

## 7. Public and Agency Outreach

---

Metro initiated a comprehensive outreach program for the Proposed Project. The outreach program focused on increasing awareness and education, disseminating information, garnering public input, and supporting the technical and legal environmental processes. To encourage the submittal of comments during the Public Scoping period, legal advertisement notices were published in ten newspapers and 178,198 notices were mailed to occupants, property and business owners located within 500 feet of the route and route options or within 0.25 mile of proposed stations. Metro received 2,584 comments during the Public Scoping period. All Public Scoping comments are available in their entirety in **Appendix V**. Comments were received through the following methods: the Proposed Project website; a special Proposed Project email address and telephone number; U.S. Mail; Metro social media and blogs; or by submitting a written or oral comment at the five Public Scoping Meetings and one Community Open House meeting. During the Public Scoping period, comments were also received through a set of transit rider intercept surveys conducted at major transit stops along the BRT Corridor. This section summarizes both the Public Scoping efforts and comments received during the 60-day Public Scoping Period. Metro extended the original 45-day Public Scoping Period by 15 days to ensure all stakeholders had sufficient time to submit comments between June 17, 2019 and August 15, 2019.

Additional community engagement activities were implemented after the Public Scoping process that included sharing information at key community events, presenting at community group meetings and hosting a round of community workshops where participants provided feedback on amenities and features of the proposed Bus Rapid Transit project through facilitated activities. Appendix V provides a full report of the community workshops, participants and comments received.

### 7.1 SCOPING PROCESS

The scoping process included the following activities:

- Filing the NOP with the County Clerk/Recorder of Los Angeles County and with the State Clearinghouse Office of Planning and Research to formally initiate the CEQA process.
- Placing NOP notices in newspapers for public circulation.
- Mailing the NOP to potentially affected government agencies, Native American tribes, residents, and businesses to advise them of Project initiation and to invite participation in scoping meetings.
- Holding meetings with potentially affected and/or interested parties in the Project Area.
- Recording comments that were received during and after the scoping meetings.

The comments and questions received during the Public Scoping process were reviewed and considered by Metro and were used in determining the appropriate scope of issues to be addressed in the Draft EIR. The comments are part of the public record for the Proposed Project.

## 7.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

In accordance with Metro’s Public Participation Plan, targeted community outreach efforts were completed in various cities throughout the study area to ensure participation of Limited English Proficiency (LEP), Environmental Justice (EJ), and Equity Focused Communities (EFC). Information booths were staffed at various community events shown in **Table 7-1** by bilingual personnel to share and elicit feedback from LEP individuals as well as to broaden the dialogue with the general public.

**Table 7-1 - Pop-Up Events**

Event	Date
North Hollywood Food Truck Collective	Thursday, June 27, 2019
North Hollywood Summer Nights	Saturday, June 29, 2019
Eagle Rock Annual Concerts in the Park and Fireworks	Sunday, June 30, 2019

**SOURCE:** Metro, *Public Scoping Summary Report*, 2020.

## 7.3 GOVERNMENT AND OTHER AGENCY CONSULTATION

Per CEQA requirements, Metro notified federal, State, county, city agencies and Native American tribes within the Project Area, including responsible agencies, public agencies that have legal jurisdiction with respect to the Proposed Project, and other organizations or individuals that requested notice. Additionally, a copy of the NOP was filed with the Los Angeles County Clerk and State Clearinghouse.

Prior to the initiation of the five Public Scoping Meetings, a meeting with the Technical Working Group (TWG), which includes city and agency members from cities along the corridor, was held on July 9, 2019, at Metro Headquarters. The purpose of the meeting was to provide the cities and agencies with an update and to inform them of the scoping period and upcoming meetings. During the meeting, staff shared information and materials similar to the Public Scoping Meetings. The agencies included:

- Caltrans
- City of Burbank
- City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation
- City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning
- City of Pasadena
- City of Glendale
- Foothill Transit

- Metrolink (Southern California Regional Rail Authority)
- Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority

As shown in **Table 7-2**, a total of eight agencies submitted comments during the 60-day comment period.

