood. That's something that people have been wanting

19 for a long, long time. I think we need it a lot longer

20 than Sylmar.

21 MS. LITVAK: All right. Thank you very much.

22 Ms. Fogler, you need us to bring the microphone to you?

23 Okay. Great.

24 Following Ms. Fogler --

25 MS. FOGLER: Hello.

1 MS. LITVAK: Hang on. Hang on just a minute. Hold
2 on. Following Ms. Fogler will be Jack Lindblad.
3 Are you able to see the two-minute clock from
4 where you are, ma'am?
5 MS. FOGLER: Let me hold it, please.
6 MS. LITVAK: She can hold it. It's fine.
7 MS. FOGLER: Thank you.
8 MS. LITVAK: Can you see the two-minute clock from
9 where you are?
10 MS. FOGLER: Yes, I do.
11 MS. LITVAK: Great. Okay.
12 MS. FOGLER: I want to let you know that they shut off
13 the videoconferencing here in the valley so we can't speak
14 on transportation issues in the city. In the Van Nuys
15 City Hall, they shut it down. And that should be turned
16 back on, folks.
17 And you need to put pressure on the City Council
18 Mayor to put it back on for the disabled because there is
19 no access on these buses, you know, where you have back
20 problems and arthritis issues and you can't walk too well,
21 and you can't stand a long period of time. The
22 accessibility for public transit is very archaic.
23 And let me tell you, folks, this is a joke
24 because Antonio Villarosa is a conflict of interest. To
25 shut off videoconferencing when we had him on the

1 transportation committee -- he should be -- he should have
2 not never been on it and been mayor at the same time.
3 Absolute monopoly from the first, from the goal.
4 She has -- can only get a bus pass once a month
5 on the 25th. This is an outrage. I think you people
6 should have -- should look behind you and look and see
7 what you're doing because this is an outrage to charge
8 one-and-a-half percent tax on us, and she can't even get a
9 bus pass a different day. She has to go all the way
10 downtown wherever to get a bus pass if she doesn't get it
11 on the 25th that she can get one.
12 And it's so hard getting around because you
13 people make it very difficult. You want us to put you in
14 so that you can have eminent domain so you can take out
15 any projects, which is why -- you want to set yourselves
16 up all over here along the main corridor where all the
17 businesses are so you can put your own people in. They've
18 got those businesses. Put them in -- whatever you want.
19 Anybody who's in the way of a project will be taken out by
20 eminent domain, by the MTA, and the LAUSD just like the
21 CRA.
22 I'm just telling you folks you're getting ripped
23 off left and right paying all this tax. And what are you
24 getting for it? You're not getting anything. The fact is
25 that the buses --

1 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.
2 MS. FOGLER: -- are very -- cannot be accessible for
3 disabled people.
4 MS. LITVAK: Okay.
5 MS. FOGLER: It's an outrage.
6 MS. LITVAK: Thank you. Jack Lindblad? Following
7 Mr. Lindblad is Jose Juarez.
8 MR. LINDBLAD: Testing. Testing.
9 MS. LITVAK: As soon as we're ready, go ahead.
10 All right. Go ahead.
11 MR. LINDBLAD: Well, I won't do my Elvis, but I'm
12 Jack Lindblad. And I hear your comments about the
13 disabled access and the eminent domain.
14 The problem that we have in California, in the
15 world -- we're making the most progress in Los Angeles
16 thanks to a very proactive transit mayor. He's bringing
17 our global greenhouse gases into line and reducing them
18 and reducing them and so forth. We have to meet a
19 deadline by 2020 because at that point funding is going to
20 be cut off. We're going to be in a very difficult
21 situation if we don't meet our global greenhouse gas
22 reduction in 2020 AB32.
23 LRT does it. Van Nuys Boulevard did it. So for
24 the same reasons that Metro has chosen the Van Nuys
25 Boulevard with some small part that we've added throughout

1 the neighborhood councils and the entire East San Fernando
2 District north and south of 16 neighborhood councils that
3 we've coalesced into a Facebook page. And we have about
4 an eighth of the likes on the Metro official study page,
5 so we're very proud of that.
6 One of the things is that Metro I think really
7 has a very good responsibility here of showing the
8 financial capability as a screening criteria because we've
9 all demonstrated political will here tonight. And even
10 though we're kind of top-heavy with electives, volunteers,
11 and paid electives, but basically elected officials and
12 staff from Metro is that, you know, we put up all of the
13 screening criteria, community input, economic land use
14 development, economic environmental benefits. But the
15 financial capability has to be explored in as great or
16 greater depth because this is a project that costs about
17 ten times as much as one of the projects.
18 So it isn't -- it's almost like putting up a
19 false flag. So you have Project A and Project B. But
20 Project B only costs ten percent, but it's got built in
21 BRT creep. In other words, a bus rapid transit that has
22 been acknowledged across the Americas --
23 MS. LITVAK: Is time up? I wasn't watching. I'm
24 sorry. It is. Time up.
25 MR. LINDBLAD: Has BRT creep in it -- okay. Well --

1 MS. LITVAK: Wrap it up.
 2 MR. LINDBLAD: LRT is the best choice.
 3 MS. LITVAK: Got it. Thank you. I'm sorry. I got
 4 distracted.
 5 Okay. Jose Juarez, come on up, followed by
 6 Sergio Ibarra. I zoned out for a moment there. Hang on.
 7 Hang on. There we go.
 8 MR. JUAREZ: All right. Well, I mean, I have no
 9 prestigious titles to my name. And I've been to several
 10 of these meetings before, and I cannot stress the
 11 importance of building a light rail transit out here
 12 because the citizens of the San Fernando Valley --
 13 whenever they see a bus rail transit, they don't see a
 14 cheap innovative way to travel. They see a community
 15 that -- or, like, a city council or a city that didn't
 16 want to invest enough in their citizens to build a more
 17 efficient way to get around.
 18 I think the bus rail transit is a joke because
 19 it's just -- it's not appealing to somebody who wants to
 20 try using public transportation. So I feel like it's a
 21 bit upsetting to see as few people here as there is
 22 because I know way too many people that -- around my
 23 community that constantly complain about how difficult it
 24 is to get from one side of the valley to the other, so
 25 it's very disappointing. And it just goes to show me that

1 people don't care enough about the subject because it's
 2 not present.
 3 You know, one is -- it's not around. It's not in
 4 eyesight. So if a light rail transit were to be built, it
 5 would definitely promote a lot more prosperity in each
 6 community, and it would be a lot easier for everybody to
 7 want to just take -- use public transportation as the
 8 alternative instead of cars. So I feel like it's very
 9 important that we build a light rail transit. And I mean,
 10 it's -- I cannot stress that enough.
 11 It's just -- it's a joke that one of the largest
 12 metropolitan cities in the world has as bad of a
 13 transportation system as Los Angeles does, so I think
 14 something desperately needs to be done. And I mean, I
 15 wish there was a more -- a better way to connect the --
 16 the -- the line to -- like the Red Line, say, or, like,
 17 provide some sort of easier connection to the greater
 18 Los Angeles area or -- or downtown. So I mean, that's my
 19 two cents.
 20 MS. LITVAK: Great. Thank you so much.
 21 Sergio Ibarra? After Mr. Ibarra, we have John Hernandez.
 22 MR. IBARRA: Let me know when you're ready.
 23 MS. LITVAK: We're ready whenever you are.
 24 MR. IBARRA: Good evening. My name is Sergio Ibarra,
 25 and I'm the president of the Arleta Neighborhood Council.

1 I've been a long-time resident of Arleta, and I want to
 2 say welcome to Arleta. Thank you for coming.
 3 We're here today. I'm here today speaking -- a
 4 supporter of LTR (sic), the light rail project. It's time
 5 for the City of Los Angeles and Metro to really explore in
 6 investing in the San Fernando Valley.
 7 We send our tax dollars to Measure R to transit
 8 projects. It's time for Metro to really commit to giving
 9 us a top quality transportation system in the San Fernando
 10 Valley. That's why I did not support Measure J because
 11 this project was not on -- on the list of projects that
 12 would receive additional funding.
 13 I ask Metro really truly explore the
 14 possibilities of really funding this project. I keep
 15 hearing from Metro that it's going to cost extra money to
 16 place a rail yard and a maintenance yard in the
 17 San Fernando Valley. Well, guess what, folks? We want
 18 investment in the San Fernando Valley -- in the northeast
 19 San Fernando Valley because that means jobs.
 20 We want jobs. We want development. We want
 21 services that we need here in the San Fernando Valley. I
 22 want a Starbucks at the corner and places where our youth
 23 here from Arleta High School can go there and do their
 24 homework and create communities.
 25 The other thing I'm asking for is on the map, you

1 state that there's going to be a station in front of
 2 Arleta High School. I would be opposed to a station at
 3 Arleta High School. I would recommend that the station be
 4 located on Van Nuys Boulevard and Woodman, our commercial
 5 heart of Arleta.
 6 And again, thank you for coming out and
 7 supporting the top quality -- thank you for coming out and
 8 supporting the top quality transportation system that we
 9 need. And we want to connect it from Mission College to
 10 UCLA. We want our students to go to UCLA in 37 minutes.
 11 MS. LITVAK: All right.
 12 MR. IBARRA: Thank you.
 13 MS. LITVAK: Thank you. All right. John Hernandez?
 14 And after Mr. Hernandez, the last speaker card I have is
 15 for Robert Gardner, but it does not have to be the last
 16 one. So if you still want to speak, hold up your filled
 17 out card or hold up your hand, and we'll get you a blank
 18 card.
 19 Go right head, sir. Step right on up.
 20 MR. HERNANDEZ: Great. Thank you. Good evening. My
 21 name is John Hernandez. I'm with the Pacoima Neighborhood
 22 Council as well as Arleta Neighborhood Council. I'm also
 23 a small business owner on the Van Nuys Corridor in
 24 Pacoima.
 25 I'm a proponent personally for the LRT program.

1 I think it will bring that visibility, that presence, the
2 beautification that we need in the northeast San Fernando
3 Valley. In addition to that, we also -- like
4 Sergio Ibarra stated earlier, we need the opportunity to
5 move the kids from this community into more affluent
6 areas: UCLA, Loyola, USC. In the evenings,
7 unfortunately there is no Metro going to Mission College
8 at night, so we definitely -- there is an opportunity
9 there as well.

10 Hopefully -- the Metro has also done studies with
11 other communities that have the same demographics as ours
12 like Pasadena, Highland Park, Lincoln Park just to name a
13 few. So thank you for the opportunity to speak this
14 evening and have a good night.

15 MS. LITVAK: Okay. Great. Oh, thank you. While
16 Mr. Gardner comes up, I've been told all these -- let me
17 look at the camera here.

18 For our UStream viewers who would like to submit
19 comments, please use the chat feature on the channel. And
20 this would probably be a good time to do that; right?
21 Okay.

22 Mr. Gardner, go right ahead.

23 MR. GARDNER: I just wanted to say that I do believe
24 that the train should go -- extend to Mission College and
25 the medical center. And also wanted to point out what

1 they were saying about how they have to go all the way
2 downtown just to get, like, a senior or disabled bus pass.
3 And I understand where they're coming from because I have
4 to go all the way downtown just to get a student pass.
5 And there's only two Metro places that I know. It's the
6 one downtown and one in Crenshaw Baldwin Hills Plaza that
7 people can physically go.

8 So I think that you guys should look into the
9 possibility of having another Metro center maybe somewhere
10 near the Van Nuys Courthouse so people can have easier
11 access to get their disabled pass, senior pass, school
12 pass. I think it will be much easier because there's
13 nowhere that you can go in the valley. And I believe --
14 you know, if you're going to create this massive project,
15 going to have all these commuters, you should have at
16 least one more location where people can go so they can
17 have it easier to access these discounted passes. That's
18 it.

19 MS. LITVAK: Thank you. Do we have any comments on
20 our UStream channel yet? No? Okay. That's okay.

21 Bart Reed, come on up. That's our -- Bart?
22 Bart? I'm going to start counting your two minutes now.

23 No. No. Come on up. No. Come on up. Come on
24 up. If there's anyone else who wants to speak, please get
25 us a form.

1 MR. REED: Hi, I'm Bart Reed, executive director of
2 the Transit Coalition, and I run the California State
3 University Northridge Transportation Tiger Team. This
4 East San Fernando Valley Transit project light rail option
5 is probably the most important element that will ever be
6 presented into the San Fernando Valley. Bear in mind that
7 until 1952, we actually had rail transit on Van Nuys
8 Boulevard from Chandler to Parthenia at one point, but
9 then it was shortened to Sherman Way. But we always had
10 rail transit on Van Nuys Boulevard from 1912 to 1952.

11 This isn't new. This is why Van Nuys Boulevard
12 is so wide. It has been there -- accommodated transit for
13 whatever the years were -- between 1912 and 1952, and it's
14 important.

15 Side comment: We are also working on night and
16 weekend bus service to get to Cal State Northridge. We're
17 looking for supporters on that. That's one element.
18 We're also working with Jason Ackerman to improve the
19 service on Balboa Boulevard.

20 Back to the transit on Van Nuys Boulevard, light
21 rail is the most cost effective option. Bear in mind that
22 each light rail train car can carry about 150 people -- in
23 a three-car train, about 500 people. Compare that to the
24 capacity of the roads, which is only about 500 an hour per
25 lane. So you don't really have that much road capacity.

1 So if you can be carrying several thousand people
2 an hour on light rail, you're increasing the capacity of
3 the road. Even though the road might have to get narrowed
4 a little bit, it actually makes the road more cost
5 effective for the citizens.

6 There's no eminent domain involved despite
7 misstatements from some people. I don't know how you
8 eminent domain city streets that used to have rail line in
9 it anyway, but there's bizarre ideas here. Thank you very
10 much.

11 MS. LITVAK: Thank you. And I got one more comment
12 card from Tony Warte. Tony, come on up. Okay.

13 MR. WARTE: Hi, I'm Tony Warte. I'm a resident of
14 Arleta. And I'm happy that you are looking at the
15 Van Nuys Boulevard Corridor and San Fernando Road Corridor
16 for this project.

17 I'm in favor of light rail transit because I am a
18 daily rider of Metro. I work in East Hollywood, so I take
19 the Red Line, the Orange Line, and either the 233 or 761.
20 So I am very familiar with other modes of transit here
21 including the Gold Lines I ride occasionally.

22 I've been reading about past histories on other
23 projects, and I'm kind of disappointed as to how the
24 Orange Line came out and the outcome of it. And I wish it
25 was light rail. I don't want to see the same thing happen

1 to Van Nuys Boulevard, San Fernando Road. And I want to
2 see that as a combined project with the -- with the
3 Sepulveda Pass subway corridor down to the west side.

4 And just this evening on my way here -- I usually
5 don't get home until, like, late evening. But
6 apparently -- I checked the next trip, and I noticed that
7 there was a 40, 50-minute gap in 761 service. So I was
8 forced to take the 233 bus.

9 And it's a five-and-a-half -- five-and-a-half
10 mile trip from the Orange Line at Oxnard all the way up
11 here. It took 50 minutes. And it was horrendous because
12 that bus itself -- the driver -- he was probably
13 frustrated himself. He had to handle not only the 233
14 stops and the riders but also the 761 riders.

15 And there's definitely a lot of -- a lot of
16 transit dependent people on that corridor that are
17 depending on the service, and light rail definitely is a
18 lot more dependable. It's a lot more reliable. You can
19 be serving the existing 25,000 riders that currently use
20 the 233 and 761.

21 At the same time, you're also going to get the
22 discretionary riders. And that's a bonus because this
23 light rail line -- if it is light rail -- will be very
24 successful from day one. Thank you.

25 MS. LITVAK: Thank you. All right. Do we have any of

1 our -- no? All right.

2 Are there any more commenters? We've had a lot
3 of commenters tonight. Thank you all so much. Okay. No.
4 we're not going to do a second round. So we're going to
5 wrap it up here.

6 We'll hang out until 8:00 o'clock to answer your
7 questions. You'll see us -- you can see us next Wednesday
8 at 4:00 o'clock at the Van Nuys Civic Center. And wait a
9 minute. And if you want to get your comments in to us,
10 here's all the ways to do that.

11 For those of you, between now and next Wednesday,
12 who will be celebrating the beginning of Passover, happy
13 Passover. We'll see you next Wednesday. Thank you all so
14 much for coming this evening.

15 (Off the record)

16 MS. LITVAK: Hang on. We got one comment on the Web.
17 Hold on. Hold on. Let me read it.

18 Web comment. This is from "Gone Fishing." "The
19 LRT option is the best, only option. Woodman/Van Nuys
20 Station is better than Arleta for shopping, housing."

21 All right. Thank you so much. And with that,
22 we're done.

23 (Meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.)
24
25

ESFV COMMENTS: Community Meeting #4 - Van Nuys Constituent Center (Written)					
Date	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Address	Comment
3/27/2013	Freddy	Cortes		1733 Sherman Way Lake Balboa 91406	Dash (LADOT) and Metro should merge and thus save us taxpayers some dollars hard to come by in this national economy that hurts the poor!
3/27/2013	Beth	Brody		14141 Ventura Blvd Sherman Oaks 91423	I am with an apartment developer/owner and we have many buildings in the SFV. Van Nuys Blvd is a major transit street (the hub of Panorama City at Van Nuys and Roscoe) and we'd love a transit line down Van Nuys Blvd! Improve transportation to all of the SFV!
3/27/2013	Chris	Carrera		14751 Lassen St Mission Hills 91345	The light rail transit is the best option. It will move the most people and have the best opportunity to have more people switch to transit and increase ridership. The maintenance facility should be in Pacoima or Van Nuys. This line needs to be planned in conjunction with the 405/Sepulveda Pass Project.
3/27/2013	N/A	N/A			Van Nuys Blvd is very narrow between Laurel Canyon Blvd and San Fernando Rd. How to handle? No Tops!! Must start/terminate Sepulveda/Ventura!! Must go to Foothill!! Put bike lanes on Van Nuys and Truman in not there already. Most important: route.
3/27/2013	Dolores	Tukich		14937 Greenleaf St. Sherman Oaks 91403	Light Rail
3/27/2013	Jerry	Martin	VNNC/Rail PAC	5700 Etiwanda Ave #151 Tarzana 91356	I am try to push for a bus plaza/transit hub for Van Nuys Amtrak Station. Need to improve connection between Metro, LADOT, Metrolink, Amtrak and possible new transit services. My Neighbor Council wants to see better service. I hope to work with Metro/LADOT etc..
3/27/2013	Malcolm	Klugman		109 N. Screenland Dr #D Burbank 915050	Before your major project, how about continuing the 734 Rapid bus farther down Sepulveda Blvd. It could run all the way to LAX or stop at the Expo Sepulveda Stop when completed. This bus should run every 15 minutes. It's a long run, but so are the 460 and 720 buses and they are very successful. One year trial.
3/27/2013	Miriam	Fogler		PO Box 4706	We need better efficient busses get you around. Ask Donna Pearman (818) 645-4312. There's an awful lot of traffic if Van Nuys Blvd especially when you get up to the GM Plants, shopping center past the Sepulveda tracks. Mr. Davis said San Fernando would need first the study for the LRT or BRT. How is San Fernando going to the...? The industrialized area where there's manufacturing. There needs to be a report if eminent domain is used. TSM- Very good. The best. why not use Sepulveda only to lessen the traffic over the Sepulveda Pass. We need it there not on Van Nuys Blvd. BRT and LRT. Chuck says we need transportation for those 38,000 riders. 18,000 will get off on Sepulveda and Ventura how do they get around.
3/27/2013	Algandra	Palma		6706 Bakman Ave N. Hollywood 91606	I believe the light train rail option is best for the San Fernando Valley. Since it is faster and will allow bus riders to get to their destination as well. I believe it will lead to less congestion, less traffic, and less use of cars. It will encourage people to use the train and or bicycles as well. I believe a bicycle should be placed on the path as the light train rail. Thank you Metro for putting this project forward.

