

ATTACHMENT A

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT 2003 SHORT RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

NOTE: The Draft 2003 SRTP was distributed for review and comment on May 5, 2003. Nearly 650 copies were distributed and comments were requested by July 3, 2003. The following reflects all revisions proposed for the Final SRTP.

Page(s)	Major Revisions
Global	Reflect that the Exposition light rail transit line is ultimately planned to terminate in Santa Monica.
Global	Reflect that the boundaries for the Gold Line Extension preliminary engineering are from Pasadena to Claremont.
11	Revise local bus discussion of MTA service to note the comprehensive restructuring of the Metro Bus System to improve service quality and operational efficiency by establishing a Hub and Spoke network. Add the following recommendations to the Local Bus Action Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 2004, MTA will develop and begin implementing the Hub and Spoke bus system restructuring plan. • By 2006, MTA will complete the implementation of the Hub and Spoke bus system restructuring plan.
14, 16	Revise maps to depict alignment for San Fernando Valley North/South improvements as Metro Rapid Expansion Lines pursuant to Major Investment Study.
15	Revise Metro Rapid implementation schedule to reflect that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because of project readiness, Vernon-La Cienega will be completed in FY 04 rather than FY 06, Hollywood-Fairfax-Pasadena will be completed in FY 05 rather than FY 06, Beverly will be completed in FY 05 rather than FY 06, and West Olympic will be completed in FY 08 rather than FY 07; • At the request of Santa Monica Big Blue Bus, Lincoln will be moved from FY 08 to FY 06 and Pico will be moved from FY 05 to FY 07; • Because of construction for the Santa Monica Parkway, Santa Monica Metro Rapid will be moved from FY 05 to FY 06; and • San Fernando Valley North/South near term improvements will be integrated into the Metro Rapid implementation schedule" by adding Sepulveda (south) to FY 05 and Reseda to FY 06.

Attachment A: Summary of Proposed Revisions to the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Page(s)	Major Revisions (continued)
16	Revise map to eliminate duplication of Future Rail Extension in legend and show the Exposition Line from downtown Los Angeles to Santa Monica and the Gold Line Extension from Pasadena to Claremont as “Future Rail Lines.”
17	Revise footnote for San Fernando Valley North/South project to note that the schedule for initial improvements is preliminary pending further coordination with Metro Rapid program implementation.
18	Add the following bullet to Metro Rail Action Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore the feasibility of a Downtown Light Rail Connector that connects the Metro Gold Line, Metro Blue Line, and Exposition light rail lines through downtown Los Angeles. This would allow uninterrupted service across a variety of Metro Rail lines.
21	Add paragraph to Highway Section stating that MTA will explore mechanisms to program funds for the SR-14 carpool lane project (Pearblossom Highway to Avenue P-8) and the I-5 Carpool/Mixed Flow Lane project (I-605 to Orange County Line), which were deferred as a result of the State funding shortfall. Funding mechanisms will include examining existing financial capacity, bonding, and other new funding sources.
22	Revise schedule for I-10 Carpool Lanes between I-605 to Puente Avenue to indicate construction beginning in FY 06 and ending in FY 08.
23	Add following recommendations to Highway Action Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop recommendations for funding the SR-14 carpool lanes (Pearblossom Highway to Avenue P-8) and I-5 carpool/mixed flow lanes (I-605 to Orange County Line) as the next highway priorities. • Work with subregional agencies and local agencies in seeking additional funding for regionally significant projects recommended through the I-710, the I-101, and the I-5/SR-14/SR 138 corridor studies. • Work with California Highway Patrol and Caltrans to establish a truck inspection station on I-710 to ensure that trucks operating along the corridor meet state standards to minimize congestion impacts resulting from truck related break-downs and accidents. • Examine the feasibility of instituting Freeway Service Patrol-style service on I-710 that would use big-rig tow trucks capable of moving large trucks to a safe drop location to minimize congestion impacts resulting from truck-related breakdowns. • Examine local, state, and federal regulatory changes that would restrict non-local truck operations on key freeways, such as I-710 during peak commute periods. • Examine opportunities to implement toll lanes and/or congestion pricing on major highway facilities. • Commit \$5 million for the environmental analysis needed for the I-710 Corridor study during FY 2005.

Attachment A: Summary of Proposed Revisions to the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Page(s)	Major Revisions (continued)
23	Revise bullet on I-710 Gap Closure Tunnel Study to indicate that the study will be conducted in a manner which will provide for extensive community consultation.
23	Summarize the results of the Capacity Enhancement/System Preservation Needs Assessment Study, which indicates that deferring system preservation adds 10 percent per year to the cost of the existing project backlog.
24	Add the following recommendation to Arterial Action Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Work with sub-regional and local agencies to seek additional funding for regionally significant system preservation and maintenance needs. Such funding should complement, but not replace existing local system preservation and maintenance funding and should include a local maintenance of effort requirement.
44	Add a section to the Benefits section on environmental justice to summarize transportation system benefits to minority and low-income communities.

Attachment A: Summary of Proposed Revisions to the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Page(s)	Technical Revisions to the Plan
Global	Update the references to the “San Fernando Valley Metro Rapidway”, rather than the Victory-Chandler Metro Rapid Transitway.
Global	Clarify that the Pasadena Metro Gold Line was completed in 2003.
Global	Commit \$5 million for the environmental analysis needed for the I-710 Corridor study during FY 2005.
Global	Include the Arbor Vitae half-interchange improvement at the I-405 as a fully-programmed highway improvement.
Global	Clarify that twenty-three new Metro Rapid bus lines will be implemented by 2009.
2	Add language in Our Short Term Challenges section recognizing the need to maximize and protect the regional arterial system.
5	Revise third paragraph to clarify that MTA adopted the transit fare restructuring program in May 2003.
5	Revise footnote 1 to include the total amount for highway uses includes \$2 billion for capacity increasing projects and \$1 billion for highway safety, maintenance, and rehabilitation.
5-6	Include a statement under each financial option as to what is necessary to implement the possible action (i.e., County Sales Tax, GARVEE Bonds, Gas Tax).
6	Modify description of oil barrel fee to exclude references to AB 1500.
7	Insert discussion of hub and spoke in the discussion of local bus service in paragraph 2.
7	In paragraph 4, clarify that the preliminary engineering is planned to begin on a Gold Line extension eastward to Claremont.
10	Clarify that since 1995, 500 peak-hour buses have been added to MTA service while municipal services have added approximately 100 peak-hour buses.
10-11	Revise language regarding clean fuel vehicles to note that other transit operators have been transitioning their fleets over the last five years.
10-13	Recognize role played by LADOT DASH system in Local Bus section.

Attachment A: Summary of Proposed Revisions to the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Page(s)	Technical Revisions to the Plan
11	Revise the third full paragraph to clarify that local bus partnership programs are described in detail in the 2002 Regional Short Range Transit Plan, which identifies a number of transit improvements anticipated by MTA and 17 municipal operators.
12	In first sentence, delete reference to improving the connectivity of the regional system.
12	Add language to recognize that Long Beach Transit already has articulated buses in service in high volume corridors.
12	Revise Bus Service Improvements by Operator chart to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add Service Expansion & On-time Improvements for Santa Monica Big Blue Bus; • Add Service Coordination Improvements for Santa Clarita Transit, Gardena Municipal Bus Lines, Torrance Transit; and Redondo Beach WAVE; • Add Clean Fuel Stations for Santa Monica Big Blue Bus and Foothill Transit; • Remove Clean Fuel Stations for Norwalk Transit Systems; and • Add ITS Enhancements for Santa Clarita Transit, Gardena Municipal Bus Lines, Foothill Transit, Torrance Transit, and Culver CityBus.
12-13	Add note that bus-only lanes is an additional option for increasing bus speeds.
13	In Local Bus Action Plan, revise first bullet to remove reference to table.
13	Revise local bus action plan with new bullet indicating need to seek additional funding sources for transit operations and additional capital and operating funding to meet the increasing demands on transit operators serving the subregions projected to experience significant growth.
14	Clarify second paragraph to note that as of August 2003, Metro Rapid bus service operates along six corridors.
17	Clarify footnote 3 to indicate near term improvements on the San Fernando Valley North/South Transitway will be integrated into the "Metro Rapid Projects Implementation Schedule."
19	Add discussion of Amtrak/Metrolink "Rail 2 Rail" program to Metrolink section.
19	Revise the fourth paragraph to read: "This Plan incorporates capital and operational priorities through 2009 from the Metrolink Five Year Plan."

Attachment A: Summary of Proposed Revisions to the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Page(s)	Technical Revisions to the Plan
23-24	Add reference regarding need to seek additional funding for ITS improvements in Arterial Action Plan.
25	Add discussion of peak-period parking restrictions as a means of adding capacity as part of System Management section.
26	<p>Revise Management Control Center as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 26, 1st column, change title from “Management Control Center” to “Transportation Management Center” • 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence should be replaced with, “In partnership with MTA, Caltrans and CHP developed a new, state-of-the-art traffic control center which will do just that for LA County's freeway system.” • 3rd sentence should replace “Management Control Center” with “Los Angeles Regional Transportation Management Center.” • 4th sentence should be replaced with, "Through the linkage of loop detectors embedded in freeway pavement and closed circuit television cameras strategically placed throughout LA County's freeway network that utilize a high speed fiber-optic communication network, and a Computer Aided Dispatch system, Caltrans and CHP will improve freeway performance by monitoring freeway traffic in real-time, and assisting with incident management.” • 5th sentence should be replaced with, “Combining these tools into one management center will reduce traffic delays caused by accidents through the immediate dispatching of incident response teams and recovery equipment, providing the ability to change signal timing on arterials, and alerting motorists to avoid congested areas via traffic advisories.” • 2nd paragraph, last sentence should replace “Caltrans Management Control Center” with “Caltrans/CHP Transportation Management Center when it is completed.” • 2nd column, “Transportation” should be added before “Management Center” • 1st bullet, replace “Management Control Center” with “Traffic Management Center.”
26	Revise Metro Freeway Service Patrol section to recognize role of California Highway Patrol and to indicate that disabled motorists are taken off the freeway to pre-designated locations where they can seek further assistance.
26	Update Freeway Service Patrol/Call Box Action Plan to note that MTA will take the lead in initiating potential changes to FSP/SAFE legislation to further clarify and enhance these programs' roles and responsibilities.
26	In the third paragraph, clarify that the Text Teletypewriter keypad improvements to call boxes was completed in 1999 and ensure accessibility to individuals with speech or hearing impairments.

Attachment A: Summary of Proposed Revisions to the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Page(s)	Technical Revisions to the Plan
29	Revise language regarding Metro Parking Policy discussion to note that park and ride lots also support commuter express bus service.
36	Remove Traffic Signal Forum reference in Central Los Angeles section.
37	Add reference to traffic signal timing coordination on numerous arterials to South Bay Cities section.
37	Delete reference to Metrolink locomotive and passenger coach purchases for the South Bay and Westside subregions.
39	Insert the Exposition Light Rail Transit preliminary engineering to the list of major short-term projects planned along the I-10 (Santa Monica Freeway).

Attachment A: Summary of Proposed Revisions to the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Page(s)	Technical Revisions to the Technical Document
Global	Alphabetize list of cities within each subregion.
Global	Include short and mid-term mobility improvement projects included in the Rt. 101 Corridor Study in the Las Virgenes/Malibu, San Fernando Valley and Central Los Angeles subregional sections, subject to further community review and refinement and modification by affected agencies.
7	Add language regarding the Information Exchange Network to Gateway Cities signal synchronization improvements.
8, 64	Include Gerald Desmond Bridge Replacement Project as a stakeholder recommendation in Gateway Cities Subregion and I-710 Congested Corridor.
14	Remove Santa Clarita Bicycle Station and add Santa Clara River Regional Commuter Trail to North County Subregion.
25	Include Mission Blvd/SR-71 project as a San Gabriel Valley stakeholder recommendation.
25, 72	Add Eastern Gateway Freeway Corridor Improvement Study as a San Gabriel Valley and I-10/SR-60 Congested Corridor stakeholder recommendations.
25	Add the following projects as San Gabriel Valley stakeholder recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I-10/I-605 interchange upgrade; • SR-71 freeway upgrade and carpool lane between SR-60 and I-210; and • Engineering funding for 710 gap closure tunnel.
27	Add Carson Circuit, Lawndale Beat, and San Pedro Trolley to South Bay Cities major transportation facilities section.
29	Revise South Bay Cities mobility challenges to address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth of heavy truck traffic and the impact on I-405 and I-110, • Providing access for Los Angeles Air Force Base and National Training Center, • Noting that subregion is concerned with commuter travel and general travel mobility, and • Upgrading north/south arterials.
30	Remove "native plant restoration" language from Transportation Enhancements section.