**Table 7-2 - Agency Comments**

No.	Agency	Date Submitted
1.	City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering	July 8, 2019
2.	South Coast Air Quality Management District	July 9, 2019
3.	California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 7	July 17, 2019
4.	Southern California Regional Rail Authority (Metrolink)	July 25, 2019
5.	City of Pasadena	July 26, 2019
6.	City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning	August 12, 2019
7.	City of Burbank	August 12, 2019
8.	City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation	August 13, 2019

**SOURCE:** Metro, *Public Scoping Summary Report*, 2020.

## 7.4 TRIBAL COORDINATION

In accordance with AB 52, Metro notified and consulted with Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the Proposed Project. Consultation with an affiliated tribe is required within 30 days of receiving a request for consultation. Metro consulted with Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation and Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians. Further discussion of the tribal consultation process is provided in Section 3.11, Tribal Cultural Resources.

## 7.5 COMMUNITY OUTREACH

### 7.5.1 Community Notification Methods

To maximize public awareness, a variety of noticing methods were implemented in advance of the Public Scoping Meetings. These included:

- Mailing bi-lingual (English/Spanish) notices;
- Distributing multi-lingual (English/Armenian/Tagalog/Spanish) electronic noticing to the Proposed Project database of contacts;
- Distributing flyers door-to-door within the community of Eagle Rock;
- Purchasing geo-targeted social media advertisements on Facebook;

- Posting meeting information at the Eagle Rock Plaza mall – where the Eagle Rock scoping meeting was held.
- Posting meeting information on Nextdoor within Eagle Rock and Highland Park;
- Sharing Proposed Project information and scoping meeting flyers at various community events, via staffed information booths;
- Presenting to various community groups, business groups, councils of governments, elected officials, and neighborhood councils throughout the Project Area;
- Reaching transit-riders at key transit stations in North Hollywood, Burbank, Eagle Rock, Highland Park and Pasadena; and
- Placing paid media advertisements and earned media through organic publicly gained media, including stories from local blogs, print, and online newspapers advertising the meetings.

All forms of noticing provided meeting details (dates, times, locations, and in-language services) as well as contact information for accessing additional details. Additionally, each notice provided information on the public comment period deadline and the various ways the public could submit comments for consideration in the Draft EIR.

All meeting notices were produced in English and Spanish, with a request to provide meeting flyers in Tagalog for distribution within the Eagle Rock community. Notices were mailed to a total of 178,198 property owners, business owners, and non-owner-occupied residents, located within 500 feet from each of the alignment alternatives and 0.25 mile from each proposed station. Notification efforts also included communicating via email with over 5,000 interested contacts in the Proposed Project database that included contact names, organizations (if any), mailing addresses, email addresses and also included contact information for all federal, State and local elected offices and city staff within the Project Area.

### 7.5.2 Notice of Preparation

The first step in the Draft EIR or scoping process was the filing of an NOP. The NOP was filed with both the Los Angeles County Clerk and State Clearinghouse on June 17, 2019. The NOP was mailed to responsible agencies (the four cities along the corridor and Caltrans) and members of the public to transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 60 days of receipt of the NOP from the lead agency. As the Lead Agency for the Proposed Project, Metro is responsible for preparing an EIR.

## 7.6 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS

Metro conducted one TWG Meeting; five Public Scoping Meetings in North Hollywood, Burbank, Glendale, Eagle Rock and Pasadena; and one Community Open House Meeting in Eagle Rock during the extended 60-day scoping period. These meetings were held in each of the five communities of the proposed project area with an additional meeting added at Occidental

College in Eagle Rock, to provide an additional forum to accommodate a larger volume of community members within this community. The additional scoping meeting allowed an opportunity for one-on-one dialogue with the project team and included various options to provide public comment. Notification of the meetings was conducted in compliance with CEQA Guidelines. Representatives that attended public scoping meetings from government agencies, elected officials, and special districts are shown in **Table 7-3**. A total of 818 people attended the Public Scoping Meetings and Community Open House Meeting in July and August 2019. A total of 792 comments were received during the public scoping meetings. **Table 7-4** provides the number of participants and comments submitted at each meeting.