ESFV COMMENTS: Community Meeting #4 - Van Nuys Constituent Center (Verbal)		
First Name	Last Name	Comment
Raul	Bocanegra	I don't want to take all of two minutes. I'll be brief. Just very quickly, I appreciate the turnout of the Neighborhood Council members and I also see the attendance of folks from Cal State Northridge, and I was a former professor there at Northridge. There's a couple of students here and part of my motto in that class was that transportation planners, urban planners, and planners will change the world. This project has an opportunity to be a real game changer for the San Fernando Valley. I look forward to both alternatives being detailed and studied. I encourage you to give the utmost consideration to the Light Rail alternative, but I'm going to have an open mind to that, but I believe the Light Rail option is something that will have a real game-changing character, a transformative nature here than in the Northeast San Fernando Valley. We need some equity, much like other places in Los Angeles who have a Gold Line and a Blue Line. I think it's time for the San Fernando Valley to enter the 21st Century with a good, quality transportation system. Also, we want to work with Metro. We'd like to see very little disruption of the businesses that might be affected in either option. And lastly, on the maintenance yard location, we'd like to have more information on that, what kinds of jobs, the number of people, the types of impacts that might have to the surrounding area. It's my pleasure to be here and I look forward to the rest of the comments.
Wesley	Hernandez	Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you, Metro and City staff for inviting us all here. Assembly Member Bocanegra and community stakeholders, while Councilmember Koretz has not weighed in on a preferred alternative for the San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor, we do request that Metro study seamlessly connecting the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor and the Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor. This is especially timely since I know that Metro is currently working on a plan to accelerate the Measure R funding for second and third decade projects, which includes the Sepulveda Pass project. Both of these projects are of great interest to our office and our constituents because they will provide a desperately needed north-south connection between the San Fernando Valley and the employment hubs within the Fifth Council District, which include Century City and UCLA. On any given day, 350,000 plus trips are taken through the Sepulveda Pass Corridor. Metro and the City of Los Angeles must have the foresight to plan for this region's future needs, regardless of any conditions, fiscal or otherwise. I commend Metro for the fantastic job that you have done in noticing the public release for the Transit corridor and I hope that transparency continues. Thank you.
Gabriela	Marquez	Good afternoon. My name is Gabriela Marquez and I'm here from the office of Congressman Tony Cardenas. I would like to thank you all for coming here and I wanted to add that I was at the first meeting that Metro put together and my interest was to come and hear the constituents' concerns, the questions that were being brought up, and I relayed that message to the Congressman and after a brief conversation, his interest is obviously the community's -- you know, he has the community's interests at heart. With that, he knows that there's a particular strength and that there's a lot of things involved in planning something and getting this project done. He's supportive of the -- he was supportive of the BRT project and now as Assembly Member Bocanegra said, we also believe and he supports the idea that the San Fernando Valley deserves a better and more futuristic plan of transportation, a mode of transportation. If there's anything else that he would like to add to that, I'm sure he'll relay the message to me and I'll be sure to connect to anyone; and our office is open to any comments or anything that you guys would like to ask us. And that's it for my part. Thank you.

<p>Bob</p>	<p>Anderson</p>	<p>Hi. I'm Bob Anderson. I'm with the Sherman Oaks Homeowners' Association. We support smart transit. Sherman Oaks is a very crowded area. We just want the study to prove to us that this is smart transit. The real north-south traffic problem does occur in the Valley, but the biggest problem is getting over the hill to the Westside. There are huge amounts of traffic. There are no bus lines that go there except the one that goes to the UCLA campus and wanders around, so there is really nowhere for the people exiting this project at Ventura Boulevard to go if they want to go over the hill and that's a serious problem, and Wesley brought up that this project does have to seamlessly integrate with an over-the-hill project or this project really accomplishes very little. So as part of this study, you should look at other alternatives of getting people over the hill that can be coupled with this project on a short-term basis since the project over the hill is way in the future, if at all. So you must look at a seamless connection in your study; and if you cannot somehow identify how a connection will be made over the hill, you should note that in the study and note the impacts of that and maybe consider the No Build option, under the hill, over, however you get there. The Bus Rapid Transit route on Van Nuys Boulevard switches from dedicated to mixed flow in the most crowded part of Van Nuys Boulevard for one of the options and that has to be studied carefully to see what the actual impacts are. I noted the differences between transit times for bus and light rail and they were very close and that's probably only due to the buses having to be in mixed-flow traffic. The other thing is that the study should prove to the people in the Environmental Impact Report -- The project should not reduce the net flow of people on any street that the project occupies.</p>
<p>Dennis</p>	<p>Hindman</p>	<p>Hi. My name is Dennis Hindman. The flexibility of bus operations needs to be part of the evaluation. Multiple bus routes can be run on a BRT bus line, each not having to make the same stops, decreasing the odds of bus overloading at stations while also making headways possible. Where the majority of the potential transit users want to go also needs to be considered. Even with the completion of the Sepulveda Pass project, more transit riders using the Van Nuys Boulevard Corridor will likely head towards the North Hollywood Subway Station rather than UCLA or Century City where the workers tend to have higher paying jobs that require more education, making them financially capable of still preferring to drive rather than taking Transit. BRT along Van Nuys Boulevard has the potential to make a faster and more direct connection to the Red Line by having every other bus route and every other bus turn into the Orange Line bus and then head directly to the last stop across from the subway. This also puts more service where it's needed on the Orange Line between the subway station on Van Nuys Boulevard and north of the Orange Line on Van Nuys Boulevard. For increased safety, bicycles need to be separated from vehicles and in much greater mass and speed, which also encourages more people to cycle. Any length within a route that exceeds the tolerance from stress for people to ride a bicycle effectively makes the entire route too stressful for them to ride. Putting bike lines on only a portion of Van Nuys Boulevard would make this route useful for less than 1 percent of the adult population who are traffic tolerant. Transit combined -- obtained a 1.1 percent waiver portion of the overall transportation commuting mode share in L.A. from 2005 to 2007, yet the mode share for bicycle increased about 36 percent of what Transit did in this time period, and the city was only averaging I think about six to eight miles of bikeways a year. For the last year and a half, L.A. has been installing bikeways at the rate of about six times what the average has been of these previous years. Bicycling needs to become more effective on Van Nuys Boulevard for a large portion of the population to use it. Thank you.</p>

<p>Miriam</p>	<p>Fogler</p>	<p>Before we look at all these proposed alternatives, I talked to Mr. Davis of late. I've been coming to a number of meetings. I'm getting more familiar with the thing. The fact is that they don't have the EIR or the EIS thing. They don't give you in-depth study of what this is going to do to all the people that are going to be impacted along the whole thoroughfare here and how it's going to affect the ridership and cars, how it's going to affect the bikes. I just don't see how you can put the cart before the horse if you don't have the information first. I think that the people should be scrutinizing this and wondering maybe we should put in the TSM to carry us to make gradual improvements. Let's do this little by little instead of doing it all at once and spending billions of dollars where -- where is this thing going to be feasible and practical for us, especially for people who are disabled, seniors, people who ride bikes, people who still want to drive their cars? We have to look at all these angles. So please, before you consider putting the BRT or LRT in, look at -- look at what we can afford. Okay? We can't put the cart before the horse. We need to be rational and reasonable of what's going on, what's happening here, because if we don't, then, you know, what we're doing is wasting our tax dollars. You understand me? You understand? What we need to do is hold a little at a time, get the consensus from all the businesses, the industry, because they need these maintenance yards. We need to have an evaluation of how they -- 'cause they have the power of eminent domain, if people don't want to sell their property at market value, which he has told me that they will do that. They can also bring in, you know, low-income housing, affordable housing. All that is at stake. Thank you.</p>
<p>Beth</p>	<p>Brody</p>	<p>Hi. I'm Beth Brody. I'm with B.W. Brody Affiliated Companies. I work for a real estate apartment developer, an investor in the San Fernando Valley. We have a bunch of apartments in the San Fernando Valley and, therefore, are very excited about improving the transportation to and from the Valley and within the Valley itself. The reason I'm here is just to mention that, you know, when looking at the different alternatives in terms of the light rail, it goes directly down Ventura Boulevard; and with the bus line, it kind of curves and goes down Sepulveda. The only thing is going to Ventura and Van Nuys Boulevard is also a very busy intersection and I think that that would be a really good area to also let the bus go down to, but of course it depends on the studies you guys do. So thank you for all the work you guys will be inputting and everything you will be doing to try to get this to the Valley. We appreciate all the hard work that everyone at Metro and the City is doing for all the people in the Valley. I know that our best interests are in your heart. So thank you.</p>
<p>Ron</p>	<p>Ziff</p>	<p>Thank you. Ron Ziff. I'm from Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council. We encourage you to build this system and get the most for our money. Other major transit programs in other cities recognize two different needs, the need to move people short distances and long distances. There's no problem right now moving people short distances. The invitation to this meeting gave us nine bus lines that travel right here. There is a need, a tremendous need, for moving long distances. Your own figures show 500,000 people going through the Sepulveda Pass every day, another 100,000 going through the canyons, a total of 600,000. That's one out of every seven people in the entire city of Los Angeles and there's no public bus transportation. The Sepulveda Pass is the most traveled corridor in the entire country. The need is to bring the bus or the street car down to Ventura Boulevard and continue somehow over the pass to destinations like Century City, LAX, Culver City Transit Center, the Expo Line. The problem with these proposals is they don't go beyond Ventura Boulevard. The result right now with all the systems is that we have all these people who want to get over, we have a three-hour traffic jam every single morning that impacts every major road in the Valley and many of the residential streets. A system that doesn't go beyond Ventura Boulevard is a bridge to nowhere.</p>

<p>David</p>	<p>Garfinkle</p>	<p>My name is David Garfinkle. I'm president of the Tarzana Property Owners' Association and a member of the Tarzana Neighborhood Council. That's information, identification only. I'm speaking for myself at this point. You've already heard and I'm sure you're going to hear many more times the absolutely critical need to tie whatever choice you make into the cross-hill Sepulveda Corridor. So I'll just add my vote to that and go into other things. I think that in addition to coordinating with that, you need to coordinate with whatever other projects may be coming down the pike that would affect this or which could most -- could coordinate with it. I think that as an example that you're not responsible for but not tying the cross-Sepulveda transit into the current 405 Freeway construction was a terrible mistake. It's just going to tie up traffic in that area two different times for years at a time. Let me talk a little bit about time. The three years that you're planning for construction is just too much. I think that whatever you need to do should minimize the impact on businesses and on current users of transportation in that corridor. Take the repair of the freeways after the Northridge Earthquake as an example. That was done expeditiously, very quickly, perhaps a little more expensive in period -- dollars per period of time, but it was least disruptive and I think you need to think very closely about how to shorten the time so that you minimize the impact on those people that would be affected. Thank you.</p>
<p>Robert</p>	<p>Gardner</p>	<p>Hi. Hello, everyone. My name is Robert Gardner. The first comment I have, I believe that there should be a stop at Burbank Boulevard. Even though I know they're close, the Orange Line and then Burbank Boulevard, they're really close, but I believe there should be a stop at Burbank Boulevard because once you get toward the Chandler Estates area, there's only two lanes. So I think the train should submerge and then shoot straight down to Ventura area. Also, I just wanted to say that if we're not going to have a light rail train down Van Nuys Boulevard, then I personally believe that you shouldn't even do anything, because it's either light rail or nothing because as a frequent passenger of the bus -- of the Orange Line busway, it's just -- it just makes me so mad that if I had a car, I wouldn't even bother with it. I mean, I'm tired of being squished. I'm tired of having two or three buses pass me by. I'm tired of seeing people with bikes having to wait almost -- having to wait for like three buses in the middle of the night because they can't put their bikes on the bus and there's no room and it's just a bad situation, and a No Build option is not an option. We -- this project is going to be worth every penny and I believe that everyone should come together. Whether Van Nuys, Sherman Oaks, Pacoima, no matter what neighborhood you live in, everybody should come together and everybody should realize that this project is important and we can work this out in a meaningful manner, you know. So everybody, you know, keep up the good work, Metro. You guys are doing a great job. Everybody, submit your comments and support light rail.</p>
<p>Chuck</p>	<p>Betz</p>	<p>Yes. I think we're putting the cart before the horse in this project. We are going to make a bad situation a lot worse for a much longer period of time if we follow this procedure because the problem isn't getting around the Valley. It's getting over the hill -- -- and you're going to bring people from Antelope Valley that are going to get off the commuter trains and come down this corridor to go over the mountain and you're going to get to Sepulveda Boulevard and Ventura Boulevard, which is an F-rated intersection, and you're going to bring not the whole 38,000 passengers because some of them will get off before; but if only half of them go down there, you're going to have 18,000 people get down to Ventura and Sepulveda, and where are they going to go? You're going -- you can't put more buses on the freeway. A bus going up over the mountain probably goes 10 miles an hour and that's going to back up the other traffic. When they get down to Sepulveda and Ventura Boulevard, they're not going to have a car. They're not going to have any other way to get over the mountain except a bus, and so -- and the under the mountain was supposed to be finished in 2030, but on Wednesday night at our homeowners' meeting, they said it's not going to be done until 2039. How many people are going to be around then? A lot of the people in this room won't be around and we'll have to put up with that problem. So I think you need to reconsider that. Thank you.</p>

<p>Jose</p>	<p>Palma</p>	<p>I'm Jose Palma. I'm part of The Transit Coalition Tiger Team and first of all, I wanted to address the fact that population is continuing to grow in this Valley. If we don't do anything to move this population out of this Valley, because word will come around anywhere, even if people come from the Antelope Valley, even if people come from Ventura, we still need a way to move people around. We can't just be waiting to build more freeways and expect that to be a solution. There's going to be more cars and more pollution. You have to think a little outside the box and think of it more as an investment. America was an investment in a way of coming into this new land and creating new dreams and hopes, and I think when it comes to building new transitions like this light rail option, I think it's very important for this community, especially San Fernando Valley. When it comes to community building, there's a term in planning called TOD, Transportation Oriented Development, but there's also one they should also analyze which is TOC, Transportation Operating Community. So when it comes to that, you want to encourage people to live closer to transit so there's an option when it comes to not using a car for less pollution. You want to encourage other businesses to also develop around that TOD or TOC. You want to encourage people to make sure that they can not only give up their car and also take Metro but also use the bike. You want to ensure that there's bike options on the Metro. You want to ensure there is racks. You want to ensure that there's bike lanes on Van Nuys. Doing this, you're also lowering the amount of cars that are on the street, meaning there's less chances for traffic and collisions and also a chance for cleaning up the environment. You have to take that into consideration as well. This is a huge investment that I think is going to be paying off so much better. There's just so much opportunities when it comes to investing in your community, especially with light rail. There's nothing for BRT. Orange Line did not work for me.</p>
<p>Pat</p>	<p>O'Connor</p>	<p>I'm very disgusted because as usual, the poor people at the far northeast end of the San Fernando Valley are again overlooked. I have resided in Pacoima for over four decades and I have seen every bus line killed, changed, modified, and ended, and now you're just repeating that pattern because I have checked over your thing here and I see there is no stop with your -- either proposal for Paxton Avenue where we have a major shopping center, and I worked with Alex Padilla to get that installed so the people can have jobs in that poverty neighborhood. You also will not have a stop on Woodman. That's another major shopping center. The gigantic supermarket is there which takes many residents of Pacoima to shop there. The second thing is be that as it may, 'cause you will do what you want no matter what we say, I would suggest you keep it a bus because -- Pacoima has worked very hard to beautify. They have a brand-new center divider in the middle of Van Nuys Boulevard under the program of Beautify Pacoima, which I also worked with a few years ago. You'd have to tear all that out. Sepulveda Boulevard is actually wider and would have room for a two-lane rail track if this is indeed going to be on tracks you're going to have coming and going. You're going to relegate Van Nuys Boulevard to a simple one-lane forward and coming if you do the installation of a rail in the middle of that boulevard. You're going to create more traffic. People need their cars because they take their groceries home, they lug their laundry to the Laundromat. We cannot do that on a bicycle. We can barely do it on a bus, but at least it is possible with a stroller carriage. So, again, I resent that Pacoima residents are again being overlooked. Again, people who need to get to Glen Oaks and Foothill are out in the cold. And I have a question: Does this plan eliminate the 561 Red Rapid?</p>