Attachment A: Summary of Proposed Revisions to the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Page(s)	Technical Revisions to the Technical Document (continued)
30, 56	Add I-405 at Rosecrans access point improvements to South Bay Cities and I-405 Congested Corridor stakeholder recommendations.
30, 57	Add planning for Metro Green Line extension south to South Bay Galleria as stakeholder recommendation for South Bay Cities and I-405 Congested Corridor.
30	Add promoting the Harbor Transitway and constructing the Crenshaw Corridor as South Bay Cities stakeholder recommendations.
31-68	Incorporate project recommendations from Westside Cities to Westside stakeholder recommendations.
33, 65	Include language recognizing the need to improve connection between freeway and arterial system in Westside area.
38	Add HOV and truck lanes on mainline I-5 between SR-14 and SR-126 and initiate local fixed route transit service between Santa Clarita and San Fernando Valleys to I-5 stakeholder recommendations to I-5 Congested Corridor.
41	Include projects recommended by City of Los Angeles as Stakeholder Recommendations for I-5 Congested Corridor.
41, 44	I-5/SR-134 and I-5/SR-14 interchange improvements, and access improvements between Downtown Los Angeles and I-5, will be added to I-5 Congested Corridors Stakeholder Recommendations.
47	Include the TSM and TDM improvements identified as part of the I-5 Preferred Alternative in the I-5 corridor major investment study as stakeholder recommendations for the I-5 Congested Corridor.
50	Change "Cross Valley Connector" to "High Desert Corridor."
54	Add language to "Current Conditions" regarding severity of congestion on arterials to I-405 Congested Corridor.
54	Add Rosecrans and La Cienega as Hot Spots to I-405 Congested Corridor.
56	Add better and consistent HOV signs for ingress and egress to short term corridor strategy to I-405 Congested Corridor.
57	Remove implementing Metro Rapid on Long Beach Boulevard to I-405 Congested Corridor.

Attachment A: Summary of Proposed Revisions to the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Page(s)	Technical Revisions to the Technical Document (continued)
58	Add LA City and County as affected jurisdictions in "Setting" section to I-405 Congested Corridor.
58	Add language indicating potential impact of entertainment complexes in Carson to I-405 Congested Corridor.
108	Add a section on environmental justice to provide the technical analysis regarding transportation system benefits to minority and low income communities.
111	Exhibit 2: Eliminate "Municipal Capital" words from last entry under Municipal Operators. This last line becomes a separate entry titled "Countywide Transit Enhancements" and is moved to the full left side of the margin as a heading title itself.
111	Change footnote to: "Includes MTA non-allocable overhead, regional planning and support, agencywide computer systems and other capital, and restricted/reserved costs for other agencies."
118	Last line on the right side of the page insert the word "some" before "Proposition A local return revenues...."
119	Insert new sentence after the fourth line down on the left to state: "Other Proposition A local return funds are used for local transit and improvements to transit service."
121	Under the heading " <i>State Transit Assistance (STA)</i> " - reword the first paragraph's last two lines to state, " <i>revenue share is used for MTA and Municipal Operators bus capital and operating needs.</i> "
124	Add a sentence after the second line from the top on the right side to state: "The Municipal Operators plan on purchasing approximately 100 buses annually and some are considering procurement of articulated buses in the next few years."
125	<p>First bullet under MTA Bus Operations is amended to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operating and maintenance cost projections are based on the OMB Ten-Year Forecast (August 2002 and 2004 for inclusion of the adopted FY-2004 MTA budget) and grows at the rate of inflation after FY-2012 except for the following changes since August 2002: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional service hours for the Consent Decree have been assumed at the rate of at least approximately 237,500 annually throughout the planning period; and • Service hour changes as a result of FY 2004 MTA budget and new transit scheduling techniques. Increased operating efficiency, if any, would be reflected in the annual update to the Short Range Transportation Plan. • The 2004 MTA Ten-Year Forecast will be used in this Short Range Transportation Plan as an operating and capital expenditure guide prior to the next Short Range Plan update.

ATTACHMENT B

PUBLIC OUTREACH MEETINGS ON THE DRAFT 2003 SHORT RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

NOTE: The Draft 2003 SRTP was distributed for review and comment on May 5, 2003. The following summarizes the public outreach efforts made during the public review of the Draft SRTP.

Date / Time	Meeting	Location
May 5, 2003 10:30am - 12:30pm	North County Transportation Coalition (Technical Staff)	Palmdale Cultural Center - 38350 N. Sierra Highway
May 7, 2003 9:30am - 11:30am	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	MTA - Union Station Conference Room - 3rd Floor
May 7, 2003 4:00pm - 6:00pm	Gateway Cities COG Transportation Committee	Cerritos Sr. Center - 12340 South St. Cerritos
May 7, 2003 6:00pm - 8:00pm	Gateway Cities COG Governing Board	Cerritos Sr. Center - 12340 South St. Cerritos
May 8, 2003 7:30am - 9:30am	Gateway Public Works Administrators Committee	Lakewood Center, Executive Board Room - 5000 Clark Ave.
May 8, 2003 9:00am - 11:00am	Arroyo Verdugo COG - Transportation Subcommittee	La Canada Flintridge City Hall - 1327 Foothill Blvd.
May 8, 2003 9:00am - 11:00am	South Bay COG - Transportation Oversight Committee	Carson Community Center - 701 E Carson Street Room 206
May 8, 2003 2:00pm - 3:00pm	Board Staff Briefing	MTA - Board Staff Briefing Room
May 8, 2003 3:00pm - 5:00pm	San Gabriel Valley COG - Transportation Committee	West Covina City Hall , Community Room 1st Floor - 1444 West Garvey Ave., West Covina

Attachment B: Public Outreach Meetings on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Date / Time	Meeting	Location
May 12, 2003 3:00pm - 5:00pm	LA County Department of Public Works	12th Floor Executive Conference Room - 900 S. Fremont, Alhambra
May 13, 2003 9:00am - 11:00am	SRTP Public Workshop	MTA - Board Room
May 13, 2003 10:30am - 12:30pm	Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Air Quality	MTA - Pasadena Conference Room, 22nd Floor
May 13, 2003 6:00pm - 8:00pm	SRTP Public Workshop	MTA - Board Room
May 14, 2003 1:00pm - 2:00pm	Planning and Programming	MTA - Board Room
May 15, 2003 9:30am - 11:30am	Streets and Freeways	MTA - Windsor Conference Room, 15th Floor
May 19, 2003 9:00am - 11:00am	Arroyo Verdugo COG - Steering Committee	La Canada Flintridge City Hall - 1327 Foothill Blvd.
May 19, 2003 12:00pm - 2:00pm	San Gabriel Valley COG - Public Works Committee	4 Points Sheraton - 700 W. Huntington Dr., Monrovia
May 20, 2003 8:00am - 10:00am	Central City Association	610 Olive St., 10th Floor, Los Angeles
May 20, 2003 8:30am - 10:30am	Las Virgenes/Malibu COG - Governing Board	Westlake Village City Hall - 31200 Oak Crest Drive, Westlake Village
May 20, 2003 2:00pm - 4:00pm	Congestion Management Program Policy Advisory Committee (CMP PAC)	MTA - Gateway Plaza Conference Room, 3rd Floor
May 22, 2003 9:00am - 10:00am	City of Los Angeles	Department of Transportation Offices, 5th Floor Conference Room - 221 S. Figueroa, Los Angeles

Attachment B: Public Outreach Meetings on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Date / Time	Meeting	Location
May 22, 2003 9:30am - 11:30am	MTA Board Meeting	MTA - Board Room
May 22, 2003 2:00pm-4:00pm	Westside Cities	Santa Monica Airport - 3223 Donald Douglas Loop South, Suite 3
May 22, 2003 6:00pm - 8:00pm	San Gabriel Valley COG - Governing Board	Duarte Community Center - 1600 East Huntington Blvd.; Duarte
May 22, 2003 7:00pm - 9:00pm	South Bay COG - Governing Board	Lomita City Hall, 2nd Floor Conference Room - 24300 Narbonne Ave.
May 29, 2003 1:30pm - 3:30pm	Local Transit System Subcommittee (LTSS)	MTA - Windsor Conference Room, 15th Floor
June 3, 2003 9:30am - 11:30am	Bus Operators Subcommittee (BOS)	MTA - Gateway Conference Room, 3rd Floor
June 3, 2003 11:30am - 1:30pm	Northern Corridor Cities Meeting	Santa Clarita
June 5, 2003 2:00pm - 4:00pm	I-5 Joint Powers Authority (JPA) Technical Advisory Committee Meeting	Norwalk City Hall, Rm. 4 - 12700 Norwalk Blvd., Norwalk
June 5, 2003 2:00pm - 3:30pm	Transportation, Water and Infrastructure Committee of the LA Area Chamber of Commerce	Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce
June 12, 2003 2:00pm - 4:00pm	South Bay COG - Transit Working Group	Redondo Beach City Hall, Planning Conference Room, Door E, 415 Diamond St.; Redondo Beach
June 13, 2003 9:30am - 11:30am	South Bay Governance Council	Carson Community Center - 801 East Carson St.; Carson
June 16, 2003 2:00pm - 4:00pm	North County Transportation Coalition - Board	Santa Clarita City Hall, Orchard Conference Room - 23920 Valencia Blvd., 1st Floor, Santa Clarita

Attachment B: Public Outreach Meetings on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Date / Time	Meeting	Location
June 17, 2003 8:00am -9:00am	Antelope Valley Board of Trade	Desert Inn, Wine Cellar Room - 44219 Sierra Highway, Lancaster, CA. 93534
July 9, 2003 2:00pm - 4:00pm	I-5 JPA Board of Directors	Norwalk City Hall, Rm. 4 - 12700 Norwalk Blvd., Norwalk

ATTACHMENT C

RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT 2003 SHORT RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

NOTE: The Draft 2003 SRTP was distributed for review and comment on May 5, 2003. The following reflects staff responses to written comments received on the Draft SRTP through the mail.