**Table 7-3 - Government Agencies, Elected Officials, and Special Districts Represented at Public Scoping Meetings**

Meeting	Stakeholder Organization
Public Scoping Meeting #1 – North Hollywood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Los Angeles Council District 2 - Paul Krekorian</li> <li>• Los Angeles Council District 4 - David E. Ryu</li> <li>• City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning</li> </ul>
Public Scoping Meeting #2 – Pasadena	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Office of Los Angeles County Supervisor Kathryn Barger 5<sup>th</sup> District</li> <li>• Pasadena Department of Transportation</li> <li>• Los Angeles Council District 2 – Paul Krekorian</li> </ul>
Public Scoping Meeting #3 – Eagle Rock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Los Angeles County Supervisor Hilda Solis 1<sup>st</sup> District</li> <li>• Los Angeles City Mayor’s Office Eric Garcetti</li> <li>• Los Angeles Council District 14 - Jose Huizar</li> <li>• Los Angeles Council District 2 – Paul Krekorian</li> <li>• Los Angeles Unified School District</li> </ul>
Public Scoping Meeting #4 – Burbank	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Burbank Mayor Emily Gabel-Luddy</li> <li>• Burbank Councilmember Sharon Springer</li> <li>• Office of Los Angeles County Supervisor Kathryn Barger 5<sup>th</sup> District</li> <li>• Office of Senator Bob Hertzberg 18<sup>th</sup> Senate District</li> <li>• Office of Senator Anthony Portantino 25<sup>th</sup> Senate District</li> <li>• City of Burbank</li> <li>• Los Angeles Council District 2 – Paul Krekorian</li> <li>• Burbank Transportation Commission</li> <li>• City of Burbank Planning</li> </ul>
Public Scoping Meeting #5 – Glendale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Glendale City Mayor and Metro Board member Ara Najarian</li> <li>• Los Angeles County Supervisor Kathryn Barger 5<sup>th</sup> District</li> <li>• Office of Assemblymember Laura Friedman 43<sup>rd</sup> State Assembly District</li> <li>• City of Glendale Planning</li> <li>• City of Glendale Public Works</li> <li>• Los Angeles Council District 2- Paul Krekorian</li> </ul>
Community Open House Meeting #6 – Eagle Rock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Los Angeles County Supervisor Hilda Solis First District</li> <li>• Assemblymember Wendy Carrillo 51<sup>st</sup> State Assembly District</li> <li>• Glendale City Mayor and Metro Board member Ara Najarian</li> <li>• Los Angeles City Mayor Eric Garcetti</li> <li>• Los Angeles Council District 14 - Jose Huizar</li> </ul>

**SOURCE:** Metro, *Public Scoping Summary Report*, 2020.

**Table 7-4 - Public Participation by Meeting**

Meeting	Date	No. of Attendees	No. of Comments
Public Scoping Meeting #1 North Hollywood	Tuesday, July 9, 2019	51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speakers: 18</li> <li>• Written Comments: 19</li> </ul>
Public Scoping Meeting #2 Pasadena	Wednesday, July 10, 2019	80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speakers: 29</li> <li>• Written Comments: 26</li> </ul>
Public Scoping Meeting #3 Eagle Rock	Saturday, July 13, 2019	226	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speakers: 91</li> <li>• Written Comments: 217</li> </ul>
Public Scoping Meeting #4 Burbank	Monday, July 15, 2019	90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speakers: 22</li> <li>• Written Comments: 30</li> </ul>
Public Scoping Meeting #5 Glendale	Wednesday, July 17, 2019	84	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speakers: 29</li> <li>• Written Comments: 23</li> </ul>
Community Open House Meeting #6 Eagle Rock	Wednesday, August 7, 2019	287	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oral Comments: 66</li> <li>• Written Comments: 222</li> </ul>
<b>Total</b>		<b>818</b>	<b>792</b>