<p>Doug</p>	<p>Arseneault</p>	<p>Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Doug Arseneault with the Valley Industry and Commerce Association, representing more than 380 businesses who pay millions of dollars through Measure R and other measures into our transit system. VICA looks forward to the development of the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor through the cities of San Fernando and Sherman Oaks. In development of the EIR, we request three major aspects are addressed. First, route, including which route provides the best access for customers, the ridership of existing bus lines along each route, and whether there's a need to ease crowding in which lines? What regional landmarks, government offices, and economic centers of activity are along each route? Which route provides the best connectivity to current systems, including the Red Line and Orange Line, as well as future transit projects, including the Sepulveda Pass Corridor? What are the environmental benefits of these higher ridership, reduced crowding, and reduced distances for customers to connect to these major centers of activity? The second aspect is the type of vehicle and what the environmental benefits are in terms of ridership capacity, speed and frequency of service of BRT, LRT, and HRT. Regarding costs, VICA would like an analysis of the construction costs of each alternative and what alternative provides the best cost recovery. Which alternative will be most attractive to riders and to private investment in case a PPP is considered? Overall, we request that the study compare if each alternative will prevent the issues that are associated with the San Fernando Valley's only other major Transit system, the Metro Orange Line. VICA would like to prevent the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor from the overcrowded, high-traffic levels, and slow speed that trouble Orange Line drivers and discourage ridership. We look forward to answers to these questions that have importance to Valley residents and businesses.</p>
<p>Freddy</p>	<p>Cortes</p>	<p>Good afternoon. Years ago, I was in a group from East L.A. and it was a community group that studied the new train coming in from Union Station to Atlantic. The issues that were mentioned here today such as businesses being taken over or being offered compensation for the real estate and all that, we looked at those and now, as you know, the train is already in operation. At that time, I belonged and I'm still a member of the Bus Riders' Union and the discussion that I heard the members having was, Is it buses versus light rail? And that was the big problem that Metro had, trying to secure funding from the Federal government. Now I'm looking at my notes here and I noticed that we are commenting on what Metro is doing because it's a mandate from the Federal government, but the question I have is the City of Los Angeles also has some buses that are running and that's LADOT, the Department of Transportation, but have they been considered? That's one of the questions I have. Another question we have is the traffic that comes from, as previous speakers said, Pacoima and other places going north and south. Has the private driver been considered, how heavy the traffic is? Also, there seems to be a concern about carpools. So that be would be my question. Thank you.</p>
<p>Jason</p>	<p>Ackerman</p>	<p>All right. So my name is Jason Ackerman. I'm with the Encino Neighborhood Council. I have lived in this Valley all my life. I want to briefly touch on the five points I made at the last presentation, which is, one, this project has to link up with the Sepulveda Pass Corridor; two, it has to be light rail; three is that we have to look at extending the study area farther north to include Mission College and Olive View Medical Center. So that way, when we eventually get this train to UCLA, we can have students going from UCLA to UCLA Olive View Medical Center on the train. And there's a lot of concern about cost and cost-effectiveness. Well, I've looked at a couple of studies and it turns out that per passenger mile, light rail is cheaper. It's a much steeper initial investment, but it is a much better long-term return on that investment. It is also a much more attractive form of transportation. I know a lot of people who will only take the train and they always complain that L.A. doesn't have mass transit. Why? Because we're not New York and we don't have subways every other block. And then I point out to them, Well, you put two Manhattans in the San Fernando Valley and it costs ridiculous amounts of money, but we definitely need light rail on Van Nuys. We definitely need to turn the Orange Line into light rail, and this investment in a storage yard is step one in making that happen and we need to keep pushing, we need to keep investing so we can push this thing under the Sepulveda Pass, not over, and we need to connect it to UCLA and the Expo Line and eventually the Crenshaw and Green Lines. Thank you very much.</p>

Juanita	Palma	My name is Juanita Palma. I am very happy with the new project that's going to take place, especially for the light train because with this, there's going to be less traffic, less accidents, pollution as well. This is a good solution for all the students that go to school and for us that we take the bus. This is going to be good. I would like it for the -- I would like it for the future if they could extend it to UCLA. Thank you very much.
Noel	Barajas	Hello. My name is Noel Barajas. I'm with State Senator Padilla's office. The one thing that the State Senator has seen, we've been promoting efficiency and moving people throughout the Valley, but -- which this project is one of its purposes; but as pointed out, the Sepulveda Pass Project is also part of the measure. So not only do we have to consider getting them to the southern end of the Valley for what will happen to them there, but likewise if this project becomes a BRT project which only handles 75 people, what will happen when the Sepulveda Pass Project is a light rail and leaves 300 passengers at the southern end of the Valley? How are they going to get up to the northern end of the Valley? BRT bus, you would need four buses for every train in order to get those 300 passengers out of the Sherman Oaks/Studio City area out to the northern end of Pacoima/Sylmar area. So I think we definitely need to look at the big picture not only of one route individually but both routes and how they're going to function with the whole Metro system. In addition, people are talking about our taxpayer money. Yes, that's correct, Measure R was passed. We are currently being taxed taxpayer money for these projects, so if -- whatever we do, if we choose not to do anything, then we are basically paying for no projects being built in the Valley and all our taxpayer money is going to projects in other parts of the County, be it the Subway to the Sea, the Crenshaw line, expansion of East L.A., so that's the other thing to think about as residents. Are we wanting nothing to improve our public transit in the Valley and our resources to be given to other projects in the other parts of the county? Thank you.
Chris	Carrera	Okay. I just wanted to sort of reiterate some of the good ideas I've already heard today. This needs to be a light rail, not bus. It needs to be light rail. It needs to be connected to the 405 project, under or through the mountain. And there was a stop that's listed at around Arleta High School and it really would be better around Woodman. So I'm not sure I could actually add anything else to that. Thank you.
Quirino	de la Cuesta	I was born and raised in L.A. and I've seen the gradual changes at L.A. because it's becoming a more -- before, it was a car-centric society, but now we've changed because of an increase in density, also the environment, and I would like to see light rail because I think it shows that -- what we do with light rail, you can see what's happening in downtown L.A. with Hollywood, with Koreatown. It's -- it's -- it really increases growth and investment and money because it really is an important step toward the future of L.A. and I think it's also for the future, for the youth to be involved in this process, because I really like the way you guys have been doing this, as being more transparent to the community for the reason that, you know, that everybody can get involved and I really appreciate it. And also, I am doing a documentary about urban planning, design and architecture and I think this is a perfect storm that could happen. It could be a -- it could make L.A. a world-class city and I would like to ask Mr. Davis and hopefully Jody if they would be interested in being interviewed for this documentary I'm working on.
Lynn	Bronstein	Some years ago, a journalist asked members of the L.A. City Council if they used public transit. The ones who deemed to reply said they sometimes did, but mostly they used their cars because they said, "We would never get anywhere on time if we did it." This does not speak well to the public transit that we have been using, and as a lifelong user of public transit, I would urge the Metro officials and people working on this project to travel themselves at peak hours or late at night and experience what I have experienced and what other people have experienced: having to wait a long time at a stop, having to get connectivity and having to race to make sure that you get the last one on time; you know, experience what the density of traffic is like on a street like Van Nuys Boulevard that you're considering where, you know, is there going to be room for either a light rail or a bus and for the stations with the pedestrian traffic? Consider the safety factors. Consider yes, we do need to go over the hill because I need to get from Van Nuys to Westwood on a regular basis and it takes over an hour. Consider all of these factors as you yourself travel and ask yourself if it makes you uncomfortable, how much more uncomfortable it is probably making everyone. So keep all these things in mind as you are planning this project. Thank you.


Van Nuys CC (Spoken)

<p>Nate</p>	<p>Zablen</p>	<p>Good evening. I'm Nate Zablen and I'm with the Southern California Transit Advocates and I'm speaking for myself. I'm looking to the various alternatives. Whether it's bus or rail, the important thing is not so much whether bus or rail, but can you improve on the Orange Line? Can you make it better than the Expo Line? For example, you have an Orange Line that has its right-of-way, but it doesn't have signal priorities. It has to stop at a lot of intersections and has to slow down to a crawl at other intersections. So the time that you save being on the Orange Line compared to a Rapid Bus is not very much and it's a very crowded bus. So if you have a bus lane on Van Nuys Boulevard, you have to have the signal priority. You have to work with the City of Los Angeles so that people on a bus or a train will have more priority than people -- individual people in a car, and that's -- I know that's very difficult; but in the meantime, you have to work with the City to get that to optimize the transit that you have. Ideally, light rail would be great, but I know funding is going to be a problem because Proposition J just didn't make it. So we may be stuck with a bus line or a bus option, but the important thing, like a lot of these people have said, is it has to connect with the Sepulveda Pass. You don't want hundreds of people stranded on Ventura Boulevard and Sepulveda waiting to connect to go to UCLA or to visit the Getty Center or Skirball museum. There's a lot of traffic there. So you have to think -- it has to be more than just the Valley. It has to include connections to the Westside, particularly the Sepulveda Pass, the museums, and to UCLA. So that's very important. So I think in the meantime before we have this light rail or the bus line, you have to make improvements right now on Van Nuys Boulevard. You have to improve the bus stops. You have to work with the City so that, for example, the bus stop here on Calvert -- rather, Aetna is horrible. They need improvement. They need better benches, better furniture, to make it attractive for all people.</p>
<p>Jack</p>	<p>Lindblad</p>	<p>Well, again, I'm Jack Lindblad and this is a reality that we've projected in our campaign for Assembly for years. Going back to 2008, especially in 2010, part of my campaign was to ask folks in the Assembly District whether they would like light rail down Van Nuys Boulevard; and with no money in the campaign, against all the corporate interests, and getting the money out of politics, people resounded with 22 percent of the vote in 2010. Right after that, I believe Metro took up the cause and started to scope -- started preliminary studies, and that's where we are right now in a preliminary scoping environment that are two projects weighed against each other, not similar in cost. So one weighs ten times as more costly as the other. We have Federal mechanisms to finance this, the MAP-21 in America Fast-Forward, and I'm sure folks know more, too. So part of Metro's programming effort has to include the means, methods, and practices of financing this. So we also have a social complement. We have 1.4 million or so people in the Valley that are trying to be upended by some hillside developers, some hillside speculators, some hillside residents that see their interests threatened by having the right of everyone of freedom of movement. Right now it's a clog. BRT has a clog that goes for two miles and is mixed-flow traffic into very busy San Fernando Road. Light rail will have the right-of-way like pedestrians and bicycles do over the private car. We have the 2020 mandate in California called the Climate Law and --</p>
<p>Sergio</p>	<p>Ibarra</p>	<p>Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Sergio Ibarra. I'm president of the Arleta Neighborhood Council and I would like to say thank you for all the neighborhood council representatives here tonight. It shows that we are getting involved, we do represent our community, and we want the best in our community. And the question to our neighbors in Sherman Oaks is I want you to be there and alive when this project gets built. If not now, then when? Measure R funds are currently being taxed out of the San Fernando Valley and we are not reaping the benefits. We are paying these funds to other areas of the city. It's time. It's time that light rail come to the San Fernando Valley. It's time that our tax dollars come back to our communities. We are one San Fernando Valley, not north or south. We are one San Fernando Valley. I like that Metro studied the economic developments and possible TODs along the route, the increased ridership along the route, how many jobs will be created, including the new maintenance yards and new jobs that will be created. Commercial and TOD developments along the route, including the TOD development at Van Nuys and Woodman, which is a wonderful commercial area in Arleta, and I welcome you to come visit us and shop when you're going through Van Nuys Boulevard and the revitalization that any type of transportation development and investment is going to have along the Van Nuys Corridor. The other day after the meeting in Arleta, I went out there and I drove the area and there was -- at 10:30 at night on a Wednesday night, there were 75 people waiting at Van Nuys and the Orange Line, literally a 75-people driving area. You will see that the BRT route on Van Nuys Boulevard, Van Nuys Boulevard is literally at capacity. You're going to pass four buses when people get off on the train? I don't think so. Thank you. Support light rail.</p>

<p>Glenn</p>	<p>Bailey</p>	<p>Good afternoon. My name is Glenn Bailey. I am president of the Encino Neighborhood Council and I'm also vice chair of the City of Los Angeles Bicycle Advisory Committee; however, today I'm speaking as an individual. First of all, having the experience with the Orange Line I think is helpful. As someone who uses it regularly, I can tell you that the statements made here earlier regarding -- they didn't say this, but packed in like sardines for much of the day is a result of putting a bus line where there really should be grade-separated rail and so that was -- that's a fundamental flaw. To take nearly an hour to get from the Chatsworth line to the North Hollywood line is not rapid transit; maybe mass, but it's not rapid. So please don't repeat that mistake. Use grade-separated, use rail, so that you can accommodate the future demands. Now, we all know that a lot of the problems we have on the 405 are generated by areas outside the Valley, Santa Clarita, Antelope Valley, Simi Valley, et cetera, so I think it's real important that this technology be able to be compatible either to serve the Westside or for the Westside to come up and serve it. What we don't want to have is multiple transfers. Our goal should be like zero, but no more than one and if you can do that with that technology, I -- think, you know, with keeping that in mind. So lastly, I'll close on as an advocate for bicyclists, the City of Los Angeles has designated both Sepulveda and Van Nuys Boulevard as part of the backbone network. Anything the City does under the City's adopted plan is required that there be bicycle accommodation. That means bicycle lanes of some sort on those two streets. So whatever you do and however you do it, please make sure that you comply with the City's adopted plan. Thank you.</p>
<p>Jennifer</p>	<p>Charles</p>	<p>Hi. My name is Jennifer Charles. I'm an architect who lives and works in the south end of Van Nuys Boulevard and Sherman Oaks and I wanted to touch on two of the important things to me, the first being connections and the second being bicycles. I would like to reiterate what people have said about how this project will connect into the Sepulveda Pass I think is crucial, and I encourage Metro to keep thinking big and think really of the future. I mean, people have talked about, Well, 40 years from now, we're not going to be here, but the city is going to be here. It's not going anywhere and I wish something like this had been done 40 years ago for us to reap the benefits. So I also strongly support light rail as really the only way to move the capacity of people that are using the corridor right now. Also, in terms of local connectivity, we've talked a lot about people being dumped into Ventura Boulevard. As an architect, I love Ventura Boulevard. It's a historic commercial corridor through the Valley and I feel like it's very underserved by mass transit, so I would hope that also as this project gets developed that some of these east-west corridors like Ventura Boulevard are strengthened and become part of the transit system even more than they are. And then just the last thing with bicycles, I bicycled here tonight. It's an easy bike ride, but bicycling on Van Nuys Boulevard is not that fun right now, but I would prefer it over driving here, which would have taken me the same amount of time through traffic. And so to really keep bicycling as part of whichever project is chosen is incredibly important because that allows people to have multiple connections into the system and out of the system and also travel local distances once you've kind of gotten off on the major transit stations. Thank you very much.</p>

Van Nuys CC (Spoken)

<p>Alexander</p>	<p>Freedman</p>	<p>Yes. Alexander Freedman and I used to go to Cal State Northridge, so thank you. I live in Hollywood and I travel to the San Fernando Valley, although personally I try to avoid the Valley because it's got no decent transit, to be honest, and I don't want to sit in traffic in the car. The Orange Line is a joke. I'm sorry. The Orange Line is a huge -- the BRT is a huge disrespect to the transit ridership and to the pedestrians and something better needs to be done. So, I mean, honestly, in this time and age it's hard to believe that BRT is still proposed as one of the alternatives. I think it would be a step in the wrong direction. Just -- it should be definitely light rail. So I believe it should be a light rail combined with a class 2 separated bike lane. If you cannot make it separated, please make it a class 2 dedicated bike line. Also, I think in South L.A., when it connects to Ventura, it should not stop at Ventura, but it should go to the Sherman Oaks Galleria because you're going to dump all those people at Sepulveda and Van Nuys. It's not in the middle of nowhere, but it's literally close to Sherman Oaks Galleria, but it's not quite there. It's like a line to summer but not to summer. So if you can deviate the last portion of the leg to Sherman Oaks Galleria to connect people to the Entertainment Center, to the jobs, I think that would be very helpful. Also, I think it should be a part of the three-phase project from the Valley to LAX. The first phase should be from Sylmar Station to Sherman Oaks and the second phase should be from Sherman Oaks to Westwood and the third phase from Westwood to LAX. If you build through this line, it's going to be a phenomenal transportation of the City of Los Angeles and City of San Fernando. Also, for the future, I think Orange Line should be developed, upgraded, to LRT. Lastly, the Red Line subway should be extended to Burbank Airport. Thank you.</p>
<p>Gregory</p>	<p>Wright</p>	<p>Hello. My main idea is to make the current bus service as good as possible in as many ways as possible in advance of the Van Nuys Corridor of the future to come in order to prime the corridor for the improvements and for the increased transit use that we hope this will create and to the greatest extent possible make these improvements as a model for improvements that can be made across the MTA system. For example, start with the bus stops themselves and make the experience of waiting for a bus as pleasant as possible. It really isn't now. For example, shade the most sun-exposed bus stops. I was looking at the bright sun as I waited for a bus on Van Nuys Boulevard to get here; and to do this, undertake a survey right now to figure out which stops are in most need of this kind of shade to -- and start there to shade them. Another idea is to create more prominent signage so that people become more aware of the bus option and very importantly amalgamate the local and rapid bus stops and bus service so nobody ever has to see one or more buses pass them again while waiting for a bus at what might be the wrong stop for local and rapid. That's very frustrating. Enhance the Van Nuys Corridor service with Dash buses. This could help people, as a previous speaker noted, in carrying groceries and other heavy stuff. Maybe make the Van Nuys corridor a free Wifi zone, just like this Civic Center across the entire web. And definitely creatively promote the future corridor with visionary arts showing what will be here within a decade. Do it on the kiosks. Do it on the buses themselves. You've got these huge, long, panoramic wraps to create a visual of the future and maybe you can also do it on Transit TV. I've got other ideas if anyone would like to talk with me about that.</p>
<p>Rolando</p>	<p>Chavarria</p>	<p>Yes. Hi. My name is Rolando. I'm a student at LAVC. I live not too far long from the Orange Line and Van Nuys Boulevard. I've been living there for 18 years so I know everything about what's going on. I came here because I really want -- I still want the light rail because Van Nuys Boulevard is more like Wilshire Boulevard and so please -- and because a lot of people have been taking the bus, 761 has always been crowded ever since, and from Westwood to Sherman Oaks you will see how crowded is the buses and everything else. So I still really want to see this not to become -- end up the same thing as the Orange Line because the Orange Line has always been crowded and simply -- I do want the Orange Line to become a light rail instead, so -- but I really wanted to see how the rail -- the light rail to turn into an underground option on Sherman Oaks because of the 101 Freeway and Van Nuys Boulevard and Ventura Boulevard. So I'd still prefer to see it going underground on the light rail and also I'd really love to see San Fernando and Pacoima right next to the Metrolink tracks. I'd really love to see something more like the Orange Line and the Expo Line because it's not -- it doesn't look very good. It looks very serious and everything like that. So hopefully if this is going to change and everything like that, then I'd really love to see more riders riding the rail instead of buses, because if you put buses, it's going to get even more crowded than the Orange Line bus. So hopefully I want this thing to get done as soon as possible.</p>



East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <i>William Fogler</i>	
Organization/Organización:	
Address/Dirección: <i>PO BOX 4786</i>	
Tel:	Email/Correo electrónico:

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:

- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

*We need better efficient buses get you around. Ask
 Donna Pearson 818 645-4312
 There's an awful lot of traffic on Van Nuys Blvd
 especially when you get up to the gym plant shopping
 ctr past the railroad tracks at the main intersection
 said San Fernando would need further study for the LRT or
 BRT*

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.


Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.

*How is the San Fernando going to be affected? The industrialized
 area where there's manufacturing. There needs to be
 a report if there's if Metro eminent
 domain is used*



Metro





East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: MR. F. G. CORTES B.A.	
Organization/Organización: Mex. Am. Univ. / Brown Berets de Aztlan	
Address/Dirección: 17331 Sherman way Lake Balboa CA 91406	
Tel: 323-344 9097	Email/Correo electrónico: cortesfeddy@ynho.com

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

DASH (LADOT) and METRO SHOULD MERGE AND THUS SAVE US TAXPAYERS SOME DOLLARS HARD TO COME BY IN THIS NATIONAL ECONOMY THAT HURTS US THE POOR!

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <u>Beth Brody</u>	
Organization/Organización: <u>BWBrody Affiliated</u>	
Address/Dirección: <u>14141 Ventura Blvd</u>	
Tel: <u>818-981-1151</u>	Email/Correo electrónico: <u>beth@bwb.com</u>

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

I am w/ an apartment developer/owner and we have
many buildings in the SFV. Van Nuys Blvd is a
major transit sheet (the hub of Panorama City, a
Van Nuys and Roswe) and we'd love a transit line
down VanNuys Blvd! Improve transportation to
all of the SFV!

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <u>Chris Carrera</u>	
Organization/Organización:	
Address/Dirección: <u>14751 Lussow St Mission Hills</u>	
Tel: <u>818 920 2944</u>	Email/Correo electrónico: <u>ccarrera@verizon.net</u>

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

The light rail transit is the best option. It will move
 the most people and have the best opportunity to have more people
 switch to transit and increase ridership. The maintenance facility
 should be in Pacoima or Van Nuys. This ~~is~~ line needs to
 be planned in conjunction with the 405/Sepulveda Pass
 Project.

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project
 Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA
 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a
 Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre:	
Organization/Organización:	
Address/Dirección:	
Tel:	Email/Correo electrónico:

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


- Van Nuys Civic Center BRT
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

VAN NUYS BLVD IS VERY NARROW BETWEEN
 LAUREL CANYON BLVD AND SAN FERNANDO RD.
 HOW TO HANDLE?
 NO TOPS !!
 MUST START / TERMINATE SEPULVEDA / VENTURA !!
 MUST GO TO FOOTHILL!

PUT BIKE LANES ON VAN NUYS & TROMAN IF NOT THERE ALREADY
 Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

MOST IMPORTANT: ROUTE
 Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <i>DOLORES TURICH</i>	
Organization/Organización: <i>resident</i>	
Address/Dirección: <i>14937 Greenleaf St S.O. 91403</i>	
Tel: <i>818-783-3749</i>	Email/Correo electrónico: <i>greenleaf@att.net</i>

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

Light Rail

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: Jerry Martin	
Organization/Organización: VNNC/Rail PAC	
Address/Dirección: 5700 5700 Et. Wanda Ave #151 91356	
Tel: 818-518-7155	Email/Correo electrónico: m-martin48@yahoo.com

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

I am try to push for a bus plaza / Transit Hub for ~~Van Nuys~~ Van Nuys Amtrak Station. Need to improve connection between Metro, LADOT, Metrolink, Amtrak and possible new transit services. My Neighbor Council wants to see better service. I hope to work with Metro/LADOT etc.

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.






East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: MALCOLM KLUGMAN	
Organization/Organización: SELF	
 Malcolm Klugman 109 N. Screenland Dr., #D Burbank, CA 91505-4310	
Tel: 818-846-5291	Email/Correo electrónico:

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:


Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

BEFORE YOUR MAJOR PROJECT, HOW ABOUT CONTINUING THE 734 RAPID BUS FARTHER DOWN SEPULVEDA BLVD. IT COULD RUN ALL THE WAY TO LAX OR STOP AT THE EXPO SEPULVEDA STOP WHEN COMPLETED. THIS BUS SHOULD RUN EVERY 15 MINUTES. IT'S A LONG RUN, BUT SO ARE THE 460 AND 720 BUSES AND THEY ARE VERY SUCCESSFUL. ONE YEAR TRIAL.

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.





East San Fernando Valley Transit
Corridor Study

Comments/Comentarios

Please Print Clearly/ Favor de Escribir Claramente

Name/Nombre: <i>Alexandra Palma</i>	
Organization/Organización:	
Address/Dirección: <i>6706 Bakman Ave Apt #11 N.H 91606</i>	
Tel: <i>818 3219801</i>	Email/Correo electrónico: <i>alexandra23palma@hotmail.com</i>

Meeting Venue/Lugar de reunión:

- Van Nuys Civic Center
 Panorama High School
 San Fernando Regional Pool Facility
 Arleta High School

I believe the light rail rail option is best for the san fernando valley. Since it is faster and will allow us riders to get to their destination. As well I believe it will lead to less contamination, less traffic, and less use of cars. It will encourage people to use the train and/or bicycles. As well I believe a bicycle should be put placed on the same path as the light rail rail. Thank you metro for putting this project forward!

Please return comment sheets to the comment box; any staff member; or by mail to Walt Davis, Metro Project Manager; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-3; Los Angeles, CA 90012. You can also submit a comment via email to vannuys@metro.net. Comments are requested by May 6, 2013.

Por favor entregue sus comentarios en la caja, déselos a cualquier miembro del equipo o mándelos por correo a Walt Davis (al domicilio arriba) o por correo electrónico, antes del seis de mayo de 2013.



Metro



John Ulloth/ Ulloth Graphics
Post Office Box 7232
Van Nuys, California 91409

East San Fernando Valley Project
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
1 Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: Public Testimony for the East San Fernando Valley Transit Project

Dear Walt Davis, East San Fernando Valley Transit Project & LACMTA Staff,

The mode you choose for this alignment must be light rail. But I've been recently reminded there isn't really enough funding from the new County Transportation Sales Tax Initiative to bring forth enough investment to actually build either mode right- or any other of its many projects- that were spread (too thin) all over the County in order to achieve a supermajority by the voters. Further, you must break this project into affordable phasing- that will be required, and you should show us now- to build this East San Fernando Valley project.

May I remind you, **Light Rail mode has a significant facilities advantage (worth at least \$40,000,000-60,000,000): that is, light rail cars and a maintenance yard (that can be shared by this project rather than built from scratch) will already be there...** be there because MTA *must* and will tear out the busway to rebuild light rail on the Chandler Rail Line in 2015 (= ten years from 2005, when MTA went against enabling legislation). Per that "Robbins Bill"(in the vernacular), the Legislature's purchase price now must be refunded, because the Orange Line does not qualify as "Fixed Guideway Transit", nor is it electrified as required by County Code.) Failure is not an option either, as 1) the public will not tolerate MTA spending money like that on a fine instead of a project, 2) the Legislature would much rather cut a ribbon than throw the money into the bottomless pit of State General Fund Deficits, and 3) MTA doesn't have that kind of money to waste on No Project anyway...

Regarding Operations potential, the rail vehicle platform, and station locations:

Because they are ~8'-6" wide, light rail trains cannot stop at Red Line subway stations built for 9' wide subway cars; **but new & existing light rail cars- retrofit with 3rd-rail pickup shoes- could run non-stop from the Blue Line through the Red Line Tunnel, under Lankershim Boulevard (per the "Robbins Bill") ***, serving stops on the Chandler alignment at-grade, then potentially north & south onto this Van Nuys Boulevard corridor... making this junction at Van Nuys Boulevard a sensible place to (co-)locate a light rail yard, as I said at last testimony.

If light trains are put in the center of Van Nuys Boulevard, one shared directional platform should also be in the center to remove as little as possible width from the rest of the street, with ramps on each end: A) one landing at the traffic light's pedestrian crossing on the main street, and B) the other landing at a mid-block pedestrian crossover, *per* MetroRail Blue Line's Long Beach Boulevard platforms). This is an advantage of Rapid Buses in the center of the street, as at the last meeting we learned "left side doors" for MTA buses (required for Rapid Bus mode center platforms) will not be tolerated by Operations.

If light rail trains are to be placed at the outer edges of the street, the auto parking will go away; if this option is considered, MTA will have to consider how that parking is replaced. An acceptable answer is that parking is replaced by more choice drivers that will ride rail. But if stations are built on the curb line, eliminating the (low-floor) trolley alternative will have proven either very foolish or rail-malicious: Staff at the last meeting presentation seemed to have a mental block that trolleys are "smaller", "slower", with "less carrying capacity". This is tradition, not engineering fact, as there is no technical basis for this nonsense! **We want every light rail and trolley in the Los Angeles basin to be interoperable, regardless of its floor height!** Did MTA not waste a decade learning we should have synchronized the Blue, Green, and Gold Lines to match electrical &

technical specification in the first place? **There is no difference between a low floor light rail car and a trolley car- NONE! Write it down!** There only difference is how much more you have to spend building ramps at light-rail-height stations.

If light rail still seems undoable due to varying numbers of auto traffic lanes on northern Van Nuys Boulevard, you should consider returning the tracks to their pre-1938 alignment: abandoning the less-productive northern Van Nuys, turning west at Parthenia (re-railing sweeping curves still in place)... then north again to super-wide Sepulveda to the San Fernando Mission. East along Memory Park into San Fernando (still on the original alignment), then turning north along San Fernando Road to *parallel the MetroLink/ UP tracks without crossing them*, to prevent a repetition of the dangerous, expensive, and unnecessary Frankenstein Bridge that ate the Chatsworth multimodal station west parking lot to jump buses over mainline tracks there!

Please contact me if you have any further questions, as I have advocated for common sense, and against LACMTA transit mistakes in the county and San Fernando Valley for many years, and would really like to help you avoid them!

Very Truly Yours,

(John Jay Ulloth)

*(and again tunneling under the Coldwater Creek area required by "Robbins Legislation")



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 3/27/13

Name: Assemblymember Raul Bocanegra

Organization: State Assembly AD39

Address: 9300 Laurel Cyn. Blvd. 1st fl.
As beta 91331

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 03/28/2013
Name: Wesly Hernandez
Organization: City of Los Angeles - Council District 5
Address: 822 S. Robertson Blvd., Los Angeles, 90035

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3/27/13

Name: Gabriela Marquez

Organization: Office of Congressman Tony Cardenas

Address: 9300 Laurel Canyon, Arleta CA 91331

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: March 27, 2013

Name: Bob Anderson

Organization: Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association

Address: 4050 Woodchiff Rd, S.O., 91403

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 3-27-13

Name: DENNIS HINDMAN

Organization: _____

Address: 4400 CAITVENGA BLVD

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 5/27/13

Name: Miriam Fogler

Organization: _____

Address: PO Box 4746 PC CA 91412

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3/27/2013

Name: Ben

Organization: BWBrody Affiliated

Address: _____

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3-27-13

Name: RON ZIFF

Organization: SHERMAN OAKS NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

Address: _____

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 5/27/2013

Name: DAVID R. GARFINKLE

Organization: TARZANA PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION

Address: 6073 CALVIN AVE TARZANA, CA 91356

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 03-27-2013

Name: Robert Gardner

Organization: _____

Address: 17207 Chandler Blvd Apt 41 Valley Village CA 91607

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3/27/13

Name: CHUCK BETZ

Organization: SOHA

Address: 4334 MAMMOTH AVE #10 SHERMAN OAKS 91423

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



Metro

*4 min
spare for EIS*

EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3/27/2013

Name: Jose Palma

Organization: The Transit Coalition

Address: 6706 Bakman Ave - Apt #1 N. Hollywood CA 91606

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3/27/13 Wednesday
Name: PAT O'CONNOR 4:10 pm
Organization: RESIDENT
Address: Box # 330333 91333

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3/27/13
Name: Doug Arseneault
Organization: Valley Industry & Commerce Assoc.
Address: 5121 VAN NUYS BLVD. LA, CA 91403

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



COMENTARIO FORMAL



REUNIONES COMUNITARIAS DE ÁMBITO PROYECTO DEL CORREDOR DE TRANSPORTE DEL ESTE DEL VALLE DE SAN FERNANDO

Por favor escriba de una forma legible.

Fecha: 03-27-2013

Nombre: SR. F. G. CORTES

Organización: Mex. Am. Univ. / Occupy L.A.

Domicilio: 17331 Sherman Way V.N. CA. 91406

**POR FAVOR ENTREGUE ESTA FORMA A UN MIEMBRO DEL EQUIPO DE METRO ANTES DE QUE
COMIENZE LA SESIÓN DE COMENTARIO/TESIMONIO FORMAL.**

Por favor someta su comentario o pregunta acerca el Proyecto del Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando para que pueda recibir una respuesta en la/el Declaración/Reporte de Impacto Ambiental Borrador. Cada persona tendrá dos minutos para hacer sus comentarios.

**Nota: Personas con permiso para hablar no pueden ceder su tiempo a otras personas para que hablen de su parte.*



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3-27-13

Name: JASON ~~FRANK~~ ACKERMAN

Organization: Encino Neighborhood Council

Address: 16713 Addison St, Encino, 91436

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



COMENTARIO FORMAL



REUNIONES COMUNITARIAS DE ÁMBITO PROYECTO DEL CORREDOR DE TRANSPORTE DEL ESTE DEL VALLE DE SAN FERNANDO

Por favor escriba de una forma legible.

Fecha: 3-27-13

Nombre: Juanita Palma

Organización: _____

Domicilio: 6706 Bakman Ave #1 N.H. 91606

**POR FAVOR ENTREGUE ESTA FORMA A UN MIEMBRO DEL EQUIPO DE METRO ANTES DE QUE
COMIENZE LA SESIÓN DE COMENTARIO/TESIMONIO FORMAL.**

Por favor someta su comentario o pregunta acerca el Proyecto del Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando para que pueda recibir una respuesta en la/el Declaración/Reporte de Impacto Ambiental Borrador. Cada persona tendrá dos minutos para hacer sus comentarios.

**Nota: Personas con permiso para hablar no pueden ceder su tiempo a otras personas para que hablen de su parte.*



COMENTARIO FORMAL



REUNIONES COMUNITARIAS DE ÁMBITO ESTUDIO DEL CORREDOR DE TRANSPORTE DEL ESTE DEL VALLE DE SAN FERNANDO

Por favor escriba de una forma legible.

Fecha: 3/27/2013

Nombre: Noel Barajas

Organización: senator Alex Padilla

Domicilio: _____

POR FAVOR ENTREGUE ESTA FORMA A UN MIEMBRO DEL EQUIPO DE METRO ANTES DE QUE COMIENZE LA SESIÓN DE COMENTARIO/TESIMONIO FORMAL.

Por favor someta su comentario o pregunta acerca el Proyecto del Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando para que pueda recibir una respuesta en la/el Declaración/Reporte de Impacto Ambiental Borrador. Cada persona tendrá dos minutos para hacer sus comentarios.

**Nota: Personas con permiso para hablar no pueden ceder su tiempo a otras personas para que hablen de su parte.*



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3-27-13

Name: Chris Carreón

Organization: _____

Address: 14751 LASSEN ST

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: March 27, 2013
Name: Quirino de la Cuesta
Organization: Quasimotor Productions
Address: 6356 Van Nuys Blvd #209

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.

de su parte.



COMENTARIO FORMAL



REUNIONES COMUNITARIAS DE ÁMBITO PROYECTO DEL CORREDOR DE TRANSPORTE DEL ESTE DEL VALLE DE SAN FERNANDO

Por favor escriba de una forma legible.

Fecha: _____

Nombre: _____ *Lynne Bronstein*

Organización: _____

Domicilio: _____ *Van Nuys*

POR FAVOR ENTREGUE ESTA FORMA A UN MIEMBRO DEL EQUIPO DE METRO ANTES DE QUE COMIENZE LA SESIÓN DE COMENTARIO/TESIMONIO FORMAL.

Por favor someta su comentario o pregunta acerca el Proyecto del Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando para que pueda recibir una respuesta en la/el Declaración/Reporte de Impacto Ambiental Borrador. Cada persona tendrá dos minutos para hacer sus comentarios.

**Nota: Personas con permiso para hablar no pueden ceder su tiempo a otras personas para que hablen de su parte.*



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 9-27-13

Name: NATE ZABLEN

Organization: Southern California Transit Advocates

Address: _____

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: 3-27-13

Name: JACK LINDBLAD

Organization: ANC

Address: 8211 Shattuck

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3/27/13

Name: Sergio Ibarra

Organization: Arleta NC

Address: Sergio.Ibarra.94@my.csan.edu

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print. ³⁻²⁷⁻¹³

Date:

Name:

Organization:

Address:

Glenn Bailey

City of LA Bicycle Advisory Committee

GlennBaileySFV@yahoo.com

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: 3.27.2013

Name: JENNIFER CHARLES

Organization: RESIDENT

Address: 4518 VISTA DEL MONTE AVE #1, S.O. 91403

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK



EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS

Please print.

Date: Alexander Freedman

Name: 3/27/2013

Organization: _____

Address: on file

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



REQUEST TO SPEAK

EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
OFFICIAL SCOPING MEETING COMMENT

Please print.

Date: GREGORY WRIGHT

Name: 3/27/2013

Organization: "WRIGHT THINKING"

Address: ~~1416~~ 14161 RIVERSIDE DR., #3
SHERMAN OAKS 91423

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM TO A MEMBER OF THE METRO TEAM PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF TODAY'S FORMAL COMMENT SESSION.

Please formulate your comment or question regarding the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study so that it can be responded to in the Draft EIS/EIR. Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to provide comments.

NOTE: Speakers cannot cede their time to other people to speak on their behalf.