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<i>Comments from Federal and State Elected Officials</i>	
<p><i>Sharon Runner</i> <i>06/16/2003</i> <i>Assemblywoman, 36th District</i> <i>California Legislature</i></p> <p>Urge MTA Board to restore the SR-14 HOV project funding for commencement of work this summer; Request clarification to previous statements that the HOV project funds were only being delayed temporarily.</p>	<p>Comment noted. MTA is working aggressively to minimize any temporary delay to this project. The Final SRTP will identify this project as one of the next highway priorities if additional funding becomes available. MTA will explore additional funding mechanisms to program funds for the SR-14 project. These funding mechanisms could include examining existing financial capacity as well as bonding.</p>
<i>Comments from Cities</i>	
<p><i>Frank Colonna</i> <i>07/07/2003</i> <i>President</i> <i>Board of Directors, Gateway Cities Council of Governments</i></p> <p>Recommends an allocation of resources that is a balanced and realistic strategy for dealing with the County's mobility needs in the future.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Draft SRTP represents a constrained plan that is consistent with the MTA Board's adopted policies and programs.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>Notes that ability to secure new revenue sources will likely depend on a more even-handed approach to programming and fund allocation.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Recommends resource allocation strategies that reward efficient and effective transit operations.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Concerned that MTA transit operations and other transit/paratransit services are consuming an increasing share of flexible funding sources; recommends the establishment of a firewall or minimum guarantee of funding for streets and freeways.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Notes that the SRTP severely under-funds needed improvements to arterials and local streets and road and recommends adequate funding be allocated to arterials and local streets and roads.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The SRTP advocates for additional funding, including local sources that would help fund arterials and other local improvements.</p>
<p>Concerned that system preservation is not being seriously considered; recommends that MTA begin a serious dialogue with cities and other stakeholders countywide to address the burgeoning need for resources necessary to maintain and preserve the roadway system.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Final SRTP will be revised to emphasize the need to work with sub-regional and local agencies to seek additional funding for regionally significant system preservation needs. This funding should complement, but not replace existing local system preservation funding and should include a local maintenance of effort requirement.</p>
<p>Recommends that projects identified in the I-710 Congested Corridor strategy include specific funding resources and implementation schedule.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Corridor strategies are cost effective improvements that could be implemented in the SRTP time frame if additional funds become available.</p>
<p>Recommends that SRTP identify funding for completion of environmental document of I-710 Major Corridor Study improvements or at least commit MTA to 17% share of the regionally significant project.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Final SRTP will be updated to note that \$5 million is committed for the environmental analysis of the I-710 study improvements.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>Recommends that the Gerald Desmond Bridge Replacement Project be included in the I-710 Congested Corridor stakeholder recommendations. (SRTP Technical Document, p.64).</p>	<p>Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP as part of Stakeholder Recommendations.</p>
<p>Recommends that the SRTP should restore sufficient funding to the I-5 HOV and mixed flow lanes between the Orange County line and I-605 to complete PS&E, so that the project can be construction ready by mid-2006. Recommends that MTA commit to working with the COG and the I-5 JPA in the interim to identify funds needed for construction.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Final SRTP will note that this project is part of the next highway priorities should additional funding become available. Moreover, the Plan will specify that MTA will explore additional mechanisms to program funds for this project. These funding mechanisms could include examining existing financial capacity as well as bonding.</p>
<p>Recommends that MTA restore funding for completion of environmental documentation of I-5 improvements between I-605 and I-710.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Recommends that the Short Term Corridor Strategy as set forth in the SRTP for the I-5, Segment D (Technical Appendix, p. 47), should include all the proposed I-5 corridor TSM and TDM improvements in the I-5 Preferred Alternative as identified in the Major Investment Study.</p>	<p>Comment will be included into Final SRTP.</p>
<p><i>Ralph H. Webb</i> <i>Executive Director</i> <i>I-5 Consortium Cities Joint Powers Authority</i></p> <p>Recommends that the I-5 HOV and mixed flow lane between the Orange County Line and I-605 project be the highest and next transportation priority in the SRTP and be implemented in a timely manner.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Final SRTP will identify the I-5 project and its associated interchanges as part of the next highway priorities should additional funding become available. MTA will explore additional mechanisms to program funds for this project. These funding mechanisms could include examining existing financial capacity as well as bonding.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>Notes that SRTP is incomplete as it fails to include a funding strategy for priority transportation improvements.</p> <p>Recommends that MTA commit to replace STIP funding reallocation from I-5 improvement project between SR-91 and I-605 as part of April 2003 STIP amendment.</p> <p>Recommends that the Short Term Corridor Strategy for the I-5, Segment D include all the proposed I-5 corridor TSM and TDM improvements in the I-5 Preferred Alternative as identified in the Major Investment Study.</p> <p>Recommends that MTA recognize the I-5 JPA as one of the significant regional transportation stakeholders and engage the JPA in the further development and implementation of the SRTP as well as other regional transportation planning and programming initiatives.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment will be incorporated into the “Stakeholder Recommendations” section of the Final SRTP.</p> <p>Comment noted. MTA is committed to working closely with the I-5 JPA into the future as annual updates to the SRTP occur.</p>
<p><i>Nicholas T. Conway</i> <i>05/22/2003</i> <i>Executive Director</i> <i>San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments</i></p> <p>MTA does not propose any one funding method at this time; but offers a menu of options for the MTA Board to examine as ways to implement the plan. The SGVCOG previously adopted a policy position to work with MTA to support their efforts to secure increased funding for key transportation infrastructure projects. No comments are recommended for this section of the plan.</p> <p>The SGVCOG Transit Restructure Study identified the need for increased bus coverage for riders traveling north-south in the west San Gabriel Valley. This plan does not provide any resources to address that bus service deficiency.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. This Final SRTP will include a new bullet to the Local Bus Action Plan indicating the need to seek additional funding sources for transit operations and additional capital and operating funding to meet the</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>Page 17 of the plan identified \$878 million in construction costs for Gold Line Phase I that has already been expended outside the plan period. The Phase I Gold Line expenditure reference on page 17 is misleading and should be deleted since it is not part of the plan period.</p> <p>It is recommended that page 17, 18, and 36 be clarified to show Preliminary Engineering for the Gold Line to Claremont and it is recommended that page 17 be modified to show Gold Line Phase II construction between Pasadena and Irwindale during the period 2005-2009 and construction from Irwindale to Claremont during the period 2010-2014 pending funding availability. Language on page 18 and 36 should be made consistent with these suggested changes.</p> <p>The SGVCOG request that MTA add the following projects into the plan should additional highway federal funding becomes available:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10/605 interchange upgrade; • 71 freeway and carpool lane upgrade between 60 and 210 freeways; • engineering funds for the 710 gap closure (tunnel alternative). <p>The SGVCOG supports the freight movement action plan strategies noted on page 33.</p>	<p>increasing demands on transit operators serving the subregions projected to experience significant growth.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Final SRTP will include a footnote to the exhibit on page 17 to reflect this clarification..</p> <p>MTA is committed to funding \$10 million for preliminary engineering for a Metro Gold Line Extension from Sierra Madre Villa to Claremont. Construction schedules cannot be determined at this time due to State budget funding shortfall, and will be determined subject to funding availability.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Final SRTP will incorporate these projects as part of the “Stakeholder Recommendations” for San Gabriel Valley Subregion.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Ken Blackwood</i> <i>06/26/2003</i> <i>Chair</i> <i>South Bay Cities Council of Governments</i></p> <p><u>The Plan</u> On Page 5, each of the possible Financial Strategies should include a statement as to what is necessary to implement it. For example, a county</p>	<p>Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>sales tax would require voter approval.</p> <p>Re: the Freight Container Fee - State legislation is cited but couldn't it be considered a barrier to interstate commerce and therefore need federal legislation?</p> <p>On Page 6, regarding County Traffic Impact Fee - The SBCCOG supports a nexus study and fees going back to at least the subregion from where they came. Funds should be put in a special category and not the General Fund.</p> <p>On Page 12, on the chart. "Bus Service Improvements by Operator" Service Coordination Improvements should be checked for Torrance Transit. Gardena Municipal Bus Lines and Redondo Beach WAVE. Service Coordination improvements are occurring with the review of the South Bay & Gateway Bus Transit Restructuring Study and ongoing discussions in the SBCCOG Transit Working Group on possible restructuring. ITS Enhancements should be checked for both Torrance Transit and Gardena Municipal Bus Lines. Planned ITS Enhancements include onboard camera replacements and the regional smart card (UFS) program as well as AVL for Torrance Transit which Gardena Municipal Bus Lines already employs.</p> <p>Metro Rapid – The schedule for the Torrance–Long Beach Line should be accelerated.</p> <p>Additionally, a Metro Rapid or bus line to the Galleria to provide an east/west connection along the 91 should accompany extension to the Metro Green Line.</p>	<p>The impact of any Freight Container Fee on federal regulations would be explored if such a strategy were pursued.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment will be incorporated into the Final SRTP.</p> <p>Given current resources, Metro Rapid service is not scheduled to be implemented prior to 2005. This schedule is consistent with MTA Board adopted Metro Rapid 5-year Implementation Plan.</p> <p>MTA provides east/west bus service to the Galleria along Artesia (SR-91) through its 130 and 444 lines.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>On Page 17, we urge the MTA to advance the schedule for the Crenshaw Corridor Transitway.</p>	<p>Initial Metro Rapid improvements on the Crenshaw Corridor are scheduled for December 2003.</p>
<p>Metro Rail – planning for Metro Green Line extension south to the South Bay Galleria should be added.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Final SRTP will incorporate this comment as part of “Stakeholder Recommendations” for South Bay Subregion.</p>
<p>On Page 29, we urge the MTA to include improvements to information provided at bus stops as a priority.</p>	<p>MTA is developing and implementing a comprehensive plan to streamline and simplify transit information. Elements of this plan include a unified visual appearance to all MTA services and supporting materials and enhanced route and connection information at bus stops.</p>
<p>On Page 33, regarding the freight action plan, the SBCCOG cautions that any strategy that allows Super Trucks may be a problem in our subregion. These trucks are not made for local streets and damage the highways. In the South Bay cities the intersections may not be able to accommodate the needed corner radiuses.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This concern will be addressed in the development of a Freight Strategic Action Plan.</p>
<p>On Page 37, the SRTP should note that the South Bay subregion has 16 local jurisdictions, not 17.</p>	<p>The 17 local jurisdictions include the 16 incorporated cities in the South Bay area, as well as portions of unincorporated Los Angeles County.</p>
<p>Delete Metrolink locomotive and passenger coach purchases from this section.</p>	<p>This error will be corrected in the Final SRTP.</p>
<p>Add the Rosecrans, 1-405 access points, and Green Line extension planning.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Final SRTP will incorporate this comment as part of “Stakeholder Recommendations” for South Bay Subregion.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>Air Force Base and National Training Center need to be cited along with truck traffic generated by airport and port.</p>	<p>This comment will be included in the South Bay Subregional Description in the Final SRTP Technical Document.</p>
<p>Arbor Vitae interchange should be included in the Congested Corridors I-405 San Diego Freeway – Page 41.</p>	<p>Project is identified on page 55 of the Technical Document.</p>
<p>Include language that addresses the affect of traffic flow on the arterials as it affects the freeway and vice versa.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>The SBCCOG requests that these issues on the I-110 be designated for further analysis.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The I-110 Harbor Freeway will be considered for analysis in future updates to the SRTP.</p>
<p><u>Technical Document</u></p>	
<p>The Subregions section – All information concerning the subregions is inconsistent – ex. Setting – some have population and area numbers and others don’t.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Information is organized in similar sections for each subregion and reflects information regarding the unique character of each subregion.</p>
<p>South Bay Cities Subregion:</p>	
<p>Cities – Alphabetize the list of cities. All South Bay cities are identified on map by name except Rolling Hills Estates.</p>	<p>Comment will be incorporated into the Final SRTP.</p>
<p>Major Transportation Facilities – Add Carson Circuit and the Lawndale Beat to the regional and local transit services list as well as the San Pedro Trolley.</p>	<p>Comment will be incorporated into the Final SRTP.</p>
<p>Include the same references as on page 7 Gateway Cities section re: heavy truck traffic on I-405 and I-110.</p>	<p>Comment will be incorporated into the Final SRTP.</p>
<p>Acknowledge as priorities for our subregion: Providing ease of access for the Los Angeles Air Force Base as well as the new National Training Center along with truck traffic generated by airport and port.</p>	<p>Comment will be incorporated into the Final SRTP</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>In addition to cargo and truck traffic, the subregion is concerned with commuter travel as well as general travel mobility.</p>	<p>Comment will be incorporated into the Final SRTP.</p>
<p>While East/West arterials are reflected as mobility challenges, the upgrading of North/South arterials are also a subregional priority.</p>	<p>Comment will be incorporated into the Final SRTP.</p>
<p>Although undetermined at this time, required ground access transportation improvements and traffic impacts resulting from the implementation of any LAX planned improvements will be a subregional priority during the MTA Short Range Plan period. This would specifically include passenger rail services options on the MTA Harbor Subdivision and extending the Green Line to Metrolink – Norwalk.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Any improvements from the LAX Master Plan will be incorporated into future SRTP update.</p>
<p>One of the highest priorities for all of our cities is the need for continuous funding to maintain the system.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Add Rosecrans Corridor, I-405 access points, and Green Line extension planning to the “What The Future Holds” subsection.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Final SRTP will incorporate this comment as part of “Stakeholder Recommendations” for South Bay Subregion. Please note that the purpose of the “What The Future Holds” subsections is to list those projects that are fully funded within the 2003 SRTP six year planning period.</p>
<p>Add more focus on promoting the Harbor Transitway and constructing the Crenshaw Corridor</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Final SRTP will incorporate this comment as part of “Stakeholder Recommendations” for South Bay Subregion.</p>
<p>Delete the detail under Transportation Enhancements – specifically plant restoration and landscaping.</p>	<p>Comment will be incorporated into the Final SRTP.</p>
<p>Congested Corridors: I-405 between I-10 and Artesia <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hot Spots – Add congestion at Rosecrans and at La Cienega. Add </p>	<p>Comment will be incorporated into the Final SRTP.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>statement of concern re: severity of congestion on major arterials (see p. 58 for example)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short Term Corridor Strategy – Better and consistent HOV signs for ingress & egress would help tremendously. • Stakeholder Recommendations – Implementing Metro Rapid on Long Beach Blvd. Is misplaced and should be removed. <p>I-405 between Artesia and County line</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting – add LA City and County as affected jurisdictions • Current Conditions – Add unknown/to be determined impact of entertainment complexes in Carson • Previously Funded Projects – Is Signal Synchronization on Western and Normandie completed? If not, those streets should be added. • Stakeholder Recommendations – Many are nowhere near the congested corridor. The listing doesn't appear to be complete and the projects are not necessarily related to the congested corridor. <p>Financial Forecasting Model Assumptions: Page 115 – Why are collections different from Proposition A and C if both are ½ cent sales taxes? This should be explained.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Final SRTP will incorporate this comment as part of “Stakeholder Recommendations” for South Bay Subregion.</p> <p>Comment will be incorporated into the Final SRTP.</p> <p>Comment will be incorporated into the Final SRTP.</p> <p>Comment will be incorporated into the Final SRTP.</p> <p>Projects were completed.</p> <p>The list of projects reflects those fully funded projects recommended through the congested corridor outreach process that began in September 2002.</p> <p>While Propositions A and C are essentially the same, there are several reasons why potential revenue may differ. First, carryover funds from prior years between the two may differ. Second, the State of California Board of Equalization, who is responsible for collecting the funds, does apply credits, refunds and minor adjustments for overpayments, court ordered</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>Page 117 – The Crenshaw Corridor is the farthest off in the future. We reiterate our above stated concern for it to be advanced.</p>	<p>impoundments and other changes that vary between the two Propositions.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Talmage V. Burke</i> <i>07/01/2003</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of Alhambra</i></p> <p>For credibility, MTA must show financial capacity to complete the 710 Freeway Gap with the recently proposed drilled tunnel or, in the absence of feasibility for that alternative, with the cut-and-cover tunnel alternative tentatively endorsed by the federal government in the 1998 Record of Decision.</p> <p>The multi-mode, low-build alternative to the 710 full build: the modeling of these improvements for the 710 Design Advisory Groups shows that the effects of these improvements are minimal, and in one case, harmful to current traffic congestion.</p> <p>Recent protests to the California Public Utilities Commission proposes to slow down the Gold Line train to less than 20 mph. For every driver deterred by the slower speed of the light rail train, the greater the continuing need to close the 710 Freeway Gap.</p> <p>MTA has the funding capacity now to commit to the 710 Project based on the following analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost estimate reduction of \$897 million between the 2001 LRTP and 2003 SRTP for I-405 northbound HOV (between I-10 and US-101); • Cost estimate reduction of \$1.037 billion between the 2001 LRTP 	<p>Comment noted. In exploring the feasibility of a tunnel alternative, MTA will work closely with the City of Alhambra and other stakeholders to address these and other concerns</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. Given the funding shortfall, the SRTP reflects Board priorities for funding programs in the short-term. The LRTP remains the long-term strategy for planning programs and projects and will be updated periodically to reflect changes.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>2003 SRTP for I-5 HOV and mixed flow lanes (between Orange County Line and I-605).</p> <p>The matrix on page 23 shows a new commitment of \$1 billion to the I-5 Widening (I-605 to I-710), a previously unfunded Strategic Plan project of the 2001 LRTP. This change appears in the draft 2003 SRTP without any mention in the text of the Plan of such a significant funding priority change.</p> <p>The City of Alhambra supports the study of the tunnel alternative for technical and economic feasibility. MTA and Caltrans should use existing planning monies programmed in the SRTP right now to complete the mitigation measure definitions for the cut-and-cover tunnel surface alternative that tentatively endorsed by the federal government.</p> <p>The 710 Project is the most effective unbuilt transportation project per dollar invested in all of Los Angeles County.</p> <p>You should be aware that all pending cases on the 710 are under challenge for dismal in the state and federal courts.</p>	<p>The “Schedule of Highway Project Priorities” on page 23 identifies projects that received previous partial programming.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Mark Scott</i> <i>07/07/2003</i> <i>City Manager, City of Beverly Hills</i> <i>Jerry Fulwood</i> <i>CAO, City of Culver City</i> <i>Susan E. McCarthy</i> <i>City Manager, City of Santa Monica</i> <i>Paul Arevalo</i> <i>City Manager, City of West Hollywood</i></p> <p>Notes that there seems to be a disconnect between the SRTP and the LRTP; concerned that the Westside has lost ground on major projects,</p>	<p>Given the funding shortfall, the SRTP reflects Board priorities for funding programs in the short-term. The</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>creating a relatively large discrepancy in funded or completed major transportation improvements as compared to other parts of the County.</p>	<p>LRTP remains the long-term strategy for planning programs and projects and will be updated periodically.</p>
<p>Concerned that there seems to be no connection between the stakeholder comments, the modeling results and the outcomes that will guide MTA future funding and policy priorities.</p>	<p>Because there is insufficient funding to fully fund current commitments, the stakeholder comments are intended to reflect local priorities to be considered in the event more funding becomes available.</p>
<p>Notes that of the twelve specific recommendations the cities made in formal meeting with MTA, only seven are mentioned in the Draft Plan or the Draft Technical Document.</p>	<p>All missing recommendations will be incorporated into Final SRTP.</p>
<p>Notes that the LRTP included the first phase of the Exposition corridor in the funded baseline recommendations and the completion of the line to Santa Monica within the constrained plan, whereas the SRTP commits only preliminary engineering in the plan and fails to articulate an intent to go beyond Venice/Robertson.</p>	<p>The Final SRTP will clarify that the proposed ultimate terminus for the Exposition light rail transit line is Santa Monica, but that initial funding for preliminary engineering on the line is for the first phase to Culver City.</p>
<p>Notes that the LRTP Strategic Plan identified a westerly extension of the Wilshire Red Line, whereas the SRTP does not mention this line as a strategy to improve Westside mobility.</p>	<p>The LRTP identifies a Red Line extension along Wilshire as part of its unfunded, Strategic Plan. As such, the constrained SRTP does not identify this as a funded priority through FY 2009. Further, during recent stakeholder meetings in the Westside, this was not mentioned as an ongoing priority for the subregion.</p>
<p>Recommends that the SRTP recognize the need to improve the connection between the freeway and arterial systems, particularly the Venice/Robertson I-10 interchange because of the role it will play for the Exposition Light rail line as a temporary terminus before the line continues west to the final end point in Santa Monica.</p>	<p>The Final SRTP will reflect the need for freeway and arterial system coordination with the first-phase terminus of the Exposition Light Rail Line.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>Notes that the LRTP baseline funded plan includes an HOV lane for the northbound I-405 freeway between the I-10 and the 101 freeways. The SRTP states that this improvement was “previously only partially funded” when in fact it was fully funded in the baseline. The SRTP deletes funding for this segment and makes no provision for future commitment.</p> <p>Notes that the Westside Cities strongly support the timely implementation of additional rapid bus lines on the Westside and look forward to working with MTA on implementing the operational details to make the service effective.</p> <p>Recommends that the SRTP address improved rapid transit connections between important activity nodes, for example between Westside Cities and the airport.</p> <p>Recommend an increased commitment to operational funding placed on the Local Bus Action Plan list.</p>	<p>The Final SRTP will be revised to clarify that projects that have not been fully programmed in the adopted STIP are considered “partially funded.”</p> <p>Comment noted. MTA looks forward to working closely with the Westside cities to expand the Metro Rapid program on schedule.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Final SRTP will note that MTA is working on improving its marketing of bus service to key destinations and is restructuring its bus service to improve access to key destinations by establishing a Hub and Spoke network.</p> <p>Comment noted. This Final SRTP will include a new bullet to the Local Bus Action Plan indicating the need to seek additional funding sources for transit operations and additional capital and operating funding to meet the increasing demands on transit operators serving the subregions projected to experience significant growth.</p>
<p><i>Tom Sykes</i> <i>05/19/2003</i> <i>City Administrator</i> <i>City of Commerce</i></p> <p>MTA legal staff should research the effects of the Interstate Commerce Act on the Freight Container Fee.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>serves only a very small percentage of the region’s population; recommends that streets, roads and highway funding must be increased to address the SRTP’s stated challenges.</p> <p>Recommends that the construction of the Gerald Desmond Bridge and environmental clearance for improvements that will be identified upon completion of the I-710 Major Corridor Study be included in the I-710 Congested Corridor section.</p>	<p>different strategies to determine the optimal mix of transportation options given funding constraints.</p> <p>Project will be incorporated into I-710 Congested Corridor stakeholder recommendations.</p>
<p><i>James M. Okazaki</i> <i>06/27/2003</i> <i>Assistant General Manager</i> <i>City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation</i></p> <p>Recommends increasing funding for freeway capacity improvements, specifically including providing funding for I-5/SR-14 interchange improvements, completion of mixed flow lane connectors at the I-5/SR-134 interchange and improvements to the I-405/I-10 interchange.</p> <p>Notes that the SRTP does not adequately address funding needs for the arterial system’s maintenance and enhancement needs.</p> <p>Notes that US-101 short- and mid-range projects should be incorporated into 2003 SRTP.</p> <p>Request that all 16 projects submitted for inclusion in the I-5 Congested Corridor section appear in the SRTP.</p> <p>Recommends higher priority if funding becomes available for implementation of Crenshaw Corridor transit improvements.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The ability to fund these freeway improvements will require additional funding beyond the constrained SRTP.</p> <p>Comment noted. The SRTP recommends seeking additional funds for regionally significant system preservation needs.</p> <p>Short- and mid-range improvements from the US-101 study will be incorporated into Final SRTP.</p> <p>Projects will be incorporated into the “Stakeholder Recommendations” section of the Final SRTP.</p> <p>Comment noted. Initial Metro Rapid improvements to Crenshaw Corridor are scheduled for December 2003.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>Requests that Local Bus section acknowledge role played by LADOT DASH system.</p> <p>Recommends that 2004 SRTP include LA CBD Freeway ring as a specific congested corridor study area.</p> <p>Notes that City has different implementation schedule for Metro Rapid than that shown in draft SRTP.</p> <p>Request addition of I-5/SR-134 and I-5/SR-14 interchange improvements and access improvements between Downtown LA and I-5 to the I-5 Congested Corridor stakeholder recommendations.</p>	<p>Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Metro Rapid schedule is consistent with the Five Year Plan developed in consultation with the City of Los Angeles and MTA Board. Minor changes to this schedule have been recommend in the SRTP, in consultation with LADOT staff, to address various implementation issues.</p> <p>Comment will be incorporated into the “Stakeholder Recommendations” section of the Final SRTP.</p>
<p><i>Patrick V. DeChellis</i> <i>07/03/2003</i> <i>Assistant Deputy Director</i> <i>Programs Development Division</i> <i>Los Angeles County Department of Public Works</i></p> <p>Recommends that SRTP should seek to improve mobility and not limit itself to keeping pace with existing mobility deficiencies.</p> <p>Recommends an equitable dedication of funding resources to all modes.</p> <p>Recommends adding discussion on protecting the capacity of our arterial transportation system to The Challenges section.</p>	<p>Comment noted. While the SRTP seeks to improve mobility throughout the county and its subregions, it is also limited by funding constraints.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Final SRTP will reflect the need to maximize capacity of our arterial and other systems.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
Requests additional information on the potential countywide traffic impact fee to determine if it can be supported.	Comment noted. MTA has worked with several stakeholder groups, including the Congestion Management Program Policy Advisory Committee and MTA Technical Advisory Committee to provide additional information on the traffic impact fee nexus study.
Recommends adding discussion on improving the arterial highway transportation system to Overview of the Plan section.	Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP.
Recommends adding discussion on enhancing the capacity of the arterial system in Laying Out the Plan for the Future section.	Comment noted. “Improved traffic flow through system management” highlights key strategies and arterial recommendations are further identified in the “Highways and Arterials” section.
Recommends adding discussion of peak-period parking restrictions as a means of adding capacity as part of the Systems Management sections.	Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP.
Recommends adding reference to need to seek additional funding for ITS improvements in Arterial Action Plan section.	Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP.
Recommends removing Traffic Signal Forum reference in the Central Los Angeles area as there is none active in that area.	Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP.
Recommends adding traffic signal timing coordination on numerous arterials to South Bay Cities subregional list of planned improvements	Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP.
Recommends that SRTP address need for transit connectivity to recreational facilities, such as parks.	Comment noted.