**SOURCE:** Metro, *Public Scoping Summary Report*, 2020.

## 7.7 ACCOMMODATIONS FOR MINORITY, LOW-INCOME, AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

During the Public Scoping process, LEP accommodations were made in order to expand access for participants. Bi-lingual scoping notices were developed and distributed through several different methods, including mail delivery, email, and geo-targeted social media. Meetings were held in facilities that accommodated Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and that were easily accessible via public transit.

Materials were developed in English, Spanish, Armenian, and Tagalog, and translation request forms were made available at each of the five Public Scoping Meetings and the one Community Open House Meeting to ensure all language needs were met. Additionally, scoping meeting notices included the Metro LEP phone number, which gives stakeholders the ability to make Metro aware of any language or ADA accommodations required for attendance at any of the Public Scoping Meetings. A Spanish-language interpreter with simultaneous interpretation equipment was present at each of the five Public Scoping Meetings and the Community Open House Meeting held during the scoping period. An Armenian-language interpreter with simultaneous interpretation equipment was present at the Glendale meeting and a Tagalog-language interpreter with simultaneous interpretation equipment was present at the Eagle Rock meetings, given the demographics suggesting the need for these services.

## 7.8 SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS

Metro received a total of 2,584 comments during the Public Scoping Period, which are summarized below. Public comments were received through seven primary means including: 255 oral comments; 1,023 received electronically through email or website comment form; five through U.S. Mail; 537 through written comments submitted at scoping and open house meetings; 580 received electronically through Metro's Facebook posts, advertisements and blogs; 154 comments from transit stop intercept surveys; and 30 transcribed comments received on the Proposed Project telephone line. The following provides a breakdown of comments received by source, environmental concerns raised, and agency/elected offices comments.

### 7.8.1 Agency Comments

#### City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering

- Recommendations to consider historic properties along the corridor when developing the Draft EIR.

#### South Coast Air Quality Management District

- Recommendations to consider alternatives and use mitigation measures beyond what is required by law during construction and operation if the Proposed Project generates significant adverse air quality impacts.

#### Caltrans – District 7

- The primary street-running alignment will help Caltrans meet its statewide goals, will achieve the highest ridership, greatest mode-shift, and highest connectivity to activity centers, and will improve mobility.
- Recommendations to study freeway weaving, merging and number of buses added during peak hour for the segments on the SR-134 freeway.
- No significant impacts anticipated for either the primary street-running alignment or freeway-running alignment.

#### Metrolink

- Recommendations to include an emphasis on connections to the regional rail network, particularly Metrolink in Downtown Burbank.
- Recommendations to examine pedestrian connections, safety, and access to stations and transfers to other modes of travel and public transit.

### City of Pasadena

- Supports mixed-flow BRT configurations in the Pasadena street network.
- Recommendations to ensure that the Proposed Project takes into consideration the City's long-range plans when developing the study. Recommendations to include the following evaluations and assessments in the study: vehicular travel time, impacts on parking demand and supply, redistribution of vehicular trips and other transit services, station design, amenities and wayfinding, first/last mile plans, construction and operational impacts, roadway maintenance, monitoring and reporting of buses, emergency response, and hazardous materials.

### City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning

- The Los Angeles Department of City Planning is currently developing a Transportation Neighborhood Plan along three G Line (Orange) Stations, including North Hollywood, that would encourage higher densities and land use intensities within a half-mile of transit stations and stops.
- Recommendations to encourage transit ridership for working class and moderate-income individuals.
- Recommendations to develop incentives to foster multi-family housing developers and commercial developers to provide transit benefits to employees and residents.
- Recommendations to evaluate the gradual development and improvement of BRT stations and related infrastructure within a facilities/assets master plan, including impacts on traffic flow, and first/last mile potential.