English



COMENTARIO FORMAL

REUNIONES COMUNITARIAS DE ÁMBITO ESTUDIO DEL CORREDOR DE TRANSPORTE DEL ESTE DEL VALLE DE SAN FERNANDO

Por favor escriba de una forma legible.

Fecha: 3/27/13

Nombre: Rolando Chavarria

Organización:

Domicilio:

POR FAVOR ENTREGUE ESTA FORMA A UN MIEMBRO DEL EQUIPO DE METRO ANTES DE QUE COMIENZE LA SESIÓN DE COMENTARIO/TESIMONIO FORMAL.

Por favor someta su comentario o pregunta acerca el Proyecto del Corredor de Transporte del Este del Valle de San Fernando para que pueda recibir una respuesta en la/el Declaración/Reporte de Impacto Ambiental Borrador. Cada persona tendrá dos minutos para hacer sus comentarios.

*Nota: Personas con permiso para hablar no pueden ceder su tiempo a otras personas para que hablen de su parte.

BEFORE THE METRO

EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT TEAM

Public Scoping Meeting in the)
Matter of:)
)
EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT)
CORRIDOR STUDY)
_____)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Van Nuys, California

Wednesday, March 27, 2013

Reported by:

MARCENA M. MUNGUIA,
CSR No. 10420

Job No. :
B9376NCO

1 BEFORE THE METRO
 2 EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT TEAM
 3
 4
 5
 6 Public Scoping Meeting in the)
 Matter of:)
 7)
 8 EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT)
 CORRIDOR STUDY)
 9 _____)
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken at
 16 Van Nuys Constituent Center, 6262 Van Nuys
 17 Boulevard, Van Nuys, California, commencing
 18 at 4:30 p.m. on Wednesday, March 27, 2013,
 19 heard before the METRO EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY
 20 TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT TEAM, reported by
 21 MARCENA M. MUNGUIA, CSR No. 10420, a Certified
 22 Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of
 23 California.
 24
 25

INDEX		PAGE
PUBLIC SPEAKERS:		
1	Assemblymember Raul Bocanegra	22
2	Wesly Hernandez	24
3	Gabriela Marquez	25
4	Bob Anderson	26
5	Dennis Hindman	28
6	Miriam Fogler	30
7	Beth Brody	32
8	Ron Ziff	33
9	David Garfinkle	35
10	Robert Gardner	36
11	Chuck Betz	38
12	Jose Palma	40
13	Pat O'Connor	41
14	Doug Arseneault	43
15	F.G. Cortes	45
16	Jason Ackerman	47
17	Juanita Palma	48
18	Noel Barajas	49
19	Chris Carrera	51
20	Quirino De La Cuesta	51
21	Lynne Bronstein	53
22	Nate Zablén	54
23	Jack Lindblad	56

1 APPEARANCES:
 2 Metro Presenters: WALTER DAVIS
 Project Manager
 3 Metro
 4 JODY LITVAK
 Community Relations Director
 5 Metro
 6 Spanish Interpreter: Diana Orozco
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

INDEX (Continued)		PAGE
PUBLIC SPEAKERS:		
1	Sergio Ibarra	58
2	Glenn Bailey	59
3	Jennifer Charles	61
4	Alexander Freedman	63
5	Gregory Wright	64
6	Rolando Chavarria	66
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 Van Nuys, California, Wednesday, March 27, 2013
2 4:30 p.m.

3
4
5 MS. LITVAK: Before we get started formally, first of
6 all, if there is anybody here who needs simultaneous
7 Spanish translation, we have that available for you and
8 we'd like to make that available to you. You just need
9 to raise your hand and we'll take care of you and we're
10 going to repeat that message for you in Spanish right
11 now.

12 So, again -- oh, if any of you parked in the
13 facility here, we have parking validations for you. See
14 Megan in the back or somebody at the table where you
15 signed in and show them your parking ticket and we will
16 take care of you.

17 I am Jody Litvak from Metro. We are here today
18 to talk about the East San Fernando Valley Transit
19 Corridor Project. It's a project that Metro is doing in
20 conjunction with our friends from the City of Los Angeles
21 who I know are here in the room -- where are our LADOT
22 people? Thank you so much -- and our Council offices.

23 We really, really love it so much when our
24 elected officials send their representatives, or in this
25 case today we even have one in person.

1 Feel free to take this with you. This has our
2 address on it. All of our information tells you how to
3 get in contact with us and if you leave here today and
4 you suddenly think of something you should have said or
5 shouldn't have said, there's still time to get that to
6 us.

7 If you wish to speak today, many of you have
8 already -- we have a lot of people who have turned these
9 in already. Once we finish our presentation, which
10 should take 20 to 30 minutes, we'll be giving people two
11 minutes per speaker to speak. I need you to fill this
12 out (indicating). If you need a blank form, raise your
13 hand and someone will bring it to you. If you have
14 filled out the form already, just wave it about and
15 someone will get it from you and we will take you --
16 we're going to try and do it as close as we can to the
17 order in which they were given to us.

18 Okay. And with that, I bet you we've got about
19 20 speaker cards today.

20 Moving on, so the purpose of this meeting today
21 this afternoon is to give you some overview and
22 background on what we're looking at. We're going to talk
23 about the alternatives that are going to be studied. My
24 colleague Walt Davis over there (indicating) -- who also
25 has glasses on his head; it seems to be the thing we're

1 So first I'd like to welcome Assembly Member
2 Raul Bocanegra here in the front row. Thank you very
3 much for coming. Joining the Assembly Member is
4 Cesar Huerta from his staff.

5 From other offices, we have Jonathan Brand from
6 L.A. Councilmember Tom Labonge's office; Wesly Hernandez
7 from Councilmember Paul Koretz's office. Ruben Zaragoza
8 and Jonathan Navarro, who are taking care of L.A. County
9 District 6, which is now vacant, as is Eduardo Martinez.

10 Sorry. It was on another piece of paper. And Noel
11 Barajas is here from State Senator Padilla's office.

12 So thank you all for coming.

13 In addition, I know we have several people in
14 the room who are members of their neighborhood councils
15 and we appreciate their attendance as well.

16 So before we get into today's presentation, you
17 were all handed some information on the way in, sort of a
18 road map on what we're going to be going through today:
19 Facts Sheet, Frequently Asked Questions.

20 We'll be taking comments several ways. One of
21 the ways is if you want to turn in written comments
22 today, we have these forms for you (indicating). You can
23 fill them in and drop them in the boxes on the table in
24 the back right where Ryan is standing.

25 Ryan, wave your hand, over near there.

1 doing -- he's going to talk about that and we're here to
2 get your input on the study.

3 Now, many of you have been to our public
4 meetings before and I want to be very clear. This is --
5 we're in the scoping period for this study. So if you
6 have concerns or issues or questions, please ask them.
7 It may be a little frustrating for you. We are at the
8 very beginning of the study. We haven't done the
9 analysis, so ask us the questions, but we're not going to
10 have the answers for you. The purpose of the study is to
11 do the analysis and to get to what those answers are. So
12 ask the questions. You might be a little frustrated. I
13 need you to be patient. We're going to be doing the
14 study over the next year or so and then we'll have more
15 data to share with you, but please, please ask the
16 questions. This is your chance to tell us what you want
17 us to look at.

18 So how we got here: We're not starting off out
19 of nowhere with this. Over the last year and a half or
20 two years, we've been looking at this area, did an
21 Alternatives Analysis. We've been out in the community a
22 lot. We looked at a whole bunch of different
23 alternatives and alignments. If you laid them all on top
24 of each other, they'd look like that scrambled mess of
25 lines on your right-hand side of the screen.

1 We narrowed those down to six and after further
2 analysis, we narrowed those down to two build
3 alternatives and two required alternatives. Again,
4 Walt's going to be talking about them.

5 I want to let you know that one of the things
6 that we found early on is that the need really is to
7 focus on the Van Nuys Boulevard Corridor. Why the
8 Van Nuys Corridor is this is the heaviest-traveled
9 north-south corridor in the San Fernando Valley. It's
10 the second heaviest transit line in the Valley and it is
11 the seventh heaviest traveled transit line in the whole
12 Metro transit -- Metro bus system throughout the County.
13 So it's a very busy area. It's where we have a lot of
14 riders. There's congestion and we want to focus on
15 making things better.

16 So I want to take a break and welcome
17 Gabriela Marquez from Councilman Tony Cardenas's office
18 who I just saw walking in in the back. Thank you very
19 much for coming.

20 So I talked about why Van Nuys Boulevard, but
21 really what are we trying to do here? Within this
22 corridor in this area, we're trying to improve that
23 north-south mobility, we're trying to improve the
24 reliability of our operations and increase the
25 connections between key transit hubs and routes,

1 obviously improve accessibility and connectivity within
2 the study area and beyond to destinations within the
3 region outside of the study area, have more transit
4 options, especially we're focusing in areas here where we
5 have a lot of transit-dependent folks. And as I've said
6 before in other meetings, we really need to focus on how
7 we move more people more efficiently in the limited road
8 space we have, so we're looking to encourage people to
9 shift to transit.

10 This is the Project Development process. These
11 things take time, but I will tell you now this is an
12 incredibly, incredibly aggressive schedule. So we're
13 going to spend the next two years doing the Environmental
14 Analysis and Conceptual Engineering, both the Draft and
15 the Final Environmental Analysis.

16 I'm going to take a break for a moment. Many
17 people are familiar with the term "EIR." We're also
18 using the term "EIS." EIS is the Federal companion to
19 the State EIR requirement. You will hear both terms. We
20 are doing that in order to hopefully have a project that
21 can also compete for Federal funds.

22 Okay. So in the next two years, we'll be doing
23 this combined State-Federal Environmental Analysis. Then
24 we go into engineering and construction. Our commitment
25 to the voters -- my agency's commitment based on the

1 adopted Long Range Transportation Plan that the Metro
2 Board of Directors adopted is to have a project up and
3 running for people to use by 2018. That is an
4 incredibly, incredibly aggressive schedule, but that is
5 our commitment.

6 We will be in touch with the public throughout.
7 We will be letting you know what's going on and inviting
8 your input so that happens throughout.

9 More focused on these two years of the
10 Environmental Analysis, we're going to take the next year
11 or so to complete the Draft Environmental Analysis. Next
12 summer we'll circulate that for comments and public
13 hearings, take that forward to the Metro Board as well as
14 the City of Los Angeles and the City of San Fernando
15 since portions of the alignments go on the city streets
16 in that city as well, for them to select what's called a
17 Locally Preferred Alternative. That's the alternative
18 that will go through further analysis in the Final
19 EIS/EIR. We'll -- no questions now. We're going to take
20 them at the end. Thank you. We'll circulate that in
21 2015 and hopefully move forward and get a project going
22 into construction.

23 So just to break down again the difference
24 between the Draft and the Final EIS/EIR, we're currently
25 in this draft phase over the next year. We're going to

1 further define and refine the alternatives we're
2 evaluating. We're going to look at the benefits and the
3 impacts of those and lead hopefully to a selection of
4 that Locally Preferred Alternative that I mentioned.

5 When we get into the Final Environmental
6 Analysis and we have an LPA selected, again that will go
7 through further analysis. When the Draft EIS/EIR is
8 released, there will be a formal public comment period.
9 The final document will include written responses to all
10 of the comments we received during that comment period.
11 Any impacts that are identified that need mitigation, the
12 final EIS/EIR will recommend a mitigation program and a
13 project that will go forward for construction. So that's
14 the details of this Environmental Review process that
15 we're on.

16 Again, as I said, scoping is the opportunity for
17 you -- for you to help shape the study, for you to tell
18 us what you want to see done, what are the questions you
19 would like the study to try and develop answers to. So
20 you are welcome to comment on anything, but we would
21 encourage you especially to let us know your thoughts on
22 the study's purpose and need, the alternatives we're
23 looking at, the impacts and possible mitigations.

24 With that, I'm going to turn it over to
25 Mr. Davis. He's going to take you through the next

1 several slides and then I'll be back to wrap it up and
2 take all of your comments. Thank you.

3 MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Jody.

4 My name is Walt Davis. I'm the Metro Project
5 Manager for this project, a title that I'm happy to have
6 because I think this project is going to realize some
7 real north-south improvements in the Eastern San Fernando
8 Valley and I'm happy to be a part of it.

9 The meeting is about us hearing from you so I'm
10 going to try to be brief, but I'm going to go over what
11 the project is and what we're going to be doing for the
12 next year, year and a half.

13 In addition to better defining the project, we
14 are going to be completing an Environmental Document; and
15 within the Environmental Document, we look at these 20
16 different elements. So if you're interested, for
17 example, in noise and vibration, when the Environmental
18 Document comes out, you can turn to that chapter and read
19 what will the noise and vibration benefits and impacts be
20 and if there are impacts that are significant, how
21 Metro's going to work to try to minimize, avoid or
22 mitigate those impacts and have the opportunity to
23 comment. So that's a rather large chore and it's
24 something we're going to be initiating very soon and what
25 we'll be doing for the next nine to 12 months.

1 A lot of people in this room have been to the
2 meetings in the past. I think we've had 12 of them so
3 far in the last year and a half. At every single one of
4 our meetings, we've had this slide. The reason we have
5 this slide, and the reason we have this slide is it shows
6 not only the purpose and need, but every alternative we
7 look at we weigh against this screening criteria. We
8 went from the slide that she showed you earlier that we
9 affectionately called the spaghetti map that showed
10 alignments all over the place down to the two build
11 alternatives we'll be presenting a little bit later, but
12 this is the screening criteria and I'll point out one of
13 the screening criteria is community input and that's what
14 we're doing here tonight, getting your thoughts and ideas
15 of what we should or should not or should be looking at.

16 As part of the Environmental Document, I say we
17 have two build alternatives, but also in addition to the
18 two build alternatives, by State and Federal law, we have
19 to look at what's called the No Build alternative and the
20 Transportation System Management alternative. And what
21 the No Build alternative is, it asks the question, What
22 would happen if we did nothing? What would the
23 conditions be like in 2035 if we don't do a major capital
24 investment project in this area? Will traffic come to a
25 standstill or will it not be that bad if the only things

1 that happen are the existing transit and highway service
2 projects that are on the books and guaranteed to the
3 corridor, what would transit be like?

4 The second alternative we have to look at as
5 part of the document, the Transportation System
6 Management alternative, asks the question, What if
7 instead of doing a major capital investment project, what
8 would happen if you just did spot intersection
9 improvements, better synchronized the lights, put a whole
10 bunch more buses out there?

11 MS. FOGLER: Yes.

12 MR. DAVIS: Could you meet the purpose and need of
13 the project through System Management.

14 So these are the two alternatives we'll look at
15 and those two will be chapters in the Environmental
16 Document.

17 In addition to the No Build alternatives, two
18 Build alternatives, which are the Bus Rapid Transit and
19 we're going to look at Light Rail Transit. For the Bus
20 Rapid Transit alternative, the bus can carry
21 approximately 75 passengers; stations approximately one
22 mile apart; maintenance facilities, there are two bus
23 maintenance facilities in the San Fernando Valley so if
24 the BRT alternative turns out to be the Preferred
25 Alternative, we could service those buses without the

1 need to build a new maintenance facility.

2 The alignment: The alignment will start at the
3 Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station where we would have
4 transit redevelopment opportunities. From that point, it
5 would travel southeast along Truman Boulevard and
6 San Fernando Road in mixed-flow traffic. At Van Nuys
7 Boulevard, it would transition to a median-run -- by
8 "median," I mean the middle of the street -- dedicated
9 bus lane and then travel south on Van Nuys Boulevard at
10 least as far as the Metro Orange Line.

11 At the Metro Orange Line, we have three
12 different options. Option one is to terminate there or
13 continue south in mixed-flow traffic, option two is to
14 turn west and travel along the Metro Orange Line to the
15 Sepulveda Station, and the third option is from the
16 Sepulveda Station transition back to Sepulveda Boulevard
17 and travel south to Ventura Boulevard.

18 For this alternative, the travel distance from
19 end to end is 12 miles. We are thinking travel time of
20 approximately 41 minutes. You might know that I always
21 say "approximately" because all this information is based
22 on the 5 percent level of engineering. As the project is
23 better defined and as we work with the City of L.A. and
24 better define the project, these numbers will be tweaked;
25 but based on the information we have right now, this is

1 what we think the numbers will be like.
2 We have done a modeling effort and the modeling
3 effort is the means by which you predict what the
4 ridership will be, and the modeling effort indicated that
5 approximately 33,600 weekday boardings would be attracted
6 to this alternative by the year 2035, which is a big
7 number.

8 The cost is projected to be between 250 and 520
9 million dollars to build it from end to end. We have
10 identified 170.1 million dollars in our Long Range
11 Transportation Plan, so there is a bit of a gap between
12 the low-end gap and the money predicted for this project.

13 The next alternative is a Light Rail Transit:
14 Exclusive right-of-way. They cannot operate in
15 mixed-flow traffic. Over 300 passengers per two-car
16 train set. Stations are typically a mile apart.
17 Maintenance facilities: We do not operate Light Rail
18 Transit in the San Fernando Valley so if LRT turns out to
19 be the Preferred Alternative, we'd have to identify 10 to
20 15 acres for a Light Rail maintenance facility. And I
21 might draw your attention to that board next to Dana.

22 Dana, raise your hand.

23 Right there, we have an illustration that
24 illustrates if LRT turns out to be the Preferred
25 Alternative some locations that might be ideal for a

1 maintenance facility. We need 10 to 15 acres. We'd want
2 to do it on industrialized land. Obviously we don't want
3 to be neighbors with the residential properties; we want
4 industrial properties. And it would need to be within a
5 quarter of a mile of the alignment. We prefer within an
6 eighth of a mile. So we tentatively identified some
7 joint areas and we'd be interested in your comments
8 whether you think we nailed it or if you have other ideas
9 or any comments you might have relating to that.

10 Now for the alignments: The alignment is very
11 similar to BRT. LRT would start at the
12 Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station. It would have to
13 travel on a dedicated line, so it ends up traveling on
14 tracks along Truman Boulevard to Van Nuys and then south
15 on Van Nuys as far as Ventura Boulevard. This
16 alternative would be inclusive of approximately 13
17 stations; travel time approximately 36 minutes; and the
18 initial modeling effort indicated approximately 37,500
19 boardings by the year of 2035. Cost -- cost of LRT is
20 more expensive than BRT. It's projected to be in the
21 neighborhood of 1.8 to 2.3 billion dollars. So obviously
22 there is a funding gap that would have to be addressed
23 during the Environmental Document.