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>Recommends that SRTP account for impacts of Transit Oriented Development ordinances throughout County.</p>	<p>Comment noted. MTA is developing an inventory of TOD ordinances throughout the county.</p>
<p>Recommends adding language regarding the Information Exchange Network to the Gateway Cities signal synchronization improvements in the Technical Document.</p>	<p>Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP.</p>
<p><i>James C. Ledford, Jr.</i> <i>07/02/2003</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of Palmdale</i></p> <p>Notes that North County is one of highest growth regions in the nation.</p> <p>Urges full and immediate funding for construction of SR-14 HOV lanes between Pearblossom Highway and Avenue P-8.</p> <p>Recommends funding infrastructure improvements consistent with growth forecasts.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Final SRTP will identify this as one of the next highway priorities if additional funding becomes available. MTA will explore additional funding mechanisms to program funds for the SR-14 project. These funding mechanisms could include examining existing financial capacity as well as bonding.</p> <p>Comment noted. Funding recommendations are based on analyzing mobility needs, consistent with regional growth forecasts.</p>
<p><i>Joyce Amerson</i> <i>06/24/2003</i> <i>Director of Transportation</i> <i>City of Pasadena</i></p> <p>The SRTP should not be governed by the adage “live within our means,” but rather be more appropriately guided by “deliver when ready.”</p>	<p>Comment noted. In light of current financial constraint, MTA is evaluating its use of federal, State, and local sources. The SRTP prioritizes projects on a combination</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)		Response
<p><i>Geraldine Knatz, Ph. D.</i> <i>Managing Director</i> <i>The Port of Long Beach</i></p> <p>07/02/2003</p> <p>Recommends that the Gerald Desmond Bridge Replacement project be included in the I-710 Corridor Stakeholder Recommendations.</p>		<p>Project will be incorporated into Final SRTP as a "Stakeholder Recommendation."</p>
<p><i>Bob Murphy</i> <i>Transportation Manager</i> <i>City of Santa Clarita</i></p> <p>07/02/2003</p> <p>Requests that chart on page 12 indicate that Santa Clarita Transit plans 1) Service Coordination Improvements and 2) ITS enhancements</p> <p>Recommends that Local Bus Action Plan include language indicating the need to seek additional funding sources for transit operations and additional funding to meet the increasing demands on transit operators serving the subregions projected to experience significant growth.</p> <p>Recommends that Metro Parking Policy discussion acknowledge that park and ride lots also support commuter express bus service.</p>		<p>Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP.</p> <p>Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP.</p> <p>Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP.</p>
<p><i>Robert G. Newman</i> <i>Director of Transportation and Engineering Services</i> <i>City of Santa Clarita</i></p> <p>07/07/2003</p> <p>Recommends a commitment of funding and projects in the SRTP to address the transportation infrastructure needs of the North County consistent with the population and growth forecast developed by SCAG.</p>		<p>Comment noted. The SRTP analyzed the benefits of different strategies to determine the optimal mix of transportation options given funding constraints.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p><i>Frederick W. Latham</i> <i>City Manager</i> <i>City of Santa Fe Springs</i></p> <p>Recommends that I-5 HOV and mixed flow lanes between the Orange County line and I-605 must be treated as one of the highest transportation priorities in LA County.</p> <p>Recommends that the distribution formula for any additional funding for system preservation be based on vehicle miles and not distributed on a per capita basis.</p> <p>Recommends that projects partially funded and ready for construction be given the highest funding consideration.</p> <p>Recommends that MTA consider funding shuttle service connecting Metrolink stations to other destinations.</p> <p>Recommends that MTA maintain and expand support for the maintenance and security of parking facilities serving Metrolink stations.</p> <p>Recommend MTA support local government lobbying efforts for regionally significant projects to minimize MTA contributions.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Final SRTP will identify the I-5 project and its associated interchanges as part of the next highway priorities should additional funding become available. MTA will explore additional mechanisms to program funds for this project. These funding mechanisms could include examining existing financial capacity as well as bonding.</p> <p>Comment noted. Surface Transportation Program-Local (STP-L) funding is currently distributed on a per capita basis.</p> <p>Comment noted. Highway projects were prioritized in the SRTP based on a combination of project readiness and overall mobility benefits.</p> <p>Comment noted. The SRTP identifies the need to provide MTA and other feeder service to regional transit facilities such as Metrolink stations.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Through the MOBILITY-21 Transportation Coalition, MTA is working with local governments to secure additional funding for local needs.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)		Response
<p><i>Stephanie Negriff</i> <i>Director of Transit Services</i> <i>Santa Monica Big Blue Bus</i></p> <p align="right">06/30/2003</p> <p>Requests that chart on page 12 reflect that Santa Monica Big Blue Bus also plans 1) Service Expansion & On-time Improvements and 2) Clean Fuel Stations improvements.</p> <p>Recommends that bus only lanes be included as one of the options for increasing bus speeds; recommends that additional traffic lanes that are added to major transit corridors should be designated for buses only.</p> <p>Requests explanation for the basis of line item entitled “Agency-wide Regional Costs” on page 111 of Technical document.</p> <p>Recommends that transit fare revenue adjustments after FY 2004 conform with MTA Board adopted policy rather than utilizing Consumer Price Index. (Technical Document, page 114)</p>	<p>Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP.</p> <p>Final SRTP will acknowledge that bus only lanes are one of the mechanisms for increasing bus speeds.</p> <p>The Final SRTP will include a footnote on page 111 as follows:</p> <p align="center">“Includes MTA non-allocable overhead, regional planning and support, agency wide computer systems and other capital, and restricted/reserved costs for other agencies.”</p> <p>MTA will be implementing the fare policies contained in the Long Range Transportation Plan, which reflect policy reference to adjustments in fares to reflect inflation and cost.</p> <p>Each year when the funding marks are set for the MTA and Municipal Operators along with the local return for the cities and county, the draft report is reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and its subcommittees prior to going to the MTA Board. In the event concerns arise on how certain calculations are done than questions and comments can be generated at that</p>	