### City of Burbank

- Recommendations to include the following evaluations and assessments in the study: biological resources, land use, employment centers, station locations, ridership projections, noise impacts, impacts of police protection and services, existing Burbank transportation impacts, existing Burbank transportation and community plans, and utilities and service system impacts.

## 7.8.2 Stakeholder Comments

### California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

- Cited a Los Angeles Times article regarding reducing smog. Consider incentives to encourage drivers to take public transit and include first/last mile elements in the study. The street-running alignment will be more accessible and more environmentally friendly than the freeway-running alignment.



### Eagle Rock Chamber of Commerce

- The Eagle Rock Chamber would like to retract a letter written in 2016 to Metro regarding the Proposed Project. The Chamber supports the study of a route along Colorado Boulevard in mixed-flow traffic and the SR-134 freeway alignment.

### Investing in Place

- Supports BRT service on dedicated bus lanes, including on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. Consider the following priorities for the Proposed Project: faster and more efficient transit service, resources and assistance to protect residents and businesses from displacement, accessible and comfortable transit stops, first/last mile connections, streetscape improvements, maintain as much of the Colorado Boulevard medians as possible, consider station at Caspar Avenue, include a parking study, and provide mitigation measures for cut-through traffic on adjacent and parallel streets. Consider the City of Los Angeles' Mobility Element with this study and determine whether a Level of Service or Vehicle Miles Traveled metric will meet the adopted goals of the City of Los Angeles and Metro.

### Los Angeles River Communities for Environmental Equity

- Supports the street-running alignment on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock. Recommendations to improve pedestrian safety and access.

### North Hollywood Business Improvement District

- Supports the Proposed Project that utilizes Vineland/Chandler to connect to the Metro B/G Line (Red/Orange).

### Old Pasadena Management District

- Recommendations to include stops on Union and Green with stations on Arroyo Parkway. Consider the historic streetscape and architecture of Old Pasadena in the study.

### The Eagle Rock Association

- Supports BRT for a better connected, accessible, small business friendly, landscaped and sustainable, enhanced Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock.
- Ensure Metro complies with Take Back The Boulevard Colorado Vision Plan

### Sierra Club

- Supports a street-running alignment on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock and a street alignment in Glendale. Consider landscaping and trees in the design.

UCLA Institute of Transportation Studies

- Expresses disagreement with the use of a Los Angeles Times article citing individuals against BRT.

### 7.8.3 Community Comments

North Hollywood

- *Lankershim Route Option vs Chandler-Vineland Route Option:* Although some stakeholders expressed a preference for the Lankershim route option, more stakeholders expressed a preference for the Chandler-Vineland route option, which many identified as having a lot of space and strong potential to be a high quality corridor for transit and pedestrians.

Burbank

- *Olive Route Option:* Some community members expressed concerns with the use of Olive and the potential associated negative effects on traffic and parking with dedicated bus lanes; some comments expressed the need to study an alternative to Olive; however, the majority of the comments received for Burbank were in support of the Proposed Project on Olive, with many mentioning the benefit of a high quality transit connection to Olive's activity centers.
- Additionally, some community members wanted to preserve parking and/or reconfigure parking on Olive.

Glendale

- *Broadway Route Option vs. Colorado Route Option:* Stakeholders appeared split between the Broadway route option and the Colorado route option. Nevertheless, the majority of the comments received for Glendale were in general support of the Proposed Project along the Broadway route option; many identified potential connections to several key activity centers that would benefit the community.

Eagle Rock

- *Colorado Route Option vs. SR-134 Option:* Overall, the comments reflected a slightly higher preference for a street-running / Colorado Boulevard option through Eagle Rock; Metro received 692 comments in support of Colorado Boulevard vs. 579 comments supporting the SR-134 route option and/or expressing a need to revisit and evaluate the SR-134 freeway-running option in the Draft EIR. Commenters favoring the SR-134 identified concerns with traffic and changes to community character, among others, while commenters who preferred a street-running Colorado Boulevard option identified the benefits of introducing high-quality transit service in the community.