24 With that, I'm going to turn it back over to
25 Jody, and I thank you for your time.

1 MS. LITVAK: Give me one moment. Give me half a
2 second here.

3 We're going to get through this as quickly as we
4 can and then turn the time over to you.

5 So again, this is your chance to help us shape
6 the study. Let us know what are the issues that are most
7 important to you, not that we're going to answer today
8 but that you want us to look at in the study. These are
9 some suggestions: Do you have an opinion on whether it's
10 BRT or LRT or something else? Are you most interested in
11 travel speed for people riding transit? What is it going
12 to mean for cars? Is reliability what matters to you or
13 do you have questions about that or the station locations
14 or maintenance yard locations? You can read all of that.
15 I don't need to read it for you.

16 There are a lot of ways you can get your
17 comments to us. This scoping period goes through May
18 6th. So if there is something that you want the study to
19 look at, you have until May 6th to get us that
20 information. You can send it by plain old-fashioned mail
21 to Walt, basic address. By the way, all of the
22 information is on our printed material and on our
23 website, which you see on the right-hand side of the
24 screen. You can call us. You can e-mail us. You can
25 text us for the first time. We believe this is the first

1 Environmental Study that during the formal comment period
2 is using Facebook and Twitter to gather your comments.
3 If you go to our Facebook page, you'll see up at the top
4 a place to submit the comments. So you're welcome to
5 post on our Facebook wall, but I can't promise I'll get
6 all of those. If you use the submit public comments on
7 or scoping comments on our Facebook page, that will take
8 you to an app and these we are getting. I know. I get
9 them every day. And if you think you can tell us what
10 you have to say about this in 140 characters or less,
11 please use the hash tag EastSFVtransit and we'll count
12 those as well.

13 This is our last meeting, so never mind. It's
14 up on ustream.

15 So I think I'm going to leave that up. We're
16 going to do two minutes per speaker. See the microphone
17 over by Sam over there? He's our lovely microphone
18 assistant. I'm going to call a speaker and then the next
19 speaker to be on deck. We're coming into baseball
20 season. We might as well use baseball terms. This is
21 going to count you down to two minutes.

22 The Assembly Member is going to start off.
23 While he's coming up -- now, I know he knows this, as an
24 elected official because he's probably used to public
25 speaking, but for those of you who may not be used to it,

1 watch up here and I know he's going to demonstrate this
2 perfectly, Microphone 101. You want to not have -- no,
3 don't step away.

4 MS. FOGLER: I think you're a joke. There's nothing
5 on their page, folks.

6 MR. DAVIS: Oh.

7 MS. LITVAK: Okay? We've got our court reporter who
8 is trying to get down everything you say, so get close
9 and speak clearly.

10 Who's doing my timer? Megan is doing my timer
11 in front. So once you start, introduce yourself if you
12 need to. Then we'll count down your two minutes.

13 MS. FOGLER: Mr. Davis --

14 MS. LITVAK: I'm sorry. I'm going to interrupt you.

15 MS. FOGLER: How come it says "page not found"?

16 MS. LITVAK: After the Assemblyman will be
17 Wesly Hernandez from CD 5.

18 Go ahead.

19 ASSEMBLYMAN BOCANEGRA: I don't want to take all of
20 two minutes. I'll be brief. Just very quickly, I
21 appreciate the turnout of the Neighborhood Council
22 members and I also see the attendance of folks from Cal
23 State Northridge, and I was a former professor there at
24 Northridge. There's a couple of students here and part
25 of my motto in that class was that transportation

1 planners, urban planners, and planners will change the
2 world.

3 This project has an opportunity to be a real
4 game changer for the San Fernando Valley. I look forward
5 to both alternatives being detailed and studied. I
6 encourage you to give the utmost consideration to the
7 Light Rail alternative, but I'm going to have an open
8 mind to that, but I believe the Light Rail option is
9 something that will have a real game-changing character,
10 a transformative nature here than in the Northeast
11 San Fernando Valley. We need some equity, much like
12 other places in Los Angeles who have a Gold Line and a
13 Blue Line. I think it's time for the San Fernando Valley
14 to enter the 21st Century with a good, quality
15 transportation system.

16 Also, we want to work with Metro. We'd like to
17 see very little disruption of the businesses that might
18 be affected in either option.

19 And lastly, on the maintenance yard location,
20 we'd like to have more information on that, what kinds of
21 jobs, the number of people, the types of impacts that
22 might have to the surrounding area.

23 It's my pleasure to be here and I look forward
24 to the rest of the comments.

25 MS. LITVAK: Great. Thank you very much.

1 While Mr. Hernandez is coming up to the
2 microphone, to be followed by Gabriela Marquez from
3 Congressman Cardenas's office, two other things I want to
4 mention.

5 For those of you who wish to speak today and
6 will need translation, I will double your speaking time;
7 and for those who have perhaps some mobility challenges
8 in reaching the microphone, it's handheld. We'll bring
9 it to you.

10 Okay. Wesly, followed by Gabriela Marquez from
11 Congressman Cardenas's office.

12 MR. HERNANDEZ: Good afternoon, everybody. Thank
13 you, Metro and City staff for inviting us all here.

14 Assembly Member Bocanegra and community
15 stakeholders, while Councilmember Koretz has not weighed
16 in on a preferred alternative for the San Fernando Valley
17 Transit Corridor, we do request that Metro study
18 seamlessly connecting the East San Fernando Valley
19 Transit Corridor and the Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor.

20 This is especially timely since I know that
21 Metro is currently working on a plan to accelerate the
22 Measure R funding for second and third decade projects,
23 which includes the Sepulveda Pass project. Both of these
24 projects are of great interest to our office and our
25 constituents because they will provide a desperately

1 needed north-south connection between the San Fernando
2 Valley and the employment hubs within the Fifth Council
3 District, which include Century City and UCLA. On any
4 given day, 350,000 plus trips are taken through the
5 Sepulveda Pass Corridor. Metro and the City of Los
6 Angeles must have the foresight to plan for this region's
7 future needs, regardless of any conditions, fiscal or
8 otherwise.

9 I commend Metro for the fantastic job that you
10 have done in noticing the public release for the Transit
11 corridor and I hope that transparency continues.

12 Thank you.

13 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

14 Okay. Gabriela Marquez, followed by
15 Bob Anderson from the Sherman Oaks Homeowners'
16 Association.

17 Go right ahead.

18 MS. MARQUEZ: Good afternoon.

19 My name is Gabriela Marquez and I'm here from
20 the office of Congressman Tony Cardenas. I would like to
21 thank you all for coming here and I wanted to add that I
22 was at the first meeting that Metro put together and my
23 interest was to come and hear the constituents' concerns,
24 the questions that were being brought up, and I relayed
25 that message to the Congressman and after a brief

1 conversation, his interest is obviously the
2 community's -- you know, he has the community's interests
3 at heart.

4 With that, he knows that there's a particular
5 strength and that there's a lot of things involved in
6 planning something and getting this project done. He's
7 supportive of the -- he was supportive of the BRT project
8 and now as Assembly Member Bocanegra said, we also
9 believe and he supports the idea that the San Fernando
10 Valley deserves a better and more futuristic plan of
11 transportation, a mode of transportation.

12 If there's anything else that he would like to
13 add to that, I'm sure he'll relay the message to me and
14 I'll be sure to connect to anyone; and our office is open
15 to any comments or anything that you guys would like to
16 ask us. And that's it for my part. Thank you.

17 MS. LITVAK: All right. Thank you, or he'll send it
18 in this writing.

19 Bob Anderson, and after Mr. Anderson is
20 Dennis Hindman.

21 MR. ANDERSON: Hi. I'm Bob Anderson. I'm with the
22 Sherman Oaks Homeowners' Association. We support smart
23 transit. Sherman Oaks is a very crowded area. We just
24 want the study to prove to us that this is smart transit.

25 The real north-south traffic problem does occur

1 in the Valley, but the biggest problem is getting over
2 the hill to the Westside. There are huge amounts of
3 traffic. There are no bus lines that go there except the
4 one that goes to the UCLA campus and wanders around, so
5 there is really nowhere for the people exiting this
6 project at Ventura Boulevard to go if they want to go
7 over the hill and that's a serious problem, and Wesly
8 brought up that this project does have to seamlessly
9 integrate with an over-the-hill project or this project
10 really accomplishes very little.

11 So as part of this study, you should look at
12 other alternatives of getting people over the hill that
13 can be coupled with this project on a short-term basis
14 since the project over the hill is way in the future, if
15 at all. So you must look at a seamless connection in
16 your study; and if you cannot somehow identify how a
17 connection will be made over the hill, you should note
18 that in the study and note the impacts of that and maybe
19 consider the No Build option, under the hill, over,
20 however you get there.

21 The Bus Rapid Transit route on Van Nuys
22 Boulevard switches from dedicated to mixed flow in the
23 most crowded part of Van Nuys Boulevard for one of the
24 options and that has to be studied carefully to see what
25 the actual impacts are. I noted the differences between

1 transit times for bus and light rail and they were very
2 close and that's probably only due to the buses having to
3 be in mixed-flow traffic.

4 The other thing is that the study should prove
5 to the people in the Environmental Impact Report --

6 MS. LITVAK: Okay. Your two minutes is up. I need
7 you to wrap it up.

8 MR. ANDERSON: The project should not reduce the net
9 flow of people on any street that the project occupies.

10 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

11 All right. I want to tell you I'm really
12 thrilled at how many people have turned out and how many
13 speaker forms have been turned in. This is the most
14 we've had so far, but in order to give everyone a chance,
15 I'm going to really be watching that clock.

16 Okay. After Dennis Hindman comes Miriam Fogler.
17 I know you need us to bring the microphone to you. We
18 will do that.

19 Go right ahead.

20 MR. HINDMAN: Hi. My name is Dennis Hindman.

21 The flexibility of bus operations needs to be
22 part of the evaluation. Multiple bus routes can be run
23 on a BRT bus line, each not having to make the same
24 stops, decreasing the odds of bus overloading at stations
25 while also making headways possible.

1 Where the majority of the potential transit
2 users want to go also needs to be considered. Even with
3 the completion of the Sepulveda Pass project, more
4 transit riders using the Van Nuys Boulevard Corridor will
5 likely head towards the North Hollywood Subway Station
6 rather than UCLA or Century City where the workers tend
7 to have higher paying jobs that require more education,
8 making them financially capable of still preferring to
9 drive rather than taking Transit.

10 BRT along Van Nuys Boulevard has the potential
11 to make a faster and more direct connection to the Red
12 Line by having every other bus route and every other bus
13 turn into the Orange Line bus and then head directly to
14 the last stop across from the subway. This also puts
15 more service where it's needed on the Orange Line between
16 the subway station on Van Nuys Boulevard and north of the
17 Orange Line on Van Nuys Boulevard.

18 For increased safety, bicycles need to be
19 separated from vehicles and in much greater mass and
20 speed, which also encourages more people to cycle. Any
21 length within a route that exceeds the tolerance from
22 stress for people to ride a bicycle effectively makes the
23 entire route too stressful for them to ride. Putting
24 bike lines on only a portion of Van Nuys Boulevard would
25 make this route useful for less than 1 percent of the

1 adult population who are traffic tolerant.

2 Transit combined -- obtained a 1.1 percent
3 waiver portion of the overall transportation commuting
4 mode share in L.A. from 2005 to 2007, yet the mode share
5 for bicycle increased about 36 percent of what Transit
6 did in this time period, and the city was only averaging
7 I think about six to eight miles of bikeways a year. For
8 the last year and a half, L.A. has been installing
9 bikeways at the rate of about six times what the average
10 has been of these previous years. Bicycling needs to
11 become more effective on Van Nuys Boulevard for a large
12 portion of the population to use it. Thank you.

13 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

14 Are you going to take care -- okay.

15 Miriam Fogler -- thank you, Sam, for taking it
16 over to her -- followed by Beth. I don't have Beth's
17 last name, from B.W. Brody Affiliated.

18 Miriam, go ahead.

19 MS. FOGLER: Before we look at all these proposed
20 alternatives, I talked to Mr. Davis of late. I've been
21 coming to a number of meetings. I'm getting more
22 familiar with the thing.

23 The fact is that they don't have the EIR or the
24 EIS thing. They don't give you in-depth study of what
25 this is going to do to all the people that are going to

1 their property at market value, which he has told me that
2 they will do that. They can also bring in, you know,
3 low-income housing, affordable housing.

4 MS. LITVAK: Okay, Ms. Fogler. Thank you. Your two
5 minutes are up.

6 MS. FOGLER: All that is at stake. Thank you.

7 MS. LITVAK: Beth?

8 While Beth is coming up, I'd like to thank one
9 of our early speakers who told me there was trouble
10 seeing -- I've tried to play around with the location of
11 the countdown clock and microphone. Can you see it from
12 where you are?

13 MS. BRODY: Yes.

14 MS. LITVAK: Excellent. Beth, what's your last name?

15 MS. BRODY: Brody.

16 MS. LITVAK: Beth Brody, followed by Ron Ziff.

17 Go ahead.

18 MS. BRODY: Hi. I'm Beth Brody. I'm with B.W. Brody
19 Affiliated Companies. I work for a real estate apartment
20 developer, an investor in the San Fernando Valley. We
21 have a bunch of apartments in the San Fernando Valley
22 and, therefore, are very excited about improving the
23 transportation to and from the Valley and within the
24 Valley itself.

25 The reason I'm here is just to mention that, you

1 be impacted along the whole thoroughfare here and how
2 it's going to affect the ridership and cars, how it's
3 going to affect the bikes. I just don't see how you can
4 put the cart before the horse if you don't have the
5 information first. I think that the people should be
6 scrutinizing this and wondering maybe we should put in
7 the TSM to carry us to make gradual improvements. Let's
8 do this little by little instead of doing it all at once
9 and spending billions of dollars where -- where is this
10 thing going to be feasible and practical for us,
11 especially for people who are disabled, seniors, people
12 who ride bikes, people who still want to drive their
13 cars?

14 We have to look at all these angles. So please,
15 before you consider putting the BRT or LRT in, look at --
16 look at what we can afford. Okay? We can't put the cart
17 before the horse. We need to be rational and reasonable
18 of what's going on, what's happening here, because if we
19 don't, then, you know, what we're doing is wasting our
20 tax dollars. You understand me? You understand?

21 What we need to do is hold a little at a time,
22 get the consensus from all the businesses, the industry,
23 because they need these maintenance yards. We need to
24 have an evaluation of how they -- 'cause they have the
25 power of eminent domain, if people don't want to sell

1 know, when looking at the different alternatives in terms
2 of the light rail, it goes directly down
3 Ventura Boulevard; and with the bus line, it kind of
4 curves and goes down Sepulveda. The only thing is going
5 to Ventura and Van Nuys Boulevard is also a very busy
6 intersection and I think that that would be a really good
7 area to also let the bus go down to, but of course it
8 depends on the studies you guys do.

9 So thank you for all the work you guys will be
10 inputting and everything you will be doing to try to get
11 this to the Valley. We appreciate all the hard work that
12 everyone at Metro and the City is doing for all the
13 people in the Valley. I know that our best interests are
14 in your heart. So thank you.

15 MS. FOGLER: Oh, yeah, right.

16 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

17 Ron Ziff, and after Mr. Ziff is David Garfinkle.
18 Go right ahead.

19 MR. ZIFF: Thank you. Ron Ziff. I'm from
20 Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council. We encourage you to
21 build this system and get the most for our money.

22 MS. FOGLER: Oh, my God.

23 MR. ZIFF: Other major transit programs in other
24 cities recognize two different needs, the need to move
25 people short distances and long distances. There's no

1 problem right now moving people short distances. The
 2 invitation to this meeting gave us nine bus lines that
 3 travel right here. There is a need, a tremendous need,
 4 for moving long distances. Your own figures show 500,000
 5 people going through the Sepulveda Pass every day,
 6 another 100,000 going through the canyons, a total of
 7 600,000. That's one out of every seven people in the
 8 entire city of Los Angeles and there's no public bus
 9 transportation. The Sepulveda Pass is the most traveled
 10 corridor in the entire country.

11 MS. FOGLER: Right.

12 MR. ZIFF: The need is to bring the bus or the street
 13 car down to Ventura Boulevard and continue somehow over
 14 the pass to destinations like Century City, LAX,
 15 Culver City Transit Center, the Expo Line. The problem
 16 with these proposals is they don't go beyond
 17 Ventura Boulevard.

18 The result right now with all the systems is
 19 that we have all these people who want to get over, we
 20 have a three-hour traffic jam every single morning that
 21 impacts every major road in the Valley and many of the
 22 residential streets. A system that doesn't go beyond
 23 Ventura Boulevard is a bridge to nowhere.

24 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

25 Mr. Garfinkle. And after Mr. Garfinkle is

1 Robert Gardner.

2 MR. GARFINKLE: My name is David Garfinkle. I'm
 3 president of the Tarzana Property Owners' Association and
 4 a member of the Tarzana Neighborhood Council. That's
 5 information, identification only. I'm speaking for
 6 myself at this point.

7 You've already heard and I'm sure you're going
 8 to hear many more times the absolutely critical need to
 9 tie whatever choice you make into the cross-hill
 10 Sepulveda Corridor. So I'll just add my vote to that and
 11 go into other things.

12 I think that in addition to coordinating with
 13 that, you need to coordinate with whatever other projects
 14 may be coming down the pike that would affect this or
 15 which could most -- could coordinate with it. I think
 16 that as an example that you're not responsible for but
 17 not tying the cross-Sepulveda transit into the current
 18 405 Freeway construction was a terrible mistake. It's
 19 just going to tie up traffic in that area two different
 20 times for years at a time.

21 Let me talk a little bit about time. The three
 22 years that you're planning for construction is just too
 23 much. I think that whatever you need to do should
 24 minimize the impact on businesses and on current users of
 25 transportation in that corridor.

1 Take the repair of the freeways after the
 2 Northridge Earthquake as an example. That was done
 3 expeditiously, very quickly, perhaps a little more
 4 expensive in period -- dollars per period of time, but it
 5 was least disruptive and I think you need to think very
 6 closely about how to shorten the time so that you
 7 minimize the impact on those people that would be
 8 affected.