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>Request that SRTP clarify that 237,500 revenue service hours added to base MTA bus service starting in FY 2004 will not be included in MTA’s Formula Allocation Procedure calculations and that Consent Decree services are funded outside of this procedure. Requests that basis for the costing method assumption of a reduced marginal rate for the first two years of operation of this additional service either be provided or reflect total forecasted costs. (Technical Document, page 114)</p>	<p>time to ensure a correct report is filed. The MTA has not counted in any prior year and nor does it plan on doing so in the future the Consent Decree bus operating hours in the funding mark calculations that are done each year.</p> <p>The financial forecasting model support document is not part of the adopted documents for the Short Range Transportation Plan. A separate sheet breaking out the operating costs including the Consent Decree was provided to the TAC support-working group who reviewed the draft Short Range Transportation Plan of which Santa Monica Big Blue Bus was a member.</p>
<p><i>Michael A. Cacciotti</i> <i>07/07/2003</i> <i>Mayor</i> <i>City of South Pasadena</i></p> <p>Recommends that the Local Bus Action Plan include more specificity regarding additional bus operating funding for the development of the County’s local bus feeder network.</p> <p>Notes that the City of South Pasadena has gone on record as not opposing conducting a study of the feasibility of a tunnel alternative for the I-710 Gap Closure, providing it is comprehensive in scope and examines environmental and community concerns in addition to the physical and engineering feasibility; requests that any environmental work or scoping documents associated with the tunnel alternative not utilize or be based upon work associated with the existing I-710 Gap Closure environmental documentation.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This Final SRTP will include a new bullet to the Local Bus Action Plan indicating the need to seek additional funding sources for transit operations and additional capital and operating funding to meet the increasing demands on transit operators serving the subregions projected to experience significant growth.</p> <p>Comment noted. In exploring the feasibility of a tunnel alternative, MTA will work closely with the City of South Pasadena and other stakeholders to address these and other concerns.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>Recommends that the MTA reevaluate any investment in the I-710 Gap Closure project in light of the diminished funding situation and maintain the project in the “Strategic” category. Furthermore, the case and need for this project may not be as strong with the operation of the Metro Gold Line and the Alameda Corridor. The MTA might consider modeling the impact of the Metro Gold Line and the Phase II Extension and the Low Build Freeway Alternative improvements on the travel corridor and work with the communities to create other less impacting mobility improvements.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Plan commits to exploring a tunnel study.</p>
<p><i>Comments from Public Agencies</i></p>	
<p><i>Terri Slimmer</i> <i>07/17/2003</i> <i>Interim Executive Director and Board Chair</i> <i>Access Service</i></p> <p>In the Technical Document that supports the SRTP, the section on Financial Analysis shows a \$390.04 million outlay to “MTA Service Area Paratransit” for FY 04-09. We hope that when the new Business Plan makes the demand and budget projections available for the out years (FY 05-09), the SRTP can be updated to reflect updated projections for funding needs.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The SRTP assumes the MTA Board adopted ASI Business Plan annual funding amounts through FY 04. From FY 05-09, the SRTP financial forecast model assumes an annual inflation rate using the UCLA Anderson School of Business Annual Economic Forecast. As the SRTP will be revised on an annual basis, future updates will incorporate any future MTA Board approved ASI Business Plan funding needs.</p>
<p><i>Douglas R. Failing</i> <i>District Director</i> <i>California Department of Transportation</i> <i>District 7</i></p> <p>Concerned with the deferment of selected projects – in particular, the corridor widening and interchange improvements on I-5 at the Orange County line and the I-5/SR-14 interchange HOV connectors.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The I-5 project remains one of MTA’s top highway priorities. Funding to keep this project on schedule will be actively pursued.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>Requests more dialogue regarding funding issues before project priorities are set.</p>	<p>Comment noted. MTA will continue to work closely with Caltrans District 7 to get consensus on highway priorities.</p>
<p>Notes that the pie chart on page 5 should be clarified to indicate that of the \$3 billion for Highways/Multimodal, \$1 billion is SHOPP funding and is limited to highway safety, maintenance and rehabilitation project and not capital outlay projects. This leaves \$2 billion available for capacity increasing projects.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Footnote 1 accompanying the pie chart on page 5 will be changed by adding a new sentence at the end to read:</p> <p align="center">“The total amount for highway uses includes \$2 billion for capacity increasing projects and \$1 billion for highway safety maintenance and rehabilitation costs.”</p>
<p>Requests that construction of I-5, Carmenita Road Interchange Reconstruction project not be delayed.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This and the improvements to the I-5 corridor from the I-605 to the Orange County line are some of the next highway priorities if additional funding becomes available. Securing additional funding soon should not result in any project delays.</p>
<p>Requests that I-5 HOV lanes between SR-134 and SR-170 with Empire not be delayed.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Requests that the construction schedule for I-10 HOV lanes between I-605 and Puente Avenue be revised to begin FY 2007 and that total project cost be revised to \$106,643,000. Notes that this project was previously only partially funded with \$90 million in TCRP funding. The balance would be sought through MTA Call for Projects.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Following consultation with Caltrans, the Final SRTP will be revised to indicate that construction for this project will begin in FY 06 and end in FY 08.</p>
<p>Requests that I-10 HOV between Citrus Street and SR-57 total project cost be revised to \$120,121,000 and that this project not be delayed.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
Requests that SR-14 HOV between Pearblossom Highway and Avenue P-8 not be delayed.	Comment noted. The Final SRTP will identify the SR-14 HOV project as one of the next highway priorities should additional funding become available.
Requests that I-5/SR-14 HOV direct-connector not be delayed.	Comment noted.
Notes that US-101 short- and mid-range projects should be incorporated into 2003 SRTP.	Short- and mid-range improvements from the US-101 study will be incorporated into Final SRTP.
Supports study of feasibility of implementing a countywide traffic impact fee.	Comment noted.
Requests that Eastern Gateway Freeway Corridor Improvement Study be incorporated into 1) Freight Movement section, 2) San Gabriel Valley Subregion section, and 3) I-10/SR-60 section as a stakeholder recommendation	Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP.
Notes that 2001 RTP does not include HOV lane implementation for SR-60, whereas 2003 SRTP does – however, RTP does identify truck lanes for SR-60.	Comment noted. The 2001 RTP identified HOV lanes on SR-60 as a baseline project.
What is the funding source for SR-2 terminus improvement project? (Technical Document, page 43)	This is a TEA-21 High Priority Project.
Technical Document on pages 46 and 63 identify truck impact intersection improvements – please specify which intersections affected.	Truck impact intersection improvements include 28 intersections located in the following cities: Artesia, Bell, Bellflower, Compton, Cudahy, Downey, Huntington Park, Long Beach, Signal Hill, Lynwood, Maywood, Montebello, Norwalk, Paramount, Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, South Gate, Vernon and Whittier.