- Additionally, Metro received several petitions from area groups within Eagle Rock that shared positions for or against a Colorado Boulevard alignment; there were approximately 944 signatures supporting the Colorado route option and 592 signatures for a SR-134 route option; another 629 signatures expressed nonsupport for the Proposed Project but were not specific about either of the two alignments; another 230 signatures were submitted from out of State or out of country and could not be verified that they had any local stake in the Proposed Project.
- Several community members expressed the need to bypass Eagle Rock completely to preserve its community character.

### Pasadena

- *Colorado Route Option vs. Green/Union Route Option:* Although there was some preference expressed for the Colorado route option, there were also some who expressed concerns with its use and the potential associated increase of traffic and negative effects on businesses with dedicated bus lanes (even though it was communicated that the BRT would operate in mixed flow lanes through Pasadena); some others commented on the need for a Green/Union route option and the need for a connection to Pasadena City College.
- Some community members had questions and/or concerns regarding any effects the BRT might have on the Rose Parade should it operate on Colorado Boulevard.
- Some community members expressed a preference for the BRT to exit the SR-134 at Fair Oaks to allow for better connection to the Memorial Park L Line (Gold) station.

### Comments Related to Potential Bus Lane Configurations

- *Dedicated Bus Lanes:* Many expressed the need for the Proposed Project to include dedicated bus lanes, expressly to reduce travel times and increase speed and reliability of the Proposed Project; some comments included the need for enforcement of dedicated lanes to ensure unauthorized vehicles do not have access; additionally, some community members wanted to ensure that emergency vehicles would be able to use the dedicated lanes.
- *Median Running:* Several comments expressed the need for median-running bus lanes, specifically on Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock.
- *Side Running:* Several community members expressed a preference for a side-running configuration; some community members wanted the inclusion of parking and bike lanes along with the side-running configuration.

### Environmental and Other Issues

Other comments received focused on specific environmental resources including the following:

- *Traffic*: Stakeholders were concerned about potential circulation impacts on streets that are already highly congested, such as increased congestion, diversion of traffic onto adjoining neighborhoods, and concerns that emergency vehicles and evacuation routes would be negatively impacted. Most of these comments were related to the loss of a travel lane with the implementation of dedicated bus lanes.
- *Aesthetics*: Stakeholders were concerned about potential impacts to green space or landscaping due to median removal and/or street reconfigurations. Additionally, stakeholders expressed concern that implementation of BRT could negatively affect overall community aesthetics and sense of community character.
- *Zoning Changes*: Residents are concerned that the implementation of BRT would trigger an “upzoning” or change in zoning requirements that potentially could lead to further development and/or displacement.
- *Removal of Lanes*: Many stakeholders expressed concerns regarding the loss of parking, travel, or bicycle lanes to accommodate dedicated bus lanes; several stakeholders expressed the need for mixed-flow BRT along certain segments of the corridor, specifically along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock.

Some comments focused on other issues related to environmental resources and community issues including the following:

- *Businesses and Parking*: Many stakeholders expressed concerns that the implementation of BRT could negatively affect businesses and storefronts along the corridor with the removal of any parking spaces. Stakeholders were concerned about the loss of parking and indicated that parking should be replaced; additionally, they also express the need to consider parking at the BRT stations.
- *Stations and Connectivity*: Comments related to station placement and connectivity were also received. Some of the comments related to this topic included the need or desire to have stations and/or connectivity at the following locations:
  - Hollywood-Burbank Airport
  - Pasadena City College
  - Caltech
  - Metro L Line (Gold)
  - Harvey Drive, Figueroa Street, and Townsend Avenue in Eagle Rock
  - Universal City
  - Occidental College
  - Eagle Rock Plaza
- *First/Last Mile*: Comments received related to first/last mile strategies included the need to consider bike lanes as part of the Proposed Project and/or coordination with the existing or future planned bike lanes along the corridor.