9 Thank you.

10 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

11 Robert Gardner, followed by Chuck Betz. Step on
 12 up really close to the microphone.

13 MR. GARDNER: Hi. Hello, everyone. My name is
 14 Robert Gardner.

15 The first comment I have, I believe that there
 16 should be a stop at Burbank Boulevard. Even though I
 17 know they're close, the Orange Line and then Burbank
 18 Boulevard, they're really close, but I believe there
 19 should be a stop at Burbank Boulevard because once you
 20 get toward the Chandler Estates area, there's only two
 21 lanes. So I think the train should submerge and then
 22 shoot straight down to Ventura area.

23 Also, I just wanted to say that if we're not
 24 going to have a light rail train down Van Nuys Boulevard,
 25 then I personally believe that you shouldn't even do

1 anything, because it's either light rail or nothing
 2 because as a frequent passenger of the bus -- of the
 3 Orange Line busway, it's just -- it just makes me so mad
 4 that if I had a car, I wouldn't even bother with it. I
 5 mean, I'm tired of being squished. I'm tired of having
 6 two or three buses pass me by. I'm tired of seeing
 7 people with bikes having to wait almost -- having to wait
 8 for like three buses in the middle of the night because
 9 they can't put their bikes on the bus and there's no room
 10 and it's just a bad situation, and a No Build option is
 11 not an option.

12 We -- this project is going to be worth every
 13 penny and I believe that everyone should come together.
 14 Whether Van Nuys, Sherman Oaks, Pacoima, no matter what
 15 neighborhood you live in, everybody should come together
 16 and everybody should realize that this project is
 17 important and we can work this out in a meaningful
 18 manner, you know.

19 So everybody, you know, keep up the good work,
 20 Metro. You guys are doing a great job.

21 Everybody, submit your comments and support
 22 light rail.

23 MS. LITVAK: All right. While Mr. Betz is coming up
 24 to the microphone, and he will be followed by Jose
 25 Palma -- and I remember, Mr. Palma, you had a special

1 request for me. I wrote it down -- I just want to say I
2 really would ask you all to keep the cheers and jeers
3 under control. It is making it harder for the people who
4 are recording the comments to get them and really please
5 be respectful of the speaker's two minutes and let them
6 get their time in. So that's my request to all of you.

7 Mr. Betz, followed by Mr. Palma. Go right
8 ahead.

9 MR. BETZ: Yes. I think we're putting the cart
10 before the horse in this project. We are going to make a
11 bad situation a lot worse for a much longer period of
12 time if we follow this procedure because the problem
13 isn't getting around the Valley. It's getting over the
14 hill --

15 MS. FOGLER: Right.

16 MR. BETZ: -- and you're going to bring people from
17 Antelope Valley that are going to get off the commuter
18 trains and come down this corridor to go over the
19 mountain and you're going to get to Sepulveda Boulevard
20 and Ventura Boulevard, which is an F-rated intersection,
21 and you're going to bring not the whole 38,000 passengers
22 because some of them will get off before; but if only
23 half of them go down there, you're going to have 18,000
24 people get down to Ventura and Sepulveda, and where are
25 they going to go? You're going -- you can't put more

1 buses on the freeway. A bus going up over the mountain
2 probably goes 10 miles an hour and that's going to back
3 up the other traffic.

4 When they get down to Sepulveda and
5 Ventura Boulevard, they're not going to have a car.
6 They're not going to have any other way to get over the
7 mountain except a bus, and so -- and the under the
8 mountain was supposed to be finished in 2030, but on
9 Wednesday night at our homeowners' meeting, they said
10 it's not going to be done until 2039.

11 How many people are going to be around then? A
12 lot of the people in this room won't be around and we'll
13 have to put up with that problem. So I think you need to
14 reconsider that.

15 Thank you.

16 MS. LITVAK: Thank you. Jose Palma, followed by
17 Pat O'Connor. Mr. Palma asked me -- he's going to speak
18 in both Spanish and English. He's going to do his own
19 translation or interpretation, so we're going to give him
20 four minutes.

21 What that means is this is going to count down
22 two minutes and then we'll count down again.

23 Okay. Did I get it right?

24 MR. PALMA: Yeah. You got it.

25 MS. LITVAK: Go ahead.

1 MR. PALMA: I'm Jose Palma. I'm part of The Transit
2 Coalition Tiger Team and first of all, I wanted to
3 address the fact that population is continuing to grow in
4 this Valley. If we don't do anything to move this
5 population out of this Valley, because word will come
6 around anywhere, even if people come from the
7 Antelope Valley, even if people come from Ventura, we
8 still need a way to move people around.

9 We can't just be waiting to build more freeways
10 and expect that to be a solution. There's going to be
11 more cars and more pollution. You have to think a little
12 outside the box and think of it more as an investment.
13 America was an investment in a way of coming into this
14 new land and creating new dreams and hopes, and I think
15 when it comes to building new transitions like this light
16 rail option, I think it's very important for this
17 community, especially San Fernando Valley.

18 When it comes to community building, there's a
19 term in planning called TOD, Transportation Oriented
20 Development, but there's also one they should also
21 analyze which is TOC, Transportation Operating Community.

22 So when it comes to that, you want to encourage
23 people to live closer to transit so there's an option
24 when it comes to not using a car for less pollution. You
25 want to encourage other businesses to also develop around

1 that TOD or TOC. You want to encourage people to make
2 sure that they can not only give up their car and also
3 take Metro but also use the bike. You want to ensure
4 that there's bike options on the Metro. You want to
5 ensure there is racks. You want to ensure that there's
6 bike lanes on Van Nuys.

7 Doing this, you're also lowering the amount of
8 cars that are on the street, meaning there's less chances
9 for traffic and collisions and also a chance for cleaning
10 up the environment. You have to take that into
11 consideration as well.

12 This is a huge investment that I think is going
13 to be paying off so much better. There's just so much
14 opportunities when it comes to investing in your
15 community, especially with light rail. There's nothing
16 for BRT. Orange Line did not work for me.

17 MS. LITVAK: All right. Your four minutes are up.
18 Thank you. And let me just say that's getting close to
19 the microphone.

20 Pat O'Connor, followed by Doug Arseneault.

21 MS. O'CONNOR: I'm very disgusted because as usual,
22 the poor people at the far northeast end of the
23 San Fernando Valley are again overlooked. I have resided
24 in Pacoima for over four decades and I have seen every
25 bus line killed, changed, modified, and ended, and now

1 you're just repeating that pattern because I have checked
2 over your thing here and I see there is no stop with
3 your -- either proposal for Paxton Avenue where we have a
4 major shopping center, and I worked with Alex Padilla to
5 get that installed so the people can have jobs in that
6 poverty neighborhood. You also will not have a stop on
7 Woodman. That's another major shopping center. The
8 gigantic supermarket is there which takes many residents
9 of Pacoima to shop there.

10 The second thing is be that as it may, 'cause
11 you will do what you want no matter what we say, I would
12 suggest you keep it a bus because --

13 MS. FOGLER: Yeah.

14 MS. O'CONNOR: -- Pacoima has worked very hard to
15 beautify. They have a brand-new center divider in the
16 middle of Van Nuys Boulevard under the program of
17 Beautify Pacoima, which I also worked with a few years
18 ago. You'd have to tear all that out.

19 Sepulveda Boulevard is actually wider and would
20 have room for a two-lane rail track if this is indeed
21 going to be on tracks you're going to have coming and
22 going. You're going to relegate Van Nuys Boulevard to a
23 simple one-lane forward and coming if you do the
24 installation of a rail in the middle of that boulevard.
25 You're going to create more traffic.

1 Sherman Oaks.

2 In development of the EIR, we request three
3 major aspects are addressed. First, route, including
4 which route provides the best access for customers, the
5 ridership of existing bus lines along each route, and
6 whether there's a need to ease crowding in which lines?
7 What regional landmarks, government offices, and economic
8 centers of activity are along each route? Which route
9 provides the best connectivity to current systems,
10 including the Red Line and Orange Line, as well as future
11 transit projects, including the Sepulveda Pass Corridor?
12 What are the environmental benefits of these higher
13 ridership, reduced crowding, and reduced distances for
14 customers to connect to these major centers of
15 activity?

16 The second aspect is the type of vehicle and
17 what the environmental benefits are in terms of ridership
18 capacity, speed and frequency of service of BRT, LRT, and
19 HRT. Regarding costs, VICA would like an analysis of the
20 construction costs of each alternative and what
21 alternative provides the best cost recovery. Which
22 alternative will be most attractive to riders and to
23 private investment in case a PPP is considered?

24 Overall, we request that the study compare if
25 each alternative will prevent the issues that are

1 People need their cars because they take their
2 groceries home, they lug their laundry to the Laundromat.
3 We cannot do that on a bicycle. We can barely do it on a
4 bus, but at least it is possible with a stroller
5 carriage.

6 So, again, I resent that Pacoima residents are
7 again being overlooked. Again, people who need to get to
8 Glen Oaks and Foothill are out in the cold.

9 And I have a question: Does this plan eliminate
10 the 561 Red Rapid?

11 MS. LITVAK: Okay. Thank you. Again, we'll be
12 studying all of these things.

13 MS. O'CONNOR: Can you answer the question?

14 MS. LITVAK: I cannot today.

15 Doug Arseneault, followed by -- is this you,
16 sir, Senor Cortes? You're the next speaker after
17 Mr. Arseneault. There's a chair over there for you to
18 get ready (indicating).

19 MR. ARSENEAULT: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name
20 is Doug Arseneault with the Valley Industry and Commerce
21 Association, representing more than 380 businesses who
22 pay millions of dollars through Measure R and other
23 measures into our transit system. VICA looks forward to
24 the development of the East San Fernando Valley Transit
25 Corridor through the cities of San Fernando and

1 associated with the San Fernando Valley's only other
2 major Transit system, the Metro Orange Line. VICA would
3 like to prevent the East San Fernando Valley Transit
4 Corridor from the overcrowded, high-traffic levels, and
5 slow speed that trouble Orange Line drivers and
6 discourage ridership.

7 We look forward to answers to these questions
8 that have importance to Valley residents and businesses.

9 MS. LITVAK: Thank you so much.

10 Mr. Cortes, we're bringing the microphone over
11 to you. I'm going to -- without spilling everything on
12 the floor, we're going to turn this so you can see the
13 countdown.

14 Following Mr. Cortes is going to be Jason
15 Ackerman.

16 Go right ahead, sir.

17 MR. CORTES: Good afternoon. Years ago, I was in a
18 group from East L.A. and it was a community group that
19 studied the new train coming in from Union Station to
20 Atlantic. The issues that were mentioned here today such
21 as businesses being taken over or being offered
22 compensation for the real estate and all that, we looked
23 at those and now, as you know, the train is already in
24 operation.

25 At that time, I belonged and I'm still a member

1 of the Bus Riders' Union and the discussion that I heard
 2 the members having was, Is it buses versus light rail?
 3 And that was the big problem that Metro had, trying to
 4 secure funding from the Federal government. Now I'm
 5 looking at my notes here and I noticed that we are
 6 commenting on what Metro is doing because it's a mandate
 7 from the Federal government, but the question I have is
 8 the City of Los Angeles also has some buses that are
 9 running and that's LADOT, the Department of
 10 Transportation, but have they been considered? That's
 11 one of the questions I have.

12 Another question we have is the traffic that
 13 comes from, as previous speakers said, Pacoima and other
 14 places going north and south. Has the private driver
 15 been considered, how heavy the traffic is? Also, there
 16 seems to be a concern about carpools.

17 MS. LITVAK: Mr. Cortes --

18 MR. CORTES: So that be would be my question. Thank
 19 you.

20 MS. LITVAK: We need you to wrap it up.

21 MR. CORTES: I did.

22 MS. LITVAK: Thank you very much. Perfect.

23 Where's Jason Ackerman? Step right up to the
 24 microphone. Tell me that you can see the countdown clock
 25 now that we've repositioned everything.

1 MR. ACKERMAN: Yes, I can see the countdown clock.

2 MS. LITVAK: After Mr. Ackerman is going to be -- I
 3 believe it's Juanita Palma who is next.

4 That's you, and you'll need translation, ma'am?
 5 Yes? We'll take care of you.

6 Go right ahead.

7 MR. ACKERMAN: All right. So my name is Jason
 8 Ackerman. I'm with the Encino Neighborhood Council.

9 I have lived in this Valley all my life. I want
 10 to briefly touch on the five points I made at the last
 11 presentation, which is, one, this project has to link up
 12 with the Sepulveda Pass Corridor; two, it has to be light
 13 rail; three is that we have to look at extending the
 14 study area farther north to include Mission College and
 15 Olive View Medical Center. So that way, when we
 16 eventually get this train to UCLA, we can have students
 17 going from UCLA to UCLA Olive View Medical Center on the
 18 train.

19 And there's a lot of concern about cost and
 20 cost-effectiveness. Well, I've looked at a couple of
 21 studies and it turns out that per passenger mile, light
 22 rail is cheaper. It's a much steeper initial investment,
 23 but it is a much better long-term return on that
 24 investment.

25 It is also a much more attractive form of

1 transportation. I know a lot of people who will only
 2 take the train and they always complain that L.A. doesn't
 3 have mass transit. Why? Because we're not New York and
 4 we don't have subways every other block. And then I
 5 point out to them, Well, you put two Manhattans in the
 6 San Fernando Valley and it costs ridiculous amounts of
 7 money, but we definitely need light rail on Van Nuys. We
 8 definitely need to turn the Orange Line into light rail,
 9 and this investment in a storage yard is step one in
 10 making that happen and we need to keep pushing, we need
 11 to keep investing so we can push this thing under the
 12 Sepulveda Pass, not over, and we need to connect it to
 13 UCLA and the Expo Line and eventually the Crenshaw and
 14 Green Lines.

15 Thank you very much.

16 MS. LITVAK: Thank you. Okay.

17 Juanita Palma. After Ms. Palma, we're going to
 18 take Noel Barajas from Senator Padilla's office.

19 Ms. Palma, we're going to give you four minutes.
 20 It's going to count down two minutes and then another two
 21 minutes. All right. Please get close to the microphone,
 22 state your name, and then we'll start.

23 MS. PALMA: My name is Juanita Palma. I am very
 24 happy with the new project that's going to take place,
 25 especially for the light train because with this, there's

1 going to be less traffic, less accidents, pollution as
 2 well.

3 This is a good solution for all the students
 4 that go to school and for us that we take the bus. This
 5 is going to be good. I would like it for the -- I would
 6 like it for the future if they could extend it to UCLA.

7 Thank you very much.

8 MS. LITVAK: Wow. With translation and everything,
 9 thank you very much.

10 Noel Barajas from Senator Padilla's office. He
 11 will be followed by -- I believe it's Chris Carrera.

12 If I have not already, I'm going to apologize in
 13 advance to anyone if I completely butcher the
 14 pronunciation of your name, I'm doing my best here.

15 Step on up. Go ahead.

16 MR. BARAJAS: Hello. My name is Noel Barajas. I'm
 17 with State Senator Padilla's office.

18 The one thing that the State Senator has seen,
 19 we've been promoting efficiency and moving people
 20 throughout the Valley, but -- which this project is one
 21 of its purposes; but as pointed out, the Sepulveda Pass
 22 Project is also part of the measure. So not only do we
 23 have to consider getting them to the southern end of the
 24 Valley for what will happen to them there, but likewise
 25 if this project becomes a BRT project which only handles

1 75 people, what will happen when the Sepulveda Pass
 2 Project is a light rail and leaves 300 passengers at the
 3 southern end of the Valley? How are they going to get up
 4 to the northern end of the Valley? BRT bus, you would
 5 need four buses for every train in order to get those 300
 6 passengers out of the Sherman Oaks/Studio City area out
 7 to the northern end of Pacoima/Sylmar area.

8 So I think we definitely need to look at the big
 9 picture not only of one route individually but both
 10 routes and how they're going to function with the whole
 11 Metro system.

12 In addition, people are talking about our
 13 taxpayer money. Yes, that's correct, Measure R was
 14 passed. We are currently being taxed taxpayer money for
 15 these projects, so if -- whatever we do, if we choose not
 16 to do anything, then we are basically paying for no
 17 projects being built in the Valley and all our taxpayer
 18 money is going to projects in other parts of the County,
 19 be it the Subway to the Sea, the Crenshaw line, expansion
 20 of East L.A., so that's the other thing to think about as
 21 residents. Are we wanting nothing to improve our public
 22 transit in the Valley and our resources to be given to
 23 other projects in the other parts of the county?

24 Thank you.
 25 MS. LITVAK: Okay.

1 Chris Carrera, followed by -- I believe it's
 2 Quirino de la Cuesta.

3 I just want to mention, because Noel mentioned
 4 it, we do have a Metro Board-adopted policy that if any
 5 project doesn't move forward in an area, that money can
 6 be reprogrammed or dedicated to other projects in the
 7 same sub area.

8 Okay. Mr. Carrera. That's you. Step on up.

9 MR. CARRERA: Okay. I just wanted to sort of
 10 reiterate some of the good ideas I've already heard
 11 today. This needs to be a light rail, not bus. It needs
 12 to be light rail. It needs to be connected to the 405
 13 project, under or through the mountain.

14 And there was a stop that's listed at around
 15 Arleta High School and it really would be better around
 16 Woodman.

17 So I'm not sure I could actually add anything
 18 else to that. Thank you.

19 MS. LITVAK: Thank you so much.

20 Mr. de la Cuesta. Did I get your name?

21 MR. DE LA CUESTA: Quirino.

22 MS. LITVAK: Quirino -- okay. I did my best --
 23 followed by Lynn Bronstein.

24 Go ahead.

25 MR. DE LA CUESTA: I was born and raised in L.A. and

1 I've seen the gradual changes at L.A. because it's
 2 becoming a more -- before, it was a car-centric society,
 3 but now we've changed because of an increase in density,
 4 also the environment, and I would like to see light rail
 5 because I think it shows that -- what we do with light
 6 rail, you can see what's happening in downtown L.A. with
 7 Hollywood, with Koreatown. It's -- it's -- it really
 8 increases growth and investment and money because it
 9 really is an important step toward the future of L.A. and
 10 I think it's also for the future, for the youth to be
 11 involved in this process, because I really like the way
 12 you guys have been doing this, as being more transparent
 13 to the community for the reason that, you know, that
 14 everybody can get involved and I really appreciate it.