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)		Response
<p><i>Julianne Nygaard</i> <i>Chair</i> <i>LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency</i></p> <p align="right">07/07/2003</p> <p>Recommends the addition of a section on intercity passenger rail be added to the SRTP, perhaps in conjunction with the discussion on Metrolink.</p>		<p>Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP.</p>
<i>Comments from Organizations</i>		
<p><i>Donna Termeer</i> <i>Executive Director, Antelope Valley Board of Trade</i></p> <p align="right">05/27/2003</p> <p><i>James C. Gilley</i> <i>City Manager, City of Lancaster</i></p> <p align="right">07/02/2003</p> <p><i>Alis Clausen</i> <i>President, Antelope Valley Board of Trade</i></p> <p align="right">07/02/2003</p> <p>Concerned about potential project delay in the SR-14 HOV lane extension from Pearblossom Highway to Ave. P-8</p>		<p>Comment noted. MTA will explore additional funding mechanisms to program funds for the SR-14 project. These funding mechanisms could include examining existing financial capacity as well as bonding.</p>
<p><i>Stephen Finnegan</i> <i>Transportation Policy, Analysis, and Advocacy</i> <i>Automobile Club of Southern California</i></p> <p align="right">07/03/2003</p> <p>Concerned that the overall allocation of resources represented in the SRTP does not adequately address LA County's transportation needs.</p> <p>Recommends a greater portion of MTA-controlled transportation resources be allocated to street and freeway maintenance, repair, reconstruction, and expansion.</p>		<p>Comment noted. The SRTP analyzed the benefits of different strategies to determine the optimal mix of transportation options given funding constraints.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>Recommends that major capital projects be re-prioritized to limit delays to key freeway improvement and widening projects.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Recommends continuing development work and seeking state and federal funding for other large-scale freeway projects, including the I-710 gap closure, addition of carpool and mixed flow lanes on US-101, and addition of truck, carpool, and/or mixed flow lanes on I-710.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Securing additional funding from federal, State, and local sources is critical to keeping capital projects on schedule.</p>
<p>Recommends modifying MTA policy regarding projects that require additional right-of-way to better balance community concerns and regional mobility and safety needs.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Recommends restoring and increasing funding for the Call for Projects.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The level of funding for the Call for Projects will be in part a function of the region's ability to secure additional funding.</p>
<p>Recommends modifying the SRTP's financial strategy and MTA's efforts to increase transportation revenues to reflect the need for a more comprehensive analysis and discussion of transportation funding issues, including the use of existing resources and the diversion of transportation funds for other purposes.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Particularly in light of current financial constraints, MTA is evaluating its use of federal, State, and local sources, as well as seeking new revenue sources.</p>
<p>Recommends adding safety to the list of key short-term challenges facing transportation in LA County and provide adequate funding and priority for road and transit safety improvements.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Ray Pearl</i> <i>07/03/2003</i> <i>Executive Officer</i> <i>Building Industry Association of Southern California</i></p>	
<p>Concerned that about the potential introduction of another fee impacting housing construction; urge MTA to abandon any concept that would</p>	<p>Comment noted. MTA will actively seek BIA's participation in nexus study if it is undertaken.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
include the study of a new fee; request that BIA be notified of any and all meetings involving this issue.	
<p><i>Darrell Clarke</i> <i>06/04/2003</i> <i>Co-Chair</i> <i>Friends 4 Expo Transit</i></p> <p>It is critical that MTA’s plans respond sufficiently and as quickly as possible to the enormous mobility challenges we face.</p> <p>The maps on pages 9 and 16 appear to use an arrow to suggest the second segment of Exposition light rail to Santa Monica, a part of the MTA Board’s 2001 decision to proceed with preliminary engineering and final environmental to Venice/Robertson. Clearer would be to use the gray dotted line of the Metro Gold Line to Claremont, from left of the I-405 shield to Santa Monica.</p> <p>Replace the second sentence in the second paragraph on page 17 with the following:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">New funding will be sought to begin construction to Culver City on a timely basis following completion of preliminary engineering, and to begin preliminary engineering and final environmental study of the second segment to Santa Monica, to complete a light rail connection to the Westside through this densely-populated, jobs-rich, severely-congested corridor.</p> <p>And shouldn’t the schedule bar for Exposition labeled “Construction schedule to be determined subject to funding availability” begin upon completion of preliminary engineering in 2005? If construction funding became available, we wouldn’t wait until 2010 to build.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The referenced maps will be corrected and incorporated into the Final SRTP.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Draft SRTP’s discussion of the segment to Culver City is consistent with this suggestion. The Final SRTP will reflect an ultimate alignment for the Exposition light rail transit line to Santa Monica.</p> <p>The schedule for construction is shown beginning in 2010 to indicate that this project is not included as a fully funded project to be operational within the Short Range Transportation Plan period. The construction schedule</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>Page 39’s list of projects along I-10 should add Exposition light rail.</p> <p>An MTA goal to begin purchasing hybrid buses (Local Bus Action Plan, page 13, and Metro Rapid Action Plan, page 15), which offer much-reduced noise and vibration, would significantly increase the attractiveness of MTA’s buses by “choice” riders.</p> <p>The South Bay and Westside Cities sections on page 37 both list “Metrolink locomotive and passenger coach purchases.” Metrolink doesn’t directly serve the Westside or South Bay.</p> <p>However, a goal of Metrolink or DMU (diesel railcar) service along the MTA-owned Harbor Subdivision track between Union Station and LAX could quickly and inexpensively provide an effective connection.</p>	<p>will be updated in future Short Range Transportation Plans once funding have been secured.</p> <p>The Final SRTP will be revised to reflect this project.</p> <p>MTA is exploring the potential to add hybrid and fuel cell buses to its transit bus fleet.</p> <p>These errors will be corrected in the Final SRTP.</p> <p>There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate this recommendation.</p>
<p><i>Dave Crowder</i> <i>07/03/2003</i> <i>Vice President – Planning</i> <i>The Newhall Land and Farming Company</i></p> <p>Commend the staff for pulling together such complex and diverse information into an intelligible form</p> <p>The Draft Short Range Transportation Plan relies too heavily on public transit and infill development presumptions about growth patterns and an extensive transit system that only serves about 5% of the trips made on a daily basis. More funding needs to be flexed toward making improvements to roads (highways and freeways) while exploiting as much benefit as can be extracted from the existing sunk capital in transit infrastructure.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. The SRTP analyzed the benefits of different strategies to determine the optimal mix of transportation options given funding constraints.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>By devising public policy that supports market incentives to build affordable housing and jobs in close proximity and supporting the transportation system needs of these new communities, we can ensure that the residents who occupy these homes are adequately housed and mobile members of our society.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Through the MOBILITY-21 Transportation Coalition, MTA, the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, and other major stakeholders are exploring ways to encourage growth in areas where our transportation infrastructure can better sustain it.</p>
<p>95% of all daily trips are made using the freeway. The STRP places an inordinate amount of focus and capital on projects that yield marginal benefits vs. those that can clearly influence economic growth, facilitate mobility, and promote the region as a vital economic engine.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The SRTP analyzed the benefits of different strategies to determine the optimal mix of transportation options given funding constraints.</p>
<p>The HOV master plan: more priority needs to be given to completing the system, especially along the I-5 and through critical passes and gaps in the system.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>There are numerous problems with the proposed transportation gap fee on new construction.</p>	<p>Comment noted. If a nexus study on such a fee is undertaken, MTA will work with key stakeholder groups, including the Congestion Management Program Policy Advisory Committee and MTA Technical Advisory Committee, to address and resolve concerns raised by Newhall Land and others throughout the process.</p>
<p>Interstate 5 is the backbone of California's transportation system for movement of goods.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The intent of the Freight Strategic Action Plan is to work regional and subregional organizations, and freight industry partners holistically to look at freight issues from a regional perspective. The I-5 is a critical north/south corridor and will be studied.</p>
<p>The SRTP reflects virtually no further planning or engineering to further the results of the North County Combined Highway Corridor Study.</p>	<p>MTA will work with subregional and local agencies to seek additional funding for regionally significant projects</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)		Response
		recommended through the North County Combined Highway Corridor Study.
<i>Comments from Members of the Public</i>		
<i>Alexander Friedman</i>	<i>05/12/2003</i>	
<i>Private Citizen</i>		
Fare changes should be implemented in a different way.		Comment noted. MTA Board adopted fare restructuring on May 22, 2003.
Bus frequency should be increased on lines 212 and 217		Comment will be forwarded to Metro Westside/Central Sector.
Metro Rapid service on bus line 4 should be implemented before 2005		Given current resources, Metro Rapid service is not scheduled for implementation along this corridor prior to 2005.
Plan to implement electric trolleybus lines		Comment noted. There are no plans to implement electric trolleybus technology. However, MTA is exploring zero-emission technologies that utilize fuel cells and/or hybrid-electric technologies.
Increase frequency of Metro Red Line		Comment noted; between Wilshire/Vermont and LA Union Station, Metro Red Line trains operate every five minutes during peak service.
Make MTA bus seats more comfortable		Specifications for future bus purchases will consider passenger comfort.

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)		Response
<p>Numerous comments about the financial and transportation modeling done to support the SRTP.</p>		<p>with similar models used by SCAG for regional transportation planning analyses.</p> <p>MTA’s financial and countywide transportation models are the basis for its planning efforts. As continual refinements to both models occur, staff will consider the technical issues raised for potential incorporation into future modeling analyses and updates of the SRTP.</p>
<p><i>Eden Stewart</i> <i>Private Citizen</i></p>	<p><i>06/25/2003</i></p>	<p>The only reasonable solution [to traffic problems in the Westside of the L.A. area] is the extension of the Red Line Subway westwards from Wilshire & Western, preferably all the way to Santa Monica.</p> <p>There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate this recommendation.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

**RESPONSES TO WEBSITE COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE
DRAFT 2003 SHORT RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

NOTE: The following reflects staff responses to written comments received on the Draft SRTP via MTA’s internet website.

Comment (Main Points)		Response
<i>Comments from Cities</i>		
<p><i>James R. Lewis</i> <i>Assistant to the City Manager</i> <i>Claremont</i></p> <p>05/30/2003</p> <p>Throughout the document Phase II of the Gold Line Project is referred to as “Gold Line Extension Phase I: Sierra Madre Villa to Irwindale.” This is misleading and is not correct. Throughout the period covered by this plan (2003-2009), preliminary design and engineering will be conducted for the entire extension of the Gold Line from Sierra Madre Villa to Claremont.</p> <p>All references to the next stage of the Gold Line Project throughout the entire SRTP should be changed to “Gold Line Extension Phase II: Sierra Madre Villa to Claremont (Preliminary Engineering).” This is the legal scope of the work and correctly reflects the work that will be done during this period.</p>		<p>Comments will be incorporated into Final SRTP.</p> <p>The Final SRTP will reflect preliminary engineering work to Claremont.</p>
<p><i>William Barnett</i> <i>Associate Transportation Planner</i> <i>City of Inglewood</i></p> <p>07/02/2003</p> <p>Use the MTA Harbor Subdivision line (BNSF route) through Inglewood and support extension of Green Line light rail service into LAX.</p>		<p>There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate this recommendation.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)		Response
<p><i>Dana E. Lee</i> <i>07/07/2003</i> <i>Government Relations</i> <i>Long Beach Transit</i></p> <p>On page 8, break out the operating costs for each of the MTA bus categories you show (Metro Bus, Metro Rapid, and Metro Rapid Transitways) and call each category "capital and operating" like you do for the municipal operators. Also, for "Miscellaneous", instead break out "Local Return" and "Debt Service" separately.</p> <p>On page 12, Long Beach Transit already has articulated buses in service in high volume corridors. The MTA should make an additional survey of the municipal operators to ensure that the information in this chart is current and up to date.</p> <p>On page 13, Long Beach Transit already has its entire fleet equipped with automated vehicle locator/global positioning system, automated voice enunciators, interior message signs, and real-time communications between operators and dispatchers.</p> <p>On page 13 ("Local Bus Action Plan"), please add specifics regarding municipal operators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek additional funding sources for transit operations. • Seek additional funding to meet the increasing demands on transit operators serving the sub-regions projected to experience significant growth. <p>On page 25, please reflect that all of Long Beach Transit's fleet is already equipped with AVL/GPS, voice enunciators and internal messages boards for identifying upcoming stops, and improved dispatch/operator radio communications.</p>	<p>The chart reflects costs and allocation of funding assumed within the SRTP and the categories listed are for purposes of identifying key funding items such as Rapid Bus and the Transit Corridors. The Technical Document provides a more disaggregated detailed summary of program costs.</p> <p>Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP. Please note that during the development of the SRTP, MTA staff contacted each of the municipal operators to portray planned service improvements through FY 2009.</p> <p>The SRTP adopts by reference the 2002 Short Range Transit Plan that describes in detail those improvements MTA and the 17 municipal operators will be implementing through 2009.</p> <p>Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP.</p> <p>The SRTP adopts by reference the 2002 Short Range Transit Plan that describes in detail those improvements MTA and the 17 municipal operators will be implementing through 2009.</p>	