- *Frequency and Reliability:* Several comments stressed the need to ensure that any alignment chosen increases the frequency and reliability of the Proposed Project. Additionally, comments mentioned the need to increase the frequency and reliability of existing bus services in the study area.
- *Ridership:* A few comments were received that questioned the projected ridership for the Proposed Project and whether the Proposed Project would be beneficial overall.

## 7.9 POST-SCOPING COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS

Metro conducted a series of public workshops consisting of a brief presentation, followed by several interactive activities including a virtual polling survey, priority pyramid, and street design activity. Some activities were tailored to each of the five communities. For example, in Pasadena, a different street activity showing the various route options and a focus on station amenities was conducted given the proposed mixed-traffic configuration of bus lanes. The activities’ purpose was to gain additional feedback on the street and station design considerations, understand priorities within each community and importance of amenities.

Noticing for the workshops included a series of eight email blasts to the Project database, consisting of over 5,000 contacts, social media advertisements on Facebook, meeting flyers distributed at public venues in the Project Area. Meeting notices were mailed to 11,599 discrete addresses. A total of 328 people attended the Post-Scoping Meetings in November 2019. **Table 7-5** provides the number of participants at each meeting.

**Table 7-5 – Post-Scoping Community Workshops**

Meeting	Number of Attendees
Pasadena Workshop Session 1: Wednesday, November 6	73 (Combined)
Pasadena Workshop Session 2: Wednesday, November 6	
Glendale Workshop: Tuesday, November 12	22
Burbank Workshop, Wednesday, November 13	17
Eagle Rock Workshop: Saturday, November 16	195
North Hollywood Workshop: Tuesday November 19	21

**SOURCE:** Metro, *Workshop Summary Report*, 2020.

The majority of local community members supported and/or were not opposed to the project. Many attendees had specific comments regarding the different route alignment options and configurations, station amenities, transit service needs and within the Eagle Rock community, a study and design consideration for an SR-134 Freeway option. The results of the priority pyramid activity are shown below:

- 1<sup>st</sup> Tier Priority: Transit Service and Amenities
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Tier Priority: Traffic Movement and Safety
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Tier Priority: Pedestrian Experience, Aesthetics/Sense of Place, and Green Initiative/Sustainability.

Virtual and online surveys conducted indicate the concerns and wishes of the respondents. The virtual survey was conducted during the community workshops and the online survey included an additional 428 respondents. A summary of survey responses is shown in **Table 7-6**, which includes the most frequently occurring answers and the percentage of respondents who provided the answer.

**Table 7-6 – Virtual and Online Survey Results**

Question	Virtual Survey Answer	Virtual Survey Answer Percentage	Online Survey Answer	Online Survey Answer Percentage
Which streetscape amenity around BRT stations is most important to you?	Street trees	52%	Street trees	50%
Which corresponding street improvements around BRT stations would you be most excited to see?	Crosswalk improvements for enhanced safety	46%	Bike lane improvements	41%
Which station amenity is most important to you?	Weather protection/shading	42%	Real-time bus arrival displays	41%
What aspects of the BRT would encourage you to use transit more often?	Clean vehicles and transit stops	47%	Clean vehicles and transit	54%
When taking transit, which is most important to you?	Transit stops near where I live and where I'm going	48%	Transit stops to where I live and where I want to go	40%
If additional landscaping is possible, where would you prefer to see it focused?	Along sidewalks	48%	Along sidewalks	56%
What currently discourages you from taking transit more often?	Limited schedule flexibility (train/bus schedule)	37%	Limited schedule flexibility	50%
If you were to use this BRT, what would you use it for?	To get to activity centers	42%	To travel to activity centers such as shopping and entertainment	51%
How often do you take transit?	Only on special occasions	26%	Regularly	25%
Which of the following describes you?	I live within the study area	51%	I live within the study area	57%

**SOURCE:** Metro, *Workshop Summary Report*, 2020.