15 And also, I am doing a documentary about urban
 16 planning, design and architecture and I think this is a
 17 perfect storm that could happen. It could be a -- it
 18 could make L.A. a world-class city and I would like to
 19 ask Mr. Davis and hopefully Jody if they would be
 20 interested in being interviewed for this documentary I'm
 21 working on.

22 MS. LITVAK: We'll talk to you afterwards.

23 MR. DE LA CUESTA: Thank you.

24 MS. LITVAK: All right. I also want to introduce a
 25 new arrival from Senator Padilla's office, Angel -- I

1 know they -- what's your last name?

2 MR. BARNUEVO: Barnuevo.

3 MS. LITVAK: Oh, thank you very much. Thank you very
 4 much.

5 Lynne Bronstein, followed by Nate Zablen.

6 MS. BRONSTEIN: Some years ago, a journalist asked
 7 members of the L.A. City Council if they used public
 8 transit. The ones who deemed to reply said they
 9 sometimes did, but mostly they used their cars because
 10 they said, "We would never get anywhere on time if we did
 11 it." This does not speak well to the public transit that
 12 we have been using, and as a lifelong user of public
 13 transit, I would urge the Metro officials and people
 14 working on this project to travel themselves at peak
 15 hours or late at night and experience what I have
 16 experienced and what other people have experienced:
 17 having to wait a long time at a stop, having to get
 18 connectivity and having to race to make sure that you get
 19 the last one on time; you know, experience what the
 20 density of traffic is like on a street like Van Nuys
 21 Boulevard that you're considering where, you know, is
 22 there going to be room for either a light rail or a bus
 23 and for the stations with the pedestrian traffic?

24 Consider the safety factors. Consider yes, we
 25 do need to go over the hill because I need to get from

1 Van Nuys to Westwood on a regular basis and it takes over
2 an hour. Consider all of these factors as you yourself
3 travel and ask yourself if it makes you uncomfortable,
4 how much more uncomfortable it is probably making
5 everyone.

6 So keep all these things in mind as you are
7 planning this project. Thank you.

8 MS. LITVAK: Thank you. We are, you know, shushing
9 the private conversations in the room because the noise
10 carries.

11 After Mr. Zablen is Jack Lindblad, who I think
12 just stepped outside to carry on his conversation
13 outside, which we appreciate.

14 Sam, could you ask him to come on in. He's
15 next.

16 So, again, Mr. Zablen, followed by
17 Jack Lindblad.

18 MR. ZABLEN: Good evening. I'm Nate Zablen and I'm
19 with the Southern California Transit Advocates and I'm
20 speaking for myself.

21 I'm looking to the various alternatives.
22 Whether it's bus or rail, the important thing is not so
23 much whether bus or rail, but can you improve on the
24 Orange Line? Can you make it better than the Expo Line?

25 For example, you have an Orange Line that has

1 its right-of-way, but it doesn't have signal priorities.
2 It has to stop at a lot of intersections and has to slow
3 down to a crawl at other intersections. So the time that
4 you save being on the Orange Line compared to a Rapid Bus
5 is not very much and it's a very crowded bus.

6 So if you have a bus lane on Van Nuys Boulevard,
7 you have to have the signal priority. You have to work
8 with the City of Los Angeles so that people on a bus or a
9 train will have more priority than people -- individual
10 people in a car, and that's -- I know that's very
11 difficult; but in the meantime, you have to work with the
12 City to get that to optimize the transit that you have.

13 Ideally, light rail would be great, but I know
14 funding is going to be a problem because Proposition J
15 just didn't make it. So we may be stuck with a bus line
16 or a bus option, but the important thing, like a lot of
17 these people have said, is it has to connect with the
18 Sepulveda Pass. You don't want hundreds of people
19 stranded on Ventura Boulevard and Sepulveda waiting to
20 connect to go to UCLA or to visit the Getty Center or
21 Skirball museum. There's a lot of traffic there.

22 So you have to think -- it has to be more than
23 just the Valley. It has to include connections to the
24 Westside, particularly the Sepulveda Pass, the museums,
25 and to UCLA. So that's very important.

1 So I think in the meantime before we have this
2 light rail or the bus line, you have to make improvements
3 right now on Van Nuys Boulevard. You have to improve the
4 bus stops. You have to work with the City so that, for
5 example, the bus stop here on Calvert -- rather, Aetna is
6 horrible. They need improvement. They need better
7 benches, better furniture, to make it attractive for all
8 people.

9 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

10 Mr. Lindblad, you ready? Mr. Lindblad, you
11 ready?

12 MR. LINDBLAD: Thanks. Thanks, Jody.

13 MS. LITVAK: Followed by Sergio Ibarra from Arleta
14 Neighborhood Council.

15 MR. LINDBLAD: Well, again, I'm Jack Lindblad and
16 this is a reality that we've projected in our campaign
17 for Assembly for years. Going back to 2008, especially
18 in 2010, part of my campaign was to ask folks in the
19 Assembly District whether they would like light rail down
20 Van Nuys Boulevard; and with no money in the campaign,
21 against all the corporate interests, and getting the
22 money out of politics, people resounded with 22 percent
23 of the vote in 2010.

24 Right after that, I believe Metro took up the
25 cause and started to scope -- started preliminary

1 studies, and that's where we are right now in a
2 preliminary scoping environment that are two projects
3 weighed against each other, not similar in cost. So one
4 weighs ten times as more costly as the other. We have
5 Federal mechanisms to finance this, the MAP-21 in America
6 Fast-Forward, and I'm sure folks know more, too. So part
7 of Metro's programming effort has to include the means,
8 methods, and practices of financing this.

9 So we also have a social complement. We have
10 1.4 million or so people in the Valley that are trying to
11 be upended by some hillside developers, some hillside
12 speculators, some hillside residents that see their
13 interests threatened by having the right of everyone of
14 freedom of movement. Right now it's a clog. BRT has a
15 clog that goes for two miles and is mixed-flow traffic
16 into very busy San Fernando Road. Light rail will have
17 the right-of-way like pedestrians and bicycles do over
18 the private car.

19 We have the 2020 mandate in California called
20 the Climate Law and --

21 MS. LITVAK: And your time is up.

22 MR. LINDBLAD: Right.

23 MS. LITVAK: You got me once. You're not going to
24 get me twice.

25 MR. LINDBLAD: That was a good ending point.

1 MS. LITVAK: It was a great ending point.
 2 Sergio Ibarra, followed by Glenn Bailey.
 3 MR. IBARRA: Good afternoon, everybody. My name is
 4 Sergio Ibarra. I'm president of the Arleta Neighborhood
 5 Council and I would like to say thank you for all the
 6 neighborhood council representatives here tonight. It
 7 shows that we are getting involved, we do represent our
 8 community, and we want the best in our community.
 9 And the question to our neighbors in
 10 Sherman Oaks is I want you to be there and alive when
 11 this project gets built. If not now, then when?
 12 Measure R funds are currently being taxed out of the
 13 San Fernando Valley and we are not reaping the benefits.
 14 We are paying these funds to other areas of the city.
 15 It's time. It's time that light rail come to the
 16 San Fernando Valley. It's time that our tax dollars come
 17 back to our communities. We are one San Fernando Valley,
 18 not north or south. We are one San Fernando Valley.
 19 I like that Metro studied the economic
 20 developments and possible TODs along the route, the
 21 increased ridership along the route, how many jobs will
 22 be created, including the new maintenance yards and new
 23 jobs that will be created. Commercial and TOD
 24 developments along the route, including the TOD
 25 development at Van Nuys and Woodman, which is a wonderful

1 commercial area in Arleta, and I welcome you to come
 2 visit us and shop when you're going through Van Nuys
 3 Boulevard and the revitalization that any type of
 4 transportation development and investment is going to
 5 have along the Van Nuys Corridor.
 6 The other day after the meeting in Arleta, I
 7 went out there and I drove the area and there was -- at
 8 10:30 at night on a Wednesday night, there were 75 people
 9 waiting at Van Nuys and the Orange Line, literally a
 10 75-people driving area. You will see that the BRT route
 11 on Van Nuys Boulevard, Van Nuys Boulevard is literally at
 12 capacity. You're going to pass four buses when people
 13 get off on the train? I don't think so.
 14 Thank you. Support light rail.
 15 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.
 16 Mr. Bailey, followed by Jennifer Charles.
 17 MR. BAILEY: Good afternoon. My name is
 18 Glenn Bailey. I am president of the Encino Neighborhood
 19 Council and I'm also vice chair of the City of
 20 Los Angeles Bicycle Advisory Committee; however, today
 21 I'm speaking as an individual.
 22 First of all, having the experience with the
 23 Orange Line I think is helpful. As someone who uses it
 24 regularly, I can tell you that the statements made here
 25 earlier regarding -- they didn't say this, but packed in

1 like sardines for much of the day is a result of putting
 2 a bus line where there really should be grade-separated
 3 rail and so that was -- that's a fundamental flaw. To
 4 take nearly an hour to get from the Chatsworth line to
 5 the North Hollywood line is not rapid transit; maybe
 6 mass, but it's not rapid. So please don't repeat that
 7 mistake. Use grade-separated, use rail, so that you can
 8 accommodate the future demands.
 9 Now, we all know that a lot of the problems we
 10 have on the 405 are generated by areas outside the
 11 Valley, Santa Clarita, Antelope Valley, Simi Valley,
 12 et cetera, so I think it's real important that this
 13 technology be able to be compatible either to serve the
 14 Westside or for the Westside to come up and serve it.
 15 What we don't want to have is multiple transfers. Our
 16 goal should be like zero, but no more than one and if you
 17 can do that with that technology, I -- think, you know,
 18 with keeping that in mind.
 19 So lastly, I'll close on as an advocate for
 20 bicyclists, the City of Los Angeles has designated both
 21 Sepulveda and Van Nuys Boulevard as part of the backbone
 22 network. Anything the City does under the City's adopted
 23 plan is required that there be bicycle accommodation.
 24 That means bicycle lanes of some sort on those two
 25 streets. So whatever you do and however you do it,

1 please make sure that you comply with the City's adopted
 2 plan.
 3 Thank you.
 4 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.
 5 All right. Jennifer Charles.
 6 We've got a few more, but we're getting near the
 7 end. Thank you all for your patience. I know the late
 8 speakers appreciate it, followed by Alexander Freedman.
 9 MS. CHARLES: Hi. My name is Jennifer Charles. I'm
 10 an architect who lives and works in the south end of
 11 Van Nuys Boulevard and Sherman Oaks and I wanted to touch
 12 on two of the important things to me, the first being
 13 connections and the second being bicycles.
 14 I would like to reiterate what people have said
 15 about how this project will connect into the Sepulveda
 16 Pass I think is crucial, and I encourage Metro to keep
 17 thinking big and think really of the future. I mean,
 18 people have talked about, Well, 40 years from now, we're
 19 not going to be here, but the city is going to be here.
 20 It's not going anywhere and I wish something like this
 21 had been done 40 years ago for us to reap the benefits.
 22 So I also strongly support light rail as really
 23 the only way to move the capacity of people that are
 24 using the corridor right now.
 25 Also, in terms of local connectivity, we've

1 talked a lot about people being dumped into
2 Ventura Boulevard. As an architect, I love
3 Ventura Boulevard. It's a historic commercial corridor
4 through the Valley and I feel like it's very underserved
5 by mass transit, so I would hope that also as this
6 project gets developed that some of these east-west
7 corridors like Ventura Boulevard are strengthened and
8 become part of the transit system even more than they
9 are.

10 And then just the last thing with bicycles, I
11 bicycled here tonight. It's an easy bike ride, but
12 bicycling on Van Nuys Boulevard is not that fun right
13 now, but I would prefer it over driving here, which would
14 have taken me the same amount of time through traffic.
15 And so to really keep bicycling as part of whichever
16 project is chosen is incredibly important because that
17 allows people to have multiple connections into the
18 system and out of the system and also travel local
19 distances once you've kind of gotten off on the major
20 transit stations.

21 Thank you very much.

22 MS. LITVAK: Thank you so much.

23 Alexander Freedman, followed by Gregory Wright.
24 After Mr. Wright, I've got one last speaker card, but
25 I'll take more if you guys are hanging in there. Go.

1 MR. FREEDMAN: Yes. Alexander Freedman and I used to
2 go to Cal State Northridge, so thank you.

3 I live in Hollywood and I travel to the
4 San Fernando Valley, although personally I try to avoid
5 the Valley because it's got no decent transit, to be
6 honest, and I don't want to sit in traffic in the car.
7 The Orange Line is a joke. I'm sorry. The Orange Line
8 is a huge -- the BRT is a huge disrespect to the transit
9 ridership and to the pedestrians and something better
10 needs to be done.

11 So, I mean, honestly, in this time and age it's
12 hard to believe that BRT is still proposed as one of the
13 alternatives. I think it would be a step in the wrong
14 direction. Just -- it should be definitely light rail.

15 So I believe it should be a light rail combined
16 with a class 2 separated bike lane. If you cannot make
17 it separated, please make it a class 2 dedicated bike
18 line.

19 Also, I think in South L.A., when it connects to
20 Ventura, it should not stop at Ventura, but it should go
21 to the Sherman Oaks Galleria because you're going to dump
22 all those people at Sepulveda and Van Nuys. It's not in
23 the middle of nowhere, but it's literally close to
24 Sherman Oaks Galleria, but it's not quite there. It's
25 like a line to summer but not to summer. So if you can

1 deviate the last portion of the leg to Sherman Oaks
2 Galleria to connect people to the Entertainment Center,
3 to the jobs, I think that would be very helpful.

4 Also, I think it should be a part of the
5 three-phase project from the Valley to LAX. The first
6 phase should be from Sylmar Station to Sherman Oaks and
7 the second phase should be from Sherman Oaks to Westwood
8 and the third phase from Westwood to LAX. If you build
9 through this line, it's going to be a phenomenal
10 transportation of the City of Los Angeles and City of
11 San Fernando.

12 Also, for the future, I think Orange Line should
13 be developed, upgraded, to LRT. Lastly, the Red Line
14 subway should be extended to Burbank Airport.

15 Thank you.

16 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

17 Gregory Wright is coming up, followed by
18 Rolando Chavarria or something close to that.

19 MR. WRIGHT: Hello. My main idea is to make the
20 current bus service as good as possible in as many ways
21 as possible in advance of the Van Nuys Corridor of the
22 future to come in order to prime the corridor for the
23 improvements and for the increased transit use that we
24 hope this will create and to the greatest extent possible
25 make these improvements as a model for improvements that

1 can be made across the MTA system.

2 For example, start with the bus stops themselves
3 and make the experience of waiting for a bus as pleasant
4 as possible. It really isn't now. For example, shade
5 the most sun-exposed bus stops. I was looking at the
6 bright sun as I waited for a bus on Van Nuys Boulevard to
7 get here; and to do this, undertake a survey right now to
8 figure out which stops are in most need of this kind of
9 shade to -- and start there to shade them.

10 Another idea is to create more prominent signage
11 so that people become more aware of the bus option and
12 very importantly amalgamate the local and rapid bus stops
13 and bus service so nobody ever has to see one or more
14 buses pass them again while waiting for a bus at what
15 might be the wrong stop for local and rapid. That's very
16 frustrating.

17 Enhance the Van Nuys Corridor service with Dash
18 buses. This could help people, as a previous speaker
19 noted, in carrying groceries and other heavy stuff.
20 Maybe make the Van Nuys corridor a free WiFi zone, just
21 like this Civic Center across the entire web. And
22 definitely creatively promote the future corridor with
23 visionary arts showing what will be here within a decade.
24 Do it on the kiosks. Do it on the buses themselves.
25 You've got these huge, long, panoramic wraps to create a

1 visual of the future and maybe you can also do it on
2 Transit TV.

3 I've got other ideas if anyone would like to
4 talk with me about that.

5 MS. LITVAK: Thank you for watching the clock.
6 Rolando Chavarria.

7 MR. CHAVARRIA: Chavarria.

8 MS. LITVAK: Come on up to the microphone and say
9 your name for me, because I'm sure I got close but maybe
10 not perfectly.

11 Is there anybody else who wishes to speak after
12 this? Don't jump up.

13 MR. CHAVARRIA: Yes. Hi. My name is Rolando. I'm a
14 student at LAVC. I live not too far long from the Orange
15 Line and Van Nuys Boulevard. I've been living there for
16 18 years so I know everything about what's going on.

17 I came here because I really want -- I still
18 want the light rail because Van Nuys Boulevard is more
19 like Wilshire Boulevard and so please -- and because a
20 lot of people have been taking the bus, 761 has always
21 been crowded ever since, and from Westwood to
22 Sherman Oaks you will see how crowded is the buses and
23 everything else.

24 So I still really want to see this not to
25 become -- end up the same thing as the Orange Line

1 Sam is already taking the meeting apart. I want to
2 especially thank our team of staff and consultants who've
3 supported us through all of these meetings. You've been
4 great.

5 We have several holidays this week. So for
6 those of you observing Easter, Happy Easter. For those
7 of you who are celebrating Passover, Happy Passover. If
8 you're following the Passover dietary restrictions, we've
9 got some appropriate macaroons for you over there, so
10 help yourself to that and we will hang out for just a
11 little bit. We're getting close to 6:00. Thank you all
12 for coming. Thank you all for participating and have a
13 great evening.

14 (Proceedings concluded at 6:00 p.m.)
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 because the Orange Line has always been crowded and
2 simply -- I do want the Orange Line to become a light
3 rail instead, so -- but I really wanted to see how the
4 rail -- the light rail to turn into an underground option
5 on Sherman Oaks because of the 101 Freeway and Van Nuys
6 Boulevard and Ventura Boulevard.

7 So I'd still prefer to see it going underground
8 on the light rail and also I'd really love to see
9 San Fernando and Pacoima right next to the Metrolink
10 tracks. I'd really love to see something more like the
11 Orange Line and the Expo Line because it's not -- it
12 doesn't look very good. It looks very serious and
13 everything like that. So hopefully if this is going to
14 change and everything like that, then I'd really love to
15 see more riders riding the rail instead of buses, because
16 if you put buses, it's going to get even more crowded
17 than the Orange Line bus. So hopefully I want this thing
18 to get done as soon as possible.

19 MS. LITVAK: Thank you.

20 All right. That is our last speaker card. I am
21 going to remind you these (indicating) are all the ways
22 you can get your comments to us. Our scoping period runs
23 through May 6th. Get us your comments by then.

24 This is the last of our public scoping meetings,
25 so I'm going to take a point of personal privilege while