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>On page 29 – Metro Parking Policy, Park and Ride lots are important not only to those ridesharing via carpool or vanpool but those using commuter bus service. Recommend changing the following sentences:</p> <p>“For example, commuters often meet at a centralized location, where they park before boarding vanpools and commuter express bus service. The availability of these lots, often near freeways with carpool lanes, is vital to supporting rideshare programs and commuter express bus service.”</p>	<p>Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP.</p>
<p>On page 34, "The Subregions": why is no bus service listed here under any of the subregions?</p>	<p>The extensive regional, municipal, and local bus network system is both described and depicted in a comprehensive manner under the Local Bus Section of the SRTP.</p>
<p>In the SRTP Draft Technical Document, MTA has made a good effort to include municipal operator needs and costs in this document. Next year these financial assumptions regarding the municipal operators should be updated since there have been changes since the LRTP was developed. Further, operating costs have increased greatly with growing workers compensation, health care, fuel and other expenses</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>On page 111, Exhibit 2, this chart needs to be restructured to more accurately reflect uses of funds by MTA Operations, countywide paratransit, municipal operators, LTSS operators, and local cities.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>On page 110, show all sources of revenues for streets, roads and highway projects and programs in charts. This chart is misleading as to the proportion of funds spend each year on transit and highway programs in the county.</p>	<p>The chart is intended to provide a high-level summary of costs and allocation of funding assumed within the SRTP.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)		Response
<p><i>Jaime Becerra</i> <i>06/27/2003</i> <i>Transit Administration Coordinator</i> <i>Norwalk Transportation Department</i></p> <p>Chart titled "Bus Service Improvements By Operator Planned Through 2009", of the Draft Plan, there is a mark for the City of Norwalk indicating that a Clean Fuel Station is planned for the future. This is no longer the case. In January of 2003, Norwalk selected a gasoline/electric hybrid path and is also planning to test diesel/electric hybrid buses.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This will be corrected in the Final SRTP.</p>	
<p><i>Mark Yamarone</i> <i>07/07/2003</i> <i>Capital Planning & Programming Administrator</i> <i>City of Santa Clarita</i></p> <p><u>Technical Document:</u> Page 14 - TDM – Remove the Santa Clarita Bicycle Station, which was deobligated last year. Add the Santa Clara River Regional Commuter Trail, which was funded in 2000 and 2001 Call for Projects.</p> <p>Page 38 - North County I-5 Stakeholder Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add HOV & Truck Lanes on Mainline from SR-14 to SR-126 - Freeway. • Initiate Local Fixed Route Service between Santa Clarita and the San Fernando Valley-Transit <p>Page 50 - Change Cross Valley Connector to High Desert Corridor</p>	<p>Comments will be incorporated into Final SRTP.</p>	

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)		Response
<i>Comments from Public Agencies</i>		
<p><i>Sergeant Vince Lee</i> <i>Freeway Service Patrol Supervisor</i> <i>CHP</i></p> <p align="right">06/03/2003</p> <p>In the first sentence please add the California Highway Patrol to the partnership. CHP plays a major role in making sure the program runs smoothly. The FSP Program is a tri-agency program comprised of MTA, Caltrans and CHP.</p> <p>After the comment “free of charge, to stranded motorists and remove traffic accidents to keep traffic going.” Please clarify that: “Disabled motorist are taken off the freeway to a pre-designated location where they can seek further assistance.” There tends to be a lot of confusion lately after MTA initiated the billboard ads recently. Motorists are under the false assumption that the FSP trucks can take them anywhere they need to go (service stations, repair shops, residence, etc...). The FSP SOP does not allow trucks to take stranded motorists to other than designated drop locations.</p>		<p>Comments will be incorporated into Final SRTP.</p>
<p><i>Sergeant Rob Lund</i> <i>CHP/TMC</i></p> <p align="right">06/05/2003</p> <p>Regarding the Caltrans/CHP Los Angeles Regional Transportation Management Center:</p> <p>Page 26, 1st column, change title from “Management Control Center” to “Transportation Management Center”</p>		<p>Comments will be incorporated into Final SRTP.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>1st paragraph, 2nd sentence should be replaced with, “In partnership with MTA, Caltrans and CHP developed a new, state-of-the-art traffic control center which will do just that for LA County's freeway system.”</p> <p>3rd sentence should replace “Management Control Center” with “Los Angeles Regional Transportation Management Center.”</p> <p>4th sentence should be replaced with, "Through the linkage of loop detectors embedded in freeway pavement and closed circuit television cameras strategically placed throughout LA County's freeway network that utilize a high speed fiber-optic communication network, and a Computer Aided Dispatch system, Caltrans and CHP will improve freeway performance by monitoring freeway traffic in real-time, and assisting with incident management.”</p> <p>5th sentence should be replaced with, “Combining these tools into one management center will reduce traffic delays caused by accidents through the immediate dispatching of incident response teams and recovery equipment, providing the ability to change signal timing on arterials, and alerting motorists to avoid congested areas via traffic advisories.”</p> <p>2nd paragraph, last sentence should replace “Caltrans Management Control Center” with “Caltrans/CHP Transportation Management Center when it is completed.”</p> <p>2nd column, “Transportation” should be added before “Management Center”</p> <p>1st bullet, replace “Management Control Center” with “Traffic Management Center.”</p>	

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)		Response
<p><i>David Reyno</i> <i>06/27/2003</i> <i>Director of Government Relations</i> <i>Foothill Transit</i></p> <p>The SRTP states MTA must work with Caltrans, municipal bus operators, and cities to ensure the Call for Projects addresses our communities' needs. Considering the State budget crisis, it doesn't appear the Call for Projects will have money to fund projects for at least 5 years.</p> <p>Will specific priorities such as commuter parking and the El Monte Station improvements be included somewhere in the Plan?</p> <p>Page 11 – Regarding feeder service, can a better term be used?</p> <p>Page 12 - Addition to the chart for Foothill. We also have Clean Fuel Stations and ITS Enhancements planned by 2009.</p> <p>Page 13 - The beginning of the page finishes the paragraph, "In addition to supporting Metro Rapid corridors and other high volume MTA bus services, this system will also support municipal bus services." How is this being coordinated?</p> <p>Under "Local Bus Action Plan", one of the bullets states, "Seek additional funding to establish new MTA bus operating division". Where will this division be located?</p>	<p>The SRTP Financial Action Plan calls addresses the need for a Countywide consensus and partnerships to ensure existing and future state, federal and local resources are protected and made available to Los Angeles County.</p> <p>The SRTP adopts by reference the 2002 Short Range Transit Plan that describes in detail those improvements MTA and the 17 municipal operators will be implementing through 2009.</p> <p>While the term is informal, the benefits of bus feeder service to regional transit facilities is crucial to providing seamless travels as the region's regional bus and rail networks expand.</p> <p>Comment will be incorporated into Final SRTP.</p> <p>MTA will continue to coordinate the implementation of the Bus Signal Priority Pilot Service through the Bus Operators Subcommittee to explore municipal operator signal priority.</p> <p>MTA is in the process of identifying potential land parcels for a new bus division in the Downtown Los Angeles area in conjunction with the Mid City/Westside Corridor Study.</p>	

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)		Response
<p>Between the El Monte Station and the SR-57 freeway, what are the plans for carpool lanes to be built on this stretch of the I-10?</p>		<p>As denoted on the highway project priorities schedule on page 23, a construction schedule for this carpool lane segment will be developed when availability of funding is better identified.</p>
<p>Will this plan be subject to an annual review by the MTA Board? Will a list of specific projects planned be necessary and if a project is not included, will it not be funded?</p>		<p>The 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan is a near-term action plan outlining funding priorities through 2009 that will be evaluated by the MTA Board annually. The Plan is intended to advance the long-term goals outlined in the MTA 2001 Long Range Transportation Plan, a 25-year plan for addressing growth and traffic in Los Angeles County.</p>
<i>Comments from Organizations</i>		
<p><i>Kenneth S. Alpern, M.D.</i> <i>Co-Chair</i> <i>Friends of the Green Line</i></p>	<p><i>07/02/2003</i></p>	<p>MTA will continue to work with the City of Los Angeles and other stakeholders to facilitate improved transit connections between LAX and the Metro Green Line. There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate these recommendations.</p>
<p><i>James Fujita</i> <i>Private Citizen</i></p>	<p><i>07/02/2003</i></p>	
<p>Supports inclusion of the Lincoln Blvd. Corridor between LAX and Santa Monica as a potential rail corridor. Inclusion of the MTA Harbor Subdivision rail line to establish passenger rail service between Downtown L.A. and LAX. Extension of the Metro Green Line to Westchester. Extension of the Metro Green Line to the South Bay Galleria. Extension of the Metro Green Line to the Norwalk Amtrak/ Metrolink Transportation Center.</p>		

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)		Response
<p><i>Victor Lindenheim</i> <i>Executive Director</i> <i>Golden State Gateway Coalition</i></p> <p align="right">07/07/2003</p> <p>Supports MTA and Caltrans requests for adding one HOV lane and one truck lane to the I-5 segment between the SR-14 and SR-126 interchanges. We encourage the MTA to maintain and continue to pursue this project as a transportation priority for Los Angeles County.</p>		<p>Comment noted. There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate these recommendations.</p>
<p><i>Claire Bowin</i> <i>Livable Places</i> <i>Project Manager</i></p> <p align="right">07/01/2003</p> <p>Urges the board to continue to move forward to secure funding for the Exposition Light Rail Line.</p>		<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Roberto Velazquez-Woo</i> <i>Metro Silver Line</i></p> <p align="right">07/07/2003</p> <p>Study the Metro Silver Line project and ultimately include it in its Short Range Transportation Plan. This project does have significant local support and is finally being addressed by community leaders.</p>		<p>Comment noted. There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate this recommendation.</p>
<i>Comments from Members of the Public</i>		
<p><i>Anonymous</i> <i>Private Citizen</i></p> <p align="right">06/16/2003</p> <p>I would like to know the future plan on extending the Metro Gold Line to Claremont. I live in San Dimas and I would like to commute to LA other than the Metrolink at times.</p>		<p>MTA is committed to funding \$10 million for preliminary engineering for a Metro Gold Line Extension from Sierra Madre Villa to Claremont. Construction schedules cannot be determined at this time due to State budget funding shortfall, and will be determined subject to funding availability.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)		Response
<p><i>Anonymous</i> <i>06/22/2003</i> <i>Private Citizen</i></p> <p>How soon will be the next phase to the Eastside begin, since funding I believe is available?</p>		<p>Construction on the Metro Gold Line Eastside extension is anticipated to begin in early 2004. Operation is scheduled for FY 2009.</p>
<p><i>Ray Bianco</i> <i>05/06/2003 and 07/02/2003</i> <i>Private Citizen</i></p> <p>Amtrak and Metrolink service from LAX eastward via BNSF to the future site of the intermodal transit center should be a top short-term service priority.</p> <p>Running limited stop commuter coach buses from LAX up and down I-405 corridor to distribute/feed passengers should be a priority.</p> <p>The current MTA bus routes, running east-west and north- south along major boulevards is too complicated to figure out. It's also too downtown centric. Few riders take the bus from Whittier all the way to Santa Monica. The signs on the front of the Metro Rapid buses that read "720 Whittier" are irrelevant to most passengers.</p> <p>Run more Express or Very Limited Stop service such as: (1) Museum Loop – Run buses from urban villages such as Third Street and Westwood directly to the Getty or LACMA and other attractions. (2) Urban Village Loop – Interconnect revitalized downtown areas such as Third Street, Westwood, Beverly Hills, and West Hollywood. Develop lines that will offer the promise of depositing passengers where their cars</p>		<p>There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate these recommendations.</p> <p>Los Angeles World Airports is exploring expanding its Fly-Away Program.</p> <p>MTA will consider a comprehensive plan to streamline and simplify transit information. Elements of this plan include a unified visual appearance to all MTA services and supporting materials and enhanced route and connection information at bus stops. In addition, improvements to local bus service through restructuring to a hub-and-spoke service concept will improve access to key destinations.</p> <p>The implementation of Metro Rapid service increases MTA’s provision of express bus service on the highest demand corridors throughout Los Angeles County. In addition, improvements to local bus service through restructuring to a hub-and-spoke service concept will improve access to key destinations.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
<p>would put them, right in the middle of the action. (3)Provide tourists with a pass that provides convenient services and limited, seamless transfers.</p> <p>Initiate Express Commuter Coach Services to the Westside from Orange County, South Bay and the Valley. Set up park and ride lots.</p> <p>Construct a bus terminal in WESTWOOD at 405/Wilshire. Use these terminals as a focal point for all Westside Bus Service. Use this same facility as a terminus for the subway and future heavy rail connections through a Sepulveda Tunnel.</p> <p>The Plan mentions Expo to Culver City but not to Santa Monica. Expo to Santa Monica is essential. No light rail to Irwindale until light rail reaches Santa Monica.</p> <p>Subway To Westwood – Essential. Heavy Rail along & under I-405 from Van Nuys Metrolink to LAX. Put this heavy rail tunnel in the planning stages.</p> <p>Inclusion of the MTA Harbor Subdivision rail line to establish (Metrolink and Surfliner/Heavy rail) passenger rail service between points North, East and South and LAX. Extension of the Metro Green Line to the Norwalk Amtrak/Metrolink Transportation Center. Inclusion of the corridor between LAX and Santa Monica as a potential rail corridor.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate this recommendation.</p> <p>The Final SRTP will reflect a proposed ultimate terminus for the Expo Line in Santa Monica. Preliminary engineering funding is available for both the Gold Line extension and the Expo Line.</p> <p>There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate these recommendations.</p> <p>There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate these recommendations.</p>
<p><i>Peter Capone-Newton</i> <i>06/29/2003</i> <i>Private Citizen</i></p> <p>Supports connecting the Green Line to LAX in the SRTP.</p>	<p>MTA will continue to work with the City of Los Angeles</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
Supports a direct connection between Union Station and LAX.	and other stakeholders to facilitate improved transit connections between LAX and the Metro Green Line. There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate these recommendations.
<p><i>Martin Culjat</i> <i>05/06/2003</i> <i>Private Citizen</i></p> <p>Regarding the MTA Short Range Transportation Plan, more of an emphasis should be placed on rail transit.</p> <p>Metro Green Line needs to connect to the Metrolink system in Norwalk and extend through the LAX area to Westchester.</p> <p>Additional Metrolink service connecting Union Station and LAX should be implemented as soon as the LAX reconfiguration issue is resolved.</p> <p>I support MTA efforts to fund the San Fernando Busway, the Eastside Gold Line, and studies of the Exposition and Irwindale lines.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Plan earmarks significant resources to expanding and maintaining the rail system.</p> <p>MTA will continue to work with the City of Los Angeles and other stakeholders to facilitate improved transit connections between LAX and the Metro Green Line.</p> <p>There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate this recommendation.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Phyllis Elliott</i> <i>07/01/2003</i> <i>Private Citizen</i></p> <p>Extensions of the Green Line to serve Westchester, the South Bay Galleria, and the Amtrak station in Norwalk. Rail service between LAX and Santa Monica on the Lincoln Blvd. corridor, and between LAX and downtown L.A. Study of options for the Sepulveda corridor.</p> <p>Funding for Exposition Light Rail to Santa Monica. Development of Red Line stations to include rest rooms.</p>	<p>There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate these recommendations</p> <p>Comment noted. The Final SRTP will identify an ultimate terminus for the Exposition Line in Santa Monica, pending funding availability.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)		Response
<p><i>Art Gonzalez</i> <i>Private Citizen</i></p> <p align="right">07/07/2003</p> <p>Supports Green Line extension to LAX, then proceeding to Westchester/Venice down Lincoln corridor.</p> <p>Supports an Eastside Gold Line extension phase 2 along the 60 freeway to La Puente/Hacienda Heights. A light rail line running from El Monte to Silver Lake. Red line extension along El Monte Busway.</p> <p>Supports Expo Line all the way to Santa Monica WITHOUT the diversion route</p> <p>Supports a large tax initiative to begin a large extension project including extending the Red Line along the valley transitway, a revised eastside line to Whittier/Norwalk, Wilshire Blvd to Santa Monica, Crenshaw elevated line, and Red Line extension to El Monte.</p>	<p>MTA will continue to work with the City of Los Angeles and other stakeholders to facilitate improved transit connections between LAX and the Metro Green Line. There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate this recommendation.</p> <p>There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate this recommendation.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Short Range Transportation Plan reflects the Exposition Light Rail Transit alignment as approved by MTA Board.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>	
<p><i>Richard Gordon</i> <i>Private Citizen</i></p> <p align="right">07/07/2003</p> <p>Supports extension of the Green Line to South Bay Galleria. Extension of the Green Line to LAX or, at least, closer to LAX via a possible extension via Lincoln Blvd. Extension of the Green Line to Norwalk Metrolink. Possible Metrolink service to the South Bay region.</p>	<p>MTA will continue to work with the City of Los Angeles and other stakeholders to facilitate improved transit connections between LAX and the Metro Green Line. There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate these recommendations.</p>	

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)		Response
<p><i>Ian Halsema</i> <i>07/01/2003</i> <i>Private Citizen</i></p> <p>Supports extensions of the Green Line: The Lincoln Blvd corridor from LAX to Santa Monica. The MTA Harbor Subdivision rail line to provide passenger service between downtown and LAX. Extension of the Green Line to Westchester. Extension of the Green Line to the South Bay Galleria.</p>		<p>MTA will continue to work with the City of Los Angeles and other stakeholders to facilitate improved transit connections between LAX and the Metro Green Line. There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate these recommendations.</p>
<p><i>Matthew Hetz</i> <i>06/21/2003</i> <i>Private Citizen</i></p> <p>The Metro Green Line needs to be extended to the airport, in order to make this useful for airport passengers. The current configuration in shuttling riders is awkward. While a route directly into LAX may not be feasible, at least try to run it to Parking Lot C / Airport Transit Center, so riders can make connections to other busses, and a connection to the airport shuttle.</p> <p>The Metro Green Line should also continue north up Lincoln Blvd. and/ or Sepulveda Blvd. There is an old freight rail line along the 405 Freeway, that passes under La Tijera Blvd., continues near the Howard Hughes Center as it parallels Centinela Ave., and then continue northwest. A Green Line extension could use this right-of-way to continue north and serve the Sepulveda corridor up to Westwood/UCLA, and possibly into the Valley. It could also serve the Marina/Venice/ Santa Monica areas.</p> <p>With the 561 cancelled from Westwood to the Green Line, the Culver No. 6, will absorb those 561 riders, and at times the route is very heavily</p>		<p>MTA will continue to work with the City of Los Angeles and other stakeholders to facilitate improved transit connections between LAX and the Metro Green Line.</p> <p>There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate this recommendation.</p> <p>MTA will continue to work with local and municipal transit operators to address service needs, such as this.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
used. Funding should become available to Culver City Bus to alleviate this problem.	This comment will also be forwarded to MTA's Westside/Central Area Service Sector.
<p><i>Robert Leabow</i> <i>07/07/2003</i> <i>Private Citizen</i></p> <p>Supports extending the Green Line to LAX and Westchester using the MTA ROW and property. This would also allow for further expansion North, like on the Lincoln Corridor or even I-405. Utilize your MTA Harbor Subdivision ROW for express rail service between LAX and Union Station (Could extend the Red Line from Union Station or tie in with Metrolink, maybe using DMUs.) Provide sound barriers for all light rail and bus stations that are adjacent to freeway traffic. Create a Master Transportation plan that includes Rail, Bus and Highways regardless of the current limiting laws.</p>	<p>MTA will continue to work with the City of Los Angeles and other stakeholders to facilitate improved transit connections between LAX and the Metro Green Line. There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate this recommendation.</p>
<p><i>Gregory Mantell</i> <i>06/24/2003</i> <i>Private Citizen</i></p> <p>Please help bring LA into the league of world-class cities and extend our light rail and subways to the LAX and Burbank.</p> <p>The Pasadena Gold Line or Eastside Light Rail should eventually connect to Ontario.</p> <p>You will never have an effective, highly-used mass transit system until it reaches the Westside via the Expo Light rail line, which must be built all the way to Santa Monica and until the Wilshire subway is extended all the way to the ocean.</p>	<p>MTA will continue to work with stakeholders to facilitate improved transit connections between LAX and the Burbank.</p> <p>There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate this recommendation, though preliminary engineering for a Gold Line extension to Claremont is proposed by 2009.</p> <p>The Final SRTP will reflect an ultimate terminus for the Exposition LRT in Santa Monica.</p>

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)		Response
<p><i>Annette Mercer</i> <i>Private Citizen</i></p> <p align="right">07/01/2003</p> <p>Supports inclusion of the Lincoln Blvd. Corridor between LAX and Santa Monica as a potential rail corridor. Inclusion of the MTA Harbor Subdivision rail line to establish passenger rail service between Downtown L.A. and LAX.</p> <p>Building the Exposition line from Downtown L.A. to Santa Monica.</p> <p>More funding for bikeways - including the one along the Exposition right of way.</p>	<p>MTA will continue to work with the City of Los Angeles and other stakeholders to facilitate improved transit connections between LAX and the Metro Green Line. There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate these recommendations.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Final SRTP will identify an ultimate terminus for the Exposition Line in Santa Monica, pending funding availability.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>	
<p><i>Andre Morimoto</i> <i>Private Citizen</i></p> <p align="right">07/02/2003</p> <p>Support 5 year 1/2 cent transportation tax provided it facilitates the building of these projects:</p> <p>A Green Line extension to Westchester via LAX w/a simultaneous extension further south into the So. Bay preferably the So. Bay Gallerias. Designation of the Lincoln Blvd. corridor as a rail corridor for further extension of the Expo and/or Green Line to connect with one another. MTA Harbor Subdivision rail line to establish passenger rail service between LAX and Downtown L.A. A Green Line extension eastward to the Norwalk Metrolink station. Commence studies and EIRs for rail (monorail, heavy rail, LRT), for the 405 Freeway. Commence EIR for rail service on the 101 Freeway spanning the West Valley-North Hollywood.</p>	<p>MTA will continue to work with the City of Los Angeles and other stakeholders to facilitate improved transit connections between LAX and the Metro Green Line. However, there are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate these recommendations.</p>	

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
Vote the repeal on the ban of subway construction and/or commence studies on either above ground or subway from Wilshire/Western Red Line station to Westwood via Century City and seek alternative funding.	Comment noted.
<i>Nomen Nescio</i> 06/07/2003 <i>Anonymous</i> 06/07/2003 <i>Anonymous</i> 06/07/2003 <i>Anonymous</i> 06/07/2003 <i>starwars</i> 06/07/2003 <i>lcs Mixmaster Remailer</i> 06/07/2003 <i>Marla Pelz</i> 06/07/2003 <i>Anonymous</i> 06/08/2003 <i>Susan Kolkowicz</i> 06/08/2003 <i>Diyamante Garber-Townsend</i> 06/10/2003 <i>Anonymous</i> 06/11/2003 <i>Julie Mirblouk</i> 06/17/2003 <i>Martin Zajac</i> 06/17/2003 <i>Private Citizens</i>	
Do not want the Exposition Light Rail going through Cheviot Hills. Support the alternate route that the MTA Board of Directors voted on that had the light rail on Venice to Sepulveda.	The Short Range Transportation Plan reflects the Exposition Light Rail Transit alignment as approved by MTA Board.
<i>Roger Rudick</i> 07/01/2003 <i>Private Citizen</i>	
MTA-owned Harbor Subdivision is not on the SRTP for future passenger use. It would offer a direct link between downtown and LAX.	There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate this recommendation.
<i>J. Salazar</i> 07/07/2003 <i>Private Citizen</i>	
Supports an elevated rail line that goes from Hollywood Bowl to	Comment noted. There are neither plans nor funding

Attachment C: Responses to Written Comment Received on the Draft 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan

Comment (Main Points)	Response
Hollywood/Highland and then down Sunset to Crescent Heights, then down Crescent Heights to Santa Monica Blvd, then underground down Santa Monica Blvd to San Vicente, then elevated again down San Vicente to Beverly Center. Support a study for the purple line.	available through FY 2009 to accommodate this recommendation.
<i>Andrew Shaddock</i> <i>06/20/2003</i> <i>Private Citizen</i>	
I cannot find any reference in the Short Range Transportation Plan to use of the Harbor Subdivision right-of-way from the South Bay/LAX towards Union Station. I advocate for better system connectivity between LAX and Downtown LA.	There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate this recommendation.
<i>Jacki Weber</i> <i>07/01/2003</i> <i>Private Citizen</i>	
Supports inclusion of the MTA Harbor Subdivision rail line to establish passenger rail service between Downtown L.A. and LAX .	MTA will continue to work with the City of Los Angeles and other stakeholders to facilitate improved transit connections between LAX and the Metro Green Line.
Supports inclusion of the Lincoln Blvd. Corridor between LAX and Santa Monica as a potential rail corridor. Extension of the Metro Green Line to Westchester. Extension of the Metro Green Line to the South Bay Galleria. Extension of the Metro Green Line to the Norwalk Amtrak/Metrolink Transportation Center.	There are neither plans nor funding available through FY 2009 to accommodate these recommendations.